CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

7.1 Conclusions:

There were three objectives of the present investigation:

1. To study the structure of decision making and the process of Thai Rectors' role in educational administrative system.

2. To study the effectiveness of decision-making of the Rectors in the Thai University administrative system.

3. To find out ways and means to make the decisions of the Rectors more acceptable and implementable.

7.1.1 The findings on the first objective are:

1. The University Rectors in Educational Decision Making of both Central and Regional levels have enough membership tenure to work for 2-4 years (from Q12 of Role Structure or R-I).

2. The University Rectors at both the Central and Regional levels, need expertise for their target setting roles for higher education budgets (from Q3 of Role Process or R-II).

3. According to the Senior Staff Group Sample the Regional University Rectors more comprehensively discuss and study
the problems of their staff and committees than the Central ones before any decision on higher education are taken. It was according to $Q_{20}$ of Role Process (R-II.)

7.1.2 The findings on the second objective are:

1. The University Rectors at both the Central and the Regional levels, carry out the tasks of Educational Decision Making according to the philosophy formulated by the UCSC (the University Civil Service Commission). It was from $Q_{10}$ of Role Effectiveness or R-III.

2. They are playing difficult roles under the administrative complexity (from $Q_{33}$ of Role Effectiveness or R-III).

7.1.3 The findings on the third objective are:

1. The Central University Rectors have got several problems from several principles of higher education (from $Q_{26}$ of Role Acceptable Ways or R-IV).

2. The Central University Rectors get opinion from their personnel for decision making (from $Q_{19}$ of Role Implementable means or R-V).

7.2 Hypotheses and Conclusions:

The present investigation was started under four hypotheses. They were:

H 1). The Hypothesis 1: "The Rector Position incumbent in the Central University system will assign more responsibility
to his position than the Rector position in the Regional University". The conclusions are:

1) The Central University Rectors have got several problems of different principles of higher education (from Q26, $H_1$ proved).

2) The Central University Rectors get opinion from their personnel in decision-making. (from Q19, $H_1$ proved).

3) There are inadequate facilities for the Regional University Rectors in Educational Decision Making. It can be concluded that there are more adequate facilities for the Central University Rectors in Educational Decision Making ($H_1$ Proved).

H 2) The Hypothesis 2: 'Incumbents of the Rector focal position will assign relatively greater responsibility to their own position than incumbents of counter position will assign to it'. The conclusions are:

1) The Role Structure of Educational Decision Making both at the Central and the Regional Universities is such that the University Rectors have enough tenure to play in 2-4 years for their educational decisions (from Q12, $H_2$ Tested).
The Central and Regional University Rectors have much in common in their roles relationship. All their roles are homogeneous and not heterogeneous (from Table 11, H2 Tested).

Both the Central and the Regional University Rectors facilitate the advancement of knowledge as a philosopher playing the role expectation (from Table 13, H2 Tested).

The process they adopt is democratic as they hold meetings, in actual role playing. Their perceived role and expected role in decision-making is congruent in Thailand. (H2 Tested).

The Hypothesis 3: "There is more consensus of University Rectors (as professors) on expectations of attributes than their obligations". The conclusions are:

1. The University Rectors at both the Central and the Regional levels, need experts for their roles for setting the targets of higher education budgets (from Q3, H3 pointed out).

2. The Regional University Rectors conduct a comprehensive study by discussing some problems of their staff and committees much more than the Central ones before any decision on higher education is taken. This result came from the Senior Staff Group sample (from Q20, H3 Pointed out).
As responded by the Senior Staff Group, Rectors' role as an evaluator and a researcher regarding congruency at both the Central and the Regional levels are excellent (from table 15, H₃ pointed out).

Generally, there is more consensus in the Thai Universities on 'what the Rectors should be' than 'what the Rectors should do'. This significance was generalized from the concept of Basic Assumption 1.

In terms of expectations on the University Rectors' attributes of Rectors' role as a Decision-Maker and his obligations, the Thai Rectors' experience less conflict with the administrators (from Basic Assumption 2, H₃).

The Hypothesis H₄: 'There is more effectiveness of the Rectors at the Central than the Regional University levels'.

The conclusions are:

In Role Effectiveness for Educational Decision Making, the University Rectors at both the Central and the Regional levels, carry out the tasks of Educational Decision-Making according to the philosophy formulated by the UCSC (the University Civil Service Commission) (Q₁₀, H₄ Proved), and they
are playing roles which are difficult under the administrative complexity (from $Q_{33}$, $H_4$ Proved).

(2) The University Rectors subscribe to the modern philosophy and goals at the Central and the Regional Universities in Thailand. (from the concept of Basic Assumption 3, $H_4$ proved). This finding can empower role of the University Rectors in educational decisions more effectively.

(3) Role of the University Rectors in Educational Decision Making at the Central Universities in Bangkok is much more advanced than at the Regional Universities in the provincial areas of Thailand. (from the concept of Basic Assumption 1, $H_4$ Proved).

7.3 Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Study:

Following recommendations are made for reducing the University Rectors' role strains:

The Thai University Rectors group at both the Central and the Regional levels, Deans group and Senior Staff group including Chairmen of Students Unions should recognize that it is time for rearrangement of their responsibilities in order to carry out the functions that society expects of all the Universities to perform.

There are twelve major functions which are expected by all the groups concerned to be performed by the University Rectors:
1) The development of human intellectual abilities.
2) The facilitation of advancement in knowledge.
3) The facilitation of advancement in technology.
4) The production of professional manpower for nation.
5) The promotion in culture and art.
6) The enhancement in morality and ethics.
7) The establishment of democratic principles.
8) The realization of all higher learning ambitions in implementation for a nation.
9) The preservation of both administrative and academic knowledge.
10) The transmission of both administrative and academic knowledge.
11) The production of both administrative and academic knowledge, and
12) The provision of social services.

There is a close link between these functions of the University and the responsibilities of the University Rectors at both the Central and the Regional levels. The University administrators and Chairmen of Students Unions are expected to fulfil obligations for administration, teaching
and learning respectively. At present, there are very heavy and important demands on the Universities to attend more closely to the provision of social services. Such demands require coordination of administration, teaching and learning. The area of responsibility held by the University Rectors, administrators and Chairmen of Students Unions, should not be mutually exclusive. They all should recognize that there should be correspondence between Rectors' "Primary" obligation and "Secondary" obligation. The University Rectors have to recognize interrelationships among their obligation of administration, research, teaching students and social services. All these obligations should be acknowledged and supported, both materially and socially by the University Executive Officers. Educational decision-making administrators at the Central Universities are responsible for balancing burdens and satisfactions of the University Rectors through providing them: good working facilities, positive responses to their requests for participation in policy decision-making and for scientific evaluative standards of performance whereas Educational decision-making administrator (especially, the University Rectors) at the Regional Universities can be brought to recognize that their task is to link learning and scholarship. They need to develop such behaviour as self-discovered learning and self-appropriated learning. The University Executive Officers should recognize that one of their reasons of going to a University is to leap the benefits of reading
books and articles, writing research papers and exchanging ideas with other people through seminar and informal discussion.

It should be clear that human resources are limited. Since there are rising expectations for various functions of the universities on the one hand, and for multiple obligations of University Rectors, administrators and Chairmen of the students on the other, this proposal calls for University Rector group which comprises University Rectors', Vice-Rectors', Directors', Deans' Groups, which is composed of Deans, Deputy-Deans and Heads of departments, and Senior Staff groups which comprises of Senior Teaching Staff members and Chairmen of the Students Unions of the University, to be devoted and committed to their tasks on a higher level. One purpose for them is to recognize the importance of their aggregate effort to move the University towards a functional relationship, which can, in turn, improve the administrative-teaching-learning and decision-making process and the productivity.

The administrative structure of the Thai Universities should be studied and if necessary changed to provide for better adaptation to the changes taking place in the function of the University and in the Thai society.

There is not only a need for inducing relationships between the individual participants and the universities but also a need for inducing relationship between the Universities and the larger system which comprises its environment. The
University Rectors should interact actively with the environment in order to stimulate a reaction by their Universities, either static or dynamic. If the reaction is static, the Universities will respond to the environment by maintaining the relationship at its original state. A dynamic reaction would be characterized by rearrangement of its functions and administrative structure. Universities in Thailand have not resisted, in fact, have often welcomed changes in their functions, but they have not yet adapted to the University Rector's administrative structure accordingly. The present structure cannot meet all needs, either within or outside the Universities. In order to reduce University Rector's role strain and to have universities make more efficient contributions to society, this proposal is designed to redirect the Central and the Regional University Rectors together with the Executive Officers aggravate efforts through rearrangements of the University administrative structure in which all interests will be suitably represented and recognized.

All problems regarding role of the University Rectors in educational decision making is lost knowledge and ability. As yet, the responsibility and their influencing power have not been accepted from other university executive officers' opinion. Its problem is counted for the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education at the best. The University Rectors and their staff should acceptably find ways and means to remove them implementably.
The University Rectors by co-operation of the Office of University Affairs and the National Education Commission or the concerned offices should organize extensions for conferences, vast training in order to adapt their attitude and receive an innovation on educational decisions for the developing universities in running their own universities suitably.

The present data can be used in policy planning and development of educational administration in Thai universities. They might help the Rector's decisions as well.