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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction

The world is moving with a terrific pace. The revolutionary change in the physical environment, cultural values and technological knowledge and skill have brought about a corresponding change in the psycho-social behaviour of the human beings. The wants and goals of the individuals have been multiplied, bringing thereby a change in the motivation, perception and attitude of the persons. In fact, motivation is a driving force that gives direction and translates into action the thinking and expression of an individual. The motivational strength that an individual possesses regardless of his vocational placement or occupational engagement largely determines his involvement in action. Self, the region of tension, is governed and regulated by individual's wants and goals. To the extent an individual is satisfied with his goal-directed behavioural outcome, to that extent his needs are actualized (Maslow, 1964) and motivations interact his behavioural outcomes. Striving hard with a view to cope-up with the complexities of life and situation is the general characteristic of almost every individual. Maladjustment with the environmental situations and prevalent norms creates
psychological stress. Substantiated fear of failure in one's own undertaking and prolonged deprivation of basic needs and rights inculcates frustration. An individual's psychological affects as a function of interaction with the existing complexities of environments and technological sophistication can be best understood when by considering him as a member of a society or an organization. The amount of frustration, therefore, an individual develops by being a member of an organization, and the subsequent influence on interpersonal relationship and work-output can be meaningfully interpreted only if the individual is viewed as a interacting complex being of any organization, Sachein (1973, p. 79) has rightly pointed out that "Managers of organizations, whether they be of business or schools, must be aware not only of the complexities of human motivation but of the dynamic processes which occur as person enters into and pursues a career within an organization". The work of output of a member of an organization is a relative consequence of an interaction of numerous factors; organizational, personality, interpersonal relationship etc. Numerous interacting variables help in structuring, and restructuring his cognitive ingredients and attitude, motivation and morale which ultimately influence his performance. The position he holds in the organization, the power he enjoys, the roles he plays, the rights he claims, the responsibility he discharges — are all meaningful so long as he is a functional member of the organization and therefore,
the psychological contract between the organization and the employee is an important variable affecting work performance.

In view of the fact that 'high quality performance' from both managers and employees, has become the order of the day in all kinds of organizations whether business, industry, education or other private and public sectors, psychological contract as a crucial variable of effectiveness in organization and production has become indicative of utilitarian-normative trend. Findings of Hawthorne Studies (1927-45) indicate that active participation in group-goals, and cohesive human relations within the organizational structure accompanied with human considerations on the part of the management bring about surprising change in the work-performance. As a consequence, the new trend recognizes that members are increasingly expected to like their work, to become personally committed to organizational goals and become creative in the service of these goals; while in exchange they are given more influence in decision making, thereby reducing the authority of management (Schein, 1973, p. 54). Once a normative base for a psychological contract has broken down, it signals that the parties to it no longer share common values and goals. Under such conditions a breakdown in communication occurs, and a failure of mutual understanding and increasing frustration leading to various kinds of emotional responses on the parts of both appear (E.H. Schein, 1970).
Thus, the dynamic process of psychological contract (H. Levinson, 1963; A.W. Gouldney 1961, G.W. Homans, 1961) depends to a large extent on two conditions; (1) the degree to which his own expectations of what the organization will provide him, and what the organizations expectations are of what it will give and get; (2) assuming that there is an agreement on expectations, what actually is to be exchanged; money in exchange for time at work, social need satisfaction and security in exchange for work and loyalty; opportunities for self actualization and challenging work – in exchange for high productivity, quality work and creative effort in the service of organizational goals, or various combinations of these and other things (Schein, 1973, p. 77).

The assumptions regarding psychological contract of management about the employees have been explained by Schein (1973, p. 55) in terms of theories of (1) the rational-economic man, (ii) the social man, (iii) the self-actualizing man, and (iv) the complex man.

The concept of rational-economic image of man functions on the reciprocal relationship between the organization and the employee. The organization buys the services and obedience of the employees for economic rewards and the organization assumes the obligation of protecting itself and the employees from the irrational sides of his nature by a system of authority and controls regulated by the management. Authority rests essentially in designated position whom the employee is expected to obey regardless of his
expertise or personality. In view of the growing complexity in jobs and competition among organizations in the present set up the management increasingly depends upon the judgment, creative capacity and loyalty of the employees. Under such conditions, the nature of the psychological contract have become more complex and more dependent on their human resources. The Hawthorne studies (1927-45) made it clear that the needs and expectations of the employees which hardly fit into the rational-economic image of man, largely determined the quality and quantity of performance as well as their relationship with the organization. This breakthrough led to the assumption of the social man (Elton, Mayo, 1945) which believed in the satisfaction of motives, social needs and expectations of the employees. Mayo (1945) reported that 'industrial life had taken the meaning out of work and had frustrated mans' basic social needs. A feeling of alienation and a loss of a sense of identity on the part of workers through interviews made Mayo to develop a set of employee-oriented considerations in terms of their needs rather tasks to be performed, their feelings in regard to acceptance and sense of belongingness and identity rather than managers concerned' with motivating and controlling subordinates, acceptance of work-groups as reality and think about group-incentives rather than individual incentives. Such a crucial change from rational-economic man to social man shifted the entire frame of reference-in
organizational structure, and function. The shift witnessed a change in managers role from planning, organizing, motivating and controlling (in rational-economic assumption) to acting as an intermediary between the employees and higher management, listening and attempting to understand the needs and feelings of his subordinates and showing considerations and sympathy for their needs and feelings. The assumption of social man shifts the initiative for work which acts as the source of motivation from management to the worker. The manager instead of being the creator of work, the motivator and the controller becomes the facilitator and sympathetic supporter.

Mayo (1945), Roethlisberger (1958), Trist (1963) have found that, if management creates a situation for employees in which they feel frustrated, threatened, and alienated, then they form into groups whose norms run counter to the goals of management. In a study, Zalaznik, A., Christensen, C.R. and Roethlisberger, F.J. (1958), reported that: (i) both productivity and satisfaction of the workers were unrelated to the pay and job status which the individuals received, but were related to group membership, (ii) regular group members tended to be satisfied and to conform to the group-norms of productivity as well as to management's expectation, (iii) deviants and isolates tended to be less satisfied and to violate group norms, (iv) deviants and isolates who aspired to group membership
and identified with the group tended to produce below the
group norms, and (v) deviants and isolates who did not
aspire to group membership tended to produce above the
groups' norms. White, W.F. (1948) observed that social
and group factors related significantly to absenteeism,
 quitting work and the quality of customer service whereas
Seashore, S.F. (1954) demonstrated that high group cohesive-
ness was associated with high productivity and low group-
cohesiveness with low productivity, accompanied respectively
by high and low confidence of group members in the management.
Feeling of jumpy or nervous or underpressure was experienced
relatively more by members of low cohesive groups. Studies
of assembly lines (Jasinski, F.J., 1956; Walker, C.R. and
Guest, R.H., 1952) and mass production (Rice, A.K., 1958)
demonstrated that the major source of employee-dissatisfaction
was the disruption of social relations, the communicative
gap and the inability to pace social contacts in terms of
their social needs. On the contrary, Trist, E.L. et al.
(1963) observed that by redesigning work with a view to
facilitate team work and social interaction, both productivity
and morale have increased unexpectedly. The studies conducted
by the Institute of Social Research at the University of
Michigan (1961), Naìøy Horse and R. Reimer (1956, p. 120-129)
and Fleishman, R. (1961) pointed out that human considerations
shown to subordinates improved productivity and morale.
It is not the production-centred approach but the employee-
oriented consideration which has been found playing a crucial role in work-performance and social motivation to organizational goals. The Scanlon Plan (F. Lesieur, 1958) further provided impetus to the concept of group incentives and group-identification as significant variables of productivity and group-goal attainment. By introducing profit sharing plans for the employees, the Scanlon Plan facilitated improved communication between management and workers in organizational activities. Schein, E.H. (1973) records that there is no simple relationship between organizational incentives, employee-satisfaction, and effective performance of productivity. In a review, Smith and Cranny (1968) proposed a model for which there is some support and which does justice to potential complexity of the relationship. First, they pointed out that employee performance is a function of employee effort, and that effort may be controllable by organizational incentives and vice versa. More pay may produce more effort and more effort may produce more pay. However, effort by itself does not necessarily produce higher performance, because there may be insufficient talent or skill. Assuming there is sufficient talent, one can hypothesize that incentives produce in the employee the setting of higher targets or goals, which produces more effort, which produces goal achievement and satisfaction. However, satisfaction may also be directly produced by organizational rewards without an increase in effort and performance.
Many studies have shown essentially zero correlations between productivity and morale. On the other hand, satisfaction can lead an employee to work harder if he perceives more effort to be a condition of continuing to obtain organizational rewards. In a similar view Vroom (1964) has postulated that performance can be hypothesized to be a function of (a) the abilities the person perceives to be required to do the job; (b) the degree to which the person perceives himself to possess those abilities; and (c) the degree to which he values the possession of such abilities. Changes in any one or more of these psychological variables can affect both actual performance and satisfaction with the job. His motives, perceptions, degrees of effort and organizational experiences all interact in a complex way to produce a given level of performance and a degree of involvement in the organization. In a study of a large trucking company, Vroom and Mann (1960) found that the nature of job being performed influenced the workers' performance for type of supervision.
These studies supported the concept of the social man theory of people in organization which claims that organizations are not set of relationships among people, but rather are relationships among sets of interlocking and interdependent groups (Schein, 1973, p.65). The concept functions more or less on the principle of 'linking pins' (Likert, 1961) that occupy key roles in organization in terms of serving as the channel of communication and influence from one group to another.

The theory of 'self actualizing man' is perhaps the extension of social man theory. The loss of meaning from work, as Mayo (1945) observed, is not related so much to man's social needs as to man's inherent need to use his capacities and skills in a productive way. (Argyris, 1964; Maslow, 1964; H.C. Gregor, 1966). Keeping in view the problems of maladjustment and frustration that arise as a consequence of diverse talents and traits acting and interacting in any organization in numerous ways, the process of self actualization can meet these challenges of the organization (Maslow, 1964). Power equalization (H.J. Leavitt, 1963) may serve as one of the techniques. However, the concept of self actualizing man is not uniformly applicable to every employee (Herzberg, F., et al. 1959); though the motivation of employees is somewhat more complex than the theory would suggest. We need rather
additional theorizing and empirical research in this important area (John, R. Hinrichs, 1970, pp. 536-37). This led to the assumption of the theory of 'complex man' which postulated that man is a more complex individual than rational-economic, social or self-actualizing man. In view of the fact that world is moving fast with terrific pace, the complexities of man within the network of a more complex and differentiated organization in the perspective of enormous growth in physical, cultural and technological environment, man must be considered not only complex but also highly variable and differentiated. The work-output as a measure of efficiency and effectiveness in any organization, therefore, is directly related to the complexities of human nature and process of motivation and morale, reinforcement and satisfaction, identity and involvement.

The findings inferred from the studies on various aspects of man in organizations engaged in work-productivity could be summarizingly explained in terms of models designed by different investigators showing the relationship between organizational systems and their environments.

The Tavistock Socio Technical Model (Trist, E.L. et al., 1963) conceptualizes that any productive organization or part thereof is a combination of technology
(task requirements, physical layout, equipment available) and a social system of relationships among the employees. The technology and the social system are in mutual interaction and are interdependent (The Hawthorne Studies, 1927-1945; Eil Trist et al., 1963). The effective work organization, then is a consequence of upon socio-technical system acting and interacting upon different combinations of technology, initial worker characteristics, and organizational structures.

George Homans (1950) has produced another model known as 'The Homans Model' which is not fundamentally at odds with the Tavistock Model but is somewhat more differentiated and complex. Homans postulated that activities, interactions and sentiments imposed through interactions by physical, cultural and technological environment among the people engaged at work are mutually dependent on one another. Thus, any change in any of the three variables will produce some change in the other two. However, the imbalance would create frustration and dissatisfaction among the people thereby adversely affecting the work-productivity as a consequence of lowering of their motivation and morale. Homans (1950) has shown that the higher the rate of interaction of two or more people, the more positive will be their sentiments toward each other; and the more positive sentiment, the higher the rate of interaction.
Likert's (1961) model of organization adds two important ideas to models already presented:

(i) The relevant environment for any given group or system is likely to be, not something impersonal but rather a set of other systems or groups composed of three parts in large scale system consisting of whole organization, system on the same level, and subsystems within the given systems.

(ii) The organization is linked to its environment through key people who occupy positions in both the organization and some environmental system; and the parts of the environment may well be linked to each other through similar key people.

Under the conditions of failure in distinguishing between types of groups and thereby accurately identifying the linking pins, Kahn (1964) proposed the 'Kahn Overlapping Role-set Model' which functions on the role sets instead of groups as Likert (1961) pointed out. The basic point of the model is that, "Given a focal person fulfilling an organizational role, with whom else is he connected or associated in performing his role?" The organization as a whole can be thought of as a set of overlapping and interlocking role sets, some of which transcend the foundaries of the organization. The behaviour of members of an organization could, then, be studied in terms of the concepts
of either 'role conflict' or 'role ambiguity'.

The kinds of expectations which members of the role set expect hold the manner in which they attempt to influence the focal person, his perception of their expectations and influences, his feelings and reactions to these, and his attempt's to cope with the feelings and tensions that may be generated. These can be related to organizational factors, to personality factors in the focal person or the role senders, or to interpersonal factors that characterize the nature of the relationship between role senders and the focal person. Kahn (1964) attaches great importance to interdependence of the organizational variables; rank, location of position in the structure, role expectations, perceptions of such expectations, coping pattern in response to perceived conflict, and effectiveness of role performance.

Lawrence, R.R. and Lorsch, J.N. (1967) and Galbraith (1969) developed models or the grounds that effective organization tended to have a structure that was adapted to the kind of technology it was in operation. Lawrence, and Lorsch (1967) designed their model on the processes of 'differentiation' and 'integration' with a view to identify the factors which make for effectiveness in different kinds of organizational environments. The key idea is that each functional part of an organization i.e. production, research
or sales, deals with a different part of the environment and develops and cognitive point view that reflects its adaptation to that part of the environment. Further, for an organization to function effectively, the various orientations of the different functional units must be coordinated. Galbraith (1969) also based his model on organizational structures; however, he pointed out that the key factor of organizational structure is the predictability of the task on which the organization is working. The more predictable the task, the clear will be the hierarchy of authority; the more formal will be the rules and regulations governing work, the greater will be the number of levels in the organization, and the higher will be the level at which key decisions are made.

The description of these models accounts for a sequential development in the organizational thinking and research in relation with the behavioural dynamics of the people involved in productivity. It is evident that both structural factors in organization as well as the dynamics of organizational behaviour largely determine the productivity and organizational effectiveness. No less important are the motivational variables and attitudinal factors of the members of the organization in addition to the organizational structure.
From the studies cited above and findings obtained there upon, it is evident that: the organizational component variables as related to work output have undergone significant changes. There have been a distinct shift from production-orientedness to employee-centred considerations; the core of which lies in feeling, motivation and morale of the employees. Sense of identity with the organization and with the organizational goals, sense of belongingness with the organization, active participation in the process of attainments of group goals are some of the important ingredients, now recognized by programme organizations. The group cohesiveness, human relations and worker's sense of belongingness and active participation are essential aspects of higher production as a goal of any organization. It is not the individual, but the group as a cohesive and harmonious organization acting and interacting on human feelings and considerations which may reap greater output. Higher Motivation and greater morale as significant intervening variables accompanied with the sense of identification, belongingness, and work-participation which can produce more and bring effectiveness in the organization. Human elements, thus, constitute the core of productivity in any organization. It is the individual in an organization with his sentiments and satisfaction, sense of belongingness, and identity, level of ego-involvement in group activities, active participation in group goals that bring home the higher production. Hence cohesive and
harmonious relationship with the management in any organization is an essential determinant that causes efficiency in the organization and effectiveness in production.

Work output, thus, is affected not only by organizational and personal factors but also by interpersonal climate existing in the organization. Apart from this, some of the personal factors like Ziagernic effect, risk-taking behaviour, vertical mobility, achievement motivation, ego involvement, job satisfaction psychological reinforcement through knowledge of results, goal-security, work-identity, adjustibility, are also important determinants of work-performance. The negative affects of such personal factors may create fear of failure and promote frustrative reactions expressed through aggressive, fixative, or regressive behaviours which block and interfere the work-productivity.

In view of the fact that environmental complexities, whether physical, cultural or technological of any organization of which employees are functional members engaged in work output are more or less similar, the findings derived from experimentations, experiences and empirical studies as cited above primarily from industrial organizations, are applicable to a large extent to educational organizations of which members of management, teachers, pupils, parents and administrators are potential components of teaching-learning and testing process, and ultimately
of the educational goals. Though the measures of productivity in the industrial organizations as compared to educational organizations appear to be different, but on wider perspective, the organizational factors, the personality variables and the interpersonal relationship that govern and regulate any organizational structure and regulate its functions are more or less the same. In any educational organization, the human relationships that exist through classroom interactions in teaching-learning processes between the teacher and the taught, or through outdoor activities, or through some purposeful encounter among parents, teachers and pupils, or through management and the teachers, are more or less to a large extent are operative identically so far as functional goals are concerned; though functional variations bring about a corresponding variation in the organizational structure. It is, thus, evident that factors and forces acting and interacting upon organizational effectiveness in educational institutions upon efficiency in teaching, learning and testing processes upon the educational outcomes and instructional behaviour are determined to a large extent by all those independent and intervening variables; whether organizational, personal or interpersonal, which have been found determinants of organizational behaviour and work-productivity in the studies on industrial organizations cited above.

The prevalent educational climate as such in India is not as congenial as not to generate frustration among the teaching personal. Most of the situations,
conditions and circumstances in day to day interaction lead to the thwarting of motives, blocking of self-actualizing processes, interfering the decisions made, and delaying and distorting the claims, rights and opportunities due to him. Obviously, inculcation of frustrations among the teaching personnel is the natural consequence of such annoying, and confronting conditions of work. Delay in payment of salary, unpayment, underpayment, non-recognition in society, devaluation of teaching profession, mistrust and mistreatment, overwork are some of the conditions of teaching profession which make a teacher frustrated and dissatisfied from his job.

P.M. Symonds (1946) pointed out that blocking or interference of the satisfaction of an aroused need through some barrier or obstruction resulted in frustration. W.C. Trow (1958) emphasized that blocking or thwarting of a goal directed behaviour usually results in aggression. When the teacher's goal directed behaviour is blocked by the management or any other agency by not providing the opportunities, they get frustrated. The greater the goal discrepancies the greater the frustration and conflict, they experience. Fear of failure and inability to escape from an annoying or confronting situation also produce frustration. A frustrated person is under emotional tension, and this, rather than the nature of situation determines his behaviour.
When a situation becomes frustrating to the individual his behaviour undergoes a distinct change. Marked emotional expression is observed under the conditions of frustration. Under such conditions, the individual becomes reasonless and loses all constructive behaviours and display indiscriminate, undifferentiated, destructive and stereotype behaviour. It is, thus, logical to think that under the influence of stereotype, undifferentiated, indiscriminate and destructive mode of behavioural expression, the work-output may be affected to that extent. The index of efficiency and effectiveness would go down as a consequence of the frustration generated because of the thwarting of the motives or blocking the path of goal attainment. The study by Zalezink, et al. (1958) reveals that blocking the self actualization efforts of the workers resulted into frustration which consequently adversely affected the work output.

Teaching as such is a different type of profession in which work-efficiency is measured in terms of knowledge and skill delivered successfully, and satisfactorily to the pupils per unit of time. The effectiveness so measured is rather abstract and subjective to a large extent. Though the teacher produces valuable precious ideas which could be no way be less valuable than the goods produced in any industry. Indeed, the educational productivity is not as objective, vivid and apparent as the industrial one. Consequently, there remains a doubt about the educational
productivity. Hence, we conceive of educational productivity in terms of instructional outcomes. Satisfying conditions of learning-teaching and testing processes leading to indicative of attaining learning outcomes, thus, would be indicative standard of attainment of educational goals. The frustrating, annoying, confronting and confusing interaction in the educational organization under the existing conditions of complex environment; physical, cultural and technological, would rather adversely affect the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and testing processes, thereby blocking the organizational goals in education.

1.2 Significance of the Problem

1.21 Need and Importance:

Teaching was considered as the most respected profession in India in the past. The teachers were respected and were honoured in the Indian society. They were given even greater honour than the 'God'; and were said to be the 'Great Guru'; i.e. one who possesses 'guruta'; the great knowledge. However, with the lapse of time and revolutionary changes in value system, the Indian values about the teacher and the teaching profession have been replaced by the materialistic attitude and values. Now teaching is considered like one of other professions; and teachers like other service
personnel. Consequently, the visual discrepancy that exists between the teachers as they visualize them by being one of the members of the materialistic society, and their recognition in the society is so significant that they could hardly identify themselves with 'the Great Gurus' of the past though on many ceremonial occasions, they are alarmed for their being the torch bearers of the society which they hardly accept, realize and recognize.

In view of the phenomenal change in the values and norms of the Indian society that exist in the present about the teachers and the teaching profession, one may feel deep concern over the educational outcome upon which the social building is constructed and the national pride and progress rests. The society expects a large from the teachers without diagnosing their inherent social and psychological frontiers of life and work.

The revolutionary changes in values and norms of the Indian society have converted the entire educational organizations into an industrial ones. On a wider perspective, they do not differ much. Consequently, because of the growing tendency of assimilating and incorporating the norms and values of materialistic society, there exists a dichotomy of rights versus responsibility, as prevalent in every organization between the management and the employees. The teachers aspire for greater recognition in the society, better salary and an improved terms and
conditions of service as enjoyed by service personnel of other organizations. Since they are also members of the society at large, denial of the status, salary and service conditions what is expected in accordance with his qualifications and experience is deprivation and discrimination; which obviously create frustration among the teachers.

Self is a region of tension. The inconsistency that exists between the mutual expectations of the educational management and teaching personnel break the psychological contract that exists between them. Thus, the relationship that exists on the psychological contract between the management and the teaching personnel creates confusion and conflict. Hurt of feelings, challenge of authority, denial of rights create cumulatively frustration and dissatisfaction among teachers with their teaching profession. Job-dissatisfaction is a significant factor of work-productivity. Thus, the unhealthy socio-emotional climate that persists in the educational organizations creates not only problems of mental health in the educational organization, but also blocks and interferes the process of work-productivity in educational institutions.

Since effective education of the future citizens of India largely depends upon their teachers; the architects of their fortunes, upon whom the entire future national progress and prosperity rest, it is in the fitness of things to scientifically study the nature and mode of frustration.
the expression of reactions to frustration, the frustrating situations; and the relationships that exist between these parameters of frustration and the teaching efficiency of the teachers.

1.22 The Scope:

Such a study would not only be diagnostic and correctional, but also promotive and preventive in nature. The remedial measures employed to reduce frustration would have a direct relevance upon the efficiency of the teachers.

The findings of this study may serve as useful diagnostic measures for improving the teaching efficiency of teaching personnel and in raising the educational standard in the institutions. It may also help the educational organizations in promoting mental health among the teachers by reducing frustrations by various means. This study would help in maintaining cordial relationship between the management and the teachers by promoting harmonious interpersonal interaction and mutual understanding. Active participation on the part of the teachers in the educational deliberations would elevate educational standard and raise educational goals. It will, thus, ensure greater amount of human resources redirected and utilised for the cause of education. This will check the enormous wastage of human energy in education.
The study is very much useful for the educational planners and policy makers, educational administrators and management. The adequate knowledge of level of frustration which could be induced by certain psychological techniques would help them to plan and implement their educational content more effectively by a way of adequately designing and directing the human potentiality involved in educational processes.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The unhealthy socio-emotional climate and conditions of life and work in educational organizations present numerous problems which could be tested and verified in the present study. Since frustration is a significant variable which determines largely the behavioural outcomes and teaching effectiveness in any educational organization, the following problems constitute the subject matter of the present study. The problems, thus, we pose are:

1) Do the teachers inherently possess frustrating behaviour? and if so, to what extent?

2) What different types of frustrative reactions do they have, and to what extent they are expressed in different forms?

3) How do and to what extent these frustration influence the teaching efficiency of the teacher?
Can frustration be induced, and its efficiency be studied. If so, how?

In view of the fact that teaching efficiency depends upon such factors as the personal attitude of the teachers towards teaching profession, age, sex, length of service, personality dispositions, socioeconomic status, family structure and composition, number of dependents upon the teacher, the social attitude toward the teaching profession, etc, the study dealing with teaching efficiency in relation with modes of frustrative reactions have to take into considerations such independent variables. It has been observed that such variables as relatively over qualifications, deprivation of claims, rights, privileges and the opportunities, family burden, unhealthy socio-professional climate and such other factors generate frustration among teaching personnel. Consequently, they display feelings/job-dissatisfaction and alienation. We aim to study, to what extent the teaching personnel develop frustration under such conditions confrontation, confusion and complexities; and to what extent such frustrative affects adversely affect the teaching efficiency and organizational goals?

1.4 Statement of the Problem

Relatively efforts have been made to answer the
problems so posed. Researches as presented in Chapter II on frustration in educational organization are relatively negligible. The present study is, therefore, significant. The problems of teachers' frustration and their impact on teaching efficiency have been pin-pointedly presented below:

(I) To study the effect of induced frustration on teaching efficiency.

(II) To study the relationship of frustration with teaching efficiency.

The present investigation, thus, tries to study 'the relationship between frustration and teaching efficiency' of higher secondary school teachers as well as the effect of frustration developed in educational organization on teaching efficiency.

1.5 **Formulation of Hypotheses**

With a view to probe into the problems of this study scientifically, suitable hypotheses have been formulated.

In the present study, frustration has been taken as an independent variable whereas teaching efficiency has been treated as a dependent variable.
(a) **Experimental Studies**:

$H_1$: "Frustration induced through (i) suspension, (ii) charge sheet, (iii) extra academic workload, (iv) detention, and (v) unwarranted warning would significantly affect adversely the teaching efficiency".

This hypothesis consists of five sub-hypotheses as given under; each of which has been further broken down into three sub-hypotheses in accordance with their types of frustration.

$sH_{1-1}$: 'Frustration induced through suspension would adversely affect the teaching-efficiency significantly'.

$sH_{1-1a}$: 'Inducing frustration through suspension to aggressive frustration subjects would significantly affect adversely the teaching-efficiency'.

$sH_{1-1f}$: 'Inducing frustration through suspension to fixative frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon the teaching-efficiency'.

$sH_{1-1r}$: 'Inducement of frustration through suspension to regressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon the teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-2}} : \] 'Frustration induced through charge sheet would adversely affect the teaching-efficiency significantly'.

\[ s_{H_{1-2a}} : \] 'Inducement of frustration through charge sheet to aggressive frustration Ss would have adversely affect significantly upon the teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-2f}} : \] 'Inducement of frustration through charge sheet to Fixative frustration Ss would have a significant adverse effect upon teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-2r}} : \] 'Inducing frustration through charge sheet to regressive frustration group would have a significant adverse affect upon teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-3}} : \] Frustration through academic overwork would inversely affect the teaching-efficiency significantly'.

\[ s_{H_{1-3a}} : \] 'Inducing frustration through academic overwork to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant inhibitory effect upon the teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-3r}} : \] 'Inducing frustration through academic overwork to fixative frustration subjects would significantly interfere the teaching-efficiency'.

\[ s_{H_{1-3r}} : \]
sH1-3r : 'Inducing frustration through academic overwork to regressive frustration subjects would adversely affect the teaching-efficiency significantly'.

sH1-4 : 'Frustration through detention would have a significant inverse affect the teaching-efficiency'.

sH1-4a : 'Inducement of frustration through detention to aggressive frustration subjects would have a significant adverse effect upon the teaching-efficiency'.

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

sH1-4r : 'Inducing frustration through detention to the regressive frustration group would significantly affect adversely the teaching-efficiency'.

sH1-5 : 'Frustration through warning would have a significant adverse effect upon the teaching-efficiency'.

sH1-5a : Inducement of frustration through verbal warning to aggressive frustration subjects would have significant inhibitory effect upon teaching-efficiency'.

sH1-5a : Inducement of frustration through verbal warning to aggressive frustration subjects would have significant inhibitory effect upon teaching-efficiency'.

sH1-5a : Inducement of frustration through verbal warning to aggressive frustration subjects would have significant inhibitory effect upon teaching-efficiency'.
\( H_{1-5f} \): 'Frustration induced through warning to fixative frustration group would significantly interfere the teaching-efficiency'.

\( H_{1-5r} \): 'Inducement of frustration to regressive frustration group through verbal warning would adversely affect teaching-efficiency significantly'.

(b) **Differential Study**:

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

(c) **Correlational Study**:

\( H_3 \): "The amount of frustration expressed through various reactions under different types of frustration would adversely affect the teaching-
efficiency significantly.

More specifically we may put it as under:

"there exists significant difference between the means on various tests measuring frustration their different reactions (e.g. aggression, fixation and regression) and different types of frustration (e.g. OD, BD, and NP) and the teaching efficiency. However, the level of significance of difference between means of teaching efficiency and the aggressive frustration reaction would be the highest while those indicative of regressive frustration reaction would be the lowest; however, the indices showing the difference between means of fixation as frustration reaction and teaching efficiency would lie somewhere in between these two limits".

$H_4$ : "The coefficient of correlation computed between the scores on various tests measuring frustration and teaching efficiency of the teachers with relatively (i) longer teaching experience, (ii) higher educational attainments (iii) older in age, (iv) more emoluments drawn, and (v) of male sex would be invariably lower than those who
are classified relatively as: (i) shorter teaching experience, (ii) lower educational attainments, (iii) younger in age, (iv) lesser emoluments drawn, and (v) of female in sex respectively."

1.6 **Delimitation of the Study**

This study would be delimited by the following considerations:

(i) This study would be conducted only on lecturers of higher secondary schools;

(ii) The sample teaching-personnel would be drawn out from the higher secondary schools of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai only. However, the teacher-trainees would be taken from the Kalyan College of Education, Bhilai.

(iii) The correlational study would be conducted on the teaching personnel of Higher Secondary Schools of B.S.P., Bhilai, whereas the inducement of frustration through experimentation would be studied on teacher-trainees of Kalyan College of Education, Bhilai.

(iv) The study of frustration would include its three major parameters, e.g. aggression, fixation and
regression; and its three types, e.g. OD, RD, and NP.

(v) This study is concerned only with the teaching efficiency as dependent variable. No other dependent variable has been included.

(vi) It is primarily an experimental study in which the effect of inducing frustration by various techniques on teaching efficiency would be studied. However, to a restricted sense, it includes some correlational as well as differential studies also.

1.7 Conceptual Framework and Operational Definitions

The present study is centred around frustration as independent variable and teaching efficiency as dependent variable.

1.71 Conceptual Framework:

1.711 Dependent Variable: The Teaching Efficiency:

Numerous synonyms have been used for evaluating the behavioural outcomes in teaching. Teacher-competence, teacher-effectiveness, teacher-performance, teaching-proficiency, teacher-efficiency, teaching-efficiency are some of them which are frequently used. Though these phrases appear to be synonyms, they are not identical in their semantics.
Teacher-competence, teacher-effectiveness, teacher-performance, teacher-efficiency are the person-oriented behavioural change in teaching whereas teaching-effectiveness, teaching-efficiency, teaching-proficiency are the process-oriented behavioural outcomes. As a matter of fact, 'competence' whether annexed with teacher or teaching, is a 'content-oriented' word whereas 'performance' is an 'action-oriented' one. 'Effectiveness' as such is outcome or product or goal-oriented behavioural change whereas 'efficiency' is a 'person-oriented' behavioural effectiveness indicating how much of the specific potentiality that he possesses is translated into process-operation and action. It is a proportion of capacity to ability put to action at a certain process operation. Effectiveness in education as such has been widely used in educational process. Efficiency did not get the educational currency to the extent competency, proficiency or effectiveness could.

In the dictionary, 'effectiveness' has a connotation of 'adequacy to accomplish a purpose, producing the intended or expected results, outcome, issue effect, consequence, results that refer to something produced by an action or a cause' whereas 'efficiency' refers to 'the state or quality of being efficient competency in performance, accomplishment of or ability to accomplish a job with a minimum expenditure of time and effort' whereas
Good teaching is a relative term. It has a relevance with some goals of the teaching process which are multiple, varied and changing in accordance with the needs and demands of the society. Thus, the concept of good teaching is interwoven with the social philosophy of any nation.

Since good teaching is a relative concept, perhaps it can be better explained in terms of teacher effectiveness which is determined by teacher variables. (Morse, W.C. et al., 1969) Numerous studies have been made of the personal attributes of good and poor teachers (Hawkins and Stoops, 1966; Ryans, 1960; Beck, 1969; Morse, Bloom, and Dunn, 1961). Through direct questioning, rating observation, projective tests, and analysis of background information, Ryans (1960) reported that "for elementary and secondary teachers combined, there was a general tendency for high teachers to be extremely generous in appraisals of behaviour and motives of other persons; possess strong interest in reading and literary affairs; be interested in music, painting, and the arts in general; participate in social groups, enjoy pupil relationships; prefer non-directive (Permissive) class-room Procedures, manifest superior verbal intelligence; and be superior with respect to emotional adjustment". In another study Beck (1967) found that the effective teachers were perceived by sixth-graders as a friendly, warm and supportive
person who communicate well and motivate them to greater effort. The poor teachers on the contrary were judged relatively as critical, unsocial and unfavourable towards pupils, and were rather less satisfactory in emotional adjustment. Morse, Bloom, and Dunn (1961) assessed the degree to which teacher statements as rated both by pupils and trained observers of preferred practice corresponded to ratings of their actual practice along four dimensions (e.g. achievement, group work, provision for individual differences, and mental health considerations) and reported that teacher philosophy, preferred practice, and actual practice were virtually unrelated; however, pupils showed a tendency to see the class as either high or low on all four dimensions; though observers and pupils saw somewhat similar class-room conditions, their perceptions were unrelated to what the teacher thought.

From these studies, it is significant to note that good teaching involves the ability to relate to and work with pupils and the ability to organize the learning experiences in some systematic manner. Thus, teaching efficiency takes into consideration the ability to manipulate, control and exploit the social, material and academic environment available in the class-room, to organize, correlate, coordinate the human elements, and learning experiences, to diagnose and evaluate the merits and
limitations of learning outcomes and to present them in effective way so as to cause learning by learners economi-
cally but effectively.

Criteria of Effectiveness in Educational Processes:

Effectiveness is relative depending upon numerous variables interacting in the class-room teaching-learning situations. From this point of view, the effectiveness of teaching has a direct relationship with the specific educational goals for a particular class-room. William C. Morse and G. Max Wingo (1969, p. 11) point out that three major elements must be taken into consideration in this operation: the teacher, the pupils, and the goals. In view of the relative nature of effective teaching, they questioned: "Effectiveness for whom and effective for what"? And, visualizing the interactive condition of a class-room teaching-learning process, defined that 'effective teaching is doing the appropriate thing for the individuals in a particular group to move them along toward specified goals' (William, C. Morse, & G. Max, Wingo, p. 11, 1969). A simplified model of the elements leading to effective teaching by them explains vividly the mechanism of class-
room teaching effectiveness.

A great deal of time and energy has been expended to find ways to appraise teaching competence and to identify
the factors that enter into it. Various kinds of observation schedules, inventories, and check lists have been devised, but there is an underlying feeling of doubt within the profession about the accuracy and adequacy of current evaluation techniques (NEA, 1964b).

The most common kind of appraisal activity is the visit of a principal, supervisor or other administrative officer to a classroom to watch a teacher at work (NES, 1965). Impressions of the teacher gained from contacts outside the classroom, observations of the teacher's contacts with people outside the classroom, studies of pupils' achievement records, and reports of what parents and other teachers say about the teacher who is being evaluated, written evaluation through self-evaluation etc. are some of the techniques of evaluating teachers' effectiveness and teaching competence.

It would be desirable to think that in the present society, "teachers are evaluated with respect to the criterion of helping students achieve maturity. Unfortunately, the empirical data now available do not support such a belief. However, work in this difficult area of appraisal is going on and it is to be hoped that the profession will eventually develop more inclusive and discriminating techniques of appraising teaching" (William, C. Morse, & G. Max Wingo, 1969, p. 510).
No standards exist which are commonly agreed upon as the criteria of teacher effectiveness (Chester, W. Harris, 1960, p. 1481). Sandford & Trump (1950) lament the lack of a generally accepted criterion for the preservice selection of teachers. In their opinion the dearth of adequate effectiveness criteria is responsible for our ignorance of the factors which account for success in teaching. American Education Research Association (Remmers, H.H., 1952; pp. 238-63 and 1953, pp. 641-58) have rather published somehow more meaningful texts on the criteria of effectiveness.

Stevens, S.S. (1939, pp. 221-263) has pointed out that teacher-effectiveness as a concept has no meaning apart from the criterian measure or operational definitions of success as a teacher. These measures should possess four basic attributes: (i) relevance, (ii) reliability, (iii) freedom from bias, and (iv) practicality.

Chester, W. Harris, (1960, p. 1482) proposed that teaching effectiveness criteria be classified according to goal-proximity, as: (a) Product criteria, (b) Process criteria, and (c) Presage criteria. Brownell, W. A. (1948, pp. 106-112) proposed such a distinction when he discussed the products of learning as different from the process of learning.
(a) **Product Criteria:**

Product criteria depend for definition upon a set of goals toward which teaching is directed. These goals are most economically stated in terms of changes in behaviour on the part of students. Rabinowitz and Travers (1953, pp. 212-19). Ryans, D.G. (1940, pp. 690-99; 1953, pp. 370-96; 1953, pp. 73-83) as well as the reports of the Committee on Teacher Effectiveness headed by Remmers, H.H. (1952, pp. 238-63; 1953, pp. 641-58) have presented cogent arguments for assessing teaching competency in the light of effects on students. These effects are variously called student gains, student growth, or student changes, but they all involve measurement of change in student behaviour, a portion of which logically can be attributed to the influence of individual teachers. Foshay (1957, pp. 29-36) attempted to translate the ultimate goals into operational goals with a view to make the product criterion a formidable one. The objectivity in measuring the product criterion is further enhanced by Cureton (1951, pp. 695-763) and Ebel (1955, pp. 23-31) by stressing that the schools need to be practical and to narrow their self-evaluation efforts to the accomplishment of goals which are immediate and measurable. Bloom, B.S. (1954) and Kearney, N.C. (1953) have also supported these views.

Chester, W. Harris (1960, p. 1483) has specifically pointed out that "considering the theoretical importance of product criteria in the assessment of teacher effectiveness, it is surprising that so few studies have used some
measure of student growth as the operational definition of teacher competence". Barrs, (1948, pp. 203-83) summary of 138 studies listed only 19 different investigations which by any stretch of the imagination can be said to use measure of student gain as a criterion. Mitzel and Gross (1956, p. 28) found only twenty studies which had used a student growth criterion to measure teacher effectiveness in elementary or secondary schools. Remmers, H.H. (1952, p. 238-63) pointed out that teacher competence be appraised in the light of teachers' effects on school operations and on school-community relations, as well as their effects on students' learnings.

(b) **Process-Criteria:**

Process criteria consist of those aspects of teacher and student behaviour which are believed to be worth while in their own right. They are not necessarily directly related to the primary goals of education, though their presence in the class-room is sometimes looked for because of their assumed mediating effects on product criteria. Process criteria are most often described and measured in the classroom in terms of conditions, climate or typical situations involving the social interactions of students and teacher. One type of process criteria is obtained from observations of teacher behaviour, another from student behaviour. Withall's, J.G. (1949, pp.347-61)
scheme for classifying teachers' verbal behaviour in the classroom along a student-centred to teacher-centred continuum provides an excellent sample of a set of process criteria. The critical incident technique developed by Flanagan (1954, pp. 327-58) seems to hold some promise as a method for the development of process criteria of teacher effectiveness. Flanders' (1960) social interactional analysis constitutes another important measure for studying the process criterion of socio-emotional climate.

(c) Presage Criteria:

Presage criteria, having origin in guessed predictions, are from a logical standpoint completely removed from the goals of education. Precedent forces their consideration as criteria, since bulk of the research on teacher competence has employed dependent variables which fit into this category. In a sense, they are pseudo-criteria, for their relevance depends upon an assumed or conjectural relationship to other criteria, either process or product. Characteristically, presage criteria lack chronological proximity to the interplay of behaviour in the classroom.

Chester, W. Harris (1960, p. 1484) notes four types of presage variables: in common use as criteria in teacher effectiveness:

(i) teacher personality attributes,
(ii) characteristics of teachers in training,
(iii) teacher knowledge and achievement, and
(iv) inservice teacher status characteristics.

With a view to enhance the meaningfulness and explain the relative effectiveness of the independent and intervening variables interacting with the learning experiences in the class-room teaching-learning situations, numerous models have been developed. Some of the significant teaching effectiveness models have been discussed as under.

Teaching Effectiveness Models:

In the Wisconsin Studies, Barr, et. al. (1961) developed the most extended criterion of effectiveness paradigm in which Beecher (1961, p. 30-31) listed seven categories (e.g. (i) Inservice rating, (ii) Peer rating, (iii) Pupil gain score, (iv) Pupil rating, (v) Comparison of test scores from tests, (vi) Practice Teaching Grades, (vii) Combination of composites of some or all of the above criteria). Domas and Tiedeman (1950) derived the criteria of teacher effectiveness from the 1000 items annotated bibliography and presented three main categories:

(i) Between (a) in-service and (b) in-training teachers,
(ii) Between criteria based on (a) pupil achievement,
(b) judgment by administrators, teachers themselves, fellow
teachers, student teachers, pupils or lay persons, and (c) performance on tests of 'teaching ability' etc.

(iii) Between pupil achievement criteria (a) 'objectively' observed, and (b) those subjectively evaluated by administrators or teachers. These criteria have been further analyzed on the 'ultimacy' and 'career levels' continua. (Domas and Tiedeman, 1950, pp. 214-215). The committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness (American Educational Research Association, (AERA) 1952, pp. 243-244) presented the hierarchy of criteria according to 'ultimacy' whereas in its second report the A.E.R.A. (1953, p. 649) identified four career levels of criteria: (i) The ultimate criteria, (ii) In-service predictors, (iii) In-Training Predictors, and (iv) Pre-training Predictors, and organized them in hierarchical levels.

Pointing out the short-comings regarding the predictors and criteria incorporated in the paradigm of teacher effectiveness, Mitzel (1957) submitted that, "...during the past 50 years it has been characteristic of the research on teacher effectiveness to jump directly from predictor variables", He, therefore, presented a 'Generalized Scheme for research in 'Teacher Effectiveness' (Mitzel, 1957, p. 5). He included four types of variables: (i) Type I : Predictor sources, (ii) Type II : Contingency factors, (iii) Type II I : Classroom behaviour, and (iv) Type IV : Criteria of effectiveness (Intermediate educational goals). In such a scheme, teacher variables (Type I) and
pupil variables (Type II) are direct determinants of teacher behaviour and pupil behaviour respectively. It is through the intercession of his Type III variables that Mitzel visualized the least hope of improvement in teacher effectiveness. Medley and Mitzel (1959) subsequently formulated the operational measures of type III variables.

'Micro-effectiveness' (N.L. Gage, 1967, p. 120) is one of the solutions to enhance objectivity and specificity in the 'criterion of effectiveness'. "Rather than seek criteria for the overall effectiveness of teachers in the many varied facets of their roles, we may have better success with criteria of effectiveness in small, specifically defined aspects of the role. Many scientific problems have eventually been solved by being analyzed into smaller problems whose variables were less complex. Hence, rather than studies of teacher effectiveness, and criteria therefore, we may make better progress if we develop 'micro-criteria' of effectiveness (Gage, N.L., 1967, p. 120)."

Ryans (1960, pp. 26-56) continued to use the term criterion, but not with the commitment to 'effectiveness'. In this sense, 'criterion' becomes synonymous with dependent variable. Mitzel (1960, p. 1483) used the term 'process criteria' or 'aspects of teacher and student behaviour' (Type III).
Smith (1960, p. 234) has offered a pedagogical model in which he classified all the variables involved in and related to teaching into three categories: Independent (teaching actions), Intervening (learning), and dependent (pupil actions) variables. The pedagogical model has been sketched below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td>Intervening variables</td>
<td>Dependent variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teacher)</td>
<td>(Pupils)</td>
<td>(Pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Linguistic behaviour</td>
<td>These variables consist of postulated explanatory entities and processes such as memories, beliefs, needs, inferences and associative mechanisms.</td>
<td>(1) Linguistic behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II) Performance behaviour</td>
<td>(II) Performative behaviour</td>
<td>(II) Performative behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III) Expressive behaviour</td>
<td>(III) Expressive behaviour</td>
<td>(III) Expressive behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model has been explained in terms of 'flow of teaching' through 'cycles of giving and taking instructions' (Smith, 1960, p. 235).

Ryan (1960a, p. 18) and Flander (1964) developed models respectively for the integration of teacher behaviour and social interaction in the classroom teaching-
learning situations. Having applied Lewins' formula of explaining behaviour (1946, p. 791, \( B = F (P.E.) \)), Ryans (1960, p. 13) illustrated the integration of teacher behaviour. Still another social interaction paradigm has been prepared by Stone, G.C. and Leavitt, G.C. (1950) which runs into thirteen interactive steps. Runkel, P.J. (1958) presented a brief model for pupil-teacher interaction which has been analyzed into ten successive steps.

It is evident from these process paradigms that there exists some common elements. Each paradigm begins with (i) an element referring to perceptual and cognitive processes on the part of the teacher. The processes evaluated in (ii) action elements on the teachers' part. The teacher's actions are followed by (iii) perceptual and cognitive processes on the pupils' part, and these in turn lead to (iv) action elements on the pupils' side. In Ryans (1960a) paradigm, the elements of type I (e.g. perceptual-cognitive) are represented by only on inclusive entry whereas in Smith's (1960), this type of element is broken down into two parts; perception and diagnosis. Similarly, while Smith (1960) and Runkel (1958) have only one element for the teachers' action, Ryans' paradigm (1960a) analyzes this rubric into four parts consisting not only of the act, but also of the teachers' subsequent environmental events, goal responses, and reinforcement induced changes. For the same type of element, Stone and Leavitt (1958) have a three
part analysis consisting of ideal proposed and actual action patterns. (Gage, N.L. 1967, p. 128). However, despite differences in their terminology, fineness of breakdown of elements in the process and methods of portraying interaction, all the paradigms observe (i) a cyclical, repetitive quality, and (ii) an oscillatory character.

However, these process models suffer seriously from neglect of enormous differences in the pupils and teachers, and the differential roles of the two sides in teaching process. "In their exclusive generality, these interaction paradigms make teaching and 'pupiling' look identical (Gage, N.L., 1967, p. 129). The process paradigms, thus, fail to present exactly as to how interacts between teachers and pupils should be combined to characterize significant processes and outcomes in the class-room. Gage, N.L. (1967, p. 129) has rightly commented that "when more experience has been gained in operationalizing the paradigms, the problems of combining interacts into educationally significant units will become more realistic".

Perhaps other such models developed by Kaoru Yamamoto (1963), Biddle, B, and N.J. Elena (1964), Ketcham and Morse (1965), Flander (1964) which examine the effectiveness of different independent and intervening variables interacting with learning experiences during the
class-room teaching-learning process may meet to a large extent some of the shortcomings enumerated in the existing teaching effectiveness models.

Though educational output is synonymous to educational outcomes, learning outcomes teaching effectiveness, teaching efficiency, etc., the present study has selected 'teaching efficiency' as the only dependent variable.

Teaching competence is synonymous to teaching efficiency to a large extent, however, the latter is a wide term that includes the former as one of its components. Since teaching efficiency is a function of teacher variables, pupil variables, content variables, teaching method variables and environmental variables, the measure of teaching efficiency has to take into consideration all these independent and intervening variables acting, interacting and counteracting upon teaching efficiency of the teacher. Thus, we may express teaching efficiency as under:

\[ TE = Fv (T \times P \times C \times M \times E) \]

Hence, teaching efficiency in the present study has been defined as that aspect of teaching effectiveness in which we measure to what extent the teacher variables have been involved in the delivery of desired unit of course-content to the pupils through appropriate methods and procedures under a given socio-emotional climate and physical environment.
The classroom teaching efficiency, therefore, could be assessed by a global interaction during a classroom teaching situation by a teacher. It is, thus necessary that any measure which intends to evaluate the teaching efficiency of a teacher has to take into consideration the interactional teaching outcomes as an index of teaching efficiency of the teacher.

(b) Operational Definition:

In the present study, teaching efficiency as conceptually presented above, has been operationally defined as the total score obtained by a teacher on a measure of teaching efficiency consisting of five components, e.g. teacher variables, pupil variables, content variables, method variables, and environmental variables. Since we are concerned with the global teaching efficiency of the teacher, the total score obtained on the teaching efficiency scale developed by the investigator would be an index of his global teaching. However, the amount of interaction of each of the components, upon the global teaching efficiency would reveal the impact of each one of the components on the total teaching efficiency.

1.712 Independent Variable: Frustration and Reactions to Frustration;
The conceptual framework of 'frustration' and its various reactions have been presented below:

Frustration has been defined as a hypothetical construct produced either by some type of inhibitory condition or by a competitive excitatory tendency aroused simultaneously with an already enjoining excitatory tendency to strength (Brown and Farber, 1951). Emotion is the core to frustration (Sargent, 1948).

Since frustration behaviour takes goal orientation and is the end of need deprivation, the strength of the inhibitory tendency varies as a function of response-blocking amount of work or non-reward (Chauhan and Tewari, 1972). The pressure, failure and inability to escape form a learning situation produce frustration (Maier, 1970).

Frustration has been studied in a variety of ways. Some investigators have studied as a motivational determinant (Amsel and Roussel, 1952; Brown and Farber, 1957; Parney, 1960; Bower, 1962), some as an inhibitor (Brown and Farber, 1951; Estes, 1958), as a harm-troubling response (Doob and Gross, 1968); some as a primary motivational condition aroused by cessation of reward (Estes, 1958; Amsel, 1958); while some others as emotionally toned phenomenon (Sargent, 1948).

Studies in frustration (Amsel and Roussel, 1952) obtained frustration effect which has been defined as the
difference between the vigour of performance following reward as contrasted with non-reward, Marx (1956) observed an association phenomenon in frustration. It was held that the organism had simply learned to make a more vigorous response under the conditions of frustration. The affective arousal as fundamental in the definition of frustration supported by Sargent's contention of considering emotion as core of frustration.

(a) Reactions to Frustration:

These concepts of frustration get expression through aggression, regression, fixation and resignation which have been operationally defined and conceptually stated as under:

(1) Aggression:

In 1934, Saul Rosenzweig formulated a theory consisted of three major points:

(i) Occurrence of an obstacle that prevented the satisfaction of need.

(ii) Some reactions to the frustrating situations (O-D, E-D, N-P).

(iii) Frustration tolerance (Reed Lawson, 19 pp. 11-12).
Aggression has been defined as an act whose goal response is an injury to an organism or organism surrogate (Dollard et. al., 1939, p. 11). It is the result of frustration (Weller and Suleman, 1968; Hollenberg and Sperry, 1951; Sears, Robert, p. 1951). In the present study, aggression has been operationally defined in terms of 'the total scores obtained by an individual on items that describe a behaviour characterised by a rule ensuring to elders, irritation, feeling of unfairness, carrying grudges, frequent quarrelling, broken engagement, unprints as to take revenge and reactionary attitudes to tradition and beliefs. Such aggressive, reactions to frustration have been measured by 'Frustration Scale' (Sharma & Srivastava, 1979) as well as by the Indian adaptation of Rosenzweig P.F. Test (Udai Pareekh, 1959).

(11) **Fixation**

Symonds (1946) considers 'Fixation' as a defense against anxiety by stopping the progress of development. Fixated behaviour as such remains compulsive (Maier, 1949). It has been observed that in fixation, reoccurrence of behaviour takes place without variation units, nature and kind, and there appears a degree of resistance to change. Fixation obstructs the inflow of information and presents psychological blocks in forming new associations, developing new adaptations. It may be the result of either over-gratification or frustration of the normal expression of instinctual drive.
In the present study, fixation has been operationally defined in terms of 'the total scores obtained by an individual on items describing a behaviour characterised by cherishing for deep and lasting hunts, persistence of childhood rears, worries of hypoweighty, feeling of physically handicapped, feeling of negligence etc! Such fixative reactions, as expression to frustration, have been measured by the 'Frustration Scale' (Sharma & Srivastava, 1979) to measure frustration developed from adverse teaching-learning situations as well as from the Indian adaptation of the Rosenzweig P.F. Test (Udai Pareek, 1959).

(iii) Regression:

Regression refers to retreat, a returning to an earlier mode of adjustment, thought, feeling and behaviour (Symonds, 1946). In their frustration regression hypothesis, Barker, Dembo, Lewin and Wright (1941) considered regression as the end response of frustration.

Operationally regression has been defined in terms of 'the total scores obtained by an individual on items describing a behaviour characterised by hashfulness, finicky about foods, feel lacking in self control, wish to be again escapist, homesick when away from home, cries easily, speech defective, excessive day-dreams, exorbitantly ambitious etc'. Such regressive reactions to frustration have been measured.
by the Frustration Scale (Sharma & Srivastava, 1979) as well as by the Indian adaptation of Rosenzweig P.F. Test (Udal Pareek, 1959).

(iv) Resignation:

Resignation has been characterised by an emotionally tinged attitude shown by cessation of active response to a situation which has been tried to alter. Zawadski and Lazaresfield (1935) obtained extreme limitation of needs, no definite relations to the future; either no hopes at all or hopes which are not taken seriously.

Resignation has been operationally defined in terms of 'the total scores obtained by an individual on items that describe a behaviour characterised by limitation of all needs, no plans, no definite relations to future, withdrawn from social contacts, frequent and serious consideration of committing suicide, longing for loneliness, returning within one's-self, lacking trust in surroundings etc'.

Types of Frustration:

The scores of frustration as measured on the Indian adaptation of Rosenzweig P.F. Test (Udal Pareek, 1959) have been further analysed into O-D (Obstacle Dominance), E-D (Ego Defence), and N-P (Need Persistence) as suggested by him. They have been operationally defined as under.
(i) **O-D Frustration**: 

O-D has been operationally defined as the 'total score obtained by a subject on all the items pertaining to the O-D aspect of frustration'.

(ii) **E-D Frustration**: 

'E-D has been operationally defined as the total score obtained by a subject on all the items related to the E-D aspect of frustration'.

(iii) **N-P Frustration**: 

'N-P has been operationally defined as the total score obtained by a subject on all the items related to the N-P aspect of frustration'.

In essence, aggression is the expression of hostile frustration while regression is a condition of fixation. Fixation is a defense against anxiety by withholding the process of developments whereas resignation is the extreme of withdrawal from reality. Thus, a global psychological construct of frustration ideally takes into consideration all these four modes of expression of frustration: aggression, fixation, regression and resignation, however, in the present study, we have included the former three modes of expression to frustration because of
the limitation of the measure of frustration at hand. Hence, frustration has been operationally defined, in this study, as 'the total score obtained by an individual on all the items of a frustration scale characterised by emotionally tinged behaviour which is the mode of expression of aggression or fixation or regression (Sargent, 1948). Frustration gets expression through negative toned stress reactions. While the total score obtained by a subject on the frustration scale used in this study represents the global frustration; the individual reflects varied aspects of frustration as indicators of frustration reactions of a specific type.

The next Chapter presents a systematic review of the relevant literature in frustration and teaching-effectiveness with special reference to teaching-efficiency.