Volume : 2 | Issue : 2 | Feb 2013 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Research Paper | Education

Investigating the Frustration of D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees

A. C. Lal Kumar — Research Scholar, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Chidambaram - 608 002, Tamil Nadu, India.

Dr. R. Muthumanicakam — Research Guide, Professor, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Chidambaram - 608 002. Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the investigating the frustration level of D.T.Ed., (Diploma in Teacher Education) Teacher Trainees. 400 D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees were taken as a sample. Out of these 129 male and 271 female teacher trainees were taken as sample. Statistical analysis was done by using descriptive and differential analysis. The result of the analysis reveals that the D.T.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on genders, optional subjects of study and parental qualification have average level of frustration.

KEYWORDS: Frustration, Gender, Optional subjects of study, Parental qualification and D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees

Introduction

Teachers are the torch bearers in creating social cohesion, national integration and a learning society. They not only disseminate knowledge but also create and generate new knowledge. Enlightened, emancipated and empowered teachers lead communities and nations in their march towards better and higher quality of life. They reveal and elaborate the secrets of attaining higher values in life and nurture empathy for the fellow beings. They are responsible for acculturating role of education. No nation can even marginally slacken its efforts in giving necessary professional inputs to its teachers and along with that due status to their stature and profession (Rajput, 2006).Thus, Teacher, the key factor in all educational development, needs to be professionally equipped with teaching competencies, commitment and determination to perform at their best. The quality of education is a direct consequence and outcome of the quality of teachers and teacher education system.

Rationale of the study

Frustration represents an act of adjustment to the surrounding environment, being part of the continuous interaction between the body and the environment, within the process of assimilation and adjustment (Pavelcu, 1970). Frustration is a negative emotional response to non fulfillment of a potentially satisfying activity, thus, conducive of a feeling of being thwarted in attaining your goals. In the Dictionary of Psychology, by Doron and Parot (1999) define frustration as:"lack of an object likely to meet a need". There is also a subjective aspect: satisfaction privation is experienced as deprivation of or deniably someone else. According to Neveanu (1978) frustration is: complexes act of emotional imbalance nurtured at the level of personality, transitory or relatively stable, as a result of unfulfillment of needs, privation of what one used to own, materially and emotionally". We often express different opinions, disagreements, feelings, and emotions in conversational arguments and such expressions may evoke emotional reactions in others, even though we may not intend that to happen. Different people have different attitudes and different means of coping with arguments. People in arguments may display a variety of negative emotions, e.g., distrust, disappointment, frustration, shame, confusion, worry, anger, or fear.

Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as 'Investigating the Frustration of D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees.

Operational Definition of the Term Used

Frustration –

Frustration is a feeling of powerlessness or becoming to the level of nothing in which the responses towards the direction of aggressive reactions are measured as (i) aggression is expressed toward the environment (extra punitive reaction) or (ii) towards self sometime benefiting (intropunitive reaction) or (iii) the frustrating situation is glossed over or minimized to the level of denying its existence (impunitive reaction).

Methodology

In the present study, descriptive survey method was followed as it is the most appropriate method to know the present status.

Sample of the Study

In the present research work, random sampling technique was used by investigators for selection of the sample of 400 D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees. Out of these 129 male and 271female from four D.T.Ed., institutions were considered.

Tool used for the study

In order to achieve the objectives of the study the investigator used the Verbal Frustration Test (VFT) Standardized by Muthayya was used.

Statistical Techniques Used

The collected data were analyzed by using descriptive and differential analyses to accept or reject the hypotheses.

Objectives of the Study

1) To find out the level of frustration of D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees.
2) To find out the difference if any between the following D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees in respect of their frustration.

(a) Gender - Male / Female
(b) Optional subjects of study - Arts / Science
(c) Parental Qualification -
(i) Illiterate and School Education
(ii) Illiterate and College Education
(iii) School Education and College Education

Hypotheses of the Study

1) The frustration of D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees is high.
2) There is a significant difference between the following sub-samples with respect to the frustration D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees.

(a) Gender - Male / Female
(b) Optional subjects of study - Arts / Science
(c) Parental Qualification -
(i) Illiterate and School Education
(ii) Illiterate and College Education
(iii) School Education and College Education

Classification of Subjects On The Basis Of Levels of Frustration

TABLE 1
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF D.T.Ed., TEACHER TRAINEES BASED ON THE LEVELS OF FRUSTRATION

Groups	N	Mean	SD	Level of Frustration Range
Entire Sample	400	7.64	2.09	Average
High- Frustration	79	10.86	0.78	Above 7.73
Average - Frustration	196	7.82	0.81	5.55 – 7.73
Low- Frustration	125	5.31	0.75	Below 5.55

Table 1 shows that the mean scores of the high, average and low frustration groups are 10.86, 7.82 and 5.31 respectively. The standard deviation values for these three groups are 0.78, 0.81 and 0.75. In this study, based on normal curve D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees secured scores in between 5.55 to 9.73 (-1s to +1s) are classified as in average level of frustration.

Descriptive Analysis - Frustration of D.T.ED., Teacher Trainees

TABLE – 2

DESCRIPTIVE STATISITCS FOR FRUSTRATION SCORES OF D.T.Ed., TEACHER TRAINEES

Categories	Sub-Samples	N	Mean	S.D	Level
Entire Sample		400	7.64	2.09	Avg
Gender	Male	129	7.27	1.99	Avg
	Female	271	7.81	2.12	Avg
Optional subjects of Study	Arts	163	7.46	1.95	Avg
	Science	237	7.76	2.18	Avg
Parental Qualification	Illiterate	111	7.19	1.86	Avg
	School Education	204	7.89	2.21	Avg
	College Education	85	7.61	2.01	Avg

Avg - Average

In the table 2 the calculated mean values are less than 9.73 and more than 5.55. Therefore, it is found that the D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees irrespective of their gender, optional subjects of study, and parental income (per-month) have average level of frustration.

Differential Analysis for Frustration Scores - D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees

TABLE 3

't' TEST VALUES FOR FRUSTRATION SCORES - D.T.Ed., TEACHER TRAINEES

Categories	Sub-Samples	N	Mean	S.D	't' Value
Gender	Male	129	7.27	1.99	2.50S
	Female	271	7.81	2.12	
Optional subjects of Study	Arts	163	7.46	1.95	1.45NS
	Science	237	7.76	2.18	
Parental Qualification	Illiterate	111	7.19	1.86	2.95S
	School Education	204	7.89	2.21	
	Illiterate	111	7.19	1.86	1.47NS
	College Education	85	7.61	2.01	
	School Education	204	7.89	2.21	1.04NS
	College Education	85	7.61	2.01	

Level of Sig- 0.05 S-Significant NS- Not-Significant

Table 3 reveals that the mean, standard deviation and 't' values for male and female D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees on frustration. The calculated 't' value is 2.50, which is higher than the table value of 1.97 to be significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the research hypothesis no 2 (a) is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected. Further it is found that the male and female D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees differ significantly in their frustration.

In the case of arts and science D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees on frustration the calculated 't' value is 1.45, which is lower than the table value of 1.97 to be significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the research hypothesis no 2 (b) is rejected and null hypothesis is accepted. Further it is found that the arts and science D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees do not differ significantly in their frustration.

Table 3 further reveals that the't' values of D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees based on their parental qualification. The D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees whose parental qualification illiterate and school education differ significantly in their frustration as the calculated 't' value is higher than 1.97 to be significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis no 2 c (i) is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. But in the case of other D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees whose parental qualification are illiterate and college education, school education and college education do not differ significantly in their frustration as calculated 't' value is less than the table value of 1.97 to be significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypotheses no 2, c (ii) and (iii) are rejected and research hypotheses are accepted.

Major Findings of the Study

- It is found that the D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees irrespective of their gender, optional subjects of study, and parental income (per-month) have average level of frustration.
- The male and female D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees differ significantly in their frustration.
- The D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees with arts and science optional subjects of study do not differ significantly in their frustration
- The D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees whose parental qualifications are illiterate and school education differ significantly in their frustration.
- The D.T.Ed., Teacher Trainees whose parental qualification are illiterate and college education, school education and college education do not differ significantly in their frustration.

REFERENCES

Best, John, W., & Khan, James, V. (2008) Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd. | Doron, R. & Parot, F., (1999), Dicţionar de Psihologie, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, | Garrett, Henry & Wood Worth, R.S.(2008). Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi | Pavelcu, V., (1970), Invitaţie la cunoaşterea de sine, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, | Rajput, J.S. (2006). Curriculum framework for quality teacher education. Retrieved April 1, 2006 from www.ncte-in.org/pub/curr/curr.htm#11 |