Role was a key concept in this study. Its conceptual definitions vary from discipline to discipline. And in one discipline, the definitions are differentiated from author to author. Indeed there are many works of literature related to the genesis of the role concept. This section, however, includes only a selected few. Since, the immediate concern of this study was not the role itself but the role in the educational decision-making, role structure, role process (set), role effectiveness, role as perceived, role as expected and role congruency, short articles presenting personal points of view of the Thai scholars on the Thai Rectors are not reviewed here.

2.1 Literature Related to the Genesis of Role Concept:

The examination of the literature pertaining to role concept revealed that the concept of role has assumed a key position in the fields of cultural anthropology, sociology and social psychology. Each discipline has a different frame of reference. The conceptualizations of role contemplated by some prominent authorities in each field are discussed in this report.
Lionel J. Neiman and James W. Hughes once remarked that:

"... The concept of role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and nondefinitive. Frequently in the literature, the concept is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the concept, the assumption being that both writer and reader will achieve an immediate compatible consensus."

Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern added that there are many conceptualizations not only of role but also of role conflict which limit the examination of the degree of role consensus and the resolution of role conflict. They noted that:

"... not only had there been little systematic research on role consensus but slight attention had been directed to the theoretical implications of differential degrees of consensus on role definition, functioning of social systems, the behavior of individual or the cultural organization of a society."

Among anthropologists role is treated as an integral part of status, or as a link between culture and social structure, Benedict, for example, said:

"... No man ever looks at the world with pristine eyes. He sees it edited by a definite set of customs and institutions and ways of thinking. Even in his philosophical probings he cannot go behind these stereotypes; his very concept of the true and the false will have reference to his particular traditional customs."
Ralph Linton's *The Study of Man* reflected his great interest in the concepts of status and role. As the basis for his explanation of status and role, Linton conceived a "society" composed of three elements: individuals, an organized social system, and esprit de corps. A society is functioning on the basis of the reciprocal behaviour of individuals. To Linton, "social system" is:

".... The sum total of the ideal patterns which control the reciprocal behaviour between individuals and between the individual and society."

Like "culture" Linton said "status" has double significance:

".... A status, in the abstract, is a position in a particular pattern. It is thus quite correct to speak of each individual as having many statuses, since each individual participates in the expression of a number of patterns. However, unless the term is qualified in some ways, the status of any individual means the sum total of all the statuses which he occupies. It represents his position with relation to the total society...."

A status as distinct from the individual it is simply a collection of rights and duties.

Two main types of statuses: 'ascribed statuses', and 'achieved statuses' were introduced by Linton.

".... Ascribed statuses are those which are assigned to individuals without reference to their innate differences or abilities. They can be predicted and trained for from the moment of birth. The achieved statuses are, as a minimum,
those requiring special qualities, although they are not necessarily limited to these. They are not assigned to individuals from birth but are left open to be filled through competition and individual effort."

Litton simply defined "role" as

"...dynamic aspect of status ... when he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role".

To him, status and role are inseparable. Role, similar to status, is used with a double significance:

"... Every individual has a series of roles deriving from various patterns in which he participates and at the same time a role, general, which represents the sum total of those roles and determines what he does for his society and what he can expect from it."

Linton further explained:

"... To such individuals the combined status and role represent the minimum of attitudes and behaviour which he must assume if he is to participate in the overt expression of the pattern ... they become for organizing the attitudes and behavior of the individual so that will be congruous with those of the other individuals participating in the expression of the pattern."

S.F. Vadal, later, contended that:

"... as an anthropologist, I view roles as modes of acting "allotted to individuals" by the norms of the society."
I am concerned also with this very allocation and the principles on which it is based, which means that my definition and analysis of role must include their "basis", the conditions entailing the "future characteristics", as much as these characteristics themselves.”

To him role is dynamic or procedural. It is not a dynamic part of status as viewed by Linton. Nadel suggested "quasi-roles" to be an appropriate term for status. He preferred to think of status, in "non-hierarchical sense, "a particular set of rights and obligations. Instead of viewing status and role as two sides of the same coin, Nadel inferred that "status is capable of being elaborated into roles while all roles have a foundation in status." These sets of attributes of roles proposed by Nadel are:

1. Peripheral attributes - its absence or variation does not affect perception of the role,
2. Required attributes - its absence or variation alter perception of the role,
3. Sanction may be applied to correct imperfect perception of the role; and
4. Legitimating or pivotal attributes - its absence or variations changes the whole identity of the role.

Sociologists' studies of roles emphasize interaction. Talcott Parsons considered interactions of individual actors as social system of action. To him the object world is composed of social, physical and cultural objects.
A social object is an actor i.e. ego or alter. Physical objects are empirical entities i.e. means and conditions of action. Cultural objects are symbols or a value pattern i.e. ideas or beliefs. While being part of a process of interaction, the act is an elementary unit of a social system.

Status-role is the unit of a social system and is a higher unit than the act. In other words, Parsons recognized status and role as attributes of an action. His views of status-role is similar to that of Linton, i.e.:

"... Each individual actor is involved in a plurality of such interaction relationships each with one or more partners in the complementary role. Hence, it is the participation of an actor in a patterned interactive relationship which is for many purposes the most significant unit of the social system.

This participation in turn has two principal aspects. On the one hand there is the positional aspect - that is of the actor in question where he is 'located' in the social system relative to other actors. This is what we will call his status, which is his place in the relationship system considered as a structure, that is a patterned system of parts. On the other hand there is the procedural aspect, that of what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system. It is this which we shall call his role."

Kingsley Davis broadened sociological perspectives of role by adding 'office' to status. He looked at role as actual
behavior and treated office and status as definers of obligatory behavior of the incumbent. In other words, Davis preferred looking at role in action as he pointed out:

"... How an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform, we call his role .... The term 'role' is meaningless without the implication that the individual is trying or is expected to try, to carry out the minimal requirements of his status. In one sense, the role is the particular way in which a given individual falls short of performing the stipulated patterns. If the individual fails completely short he does not occupy the position at all. The very fact that he does not fail completely short is due to the normative elements inherent in the status."

Differently from others, Homans did not emphasize role but the interaction process upon which 'ideal' role or ought-to-be role exerts "de jure influence". In other words, his main interest is the actual role.

"... Our society, for instance has inherited certain unwritten rules or norms about how a physician ought to behave toward his patients and toward other physicians. It has inherited what sociologists call the physician's role in this study I shall not be interested in so doing ... Doctors do not live up to their role equally well, and the role itself leaves plenty of gap for variations."

Homans treated actual roles as activities resulting from the actor's evaluation of cost against reward.

"... When a course of action requires a man to give up one reward in order to get another, we speak of the action as the
value of the foregone alternative. Cost is negative value, and the higher the cost of an activity, the less likely a man is to emit it."

Also he views status as a stimuli of cost or reward of action.

"... we shall use status to refer to the stimuli a man presents to other man (and to himself)..."

The stimuli that make up a man's status include the kind of reward he receives -- among them his esteem itself -- the kinds of activity he emits ...."

Thomas E. Lasswell agreed with Homans on the concept of status-role.

"... The man-in-interaction searches for symbolic cues for the purpose of perceiving the status of others in every social situation. He compares these cues with his cognitive images of persons and configurations of statuses. In this essential way he relates himself to others and also defines social situations. Likewise, status perception performs a basic role in social organization and in social adjustment."

Robert K. Merton supplemented role-sets, status-sets and their sequences to the concept of role-status prescribed by Linton. Furthermore, Merton distinguished role-set from 'multiple roles' as follows:

"... the complement of role relationships which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status ... multiple roles refer to the complex of roles associated not with a single social status, but with the various statuses (often in differing institutional spheres) in which individuals find themselves -- the roles, for example, connected with the distinct statuses of teacher, wife, mother, catholic, republican and so on. We designate this complement of social statuses of an individual as his statuses in turn having its distinctive role-set."
The sequence of role-sets and status-sets was disclosed by Merton as:

"... Considered as changing in the course of time, the succession of statuses occurring with sufficient frequency as to be socially patterned will be designated as is status-sequence, as in the case, for example, of the statuses successively occupied by a medical student, intern, resident, and independent medical practitioner. In much the same sense, of course, we can observe consequences of role-sets and status-sets."

Role theory written by Theodore R. Sarbin, a social psychologist, emphasized 'self' as the unit of personality. The other two conceptual units included in his role theory were role, the unit of culture; position, the unit of society.

He viewed role as the result of the interaction between two series of events. The first is the maturation series, the second is the personal-social series. The maturation series of events may be assumed to be fairly constant from culture to culture, the personal-social of events is the major determinant of psychological variation.

Sarbin defined a position as "a system of role expectations". His statement on role-expectation also specified variables affecting variations of role enactment.

"... Person occupies positions or statuses in interaction situations. Psychologically considered, positions are cognitive systems of role expectations, products of learning. Role expectations are bidimensional for every role expectation of other there is a
reciprocal role expectation of self. The organized sections of the person, directed toward fulfilling these role expectations, comprise the role. Variation in role enactment is a function of at least three variables.

(1) The validity of role perception (this implies the concurrent or just prior to perception and locating the position of other and reciprocally of self).

(2) Skill in role enactment (related to practice in the use of as if behavior).

(3) The current organization of the self—a cognitive structure that exercised a selective and directive effect on role perception and enactment.

2.1.1 Role Concepts: A deeper penetration into the concept of "role" reveals a number of possible ramifications. Thus, a "role prescription" is a social norm for a role, abstractly defined by the culture. A "role stereotype" is an individual's own personalized perception of a role, which may be largely shared with other people or be idiosyncratic. A "role description" is a report on behaviours of the role incumbents. A "role expectation" is an anticipation of a behaviour or a set of behaviour of other persons in a role. A "role perception" is an estimate of another person's expectation for one's own role. If the other person is seen as having a right to hold this expectation, it is regarded as "legitimate", if he is seen as not having such a right, then it is regarded as "illegitimate". Similarly, one's expectations for another
role may be viewed as "rights", while another person's expectations for one's own role are "obligations". Since many people may have expectations for a given focal position on role, a particular set of expectations coming from a single counter position or role may be described as applying to a "role sector". Finally, any particular role behaviour which has primarily a gratificational or deprivational significance is called a "sanction".

"Role-playing" is a term usually used to describe the overt social behaviour of a person, what he does in his role. "Role-taking" pertains to one's sympathising with another's role, usually in a passive manner. "Playing at a role", is pretending that one is acting in a training situation. Because of the possible confusion between "role-playing" and "playing at a role", the former is often better referred to as "role enactment".

The "status" of a position or role is the rank or prestige it has within its social structure. The individual's perception of his own status is his "subjective status", which is in contrast with his "objective status" (that which is accorded to him by others). This pair of term is somewhat related to "ascribed" and "achieved" status, where "ascribed" refers to status assigned to an individual because of his position, regardless of his abilities or
differences; such ascribed status attaches to the role itself. "Achieved Status", is that earned by the particular incumbent in a role because of his special qualities and performance. Any given occupied role may; therefore, have a portion of both ascribed and achieved status.*

2.1.2 Decision-Making: The essential process of adaptation in organization is decision, whereby the physical, biological, personal, and social factors of the situation are selected for specific combination by volitional action.¹

The task of "deciding" pervades the entire administrative organization quite as much as the task of "doing".²

The central function of administration is directing and controlling the decision-making process. It is not only central in the sense that it is more important than other functions, as some writers have indicated, but it is central in that all other functions of administration can best be interpreted in terms of the decision-making process.³


The present investigator finds it convenient to take mild liberties with the English language by using "decision-making" as though it were synonymous with "managing". 4

The executive is a decider and not a doer. 5

Decision-making, even for those who doubt its centrality to the theory and practice of administration, has become too important to ignore. More is involved than a simple relabeling of old concepts and experiences. The interest in decision-making symbolizes a fundamental reorientation in our view of organizations and the rapidly developing liaison between theories of administration and ideas from economics, statistics, mathematics, and the behavioural sciences. As a basic framework for organizational analysis, the decision-making approach has power, breadth, and sympathetic connections with other disciplines. 6

2.2 Research Related to University Rector's Role:

The Academic Man written by Logan Wilson was one of the pioneer studies of American professors. The author's


useful discussion on how a sociological treatment of structure and function might affect personnel problems of the academic profession emphasizes on the academicians, dispositions. Facts presented in the book represented first hand information acquired by the author from professors themselves such as Sorokin, C.C. Zimmerman, Talcott Parsons, Robert K. Merton, and Kingsley Davis. Wilson saw professors as occupying dual positions: a professional man and an employee, in a semi-bureaucratic organization. These facts create structural and personal tensions. Wilson found that competition characterized the academician's profession. The book revealed levels of the academic hierarchy: instructors, assistant professor, associate professor and full professor; problems of status, status evaluation, socio-economic status, and professional status; the social processes and functions. The author utilized sociological concepts of role and status in his analysis of academicians' problems. Wilson defined role and status as follows:

"... an individual's total status is the position he occupies in society. Status is determined by all sorts of reciprocal relations, so that one's self or social personality is the net result of these relations. Certain statuses are ascribed on the basis of sex, age, class position, et cetera, and entail definite or vague rights and duties. Other statuses, such as being a professor, Rotarian, Republican, are primarily achieved, but they also involve rights and duties. Role is the acting out of status or the dynamic side of social position."
Within the college or university ....
status or social positions .... created
formally or informally by the social
organization of higher learning, and when
occupied by concrete persons they became
individual roles. The acting out of
statuses is seen dynamically in the
functional aspects of organization.

The author treated the university as a social
organization whose structure (what it is) is based on
a sound plan of social architecture and whose function
(what it does) is based on competent academicians. He,
therefore, suggested that to discover the basic problems
of professors, one must consider that professors not
only have status within the university system but they
also occupy a broader socioeconomic status or position
in the larger society. Wilson stated that:

".... Since one's social position or
status always stands in reciprocal
relation to the statuses of other
persons, it is impossible not to
consider the socioeconomic status of the
academic man without references to the
non-academic associates...."

His study, however, neither explored attitudes of
"non-academic associates" on professors nor described their
reciprocal relations.

Lazarsfeld and Thielens introduced the Academic
Mind which reported comprehensive information about the
state of mind of 2451 social science professors in 1965
American colleges and universities during the McCarthy Era. It is worth knowing how professors' jobs and their academic freedom were affected by the difficult political situation. Although Professor David Riesman indicated some shortcomings of research techniques used in gathering data, he, however, admitted that they did not seriously impair the conclusions.

Lasarsfeld and Thielens presented detailed data about social science professors' education, family backgrounds, associations, political habits as well as attitudes toward the profession.

Caplow's 'The Academic Market Place' is a correlative reading of the two preceding books. The purpose of the study, stated in the Foreward was:

"... this book deals with the two fundamental concerns of academic man their working conditions and their performance ex cathedra...."

Caplow's definition and evaluation of prestige were discussed in Wilson's term:

"... professional recognition is achieved through activities engaging a minor portion of the average man's activities.

The prestige of the educator is primarily dependent on his students, that of the scholar is independent of his students. The latter performs of an audience of experts, competes with equals, and therefore, his prestige and the visibility of his achievement are relatively independent of the institution that supports him..."
He emphasized,

"... the value of a position to its incumbent is determined not only by his status within the organization but by the prestige of the whole organization in its external environment.

University Rectors: Problems and Reward in College Teaching by Millett revealed advantages and disadvantages of college teaching. The author's main concern was to help young persons to make intelligent professional choices in the academic market place. His chapters on "The Rector's Job", "The Rectors' Day", and "Shadows in the Picture", reflected activities and responsibilities of the rector in twentieth century America.

Marshall's The Mobility of College Teachers criticized Caplow and McGee's The Academic Market Place that "seems too ambitious and all inclusive. Many of their conclusions applicable for the broader market picture. The book provided representation of the natural sciences and the humanities (Chemistry, English) as a balance to the previous survey of social scientists. It disclosed both functioning and malfunctioning of the academic market place.

Hakanson in "College and University Professor" grouped

* University Professor = University Rector, he teaches in various fields acutely.
315 articles by subject matter area into four five-year periods: 1946-1950, 1951-1955, 1956-1960, 1961-1965. His purpose was to study the content of articles about professors published in the popular magazines, its trends and changes during 1946-1960. The study is focused on the subject matter areas of professorial involvement, not the image of professors. Those areas were academic freedom, academic personality, opportunities and compensations, academic life and student rights. He found that during 1941-1955 there were more articles about the academic freedom, none about academic life which later became the most popular topic during 1956-1965.

A sample of faculty and students of public universities in the eastern United States provided information for Barnard's study. Barnard classified faculty work role into seventeen segments. Faculty and students were asked how much importance they placed upon each segment. This provided a measure of role expectations. The faculty were asked how difficult it was for them to meet expectations of students, faculty and administration for each segment. This provided a measure of role conflict.

Faculty, also were asked how much importance they thought students placed upon each segment. Barnard reported that faculty rate instructional activities as important as
do students. Role expectations for faculty work activities differed according to the respondent's status. The highest level of role conflict was found in research and writing activities.

Klapper's study was much like Barnard's study. A differentiating factor between the two studies was that Klapper omitted students' role expectations for the faculty work role but included those of administrators. Her justification for the omission was:

"... students rarely have more than limited and indirect power over faculty. The ultimate decision to apply sanctions, and the power to do so, rests with administration, and/or, to a lesser degree, with the faculty itself. For this reason, and for time and budgetary limits as well, expectations held by students were not included.

Her data consisted of personal interviews with 120 faculty members and 8 administrators in four leading liberal arts colleges. Klapper found seven different sources of role strain:

"... (1) the college reward system, (2) the lack of consensus (among the faculty, and between faculty and administrators) on the definition of the role of the college professor, (3) the college work load, (4) the college atmosphere, (5) the lack of research facilities, and (6) the felt pressures toward research and publications."

About seventeen per cent of the faculty members experienced role strain. Research was their central problem.
Klapper differentiated role strain from role conflict. To her, role conflict "is actually a special case of the more general phenomenon, role strain, being a more intense and deeply felt strain perhaps proceeding from the existence of conflicting expectations in the role-set. Briefly she defined role strain as the faculty member's expressed difficulty in fulfilling his role obligations. There were five major classifications of the faculty member's obligations: teaching, counselling, research, committee work and administration.

AAUP has exerted "mode of influence" on higher education and on the professor in the United States, said Kadish. Differently from others, he viewed such influence entailed in the development of the theory of the profession as an integrated set of propositions with respect to (1) the nature of higher education (2) shared values, and (3) understanding of the roles.

As far as researches into the educational decision-making process of the Thai University Administrators are concerned, it can be stated that in Thailand a few researches have been done in this area. However, there is an indication that awareness of the significance of this type of research became larger. There is no doubt that one cannot investigate this problem without the co-operation of the Executive Officers of the University Affairs.