

THE CONCEPT OF ROLE

by Titaya Suvanajata

INTRODUCTION

According to Nadel, Pareto (1916) was the first who recognized the sociological significance of the status or labels that influence behavior of persons, and Weber (1920) who outlined the methodological issues in empirical sociological analysis aimed at understanding the different motivations of individuals in the given types of societies.¹ Since then, the concepts of Status and Role have been increasingly used. It was George Herbert Mead (*Mind, Self and Society*, 1934) and Ralph Linton (*The Study of Man*, 1936) who were the main-springs by which the role-concept has been put into the circulation of sociological, anthropological and psychological study. Lionel J. Nieman and James W. Hughes after their re-survey of the literature about role-concept, arrived at the conclusion that,

The concept of role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and non-definitive. 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 concensus. Concomitantly, the concept is found frequently in popular usage which adds further confusion.²

This paper is an attempt to search for the possibility of arriving at the clarification of the concept by looking at different disciplines, namely, Anthropology, Sociology and Social Psychology. These are the fields in which the role-concept is widely used. With the assumption that each discipline has different frame of references, the leading authorities of each field will be examined with the hope that consensus can

¹ S.F. Nadel, *Theory of Social Structure* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 21-22.

² Lionel J. Nieman and James W. Hughes, *Social Forces*, Vol. 30, (December, 1951), p. 149.

be obtained. Owing to the limited command of English which the author has, one will find many quotations being cited, because clarity can better be achieved in this way rather than through the use of the author's own words.

Let us turn, then, to each social science discipline, and examine its concept of role.

ROLE FROM THE ANTHROPOLOGIST'S POINT OF VIEW

The thesis of the anthropologist is based on the manifestation of culture. As Ruth Benedict wrote:

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 concepts of the true and the false will still have reference to his particular traditional customs. John Dewey has said in all seriousness that the part played by custom in shaping the behavior of the individual as over against any way in which he can affect traditional custom, is as the proportion of the total vocabulary of his mother tongue over against those words of his own baby talk that are taken up into the vernacular of his family.³

Ralph Linton was the first to offer a cogent concept of role. He views society as functioning on the basis of the reciprocal behavior of individuals or groups of individuals. "Status" is seen as a polar position in reciprocal patterns of behavior. In the absence of social interaction, the concept of status is meaningless. He wrote that:

The term status, like the term culture, has come to be used with a 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 way, the status of any individual means the sum total of

³ Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture* (New York: The New American Library, 1958), p. 18.

all the statuses which he occupies. It represents his position with relation to the total society. . . .

A status, as distinct from the individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties.⁴

Status, thus, exists prior to recognition of a certain individual as the incumbent. It is like garment which one wears. Then comes the role, which is the other side of the coin. Linton defines role as "the dynamic aspect of status."⁵

The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and the duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role. Role and status are quite inseparable, and the distinction between them is of only academic interest. There are no roles without status, the term role 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 these roles and determines what he does for his society and what he can expect from it.

. . . To such individuals the combined status and role represent the minimum of attitudes and behavior which he must assume if he is to participate in the overt expression of the pattern. Status and role serve to reduce the ideal patterns for social life to individual terms. They become models for organizing the attitudes and behavior of the individual so that these will be congruous with those of the other individuals participating in the expression of the pattern.⁵

Linton, furthermore, classifies status into two types—*ascribed* and *achieved* which are distinguished as follows :

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

⁴ Ralph Linton, *The Study of Man* (Student's ed.; New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1936), p. 113.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

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.⁶

Age and sex are the basic distinctions for the ascription of status in all social systems. Without interference from external sources most members of a society will adjust to their statuses and roles and society will function smoothly. But in a very well adjusted society, the social value of individual thought and initiative decreases. This is so, as Linton observes, because:

Through training of the component individuals becomes more necessary to the survival and successful functioning of society than the free expression of their individual abilities. Even leadership, which calls for marked ability under conditions of change becomes largely a matter of routine activities.⁷

Nadel, the British anthropologist, defines role as actual behavior, not as a static status or position. Role is dynamic or processual.

... as an anthropologist, I view roles as modes of acting 'alloted 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 'further characteristics,' as much as these characteristics themselves.⁸

Nadel disagrees with Linton's view of role as the dynamic part of status:

If it is felt that the quasi-roles ought to be especially named, status seems an appropriate term. Used broadly, in a non-hierarchical and not necessarily jural sense, it describes precisely such mere 'briefs' or 'occupancies,' i.e., particular sets of rights and obligations falling to persons. So understood, status is capable of being elaborated into roles while all roles have a foundation in status. I confess to some dislike for this broad, Jack-of-all-trades use of status, which I would restrict to

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁸ S.F. Nadel, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

hierarchical position. What is more important, most writers on the subject couple roles and status in a different sense, considering them to be strictly complementary concepts, so-to-speak two sides of the same coin I doubt the value of this double appellation; indeed I consider it not only redundant but misleading.⁹

To him, what Linton considers role is only the *governing factor* for the role proper, which a process, expressed by the following formula:

$$P = a, b, c, \dots, n$$

$$P = \text{'role'}$$

$$a, b, c, \dots, n = \text{attributes.}$$

Attributes of roles are classified into three main categories:

Peripheral attributes, the variation or absence of which does not effect the perception or effectiveness of the role, that is, they are understood to be optional or to admit of alternatives.

Required attributes, in which case variation or absence will alter perception of the role, and it is likely that sanctions will be applied in an effort to correct the perceived imperfect performance of the role. For example, the role of barber requires that attention be devoted primarily to cutting hair, not to giving massages or manicures.

Legitimizing, or pivotal attributes. Absence or variation of this type of attribute changes the whole identity of the role and the interaction which it would normally provoke. As an example, Nadel cites the situation of cohabitation without the pivotal attribute of marriage, in which case the couples roles are not husband and wife, but only "as good as husband and wife."¹⁰

Nadel's treatment of role seems to rely on sociological concepts of interaction to a greater extent than do the anthropological approaches, which tend to stay within the boundaries of the concept of culture.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-33.

Walter Goldschmidt follows Linton's line of approach. He places greater emphasis on status as position in a vertical scale, while recognizing it as a position relative to others:

For every social position carries with it an appropriate mode of behavior. A role may be thought of as the blueprint for the behavior considered suitable to a particular social position; it is not the behavior itself, but the rules and expectations what should be done when a particular office is held. . . . We must also note that the same statuses may have different role expectations in different societies. . . . Many special factors may intervene . . . the role expectations are set by the culture, and that from one culture to another, or from one time to another, they may vary widely, though expectations may be quite explicit in a given time and place. . . .¹¹

In short, the anthropologist views role as an integral part of status, culturally defined. Under the common frame of reference provided by culture, each member of the society possesses a stereotype of the behavior which he anticipates from each other in social intercourse. The means to enforce or stabilize the stereotype is sanction against deviance. Inquiry proceeds at the level of society, in which the anthropologist recognizes a culture. It is not confined to the interaction of ego and alter, eventhough he uses ego and alter as a unit of analysis. The underlying assumption is that each culture follows a pattern, from which social behaviors are derived. Ruth Benedict refers to such a pattern as the "ethos" of the culture; to Morris Opler, these underlying cultural assumptions are "themes," defined as follows:

. . . a postulate or position, declared or implied, and usually controlling behavior or stimulating activity, which is tacitly approved or openly promoted in society . . . (a theme) is identified by and directly related to behavior by its expressions, the

¹¹ Walter Goldschmidt, *Exploring the Way of Mankind* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 316-22.

activities, prohibition of activities, or references which result from the acceptance or affirmation of a theme in a society.¹²

ROLE FROM THE SOCIOLOGIST'S POINT OF VIEW

The sociologist studies the interaction of roles. As Parsons recognizes, social system of action are the interactions of individual actors which can be systematized. He also recognizes other ingredients in the interaction itself :

It is convenient in action terms to classify the object world as composed of the three classes of 'social,' 'physical,' and 'cultural' objects. A social object is an actor, which may in turn be any given other individual actor (alter), the actor who is taken as a point of reference himself(ego), or a collectivity which is treated as a unit for purposes of the analysis of orientation. Physical objects are empirical entities which do not 'interact' with or 'respond' to ego. They are means and conditions of his action. Cultural tradition, ideas or beliefs, expressing symbols or value patterns so far as they are treated as situational objects by ego and are not 'internalized' as constitutive elements of the structure of his personality.¹³

According to Harp, once the interaction of self (ego or alter) with roles is emphasized, role study is no longer sociological in nature.¹⁴ Now let us examine the concept of role from the sociologist's point of view

Parson recognizes any act as an elementary unit of a social system when it is part of a process of interaction. Status-role is a higher unit than the act. Like Linton, he takes status and role as the unit of a social system, not generally speaking, as attributes of the actor. Status exists prior to, and independently of, a particular incumbent. In his words,

¹² Ralph L. Beals and Harry Hoijor, *An Introduction to Anthropology* (2nd ed.; New York: the MacMillan Company, 1959), p. 236.

¹³ Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), p. 4.

¹⁴ John Harp, *Reflections On Role Theory*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Department of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, 1961). Mimeo., graphed, p. 5.

The actor in this sense is a composited bundle of statuses and roles. But this social actor must be distinguished from the personality as itself a system of action. This distinction derives from the mutual irreducibility of personality and social systems.¹⁵

Similarly to Linton, he sees role as the obverse aspect of status, defining it as follows:

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 of where the actor in question 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 patterned system of parts. On the other hand, there is the processual 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.

The distinction between status and role is at the root very closely related to that between the two reciprocal perspectives inherent in interaction. On the one hand each actor is an object of orientation of others (reciprocity between ego and alter) It should be made quite clear that statuses and roles, or the status role bundle, are in general attributes of the actor, but are units of the social system, though having a given status may sometimes be treated as an attributes. But the status-role is analogous to the particle of mechanics, not to mass or velocity.¹⁶

¹⁵ Parsons, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

According to him the components of action have two aspects :

— The gratificational aspect by which he means “the content of his (the actor’s) interchange with the object world, what he gets out of his interaction with it, and what its ‘costs’ to him are.” It also includes capacities or abilities of the actor.

— The orientation aspect by which he means “. . . the ‘how’ of his relation to the object world, the patterns or ways in which his relation to it are organized.” The orientational aspect is classified into :

(1) Cognitive orientation, which refers to “the definition” of the relevant aspects of the situation to the actor’s “interests.” This is, then, the cognitive orientation aspect, or cognitive mapping, in Tolman’s terminology.¹⁷

(2) Cathetic orientation, which means the significance of ego’s relation to the object or objects in question for the gratification-deprivation balance of his personality.¹⁸

(3) Evaluation — the process of ordering selection among alternatives.

Expectation is the sum total of the above three elements. He also appreciates the significance of culture :

In one sense ‘motivation’ consists of orientation to improvement of the gratification-deprivation balance of the actor. But since action without cognitive and evaluative components in its orientation is inconceivable within the action frame of reference, the term motivation will here be used to include all three aspects, not only the cathetic. But from this motivational orientation aspect or the totality of action it is in view of the role of symbolic systems, necessary to distinguish a ‘value orien-

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

tation' aspect. This aspect concerns not the meaning of the expected state of affairs to the actor in terms of his gratification-deprivation balance but the content of the selective standards themselves. The concept of value-orientations in this sense is thus the logical device for formulating one central aspect of the articulation of cultural traditions into the action systems.¹⁹

The value orientation also has three modes: the cognitive, the appreciative and the moral. He also recognizes culture and personality as independent variables.

Unlike Parsons, Kingsley Davis perceives role as actual behavior itself. He adds "office" to "status" in order to specify that both define obligatory behavior for the incumbent. The effectiveness of fulfilling the required behavior varies from individual to individual. Davis define role as:

How an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform . . . 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 falls completely short he does not occupy the position at all. The very fact that he does not fall completely short is due to the normative elements inherent in the status.²⁰

George C. Homans, The interactionist, does not ignore entirely the existence of role. He admits that it has *de jure* influence over the actor. What really interests him are the face-to-face dealings of one individual with others, which he interprets as involving both *de jure* and *de facto* influences. This he explains as follows:

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁰ Kingsley Davis, *Human Society*, quoted in C.P. Loomis and Z.K. Loomis, *Modern Social Theories* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1961), p. 131.

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, and in this book 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 room for variations.²¹

However, he includes status as an element in the interaction. He takes actual behavior as activity — any actor will respond to the motivation of sanction, reward and punishment. His formula is Profit = Reward minus Cost. He explains "cost" as

. . . When a course of action requires a man to give up one reward in order to get another, we speak of the cost of the action as the value of the forgone alternative. Cost is negative value, and the higher the cost of an activity, the less likely a man is to emit it.²²

He regards status as a stimulus:

Social approval is an actual reward, but any activity (or sentiment) may be a stimulus as well as reward, and we shall use status to refer to the stimuli a man presents to other men (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,²³

To Homans, esteem is the dynamic aspect of status in so far as the configuration of the ego and alters are concerned, Thomas E. Lasswell advocates a similar point of view:

The man-in-interaction searches for symbolic cues for the purpose of perceiving the status of the others in every social situation. He compares these cues with his

²¹ George C. Homans, *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961), p. 5.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

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 perform a basic role in social organization and in social adjustment.²⁴

Robert K. Merton, a structural analyst, modifies Linton's status and role concept by adding role-sets, status-sets, and status consequences. By role set, he means:

...that complement of role relationships which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status.

It should be plain that the role-set differs from the structural pattern which has long been identified by sociologists as that of 'multiple roles.' For in the established usage, 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.²⁵

Merton also introduces a time variable, which creates a sequence of role sets and status-sets:

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 a 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 sequences of role-sets and status-sets.²⁶

²⁴ Thomas E. Lasswell, *Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (January, 1961), p. 170.

²⁵ Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (rev.ed.; Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 369-70.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

Neal Gross, *et al.*, whose work is usually cited after reviewing the concepts of role proposed by others, concludes that:

Although their formulations have some fundamental differences most of the authors whose definitions have been presented are concerned with the same phenomena. Three basic ideas which appear in most of the conceptualizations considered, if not in the definitions of role themselves, are that individuals: (1) in social locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations.

Almost all of the authors have used the role concept to embrace the normative element of social behavior. People do not behave in a random manner; their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants. Some authors have included this idea in the concept of status or position, others in role, but nearly all include it somewhere

We feel that theoretical formulations concerned with role analysis must include these three elements — social locations, behavior, and expectations — which are common to most of the definitions of role which have been considered. The ways in which these ideas have been used in theoretical schemes, the terms used to present them, and, perhaps most important, the problems for which they provide adequate theoretical tools are far more variable than common.²⁷

ROLE FROM THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGIST'S POINT OF VIEW

Social psychology occupies an intermediate position between sociology and psychology. It seeks to understand and explain how the thoughts, feelings and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined or implied presence of other

²⁷ Neal Gross *et al.*, *Explorations in Role Analysis* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 17-18.

human beings.²⁸ The social psychologist recognizes the reality of role and status; what he looks at is how "self" performs vis-a-vis role and status. Theodore R. Sarbin writes:

The broad conceptual units of the theory are role, the unit of culture; position, the unit of society; and self, the unit of personality. We define position as a system of role expectations.²⁹

Actual behavior is the product of the interaction between self and role, with the consequence that position is the role-expectation. In summary:

Persons occupy positions or statuses in interactional 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 expectation, 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 perception and locating of 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 exercises a selective and directive effect on role perception and role enactment.³⁰

Note that Sarbin takes self as the unit of personality. George Herbert Mead conceived of the self as a social structure arising out of social experience. Sarbin takes

²⁸Gordon W. Allport, "The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology," *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), Vol.I, p. 5.

²⁹Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," *ibid.*, p. 223.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 255.

role as the result of the interaction between two series of events. The first is the maturational series ; the second the personal series. The maturational series of events may be assumed to be fairly constant from culture to culture, the personal-social series of events is the major determinant of psychological variation.³¹ Thus, personality is the action system arising out of the interplay of self and role.

PROPOSED "ROLE" CONCEPT

From the above different concepts one can conclude that social psychologists, as well as sociologists and anthropologists, consistently agree on the existence of the "ought-to behavior" which attached to the status or position by which an individual being an incumbent. Sociologists and anthropologists work from social and cultural system, respectively, down to the individual members of a society or culture, whereas social psychologists work from the level of the individual to the extent of social or cultural system influence. It is obvious that actual behavior or action may not be identical with the role prescribed behavior. This is because action is a product of the interdependent social, cultural, and personality factors.

It is also interesting to note that in sociological research about role the researchers implicitly differentiate the ought-to behavior from the role consensus. Neal Gross *et al.*, whose research on school superintendent is well recognized, define role as a set of expectation ; "A role is a set of expectations, or in terms of out definitions, it is a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position."³²

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

³² Neal Gross, *et al.*, *op.cit.*, p. 60.

Similarly, Eugene A. Wilkening defines role in his study about the county extension agent in Wisconsin.³³ Then they tried to get the consensus from the incumbent of the focal position and the counter position about the role of superintendent. By consensus, they can eliminate the incumbent's personality that has potential influence upon the actual role. However, caution should be made that the role that derived from the incumbents of focal position and counter positions may, and usually, be different from the consensus of the potential incumbents of the said positions. Furthermore, the differences can be perceived from the culturally defined role. Thus, if we recognize role as relatively static and culturally defined which is the dynamic side of the status, then role, role behavior, action and interaction can be clearly appreciated. Role, then, is the stereotype of general behaviors acknowledged by the potential incumbent as a basic requirement so that he can be recognized as the incumbent of that position, or status. Using Nadel's classification of role attributes, the potential incumbent will realize only the required attributes and legitimating or pivotal attributes. The question of how exhaustively the acknowledgment would be made dependent on the effectiveness of socialization.

Role behavior is the aggregate action that is executed by the incumbent of a status. This contains the peripheral attributes as classified by Nadel in addition to the required and legitimating attributes. At this stage, the incumbent's personality also take part in shaping the actions, too.

³³Eugene A. Wilkening, *The County Extension Agent In Wisconsin* (Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin, 1957), p. 2.

Action is a specific act that the incumbent take in order to fulfill the role behavior.

Interaction is the series of actions that administered by the incumbents of the focal position and a counter position to realize the role behavior.

It is time and space that signify the difference among the above definitions.

ท่านมาแล้วหรือยัง ?

สังคมศาสตร์ - แนวนการศึกษาสาขา รัฐประศาสนศาสตร์ ตรีภพวิทยา ปรัชญา สังคมวิทยา มานุษยวิทยา จิตวิทยาสังคม เศรษฐศาสตร์ ประวัติศาสตร์ นิติศาสตร์ และรัฐศาสตร์

สังคมศาสตร์ น คณะรัฐประศาสนศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์ ได้จัดทำขึ้นในต้นปีการศึกษา 2508 โดยได้รับความร่วมมือจากอาจารย์ผู้ทรงคุณวุฒิทั้งจากจุฬาฯ และธรรมศาสตร์ เพื่อเป็นรากฐานในการศึกษาสาขาวิชาทางสังคมศาสตร์ หนังสือเล่มนี้ได้รวบรวมเอาหลักการและแนวความคิดเบื้องต้น ตลอดจนความสัมพันธ์ที่เกี่ยวข้องอย่างลึกซึ้ง ระหว่างวิชาต่าง ๆ ดังกล่าวไว้อย่างพอเพียงที่จะช่วยให้ท่านเข้าใจสังคมศาสตร์ได้ดั่งใจ และจะเป็นประโยชน์อย่างยิ่งสำหรับผู้ประสงค์จะเข้าศึกษาในคณะรัฐประศาสนศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์ รวมทั้งผู้สนใจในสาขาวิชาต่าง ๆ ทางสังคมศาสตร์โดยทั่วไปอีกด้วย

หนังสือนี้มีจำหน่ายที่คณะรัฐประศาสนศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์

ราคาเล่มละ 25 บาท