



# A STUDY OF LECTURES' FRUSTRATION IN EXAMINATION SCRIPT ASSESSMENT IN SELECTED POLYTECHNICS IN NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA

Dr. Goddy Chukuma<sup>1</sup>, Dr Victor O. Ojetokun<sup>2</sup>, Dr Barry O. Omale<sup>3</sup>  
Kaduna Polytechnic, Nigeria

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra11091>  
DOI No: 10.36713/epra11091

## ABSTRACT

*The study investigated lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment in North Central Nigeria. The descriptive correlation survey design was adopted for the study 322 randomly selected lecturers from 6 polytechnics participated as sample. The sample was made up of 190 males and 132 females (112 senior and 210 junior lecturers). Four instruments (Organizational Frustration Scale, Examination Script Assessment Frustration Scale, Lecturers' Frustration Reaction Scale and Consequence of Lecturers' Frustration Scale) were used for data collection. Pearson r was used to test for significance on the relationship between frustration and the 15 independent variables of mediating factors of frustration in examination script assessment. The Zero Order Multiple Correlation was used to test for significance on the relationship between frustration and 11 independent variables on lecturers' reaction to their frustration in examination script assessment. The t-test was used to test for significance on the level of frustration among the groups of lecturers in examination script assessment. Regression analysis was used to test for significance on the correlation between frustration and the 13 independent variables on the consequences of frustration in examination script assessment. Based on the 15 mediating factors measured, 9 reported high relationship as in poor response to questions, out of point, empty/scanty script, bulky answer, poor handwriting, rough scripts, lobbying/interference, large number of scripts and shortage of time for marking. Also, significant relationship exist between frustration and lecturers' reaction in the 11 subscales measured as in anger, aggression against students, poor scoring, complain to authorities, succumb to pressure from students and others. A further significant difference was found among the groups of lecturers in their level of frustration. To this extent, female and junior lecturers reported higher levels of frustration than male and senior lecturers in examination script assessment. Lastly, frustration significantly correlated with 13 variables in the subscales measuring the consequences of frustration in examination script assessment as in worry over 50% examination success rate, poor results, students' agitation, stress and disciplinary actions on lecturers among others. It was recommended among others that polytechnic authorities should organize orientation programmes for fresh students on how to approach examination at the beginning of their programme and for lecturers generally; but target the female and junior lecturers more on how to deal with frustration in examination script assessment among others.*

**KEYWORDS:** Assessment, correlation, examination, Frustration, survey

## INTRODUCTION

Considerable research evidence (Byrne, 1993; Costigan & Crocco, 2006) coupled with observable behaviours of lecturers during examination script assessment, indicate frustration. Frustration in this profession cannot be overlooked because (Odunayo, 2010) the affected teachers may likely display hostility, aggression and anger on the students in the psychological development and academic achievement of their students. In North Central Nigeria, there are several polytechnics and large number of lecturers who may be frustrated during assessment of examination scripts. For instance, Costigan and Crocco (2006) report that:

*Teachers are frustrated in their adherence to scripted lessons designed to maximize students' scores on high-stake testing.*

It is known from observation and reports (Tye & O'Brien, 2002) that examination scripts are not accurately and adequately assessed by teachers suffering from frustration due to some mediating factors. The implication is that the grading and quality of polytechnic graduates in North Central Nigeria will be affected.

## THE PROBLEM

Examination script assessment by lecturers in polytechnics poses great challenge which often lead to frustration. A number of studies (Byrne, 1993; Costigan & Crocco, 2006; Tye & O'Brien, 2002) in primary and secondary schools, report that some mediating factors such as increased paper work, changing student characteristics, negativity, pressure from parents and community and tension between teachers and administration are responsible. It is doubtful whether these mediating factors will be consistent and generalizable with those of polytechnic lecturers in North Central Nigeria. Equally, a number of studies (Byrne, 1993; Tye & O'Brien, 2002) report that teachers react to their frustration in test assessment as in teacher attrition, discontent and



disappointment etc. These studies took place in primary and secondary schools. However, they are yet to be determined in the case of polytechnics in North Central Nigeria. Furthermore, studies on how different groups of lecturers react and, the consequences of their frustration in examination script assessment are available (Tye & O'Brien). However, the question of the extent to which the reports of these studies are artifacts of measuring what obtains in the case of polytechnics in North Central Nigeria, is yet to be determined. Therefore, the study is being conducted and extended to identify the mediating factors, lecturers' reaction, differences in group reactions and consequences of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment. It is hypothesized that:

- a. There is no significant relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and some mediating factors.
- b. There is no significant relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and some reactions.
- c. Level of frustration will not differ significantly among groups of lecturers in examination script assessment.
- d. There is no significant relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and some consequences.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Introduction

This review of literature is couched fundamentally on conceptual, theoretical framework, mediating factors and lecturers' reaction to their frustration. Other areas of review include differences among groups of lecturers in their reaction and consequences of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment.

### Conceptual Framework

#### *Frustration*

Frustration has been severally defined in view of existing literature. For instance, Fargnoli (1997) sees frustration as, "an emotional response to circumstances where one is obstructed from arriving at a personal goal". According to Fox and Spector (1999), frustration occurs when an instigated goal response (or predicted behavioural response) is interrupted and is comparable to anger and disappointment – a condition where expectations exceed reward, input exceed income. Similarly, frustration is seen as a common emotional response to opposition. It arises from the perceived resistance to the fulfillment of individual will (Wikipedia, 2010). Frustration can be considered a problem – response behaviour and can have a number of effects depending on the mental health of the individual.

#### *Examination Script Assessment*

Examination script assessment is the process of gathering data on students' academic progress. Specifically, assessment is the way instructors gather data about their teaching and their students' learning (Hanna & Dattmer, 2004).

The data provide a picture of a range of activities using different forms of assessment such as pre-tests, observations, practical, oral and written examination. Once these data are gathered, it can then be used to evaluate students' academic performance. The evaluation, therefore, draws on one's judgment to determine the overall value of an outcome based on the assessment data. It is in the decision making process then, that ways are designed to improve the recognized weaknesses, gaps or deficiencies (Filer, 2001).

#### *Frustration in Examination Script Assessment*

Lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment is an emotional response to situation that prevents an objective assessment of examination scripts. When frustration occurs among lecturers in examination script assessment, it is comparable to anger and disappointment – a condition where expectations exceed reward, input exceed outcome (Myers, 1993; Fox & Spector, 1999).

### Theoretical Framework

#### *Social Exchange Theory*

The Social Exchange Theory is adopted in this study to explain rigorously, lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment. The Theory explains that each individual compares the rewards he or she receives from a relationship to his or her costs or inputs. In general it explains, one expects to get more out of the relationship if he or she puts more into it. The theory predicts that, where the outcomes are equivalent, relationships will be stable, whereas inequitable ones will be unstable. This explanation applies to lecturers who are constantly assessing their rewards vis a vis their costs or inputs in lecturing task. Reward here will be good performance of students in examination. Input will refer to the amount of lecturing/teaching/practical demonstration efforts put in for students to perform academically. Discrepancy arises when assessment results show poor academic performance of students and the amount of lecturers' input. It is this discrepancy that results in lecturer frustration in the assessment of examination scripts. If lecturers perceive inequality in reward (students' poor academic performance) and costs or inputs, then the work relationship becomes unstable with chain reactions of anger and aggression with inevitable consequences.



### **Frustration – Aggression Theory**

The frustration – Aggression Theory is also adopted in this study to explain why Lecturers who are frustrated in examination script assessment display anger and aggression. The Theory attempts to explain why people scapegoat. It gives explanation as to the cause of violence. It explains that frustration causes aggression; but when the source of the frustration cannot be challenged, the aggression gets displaced onto an innocent target. This Theory tends to provide answers to the reactions of lecturers and the consequences that follow their frustration in examination script assessment (Wikipedia, 2010). For instance, Costigan and Crocco (2006) report that teachers expressed disappointment and annoyance about the demands of administrators on them to meet the state criteria for students' progress as measured by the state tests. They also report that teachers are leaving the profession as a consequence. The reaction and consequences are on students also who bear part of the action of teachers in this regard.

### **Mediating Factors of Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment**

Several mediating factors account for lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment. For instance, Tye and O'Brien (2002) report that, "test preparation, standards, assessing test and increased accountability as determined by teachers' discontent and attrition are linked to frustration in assessing test". Tye and O'Brien also report other mediating factors as, "increased paper work, changing student characteristics, negativity and pressure from parents and the community along with tension between teachers and administration". The separate findings of Lander and Ekholm (1998), Mosen (2002) and Simmons (2002) support this report that:

*Evaluation tools may be more suited to the needs of policy officials than they are to schools and teachers. Moreover, the skills required for gathering and interpreting school or programme level data are quite different from those required for class room assessment. Similarly, Costigan and Crocco (2006) confirm that, "teachers expressed disappointment and annoyance about the demands of administrators on them to meet the state criteria for students' progress as measured by state tests".*

There is great variability with respect to time and effort needed to prepare a test or examination only to discover that during assessment, performance of students does not show it. Lecturers may compare answers in different scripts to ascertain whether cheating occurred during the examination. This exercise can be very frustrating. Teachers may be forced to inflate grades especially in standardized tests to boost the image of schools and local authorities (Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Costigan and Crocco (2006) report that teachers are frustrated in their adherence to scripted lessons designed to maximize students' scores on high-stake testing.

One mediating factor in Lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment, is lecturer's stress. For instance, Byrne (1993) reports that, "stress results from an imbalance between perceived demand (by teachers) and what the students give in a test assessment; and these could lead to frustration for the teachers and students".

Overpopulation of students and shortage of time for assessment of examination scripts have resulted in stress for teachers. Teachers often complain that it takes too much time to assess children individually on a regular basis. They also complain that the wide range of writing abilities of students in their classrooms make assessment difficult. As a result, teachers feel frustrated that no one cares for how well they are able to assess students' work and know the problem first hand (Byrne, 1993). This is the case with polytechnics in Nigeria where a lecturer assesses over a thousand scripts in one semester – with bulky answers, poor handwriting, rough scripts and poor response to questions etc. Dorman (2003) reports that, "overload was a strong predictor of work pressure which in turn causes emotional exhaustion". This could lead to frustration. There is also too much time devoted to test taking strategies, administrative meetings regarding tests results and a loss of independence in the classroom. Of course, state testing has severe emotional toll on teachers (Costigan & Crocco, 2006).

Several lecturers get into trouble with authorities not because of lecturing lapses; but from assessment of examination scripts with many demoted or sacked or leaving them with the frustration of re-assessment of script. Yet, some teachers believe that their primary mission is instruction and support for the students' whole development. As a result, many teachers.

Another mediating factor of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment is ignorance in the conduct of evaluation of students. For instance, Shepard (2000) reports that:

*When teachers are not knowledgeable about how to conduct classroom evaluation of students, then the assessment of test scripts becomes a frustrating task.*

One more mediating factor of frustration has to do with uniqueness of approach to answering questions by students. Instances abound. Dorman (2003) and Sadler (2009) in their separate studies conclude that teachers confronted with the task of classroom evaluation maintain that the difficulty comes from having to assess students who are uniquely different in their approach to answering questions. The uniqueness of the students stems from their different personalities, backgrounds, learning styles and confidence levels.

Lastly, the non alignment of school work with school based evaluation could trigger – off frustration among lecturers. Evaluation tools may be more suited to the needs of policy officials than they are to polytechnics and lecturers. Moreover, the skills required for gathering and interpreting school or programme level data are quite different from those required for classroom



assessment (Lander & Ekholm; Mosen, 2002; Simmons, 2002). This is the case with polytechnics in Nigeria where curriculum is imposed and dictated by the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE); but evaluation or assessment is polytechnic and lecturer based. Frustration comes in when lecturers must comply dogmatically with external curriculum that kills their own initiative.

### **Lecturers' Reaction to Frustration in Examination Script Assessment**

Lecturers react to their frustration in examination script assessment. For example, Costigan and Crocco (2006) confirm that teachers in New York State expressed disappointment and annoyance about the demands of administrators on them to meet the state criteria for students' progress as measured by the state tests. According to the report, teachers felt it was unreasonable to judge students' skills and abilities using one measure. It should be noted that disappointment and annoyance are indices of frustration.

Teachers also react to their frustration in examination script assessment in hostility aggression and anger on students in the classroom (Otinayo, 2010). These factors produce negative effects on the psychological development and academic achievement of students. Anger, hostility and aggression could take the form of annoyance, insult on students, poor scoring, abandonment of scripts, late marking, complain to authorities, indiscriminate award of marks and succumbing to pressure from parents/students. Others are expression of disappointment, lecturers on the defensive, lecturer discontent, setting aside of offensive scripts and lecturer attrition. These reactions of lecturers are consistent with the Frustration – Aggression Theory that frustration can cause aggression. The report of Dill and Anderson (1995) in their experiment support this Theory that frustration can lead to aggression. Therefore, the reactions of lecturers to their frustration in examination script assessment are acts of aggression.

### **Consequence of Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment**

Evidences that consequences exist in lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment abound. One such consequence is lecturer attrition. For instance, Costigan and Crocco (2006) point out that good teachers are leaving the profession because they no longer feel a viable part of the education system – a system whereby students and teachers become hostages to the mandates of state testing due to the emotional toll state testing has on them. This is the case of polytechnics in Nigeria where curriculum is dictated by NBTE and tests assessment must follow the guideline.

Another consequence of frustration in examination script assessment, is that assessment of script can lead to stress and burnout especially in situations where scripts have to be re be remarked, agitation by students due to poor results, depression among lecturers and student petition over results etc. Byrne (1993) reports that in the last ten years, administrators and clinicians have observed a sharp increase in incidences of teacher burnout. Lambert et al in Burrows and Shade (2013) report that teachers are stressed by testing and increased paper work among others. Tye & O'Brien (2002) linked dictated curriculum by state standards and the emphasis on high stake testing that leaves very few decisions to teachers professional judgment as stressors – these are indicators of frustration among teachers. Once there is burnout, it is an indication that lecturers cannot function effectively in their job as a consequence of prolonged and extensive job related stress and in this case, large examination script assessment that takes time to fulfill.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

Descriptive survey method was adopted for the study. This method was found suitable because of the possibility of reaching the subjects in scattered locations in North Central Nigeria (Afolabi, 1993).

### **Sample**

Baseline socio-demographics of the 322 participants from each Federal and state polytechnics selected were: Kogi State Polytechnic, Lokoja 60, Federal polytechnic, Bida 40, Federal polytechnic, Idah 50, Benue Polytechnic, Ugbokolo 50 and Isa Mustapha Agwai Polytechnic Lafia 64, Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa 58. The participants consisted of 190(59%) males and 132(41%) females. In terms of group cadre, the participants also consisted of 112(35%) senior lecturers and 210 (65%) junior lecturers.

For the purpose of this study, lecturers from assistant lecturers to lecturer I were grouped junior lecturers; while those from senior lecturers to chief lecturers were grouped senior lecturers. Also, the study was delimited to only Federal polytechnics in North Central Nigeria.

### **Instrumentation**

The following instruments were used for data collection:

#### **a. Organizational Frustration Scale (OFS)**

The OFS is a 29 – item inventory developed by Spector (1975) to measure the frustration level of individuals in organizations as manifested by each individual's perceived co-workers acts of aggression, time-wasting, sabotage and unreasonable demands to the self. The OFS is at one end of a continuum with job satisfaction. The reliability and validity coefficients were provided by the author; while Dieke (1997) provided same for Nigeria samples. The OFS has been used to correlate other scales for the purpose of identify mediating factors of frustration etc.



- b. Examination Script Assessment Frustration Scale (E-SAFS)  
The E-SAFS was developed by the researchers as a self – report scale to measure the mediating factors of frustration among lecturers in examination script assessment. The design of the E-SAFS is clustered around two sections namely socio-demographics such as sex, rank and name of institution. The other section is designed on a Likert – type five point scale with response modes of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. In scoring the items, respondents would have a possible total score ranging from 1 – 5 which represents a respondent’s opinion. The higher the score, the more influenced the respondent is by the scale. Respondents would be required to tick against a response that represents their opinion. In all, the scale is a 15 item questionnaire – A test-retest reliability reported a Pearson r of 0.57 for the scale. The present study adopted the E-SAFS as an effort in identifying the mediating factors of frustration among lecturers due to the fact that the scale has proved useful in pilot studies in measuring the factors it intends to measure.
- c. Lecturers’ Frustration Reaction Scale (L-FRS)  
The L-FRS was developed by the researchers as a self-report scale to measure lecturers’ reaction to their frustration in examination script assessment. The design of the L-FRS is clustered around two sections namely socio-demographics such as sex, rank and name of institution. The other section is designed on a Likert – type five point scale with response modes of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Each answer in the L-FRS is scored on a scale value of 1 – 5. The higher the score, the more influenced the respondent is by the scale. The scale was developed as a paper and pencil test that would require the respondents to tick against a response that represents their opinion. In all, the scale is a 11 item questionnaire. A test-retest reliability reported a Pearson r of 0.62 for the scale.
- d. Consequence of Lecturers’ Frustration Scale (C-LFS)  
The C-LFS is a paper and pencil test developed by the researcher as a self-report scale to measure the consequences of lecturers’ frustration in examination script assessment. The design of the C-LFS is clustered around two sections namely socio-demographics such as sex, rank and name of institution. The other section is designed on a Likert – type five point scale with response mode of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Each answer in the C-LFS is scored on a scale value of 1 – 5. The higher the score, the more influenced the respondent is by the scale. The respondents are required to tick against the response that best represent their opinion. In all, the scale is a 13 item questionnaire. A test-retest reliability reported a Pearson r of 0.59 for the scale.

### **Procedure**

Four research assistants assisted in the administration of the instrument which lasted for four weeks. They were specially trained on the procedures of the exercise which includes the psyche of lecturers and the technical nature of some aspects of the instrument.

### **Data Analysis**

The statistical techniques used in the study are the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Zero Order Multiple Correlation, t-test and the COX Stepwise Regression Analysis.

## **RESULTS**

### **Hypothesis 1:**

There is no significant relationship between lecturers’ frustration in examination script assessment and some mediating factors. To test the hypothesis, the 15 mediator variables (E-SAFS) were correlated with the (OFS) scores to find out the contribution of each mediator variable to the frustration of lecturers in examination script assessment. The results of the test are presented in Table 1:


**Table 1: Pearson r. on the Mediating Factors of Frustration in Examination Script Assessment.**

Mediators	Df	r.	P	S
Poor response to questions	320	.575	.000	S
Out of point	320	.749	.000	s
Empty/scanty script	320	.677	.000	S
Bulky answer	320	.578	.000	S
Poor handwriting	320	.562	.000	S
Rough script	320	.478	.000	S
Lobbying/interference	320	.688	.000	S
Large number of scripts	320	.722	.000	S
Sight defects	320	.349	.000	S
Scoring problems (accuracy)	320	.240	.000	S
Inadequate/unavailability of marking scheme	320	-.105	.000	S
Lack of registration number	320	.201	.000	S
No numbering of questions answered	320	.222	.000	S
Shortage of time for marking	320	.502	.000	S
Missing script	320	.302	.000	S
N=322		P<0.05		

Results in Table 1 indicate positive relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and the 15 mediating factors measured. They are significant at 0.05 confidence level. However, in terms of degree of relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and the 15 (E-SAFS) subscales measured, the mediating factors of out of point ( $r = .749$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), large number of scripts ( $r = .722$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and lobbying/interference ( $r = .688$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), displayed high relationship; while poor response to questions ( $r = .575$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) poor handwriting ( $r = .562$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), and shortage of time for marking ( $r = 502$ ,  $df = 320$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) displayed moderate relationships. The results further displayed low relationship in 6 subscales measured.

#### Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant relationship between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and some reactions. The results of the test are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Zero Order Multiple Correlation Coefficients on Reaction to Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment.**

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11
<b>X1</b>	1.000										
<b>X2</b>	-.482**	1.000									
<b>X3</b>	-0.109	-0.401	1.000								
<b>X4</b>	-0.066	0.001*	-0.041	1.000							
<b>X5</b>	-0.042	-0.115	0.053	-0.440	1.000						
<b>X6</b>	-1.08	-0.009	-0.133	0.059	-0.440	1.000					
<b>X7</b>	-0.122	-0.030	-0.040	-0.400	-0.120	-0.007	1.000				
<b>X8</b>	-0.009	-0.054	-0.045	0.122	-0.008	-0.121	-0.029	1.000			
<b>X9</b>	-0.010	0.005	-0.005	-0.005	0.0026	-0.022	-0.333	-0.123	1.000		
<b>X10</b>	-0.321	-0.027	0.226	-0.006	-0.051	-0.114	-0.040	-0.033	-0.047	1.000	
<b>X11</b>	0.011	-0.023	0.218	0.020	0.021	-0.142	-0.085	0.119	-0.077	-0.047	1.000

Key

\* Lowest Coefficient.

\*\* Highest Coefficient.

X1	Anger.	X2	Aggression against students.
X3	Poor scoring.	X4	Complain to Authorities.
X5	Succumb to Pressure from Parents, students/school Authority.	X6	Indiscriminate Award of marks.
X7	Expression of Disappointment.	X8	Insult on students.
X9	Lecturers on the defensive.	X10	Lecturer discontent.
X11	Threaten to leave service.		

Results in Table 2 indicate that the correlation coefficients range from -0.482 (being the correlation coefficient between X2 – the variable of aggression against students and X1 – the variable of anger) to 0.001 (being the correlation coefficient between X4 – the variable of complain to authorities and X2 – the variable of aggression against students). In general, the pattern of lecturers' reaction to their frustration tilts towards negative because most of the correlation coefficients (65.2%) display negative values.



Similarly, the cumulative scores of Lecturers' Frustration Reaction Scale (L-FRS) X11 indicate a very low coefficients ranging from 0.002 (being coefficients of X4 and X11) to 0.021 (being the coefficient of X5 and X11). The results suggest that the variables as measured in the L-FRS are reactions of lecturers to frustration in examination script assessment.

**Hypothesis 3:**

Level of frustration will not differ significantly among groups of lecturers in examination script assessment. The results of the test are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: t-test Summary on Frustration Levels among Groups of Lecturers in Examination Script Assessment.**

Group	N	X	SD	SE	t.	df	tCrit.	P.	Sig.
Male	190	21	15.01	.581	8.01	320	1.96	000	s
Female	132	42	12.04	.432					
Senior Lecturer	112	15	11.00	.333	26.11	320	1.96		s
Junior Lecturer	210	46	10.05	.457					

N=322

Results in Table 3 indicate that female lecturers (t = 8.01, df = 320, P<0.05) are more frustrated in examination script assessment than their male counterparts; while junior lecturers are more frustrated (t = 26.11, df = 320, P<0.05) in examination script assessment.

**Hypothesis 4:**

There is no significant correlation between lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment and some consequences. The results of the test are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Stepwise Regression Analysis on Consequences of Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment.**

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient		Sig.
	B.	Std. Error	Beta	T	
1 (constant)	66.811	3.150		20.010	.000
Under assessment of scripts	1.173	.437	.090	2.582	.669
Over assessment of scripts	-.933	.436	.094	-1.138	.048
Indiscriminate award of marks	1.030	.393	.016	2.623	.000
Depression	-1.620	.459	.084	-3.528	.001
Stress	-.238	.556	.095	.428	.000
Worry over 50% examination success rate	-1.957	.637	.041	-2.072	.195
Poor results	1.266	.639	.029	1.982	.483
Students' agitation	-1.470	.618	.054	-2.30	.000
Disciplinary actions on lecturers	-1.569	.435	.028	-3.608	.002
Lecturer attrition	1.245	.377	-.078	-2.590	.010
Emotional exhaustion	.523	.404	.082	1.982	.000
Unreliable results	-1.599	.392	.056	3.303	.004
Lecturer dependence	.414	.426	.067	.702	.018

Dependent Variable: Frustration

Multiple R = .461

R. Square = .239

Adjusted RSquare = .229

**ANOVA**

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Df	Mean of Square	F.	P	Sig.
Regression	49008.044	13	2728.727	14.021	000	S
Residual	134620.79	312	123.502			
Total	186718.96					

Results in Table 4 show that multiple regression analysis yielded a multiple correlation of R = .461 with 23% of the conservative estimate of the percentage of the variance explained and F.Ratio of 14.021, significant at 0.05 level.

The analysis also reveals a standard error of only 9.359. To this extent, the subjective independent variable (C-LFS) predicted 93% of assessment. Only the variable of lecturer attrition is not a consequence of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment.



## SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The following major findings were generated in the study:

- Significant positive relationship exist between frustration (OFS scores) and the (E-SAF scores) on the 15 subscales measured. However, 9 subscales reported high relationship with frustration as in poor response to questions, out of point, empty/scanty script, bulky answer, poor handwriting, rough script, lobbying/interference, large number of scripts and shortage of time for marking.
- Lecturers react to their frustration in examination script assessment as measured between frustration (OFS scores) and lecturers reaction (L-FRS scores).
- Significant differences exist in levels of group reactions to their frustration in examination script assessment. Female lecturers are more frustrated than their male counterparts; while junior lecturers are also more frustrated than their senior counterparts.
- The consequences of lecturers' frustration as measured were reported in all the C-LFS measures except in lecturer attrition.

## DISCUSSION

The main objective of the study was to determine lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment in selected Federal and state polytechnics in North Central Nigeria. The discussion is presented in the following.

### *Mediating Factors of Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment*

From the results and analysis, the study found significant relationship between frustration and 15 E-SAFS subscales measuring poor response to questions, out of point, empty/scanty script, bulky answer, poor handwriting, rough scripts, lobbying/interference, large number of scripts and sight defects. Others are scoring problems (accuracy), inadequate/unavailability of marking scheme, lack of registration number, no numbering of questions answered, shortage of time for marking and missing script. This report is consistent with those of Shepard (2000) that:

*When teachers are not knowledgeable about how to conduct classroom evaluation of students then the assessment of test scripts becomes a frustrating task.*

The report is also consistent with those of Byrne (1993) that:

*Overpopulation of students and shortage of time for assessment of examination scripts have resulted in stress for teachers. As a result, teachers feel frustrated that no one cares for how well they are able to assess students work and know the problem first hand.*

This report can be justified. In Nigerian polytechnics, student population is usually high. Sometimes, the ratio is up to one lecturer to 400 students. To attend to them is usually frustrating. Another justification is that the demands imposed on lecturers by school authorities and parents/students in polytechnics, is very frustrating. For instance, Costigan and Crocco (2006) report that, "teachers are frustrated in their adherence to scripted lessons designed to maximize students' scores on high-stake testing".

### *Lecturers' Reaction in Examination Script Assessment*

The study found significant positive relationship between lecturers' frustration and some reactions measured as in anger, aggression against students, poor scoring, complain to authorities, succumb to pressure from parents, students and school authority, indiscriminate award of marks, expression of disappointment, insult on students and lecturers on the defensive. Others are lecturer discontent and threaten to leave service. These findings are in accord with those of Odunayo (2010) that, teachers also react to their frustration in examination script assessment in hostility, aggression and anger on students in the classroom. The report of Dill and Anderson (1995) supports this finding that frustration can lead to aggression. This result can be justified because when one is frustrated, it could lead to aggression. For example, Costigan and Crocco (2006) confirm that teachers in New York State expressed disappointment and annoyance about the demands of school administrators on them to meet that state criteria for students' progress as measured by the state test. In Nigeria, the criteria for students' progress are 50% examination success rate forced on lecturers or else the affected lecturers will face panel for poor results.

### *Level of Frustration among Groups of Lecturers in Examination Script Assessment:*

The results indicate significant difference in the level of frustration among groups of lecturers in examination script assessment. The study reports that female lecturers are higher in their level of frustration than their male counterparts; while junior lecturers are higher in their level of frustration in examination script assessment than their senior counterparts. This result does not support that of Arogundade (2003) that gender does not have significant influences on organizational frustration. This result can be justified. First, female lecturers have more emotions than their male counterparts and secondly; by that will become more frustrated.

The junior lecturers are more frustrated because they do not have the same patience, tolerance, experience and consideration like their senior colleagues.





### *Consequences of Lecturers' Frustration in Examination Script Assessment*

The study found significant correlation between frustration and some consequences in examination script assessment as in under assessment of scripts, over assessment of scripts, indiscriminate award of marks, depression, stress, worry over 50% examination success rate, poor results, students agitation and disciplinary actions on lecturers. Others are Emotional exhaustion, unreliable results and lecturer dependence. These results confirm those of Byrne (1993) that in the last 10 years, administrators and clinicians have observed a sharp increase in incidences of teacher burnout. The report also confirms those of Lambert et al in Burrows and Shade (2013) that teachers are stressed by testing and increased paper work among others. However, lecturers' attrition was not found to be a consequence of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment as against what obtains in the United States of America (Costigan & Crocco, 2006). This may be attributed to difficulty in getting alternative jobs elsewhere.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the study, it is concluded that:

- a. The mediating factors of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment are poor response to questions, out of point, empty/scanty script, bulky answer, poor handwriting, rough script, lobbying/interference, large number of scripts, sight defects, scoring problems (accuracy), inadequate/unavailability of marking scheme, lack of registration number and no numbering of questions answered. Others are shortage of time for marking and missing script.
- b. Female lecturers and junior lecturers are more frustrated in examination script assessment than male and senior lecturers.
- c. Lecturers react to their frustration in examination script assessment as in anger, aggression against students, poor scoring, complain to authorities, succumb to pressure from parents, students/school authority, indiscriminate award of marks, expression of disappointment, insult on students, lecturers on the defensive, lecturer discontent and threatening to leave service.
- d. The consequences of lecturers' frustration in examination script assessment are under assessment of scripts, over assessment of scripts, indiscriminate award of marks, depression, stress, worry over 50% examination success rate, poor results, students' agitation, disciplinary actions on lecturers and emotional exhaustion. Others are unreliable results and lecturer dependence.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- a. Polytechnic authorities should organize orientation programme on how to write/approach examination for fresh students:
  - i. By organizing a two-day orientation for fresh students immediately after their registration on how to approach examination at the beginning of their programme.
  - ii. To teach them on examination ethics.
  - iii. To teach them on examination regulations.
  - iv. To teach them on examination preparation.
  - v. To teach them on expectations concerning the appearance of examination scripts.
  - vi. To teach them on the effects of lobbying/interference.
  - vii. To teach them on the requirements of marking schemes.
- b. Lecturers should adjust to their work and social environment in polytechnics in order to avoid frustration that could lead to reactions that can endanger their health and employment.
- c. Polytechnic authorities should organize orientation for lecturers generally; but target the female and junior lecturers more on how to deal with frustration in examination script assessment:
  - i. Through the presentation of papers on how to deal with anger, aggression and impatience in a work place.
  - ii. Through the presentation of papers on the consequences of their actions and wrong judgment on assessment of examination script.
  - iii. Through the presentation of papers on how to handle examination matters in a school environment.
- d. Polytechnic authorities should reconsider the 50% examination success rate that has made many lecturers to face examination panels by:
  - i. Looking into the causes of students' failures.
  - ii. Scrutinizing students' credentials at entry point and conducting additional interviews for would-be students.
  - iii. Employing the right kind of lecturers.
  - iv. Ensuring that what is due to lecturers are paid promptly.
  - v. Providing the right kind of school environment for lecturers.
  - vi. Polytechnic authorities should ensure that the prescribed student-lecturer ratio is adhered to in order to avoid lecturer burnout, stress and frustration.
  - vii. More lecturers should be recruited by polytechnic authorities due to the over population of students. The carrying capacity for each programme and class size set by the NBTE should be adhered to in order to avoid large number of scripts per lecturer.
  - viii. Polytechnic authorities should make for the possibility of managing time for lecturers in the assessment of examination scripts. The best way to manage time is to ensure that lecturers are not over loaded with scripts.



## REFERENCES

1. Afolabi, M. (1993). *Introduction to Research for Writing Proposals, Projects and Thesis*. Zaria: Alpha Publishers.
2. Arogundade, O. T. (2003). *Perceived Organizational Stress and Burnout Syndrome among Workers*. Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis. University of Lagos.
3. Burrows, C. & Shade, K. (2013). *Is State Standardized Testing a Major Contributing Cause to Teacher Burnout?* <https://www.readperiodicals.com/201009/2087472491.html#ixzzzomlydf>. Retrieved March, 2021.
4. Byrne, B. (1993). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory: Testing for Factorial Validity and Invariance across Elementary, Intermediate and Secondary Teachers*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 197 – 212.
5. Costigan, A. T & Crocco, M.S. (2006). *High Stake Testing: What's at stake for Teachers (and students) in the Age of Accountability*. *The New Educator*, 2(1), 1 – 13.
6. Dieke, A. S. (1997). *Assessment and Management of Frustrations Associated with University Admission*. Unpublished. M. Sc. Thesis, University of Lagos.
7. Dill, J. C. & Anderson, C. A. (1995). *Effects of Frustration Justification on Hostile Aggression*. *Aggressive Behavior* 21:359-369
8. Dorman, J. (2003). *Testing a Model for Teacher Burnout*, *Australian Journal of Education and Development Psychology*, 3:35-47.
9. Fagnoli, T. (1997). *A Bridge to Simplicity through Diagrams*. New York: Prentice Publishers
10. Filer, A. (2001). *Assessment: Social Practice and Social Product*. London: Routledge Falmer.
11. Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (1999). *A Model of Work Frustration Aggression*. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20:915-918.
12. Hanna, G. S. & Dattmer, P. A. (2004). *Assessment for Effective Teaching using Context – Adaptive Planning*. Boston: Pearson A & B.
13. Lander, R. & Ekholm, M. (1998). *School Evaluation and Improvement: A Scandinavian View*. In Hargreaves, A; A Lieberman; Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Educational Change*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
14. Monsen, L. I. (2002). *School-Based Evaluation in Norway: why is it so difficult to convince teachers of its usefulness?* In D. Nevo (Ed.). *School-Based Evaluation: An International Perspective*, JAI Press, Oxford, PP: 73-88.
15. Myer, D. G. (1993). *Social Psychology*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.inc.
16. Odunayo, A. (2010). *Locus of Control and self-Esteem as Predictors of Teacher's Frustration in Lagos State Secondary Schools*, *Ife Psychologia*.
17. O'Brien & Tye, B.G. (2002). *Why we experienced teachers leaving the profession?* *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 84 (1), 24 – 32.
18. Sadler, D. R. (2009). *Formative Assessment and the Design of Instructional Systems*. *Instructional Science*, 18:145-165.
19. Shepard, L. (2000). *The Role of Assessment in Learning Culture*. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7):4-14.
20. Simmons, H. (2002). *School Self-Evaluation in a Democracy: School-Based Evaluation*. In D. Nevo (Ed.). *School-Based Evaluation : An International Perspectives*, Oxford, JAI Press, PP:17-34.
21. Spector, P.E. (1975). *Relationships of Organizational Frustration with Reported Behavioural Actions of Employees*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 635 – 637.
22. Spector, P. E. (1975). *Relationships of Organizational Frustration with Reported Behavioural Actions of Employees*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60:635-637.
23. Wikipedia: (2010). *Emotional Response of Frustration*. Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Frustration&oldid=573467.51> on March, 2021.
24. Wikipedia (2011). *Frustration – Aggression Hypothesis*. Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Frustration&oldid=573467.51> on March, 2021.