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SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

5.1 Introduction:

The Industrial revolution, technological sophistications, scientific excellence and political democratisation as a way of life have brought about a significant change in the modern world. The communicative advancement has brought the people of the world closer and made the world smaller. Consequently, the life on earth has become competitive and complex. The confronting situations and the complexities of life have presented many challenging problems of mental health before the people.

The individual is continually faced with adjustable demands of varying degrees of difficulty which place him under frustration. Since the individual strives to maintain his psychological integrity, he automatically and persistently attempts to cope-up with frustration. The promotive and preventive concept of mental health of the present world recognises the satisfactory adjustment of the individual with his total environment.

In the process of meeting these emerging complex problems of life as a necessary condition of survival, most
of the teachers fail to adjust with the environmental problems and the confronting situations of life. This causes considerable growth of frustration among the teachers. The greater the goal discrepancies between the aspiration and multiplex demands on the part of the teaching personnel, the greater the stress, frustration and conflict that they experience. "As a universal human and animal phenomenon, stress results in intense and distressing experience and appears to be of tremendous influence in behaviour". (Lazarus, 1966, p. 2). "The fear of failure generates frustration, depression, anxiety, tension". (Anuradha Gupta, 1979, p. 2).

The alarming mental health problems and their hazards obviously obstruct the teachers in achieving their goals. Healthy competition is, no doubt, necessary condition of life, but the race for competition is certainly undesirable for a happy and healthy life. Though higher n Ach is a necessary condition for material prosperity and an index of progress in the present world (Mc Clelland, 1961), however, the existing conditions of life in the present societies create unnecessary competitions which affect the mental health of the teachers, and subsequently, their teaching efficiency. It has been observed from the researches on industrial psychology and organizational behaviour that the key point in higher goal attainment is the human factor (S.L. Schein, 1970; H.Levinson, 1963; A.W. Gauldner, 1961; and G.W. Homans, 1961), and not the physical amenities

In view of these researches, it is evident that prevention of mental illness, and preservation and promotion of mental health of the teachers and learners in any educational organization contribute much toward higher goal attainment. It appears, therefore, that teaching efficiency might also be having a significant relationship with frustration that the teachers develop because of various confrontration, conflicts and confusions which they encounter during the course of their teaching profession. The relevance that exists between the frustration and teaching efficiency is, therefore, the subject matter of this study. The study has been specifically stated as under:

'A relationship between the frustration and teaching efficiency of higher secondary school teaching personnel'.

With a view to explore scientifically this problem the following hypotheses have been formulated.

Hypotheses:

(a) Experimental Study:

H₁: "Frustration induced through:
(i) suspension from practice-teaching work,
(ii) issuing charge-sheet,
(iii) assigning extra academic workload,
(iv) detention by order before the regular practice teaching lessons without any reasons, and
(v) warning,

would inversely affect the teaching-efficiency significantly; however, there exists a positive relationship between the amount of frustration induced and the teaching efficiency".

This hypothesis has been broken down in accordance with (i) techniques of inducement of frustration, and (ii) reaction to frustration as under:

Teaching efficiency as related to frustration reaction and various techniques of frustration inducing.

$h_{1-1}$: 'Frustration induced through suspension from practice-teaching work would adversely affect the teaching efficiency'.

$h_{1-2}$: 'Frustration induced through charge-sheet would adversely affect the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-3: 'Frustration induced through extra academic work-load would adversely affect the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-4: 'Frustration induced through detention would adversely affect the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-5: 'Frustration induced through warning would affect adversely the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-la: 'Inducing frustration through suspension to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency'.

sH1-lf: 'Inducing frustration through suspension to fixative frustration subjects would have an inhibitory effect upon the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-lr: 'Inducement of frustration through suspension to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency'.

sH1-2a: 'Inducement of frustration through charge-sheet to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency'. 
sH1-2f: 'Inducement of frustration through charge-sheet to fixative frustration subjects would have significant adverse effect upon the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-2r: 'Inducing frustration through charge-sheet to regressive frustration group would have a significant effect upon teaching efficiency'.

sH1-3a: 'Inducing frustration through excessive academic work-load to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-3f: 'Inducing frustration through excessive academic work-load to fixative frustration subjects would seriously interfere the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-3r: 'Inducing frustration through excessive academic work-load to regressive frustration subjects would adversely affect the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-4a: 'Inducing frustration through detention to aggressive frustration subjects would seriously affect the teaching efficiency'.

sH1-4f: 'Inducing frustration through detention to fixative frustration Ss would significantly interfere the teaching efficiency'.

\[H_{1-4r} : \text{'Inducing frustration through detention to the regressive frustration group would significantly affect adversely the teaching efficiency'}.\]

\[H_{1-5a} : \text{'Frustration induced through verbal warning to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency'}.\]

\[H_{1-5f} : \text{'Frustration induced through verbal warning to fixative frustration group would significantly interfere the teaching efficiency'}.\]

\[H_{1-5r} : \text{'Inducing frustration through verbal warning to regressive frustration subjects would significantly lower down the teaching efficiency'}.\]

(b) **Differential Study**:

\[H_2 : \text{'The means scored by lecturers with relatively (i) longer teaching experience; (ii) higher educational attainments; (iii) older in age; (iv) lesser emoluments drawn; and (v) of male sex would be significantly higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching }\]
efficiency than those who are classified relatively as of (i) shorter teaching experience, (ii) lower educational attainments, (iii) younger in age, (iv) lesser emoluments drawn, and (v) female in sex respectively'.

\( s^H_{2-1} \): 'Lecturers with longer teaching experience would score significantly higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching efficiency than those relatively having shorter teaching experience'.

\( s^H_{2-2} \): 'Lecturers having higher educational attainments would lie significantly higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching efficiency than those having relatively lower educational attainments'.

\( s^H_{2-3} \): Lecturers who are older in age would score higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching efficiency than those who are younger in age'.

\( s^H_{2-4} \): 'Lecturers drawing more emoluments would score significantly higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching efficiency than that those who are drawing lesser emoluments'.
H2-5: 'The male lecturers would score significantly higher on the test of frustration but lower on the test of teaching efficiency than those of the female lecturers'.

(c) Correlational Study:

H3: 'The amount of frustration expressed through various reactions under different kinds of frustration would inversely affect teaching efficiency significantly'.

More specifically, we may put it as under:

"There exists significant negative linear relationship between the scores on various tests measuring frustration and its different reactions (e.g. aggression, fixation and regression) under different frustrating situations (e.g. O-D, E-D and X-P) and the teaching efficiency. However, the level of significance of relationship between scores on teaching efficiency and aggressive frustration reaction would be the highest whereas that indicative of teaching efficiency and regressive frustration reaction would be the lowest. The coefficient of correlation between scores of fixation as frustration reaction and teaching efficiency would be somewhere in between..."
these two limits'.

$H_4$ : The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring different reactions to frustration (e.g. aggression, fixation and regression) and teaching efficiency scale of the lecturers with relatively (i) longer teaching experience, (ii) higher educational attainments, (iii) older in age, (iv) more emoluments drawn, and (v) of male in sex would be invariably lower than those who are relatively of (i) shorter teaching experience, (ii) lower educational attainments, (iii) younger in age, (iv) lesser emoluments, drawn, and (v) female in sex respectively.'

$H_{4-1}$ : 'Coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring different reactions to frustration and teaching efficiency scale of the lecturers with relatively longer teaching experience would be invariably lower than those with shorter teaching experience'.

$H_{4-2}$ : 'The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring reactions to frustration and teaching efficiency scale of the lecturers with relatively higher educational attainments would be invariably lower than those
who have obtained relatively lower educational attainments'.

\textsuperscript{SH}_{4-3} : 'The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring different reactions to frustration and teaching efficiency scale of the lecturers with relatively older in age would be invariably lower than those who are relatively younger in age'.

\textsuperscript{SH}_{4-4} : 'The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring reactions to frustration and teaching efficiency scale of the lecturers with relatively more emoluments drawn would be invariably lower than those who have drawn relatively lesser emoluments'.

\textsuperscript{SH}_{4-5} : 'The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring different reactions to frustration and teaching efficiency scale of the male lecturers would be invariably lower than those of female ones'.

Sample :

Three hundred thirty lecturers and pupil teachers as specified below have been taken for the experimental, differential and correlational studies.
For experimental study, ninety pupil-teachers (40 males & 50 females) of Kalyan College of Education, Bhilai, have been classified into six matched groups one of which functioned as 'control group' while the other five as 'experimental groups. The groups were matched for age, qualifications, teaching experience, sex, total emoluments, and socio-economic status. For correlational and differential studies, two hundred forty lecturers (170 males and 70 females) were drawn out on a criterion of 100% quota sampling from the Higher Secondary Schools of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai, M.P.

**Instruments used:**

For measuring the frustration and teaching efficiency the following instruments were used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument for measurement</th>
<th>Instrument for the measurement of Teaching efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Frustration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teaching Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Indian Adaptation of Rosenzweig P.F. Study (Udai Pareek, 1959).</td>
<td>Teaching Efficiency Scale standardized by the investigator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Teaching Frustration Scale (Sharma &amp; Srivastava, 1979).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure:

Standardized instructions and procedures given in the manual of norms have been used for collecting data. All tests were administered under identical conditions over the same subjects in different sessions.

Data Collection, Processing and Analysis:

The data was collected individually. Responses obtained on various instruments were scored in accordance with the scoring system given in the manual of the norms. The responses were then analysed and processed in accordance with the hypotheses formulated. The data were processed through computer at Bhilai Steel Project, Bhilai. Data were statistically treated in terms of appropriate statistics as per requirements of the hypotheses.

5.2 The Conclusion:

(a) Findings on Experimental Studies:

I. (i) Frustration induced through suspension from practice teaching has adversely affected significantly the teaching efficiency of pupil teachers ($t = 23.55, P < .01$).
(vi) Frustration induced through detention has adversely affected significantly the teaching efficiency of the pupil-teachers (t = 20.435, P < .01).

(vii) Inducement of frustration through suspension from the practice teaching to aggressive group of pupil-teachers has significantly affected the teaching efficiency (t = 2.56, P < .05).

(viii) Inducement of frustration through suspension from the practice-teaching to fixative group has significantly affected adversely the teaching efficiency (t = 7.454, P < .01).

(ix) Inducement of frustration through suspension to the regressive group of frustration has adversely affected significantly the teaching
efficiency of the pupil-teachers \((t = 12.85, P < .01)\).

(i) Inducement of frustration through charge-sheet to aggressive group of frustration has significant inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency \((t = 20.13, P < .01)\).

(ii) Inducement of frustration through charge-sheet to fixative group of frustration has significantly affected the teaching efficiency \((t = 6.093, P < .01)\).

(iii) Inducement of frustration through charge-sheet to regressive group of frustration has adversely affected the teaching efficiency significantly \((t = 7.769, P < .01)\).

(iv) Inducing frustration through excessive academic work-load to aggressive frustration subjects has inversely affected significantly the teaching efficiency \((t = 17.78, P < .01)\).

(v) Inducing frustration through excessive academic work-load to fixative frustration group has significantly affected adversely the teaching efficiency \((t = 12.94, P < .01)\).

(vi) Inducement of frustration through excessive academic work-load to regressive frustration
subjects has adversely affected significantly the teaching efficiency \((t = 10.329, P < .01)\).

(xv) **Inducing frustration through detention to aggressive frustration subjects has adversely affected teaching efficiency significantly** \((t = 5.718, P < .01)\).

(xvi) **Inducing frustration through detention to fixative frustration subjects has adversely affected teaching efficiency significantly.** \((t = 8.257, P < .01)\).

(xvii) **Inducing frustration through detention to regressive frustration subjects has adversely affected the teaching efficiency significantly.** \((t = 8.589, P < .01)\).

(xviii) **Inducing frustration through verbal warning to aggressive frustration group has an inhibitory effect upon teaching efficiency** \((t = 4.719, P < .01)\).

(xix) **Inducing frustration through verbal warning to fixative frustration group has affected inversely the teaching efficiency significantly** \((t = 6.535, P < .01)\).

(xx) **Inducement of frustration to regressive frustration group through verbal warning has affected**
adversely the teaching efficiency significantly (t = 6.22, P < .01).

These findings led to the entire retention of H₁.

(b) Findings on Differential Studies:

H₁ (i) Lecturers with relatively longer teaching experience in comparison to the lesser ones have not scored significantly higher on the test of frustration (T₁₀ - T₁₅ : t = .468, P > .05; T₁₅ - T₂₀ : t = 0.58, P > .05; T₁₀ - T₂₀ : t = 1.00, P > .05; T₅ - T₁₅ : t = 1.231, P > .05; T₅ - T₂₀ : t = 1.626, P > .05), except in case of T₅ - T₁₀ which is barely significant (t = 1.663, P < .10). However, on the measure of teaching efficiency significant difference between means of the two teaching experience groups has been observed in case of T₁₅ - T₂₀ (t = 3.129, P < .01), T₅ - T₂₀ (t = 2.03, P < .05), and barely significant between T₁₀ and T₁₅ (t = 1.65, P < .10), whereas all other differences between different means (e.g. T₅ - T₁₀ t = 0.772, P > .05; T₅ - T₁₅ (t = 0.949, P > .05) and T₁₀ - T₂₀ (t = 1.014, P > .05) have not been found significant. By these findings, H₂ - 1 has been partially rejected.
(ii) There existed significant differences both between the H_EAG and L_EAG both on the tests of frustration ($t = 9.02, P < .05$) and teaching efficiency ($t = 3.50, P < .01$). $H_{2-2}$ has been partially retained.

(iii) Older lecturers have expressed relatively greater amount of frustration and inferior teaching efficiency than those who are younger. On a psychological continuum of frustration and teaching efficiency, they have been ranked as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Mean scores on Frustration</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Mean scores on Efficiency</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A26-30</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>154.7</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31-35</td>
<td>165.2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A36-40</td>
<td>163.7</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>154.4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A41-45</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A46-50</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>153.4</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A51-55</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 't' values calculated between the means of different groups are as under:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Frustration Test t values</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Teaching Efficiency t values</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_{26-30}$ vs $A_{31-35}$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{26-30}$ vs $A_{36-40}$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{26-30}$ vs $A_{41-45}$</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{26-30}$ vs $A_{46-50}$</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{26-30}$ vs $A_{51-55}$</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>$P &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{31-40}$ vs $A_{36-40}$</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{31-40}$ vs $A_{41-45}$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{31-40}$ vs $A_{46-50}$</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{41-40}$ vs $A_{51-55}$</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{36-40}$ vs $A_{41-45}$</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{36-40}$ vs $A_{46-50}$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{36-40}$ vs $A_{51-55}$</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$P &lt; .05$</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{41-45}$ vs $A_{46-50}$</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{41-45}$ vs $A_{51-55}$</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$P &lt; .05$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{46-50}$ vs $A_{51-55}$</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$P &lt; .05$</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$P &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings led to the partial retention of our latter of the sub-hypothesis $H_{2-3}$ to the extent of teaching efficiency only and its rejection so far as the measure of frustration was concerned.
(iv) Lecturers drawing the largest emolument (E\textsubscript{1400}) did not differ significantly (t = 1.40, P > .05) from those getting the lowest one on the test of frustration; however, a significant difference (t = 2.7, P < .01) between them has been observed. Hypothesis (H\textsubscript{2-4}) is rejected entirely on the strength of these findings.

(v) There existed a significant difference between the means of the male and female lecturers on the test of frustration (t = 3.641, P < .01); however, they did not differ significantly in their teaching efficiency (t = 1.641, P > .05).

(c) Findings on Correlation Study:

III.

There existed a low positive relationship between the independent (frustration) and dependent (teaching efficiency) variables. All the parameters of frustration have poor positive correlations teaching efficiency; however, they all indicated linear interrelationships. The index of correlation between frustration and teaching efficiency of the aggressive group has been found the highest (r = +.267) whereas of the fixation group,
the lowest \((r = +0.0962)\); the relationship of the regressive group being placed in between these two limits. It is evident that the aggressive and fixative frustration groups have obtained the extreme places while the regressive has been placed in between these two limits. Hypothesis III has been completely rejected.

IV. (i) There existed a very low positive relationship between the measures of frustration and teaching efficiency of various groups, having different length of teaching experiences \((T_5: r = +0.3582; T_{10}: r = +0.2501; T_{15}: r = +0.0507; T_{20}: r = +0.0878)\). There exists a linear relationship between frustration and teaching efficiency of the teachers with respect to their teaching experiences. The teaching efficiency went on deteriorating as the teaching experience advanced. The sub-hypothesis \(H_{4-1}\) has been fully retained.

(ii) The coefficients of correlation computed between scores on the test of frustration and teaching efficiency of the \(H_{EAG}\) and \(L_{EAG}\) have been estimated to be \((r = +0.3001)\) and \((r = +0.5711)\) respectively. Sub-hypothesis \(H_{4-2}\) is retained fully on the strength of these findings.
(iii) The coefficients of correlation between frustration and teaching efficiency with respect to various age groups of the lecturers have been, no doubt, found positively correlates; however, they hardly stand in a systematic order. There existed therefore, no linear relationship i.e., $A_{26-30} : r = +.2823; A_{31-35} : r = +.0171;
A_{36-40} : r = +.0111; A_{41-45} : r = +.3516; A_{46-50} : r = +.2129$ and $A_{51-55} : r = +.4412)$. Sub-hypothesis $(H_{4-3})$ has been fully rejected.

(iv) The relationship of frustration and teaching efficiency of $E_{1000}$ ($r = +.0331$), $E_{1300}$ ($r = +.2367$) and $E_{1400}$ ($r = +.2451$) groups have been estimated to be rather poor but positive related while of the $E_{100}$ ($r = .9305$) and $E_{1200}$ ($r = -4832$) have been found negatively correlated. The sub-hypothesis $(H_{4-4})$ has been fully rejected.

(v) The coefficients of correlation computed between the scores on the tests of frustration and teaching efficiency of male and female lecturers were found to be $r = +.072$ and $r = +.0713$). The sub-hypothesis $(H_{4-5})$ is fully retained.
5.3 Suggestions:

Attainment of educational goal is considered as the primary concern of any educational organisation. Numerous inhibitory and interfering factors emerge that break-through the built-in-process of organisational functioning. Consequently, problems of mental health among the persons who are directly or indirectly involved in the structure and functions of the organisation affect the organisational goals to that extent. In this perspective, it is suggested that such immediate measures as may help attaining the educational goals and promoting mental health among the learners and teachers be taken up.

With this in view, the following suggestions are offered.

(I) Every educational organisation should see that the rights and claims of the members of the institutions are properly and adequately recognised and fulfilled, so that they are satisfied with their jobs and no frustration should be inculcated. Precautions should be observed to promote sense of belongingness among the teachers for the institution where they are employed.
All measures must be taken up by the educational institutions to diagnose the mental illness among the teaching personnel and learners and necessary immediate steps be taken up to prevent and promote mental health among them by introducing various plans, schemes and measures so that educational goals may not be arrested. This requires the services of a sensitive head of the institution towards the various problems of the teachers and learners in the educational institutions who can foresightedly and insightfully visualize the probable onset of the causal factors of frustration and conflict.

The head of the educational organisations should promote the human consideration aspect of 'problem-solving behaviour'. He should develop a vision for 'employee-centred approach' rather than 'educational goal-oriented' one. At the same time he should also observe that every individual of the educational organisation is well satisfied with his work of learning and teaching. He should try to avoid generating tensions and creating conflicts in the institution which may adversely affect the teaching effectiveness. In fact, it is not the teaching personnel, nor the learners, but the organisers and management who are, indeed, responsible
for the effective introduction and execution of educational processes and goal attainment.

5.4 Follow-up Studies:

In view of the fact that frustration and teaching efficiency are significant variables directly or indirectly affecting the educational goals of any educational organization, we propose the following follow-up studies which could be immediately taken up as diagnostic and corrective measures in promoting mental health of the teaching personnel and thereby enhancing the teaching-learning outcomes. Some of the significant studies are:

(1) To study frustration tolerance and ego strength as related to teaching efficiency.

(2) To study various physiological indicators of frustration and anxiety (e.g. blood volume and pressure, heart-rate, respiration, oxygen, ECG, EEG etc) and teaching-learning outcomes.

(3) To study the relationship of teaching efficiency between teaching personnel having polar traits of personality (e.g. introvert-extrovert, authoritarian-democratic, dominant-submissive, high ego-ideal-poor ego-ideal, high frustration tolerance low frustration tolerance etc).
(4) To study the effect of inducing frustration consciously or unconsciously by various ways in different educational institutions and their relative educational outcomes.

(5) A study of job-satisfaction, frustration and teaching efficiency.

(6) A study of educational interactions, frustration and teaching effectiveness.

(7) Educational goals as related to Mental Health Problems in educational institutions in India.

(8) A study of psychological stress among the teaching personnel.

(9) A study of psychological stress as related to scholastic accomplishments of learners.

(10) Teacher effectiveness as a function of frustration.