

## A conceptual framework of the concepts of frustration, work motivation & leadership behaviour

<sup>1</sup> Sukhdev Mittal, <sup>2</sup> Dr. Mudita Bhatnagar

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Singhania University, Pachari Bari, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, India

<sup>2</sup> Principal, PKR Jain College of Education, Ambala City, Haryana, India

### Abstract

Modern educational organizations have grown more complex. There is requirement for intelligent guidance and supervision which only talented and creative people can give. Need of highly skilled leadership is therefore, the psychology of the group. The leader has to provide good morale and sustain the influence which involves as attempt to affect the behaviour through communication. Leadership is generally associated with certain goals and the means to achieve the group. A good leader is not only able to command well but is able to interact well from his followers to the best of their abilities and aptitudes. Significantly, Leadership and work motivation are very essential to the continuing growth of educational systems around the world and they rank alongside professional knowledge and skills, centre competencies, educational resources as well as strategies, in genuinely determining educational success and performance.

In the present paper the researcher has made an attempt to conceptualize the basic theoretical framework of the concepts of Frustration, Motivation & Leadership Behavior. The purpose of this paper is to have a proper understanding of the core concepts and its related approaches.

**Keywords:** frustration, RFS, work motivation, leadership behaviour

### Introduction

In every social group, we have leaders and the led. The former are active, whereas the later are passive. Every society, for its survival, ask for more and better leaders. The insistence for the demand for leaders evidently due to pressing needs of the environment. Everybody can't lead and every person can't effectively handle organized human relationship. A leader is always an individual who has outstanding qualities or head and heart. The identity of an institution depends upon its head. Leadership is a demand in different fields and situations like social, political, cultural and educational.

### Frustration

**Frustration is the feeling of being upset or annoyed as a result of being unable to change or achieve something. It is the prevention of the progress, success, or fulfillment of something.**

The frustration aggression theory is a psychological theory that aggression is caused by blocking, or frustrating, a person's efforts to achieve a goal. The theory has its origin in a 1939 hypothesis and study by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mower and Sears. According to frustration aggression theory, frustration augments the probability of aggression. Appalachian State University records that the original proponents of the theory defined frustration as "*the state that emerges when circumstances interfere with a goal response.*" Subsequent research has found that frustration is more likely to lead to aggression when the frustrated individual believes that aggressive behavior will reduce his frustration.

In the 1939 experiment that serves as the basis for frustration aggression theory, subjects were asked to create a specific origami pattern with instructions that were only to be repeated once. During the experiment, a confederate interrupted the instructions, asking the experimenter to slow

down. In the unjustified frustration group, the experimenter refused to slow down due to a pending appointment with a boyfriend or girlfriend. The experimenter in the justified group also refused to slow down but attributed his refusal to limited availability of the experiment room.

The experimenters measured the subjects' level of aggression by having them answer a questionnaire that supposedly determined whether the experimenter would receive additional funds or be reprovved. The unjustified group exhibited greater aggression than the justified and control groups, confirming the frustration aggression hypothesis.

### Types of Frustration

The different types of frustration are divided into environmental frustration, personal frustration, conflict-produced frustration and motivational conflict. Frustration is the reaction to the hindrance or hardship that prevents an individual from reaching a goal.

- **Environmental frustration:** It is the frustration that arises from an individual's surroundings, such as his workplace or his family. It may also come in a physical form, such as untimely rain, famine, flood or earthquakes.
- **Personal frustration:** It is caused when a person tries to achieve an unrealistic or impractical goal. When an individual experiences frustration due to his limitations as a person, it is called personal frustration. For instance, a student with average intelligence who hopes to get the highest score in his class, or a physically challenged person who wants to compete with fit people in a race, will probably experience personal frustration.
- **Conflict-produced frustration:** An individual is said to experience conflict-produced frustration when he is not on good terms with the people he has to deal with regularly. It can be caused by the hostility he feels towards others, or the hostility others have towards him. Such conflicting

frustration usually occurs between colleagues, or between an employee and the employer.

- **Motivational conflict:** It occurs when an individual has contrasting ideologies. For instance, an individual who values independence and needs strong relationships with others may experience motivational frustration.

Responses to frustration include anger, a loss of confidence, stress and depression. Meditation and a healthy perspective on life may help deal with frustration.

**Motivation**

Motivation is a human psychological characteristic that contributes to a person’s degree of commitment. It is the result of the interaction between an individual and a situation. Motivation can be defined as the processes that account for an individual’s intensity, direction, and persistence of effort towards attaining a goal.

The three key elements in this definition are intensity, direction & persistence. Intensity is concerned with how hard a person tries. However, high intensity is unlikely to lead to favorable job-performance outcome unless the effort is channeled in a direction that benefits the organization. Therefore, we have to consider the quality of effort as well as its intensity. Effort that is directed towards and consistent with the organization’s goals is the kind of effort that we should be seeking. Finally, motivation has a persistence dimension. This is a measure of how long a person can maintain effort. Motivated individuals stay with a task long enough to achieve their goals.

**Work Motivation Approaches**

We have a number of various work approaches. The following figure summarizes the various theoretical streams for work motivation from the year 1900 to the present.

**Table 1:** The Theoretical Development of Work Motivation

<b>Scientific Management</b> wage incentives		
<b>Human Relations</b> Economic security, working conditions	<b>Lewin and Tolman</b> Expectancy concerns	
<b>Maslow</b> hierarchy of needs	<b>Vroom</b> valence/expectancy	
<b>Herzberg</b> Motivators and hygiene factors	<b>Porter and Lawler</b> performance-satisfaction	<b>Festinger and Homans</b> Cognitive dissonance/ exchange
<b>Alderfer</b> ERG needs	<b>Lawler</b> E-P and P-O expectancies	<b>Adams</b> equity
<b>Content Theories</b>	<b>Process Theories</b>	<b>Contemporary Theories</b>
<b>Work Motivation</b>		

The table 1 shows three major approaches. The content theories go as far back as the turn of the century, when pioneering scientific managers such as Frederick W. Taylor, Frank Gilberth, and Henry L. Gantt proposed sophisticated wage incentive models to motivate workers. Next came the human relations movement, and then the content theories of Maslow, Herzberg, and Alderfer. Following the content movement were the process theories. Based mainly on the cognitive concept of expectancy, the process theories are most closely associated with the work of Victor Vroom and Lyman Porter and Ed Lawler. More recently, equity and its derivative procedural/ organizational justice theories have received the most attention in work motivation.

**The Content Theories of Work Motivation**  
**Maslow’ Hierarchy of Needs**

Maslow identified five levels in his need hierarchy. They are as under:

1. **Physiological:** Includes hunger, thirst, shelter, sex, and other bodily needs
2. **Safety:** Security and protection from physical and emotional harm
3. **Social:** Affection, belongingness, acceptance, and friendship
4. **Esteem:** Internal factors such as self-respect, autonomy, and achievement, and external factors such as status, recognition, and attention.

5. **Self-actualization:** Drive to become what one is capable of becoming; includes growth, achieving one’s potential, and self-fulfillment.

**A Hierarchy of Work Motivation**

1. **Basic needs:** Pay
2. **Security needs:** Seniority plans, union, health insurance, employee assistance plans, severance pay, pension
3. **Social needs:** Formal and informal work groups or teams
4. **Esteem needs:** Titles, status, symbols, promotions, banquets
5. **Self-Actualization:** Personal growth, realization of potential

**Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation**

Herzberg extended the work of Maslow and developed a specific content theory of work motivation. He conducted a widely reported motivational study on about 200 accountants and engineers employed by firms in and around Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

**Table 2:** Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

<b>Hygiene Factors</b>	<b>Motivators</b>
Company policy and administration	Achievement
Supervision, technical	Recognition
Salary	Work itself
Interpersonal relations, supervisor	Responsibility
Working conditions	Advancement

Herzberg concluded that job satisfiers are related to job content and that job dissatisfiers are allied to job context. Herzberg labeled the satisfiers *motivators*, and he called the dissatisfiers *hygiene* factors. The term hygiene refers to factors that are preventive; in Herzberg's theory the hygiene factors are those that prevent dissatisfaction. Taken together, the motivators and the hygiene factors have become known as Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation.

**Alderfer's ERG Theory**

An extension of the Herzberg and, especially the Maslow content theories of work motivation comes from the work of **Clayton Alderfer**. He formulated a needs category model that was more in line with the existing empirical evidence. Like Maslow and Herzberg, he does feel that there is value in categorizing needs and that there is a basic distinction between lower-order needs and higher-order needs.

Alderfer identified three groups of core needs that are:

1. **Existence:** The existence needs are concerned with survival (physiological well-being).
2. **Relatedness:** The relatedness needs stress the importance of interpersonal, social relationships.
3. **Growth:** The growth needs are concerned with the individual's intrinsic desire for personal development.

According to Alderfer's ERG model, that individual would be expected to then emphasize social relationship both on and off the job and become more enamored with pay and benefits.

**The Process Theories of Work Motivation**

The content models attempts to identify what motivates people at work; then try to specify correlates of motivated behaviour. The process theories, on the other hand, are more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation or effort and, more important, with the way they relate to one another.

**Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation**

The expectancy theory of work motivation has its roots in the cognitive concepts of pioneering psychologists Kurt Lewin and Edward Tolman, and in the choice behavior and utility concepts from classical theory. However, the first to formulate an expectancy theory directly aimed at work motivation was Victor Vroom. Contrary to most critics, Vroom proposed his expectancy theory as an alternative to content models, which he felt were inadequate explanations of the complex process of work motivation. *The model is built around the concepts of valence, instrumentality, and expectancy and is commonly called the VIE theory.*

- **By Valence**, Vroom means the strength of an individual's preference for a particular outcome.
- **Expectancy** is another major variable in the Vroom motivational process. Expectancy relates efforts to first-level outcomes. In other words, expectancy is the probability that a particular action or effort will lead to a particular first-level outcome.
- **Instrumentality** refers to the degree to which a first-level outcome will lead to a desired second-level outcome.

**The Porter-Lawler Model**

The content theories implicitly assume that satisfaction leads to improve performance and that dissatisfaction detracts from performance. The Herzberg model is really a theory of job

satisfaction, but still it does not adequately deal with the relationship between satisfaction and performance. The Vroom model also largely avoids the relationship between satisfaction and performance. Although satisfaction makes an input into Vroom's concept of valence and although the outcomes have performance implications, it was not until Porter and Lawler refined and extended Vroom's model that the relationship between satisfaction and performance was dealt with directly by a motivation model.

Porter and Lawler start with the premise that motivation (effort & force) does not equal satisfaction or performance. Motivation, satisfaction, and performance are all separate variables and relate in ways different from what was traditionally assumed. It is important, however, Porter and Lawler points out that effort (force or motivation) does not lead directly to performance. The rewards that follow and how these are perceived, will determine satisfaction. In other words, the Porter-Lawler model suggests- and this is a significant turn of events from traditional thinking-that performance leads to satisfaction.

**The Contemporary Theories of Work Motivation**

Although it is recognized that work-motivation theories are generally categorized into content and process approaches, equity and procedural justice theories have emerged in recent years and command most of the research attention. An understanding of these theoretical developments is now necessary to the study of work motivation.

**Equity Theory of Work Motivation**

As a theory of work motivation, credit for equity theory is usually given to social psychologist J. Stacy Adams. Simply put, the theory argues that a major input into job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity (or inequity) that people perceive in their work situation. In other words, it is another cognitively based motivation theory, and Adams depicts how this motivation occurs.

Equity theory is based on the assumption that a major factor in job motivation is the individual's evaluation of the equity or fairness of the reward received. Inequity occurs when a person perceives that the ratio of his or her outcomes to inputs and the ratio of a relevant other's outcomes to inputs are unequal. Schematically, this represented as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} < \frac{\text{other's outcomes}}{\text{other's inputs}}$$

$$\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} > \frac{\text{other's outcomes}}{\text{other's inputs}}$$

Equity occurs when

$$\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} = \frac{\text{other's outcomes}}{\text{other's inputs}}$$

Both the inputs and outputs of the person and the other are based on the person's perceptions. Age, sex, education, social status, organizational position, qualifications, and how hard the person works are examples of perceived input variables. Outcomes consist primarily of rewards such as pay, status, promotion, and intrinsic interest in the job. In essence, the ratio is based on the person's perception of what the person is giving (inputs) and receiving (outcomes) versus the ration of what the relevant other is giving and receiving. This

cognition may or may not be the same as someone else’s observation of the ratios or the same as the actual reality.

**Festinger and Homans Cognitive Dissonance Theory**

*Cognitive dissonance* refers to a situation involving conflicting attitudes, beliefs or behaviors. This produces a feeling of discomfort leading to an alteration in one of the attitudes, beliefs or behaviors to reduce the discomfort and restore balance etc. For example, when people smoke (behavior) and they know that smoking causes cancer (cognition).

Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory suggests that we have an inner drive to hold all our attitudes and beliefs in harmony and avoid disharmony (or dissonance). Attitudes may change because of factors within the person. An important factor here is the principle of cognitive consistency, the focus of Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance. This theory starts from the idea that we seek consistency in our beliefs and attitudes in any situation where two cognitions are inconsistent.

Leon Festinger proposed cognitive dissonance theory, which states that a powerful motive to maintain cognitive consistency can give rise to irrational and sometimes maladaptive behavior. According to Festinger, we hold much cognition about the world and ourselves; when they clash, a discrepancy is evoked, resulting in a state of tension known as cognitive dissonance. As the experience of dissonance is unpleasant, we are motivated to reduce or eliminate it, and achieve consonance (i.e. agreement).

Cognitive dissonance was first investigated by Leon

Festinger. According to cognitive dissonance theory, there is a tendency for individuals to seek consistency among their cognitions (i.e., beliefs, opinions). When there is an inconsistency between attitudes or behaviors (dissonance), something must change to eliminate the dissonance.

The theory of cognitive dissonance has been widely researched in a number of situations to develop the basic idea in more detail, and various factors that have been identified which may be important in attitude change.

This research can be divided into three main areas:

1. forced compliance behavior,
2. decision-making,
3. And effort.

When someone is forced to do (publicly) something they (privately) really don't want to do, dissonance is created between their cognition (I didn't want to do this) and their behavior (I did it). Forced compliance occurs when an individual performs an action that is inconsistent with his or her beliefs. The behavior can't be changed, since it was already in the past, so dissonance will need to be reduced by re-evaluating their attitude to what they have done.

**Leadership Behaviour**

A review of the leadership literature reveals an evolving series of 'schools of thought' from “Great Man” and “Trait” theories to “Transformational” leadership. Whilst early theories tend to focus upon the characteristics and behaviours of successful leaders, later theories begin to consider the role of followers and the contextual nature of leadership.

**Table 3:** Leadership Theories form “Great Man” to “Transformational Leadership”

<b>Great Man Theories</b>	Based on the belief that leaders are exceptional people, born with innate qualities, destined to lead. The use of the term ‘man’ was intentional since until the latter part of the 20 <sup>th</sup> century leadership was thought of as a concept which is primarily male, military and western. This led to the next school of Trait theories.
<b>Trait Theories</b>	The lists of traits or qualities associated with leadership exist in abundance and continue to be produced. They draw on virtually all the adjectives in the dictionary which describe some positive or virtuous human attribute, from ambition to zest for life.
<b>Behaviorist Theories</b>	These concentrate on what leaders actually do rather than on their qualities. Different patterns of behaviour are observed and categorized as “styles of leadership”. This area has probably attracted most attention from practicing managers.
<b>Situational Leadership</b>	This approach sees leadership as specific to the situation in which it is being exercised. For example, whilst some situations may require an autocratic style, others may need a more participative approach. It also proposes that there may be differences in required leadership styles at different levels in the same organization.
<b>Contingency Theory</b>	This is a refinement of the situational viewpoint and focuses on identifying the situational variables which best predict the most appropriate or effective leadership style to fit the particular circumstances.
<b>Transactional Theory</b>	This approach emphasizes the importance of the relationship between leader & followers, focusing on the mutual benefits derived from a form of ‘contract’ through which the leader delivers such things as rewards or recognition in return for the commitment or loyalty of the followers.
<b>Transformational Theory</b>	The central concept here is change and the role of leadership in envisioning and implementing the transformation of organizational performance.

Each of these theories takes a rather individualistic perspective of the leader, although a school of thought gaining increasing recognition is that of “dispersed” leadership. This approach, with its foundations in sociology, psychology and politics rather than management science, views leadership as a process that is diffuse throughout an organization rather than lying solely with the formally designated ‘leader’. The emphasis thus shifts from developing ‘leaders’ to developing ‘leaderful’ organisation with a collective responsibility for leadership.

**References**

1. Agarwal YP, Statistical Methods. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, 1986.
2. Agarwala UN, Malhan NK, Singh B. Some clarification of ‘Stress’ and its application at work. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations. 1979; 15:41-50.
3. Aggarwal R. Authoritarianism and stress: Some findings of Indian Adolescents, Psychological Studies. 1986; 31(2):16-164.
4. Anis Ahmed. Occupational stress and certain bibliographical variables as predictors of organizational



- change. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research*. 1994; 11:95-103.
5. Asthana HS. The concept of stress: A phenomenological approach. *Social Science International*. 1985; 1:39-44.
  6. Balani, Vimla J. A study of Role performance by the Heads of Secondary and its correlates. Kurukshetra KU, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of education, 1991.
  7. Barrow R, Peters RS. (eds.) *Role of the Head*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
  8. Bassett GW, *et al.* *Headmaster for Better Schools* Queensland, University of Queensland Press, 1967.
  9. Bauton, Michael, *Roles. An Introduction to the study of Social Relations*, London, Tavistoch Publications, 1965.
  10. Beehr TA. Organizational Stress and employee effectiveness: A job characteristics approach in TA. Beehr TA, Bhagat RS (eds.). *Human Stress and Cognition in Organizational*, New York: John Wiley and sons, 1950.
  11. Beens C, Poduval PR. Gender differences in work stress of executives. *Psychological studies*. 1992; 37:109-113.
  12. Benben JS. *The Principal ship – Its changing roles*, New York, Macmillan Co., 1960.
  13. Best JW, Khan JV. *Research in Education*, New Delhi Prentice-Hall of India, 1989.
  14. Bhagia NM, Juneja, Nalini, Srikant. Role performance of Heads of Colleges. NIEPA, 1988, In Buch, M.B. (Edu.) *Survey of Research in Education (Fourth)*, New Delhi, NCERT, 1983-88; 2:1075.
  15. Biddle, Bruce J, Thomas, Edwin J. (eds.) *Role Theory: Concepts and Research*, New York, John Willey and sons Inc., 1965.
  16. Borg M, Riding R, Falzon J. Stress in teaching: A study of occupational stress and its Determinants, Job Satisfaction and Career commitment among primary school teachers. *Educational Psychology*. 1991, 59-75.
  17. Caplan RD, Cobb S, French JRP, Van Harrison R, Pinneau SR. *Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences*. NIOSH Research Report, Cincinnati, OH, 1975.
  18. Chand R, Sethi AS. Organizational factors in the development of workstress. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 1987; 32:453-62.
  19. Charke, Saundra. Dimensions of Adjustment among college women Rulger (U.N.T.) *Journal of college students Development*. 1998; 39(A).
  20. Chauhan SS. *Advanced Educational Psychology*, Delhi. Vikas Publications (Pvt.) Ltd. 1978.
  21. Cohen S. Aftereffects of stress on human performance and social behaviour: A review of research and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1980; 88:82-108.
  22. Cooper CL, Smith MJ. *Job Stress and Blue Collar Work*, New York: John Wiley, 1985.
  23. Cooper CL. Identifying Stressors at work: Recent research developments, *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 1983; 27:369-376.
  24. Cox T, Mackay C. A transactional approach to occupational stress. In *stress work design and productivity* edited by EN, Carlett and J. Richardson, London: John Wiley, 1981.
  25. Day DR. *Basic Dimensions of Leadership in a Selected Industrial Organization*. Doctor's Dissertation. Columbus: The Ohio State University Library, 1961.
  26. Debta MN. *Role performance and its Correlates: Study of secondary school heads of Kurukshetra districts*. Kurukshetra KU, Unpublished M.Phil. Dissertation, Department of Education, 1973.
  27. Desai, Hetal, Daftuar, Chittaranjan N. Performance appraisal and occupational stress. *Abhigyan*. 2000; 18:44-44.
  28. Eberhart JA. *An investigation of Secondary Teachers and Principals. Role orientation and their expectation for the principal's Role Behaviour*. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1970.
  29. Fleishman EA. A leader behavior description for industry. In Stogdill RM, Coons AE (Eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*, Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph. 1957, 88.
  30. Fleishman EA. The description of supervisory behavior *J Appl. Psychol*. 1953; 37:1-6.
  31. Fleishman EA, Harris EF, Burt HE. *Leadership and Supervision in Industry*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph. 1956, 33.
  32. Foskett MJ. *Roles of Elementary School Principals*, University of Oregon, Centre for the advanced study of Educational Administration, 1967.
  33. Foster HZ. *A Comparative Study of Ideal Role and the Actual Role of the Elementary Study principal in IDAHO*. Uni of Idaho, Doctoral Dissertaion, 1971-1998.
  34. Garrett HE. *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Bombay, Vakils Fetter and Simons (Pvt) Ltd. 1980.
  35. Gaur, Shubra Prateek, Dhawan, Nisha. Work-related stress and adaptation pattern among women professionals, *Psychological Studies*. 2000; 45:58-64.
  36. Gaurage, Anand WP. *Administrative problems of private colleges*. *New Frontiers in Education*. 1972; 2-3.
  37. Gibson JC. *Management Essentials*, Hinsdale Illinois, the Eraden Press, 1979.
  38. Gisela R. Jenny. *Asian International Students adjustment, Issues and program suggestion*, Texas A and M.U. international student counseling programs and services, college station. *Tx College student Journal*. 1997, 31(4).
  39. Good CV. *Methodology of Education Research*, New York, Appleton Century Crafts Inc, 1941.
  40. Good CV. *Dictionary of Education*, New York, McGraw Hill Book Company Inc, 1959.
  41. Good WS. A theory of role Strain, *American Sociological Review*. 25, Hariogopal K, Ravi Kumar R. (1979) *Company Satisfaction in relation to certain job attitudes and role stress variables*. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1950; 16:61-67.
  42. Halpin AW. *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Mimeo. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.
  43. Halpin AW. *The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders*. *Harvard Educ. Rev*. 1955; 25:18-32.
  44. Halpin AW. *The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents: A Study of 50 Ohio Superintendents*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
  45. Halpin AW, Winer BJ. *A factorial study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions*. In Stogdill RM, Coons AE

- (Eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph.1950-1957, 88.
46. Hemphill JK, Coons AE. Development of the Leader behavior Description Questionnaire. In Stogdill RM, Coons AE (Eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph. 1957, 88.
  47. Hemphill JK. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. *J Educ. Psychol.* 1955; 46:385-401.
  48. Hemphill JK. Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of superior leaders. *J Soc. Psychol.* 1950; 32:11-22.
  49. Hemphill JK. *Situational Factors in Leadership*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph, 1949, 32.
  50. Joshi CM. A factorial study of the Adjustment, *Indian Psychological Review*, 1964.
  51. Krishnan K, Pushpam P. How Do Teachers Perceive their Heads' Treatment? *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*. 1979, 33-3.
  52. Lam DJ. *The Occupational Stress Inventory*, Department of Psychology, University of Hong Kon, 1988.
  53. Marder E. *Leader Behavior as Perceived by Subordinates as a Function of Organizational Level*. Master's Thesis. Columbus: The Ohio State University Library, 1960.
  54. McGrath JE. Stress and behaviour in organization. In Dunnette MD (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
  55. Mcgrath JE. *Social Psychological factors in stress*, New York, Holt, Reinchart and Winsten, 1970.
  56. Shartle CL. *Executive Performance and Leadership*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956.
  57. Shartle CL. Introduction. In Stogdill RM, Coons AE (Eds.) *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph, 1957, 88.
  58. Stogdill RM, Goode OS, Day DR. The leader behavior of corporation presidents. *Personnel Psychol.* 1963; 16:127-132.
  59. Stogdill RM. *Individual Behavior and Group Achievement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
  60. Stogdill RM. *Managers, Employees, Organizations*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1965.
  61. Stogdill RM, Coons AE, (Eds.) *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph, 1957, 88.
  62. Stogdill RM, Goode OS, Day DR. The leader behavior of United States senators. *J Psychol.* 1963; 56:3-8.
  63. Stogdill RM, Goode OS, Day DR. New leader behavior description subscale. *J Psychol.* 1962; 54:259-269.
  64. Welford AT. *Stress and Performance*, *Ergonomics*. 1973, 16-567.
  65. Yogracha YS, Misra SPA. Comparative study of organizational role stress Between Clerical and Teaching female personnel, personality study and group Behaviour. 1990; 10:59-65.