



RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Comprehensive Study of Reaction Types on Frustrating Experience among School Children

Madhu Bala Chauhan

Department of Psychology, D.S. College, Aligarh

Received: 8th Jan. 2016, Revised: 14th Feb. 2016, Accepted: 27th Feb. 2016

ABSTRACT

Following a '2x2' factorial design (Religion and Sex) Uday Pareek's Indian Adaptation of Picture Frustration Study was administered on a sample (N=200) of school going students (Age: 9-13 years) to observe various types of reactions occasioned by certain frustrating situations to which they are exposed. Boys and Girls showed significant differences on obstacle-dominance and need-persistence, boys being higher on the former and girls on the latter. Whereas Muslim Ss expressed a stronger obstacle-dominance, the Hindu Ss a stronger need-persistence.

Key words: Frustrating Experience, School Children, Reaction Types
Multigrade, Teaching, Learning

©All Rights Reserved 'Council of Research & Sustainable Development', India

INTRODUCTION

Rosenzweig finds the economy of the needs frustrated as the basis of the classification of reaction to frustration. Reaction may be of different categories viz-a-viz the fate of the frustrated segmental need or the fate of the personality as a whole. The first case is that of need-persistence which invariably follows a frustrating experience. The other case is that of ego-defence which results under condition of ego threat. Both types of reactions occur together but there may be instance of each one occurring alone and so, theoretically these may be distinguished.

An elaborate account of ego-defence reaction to frustration would include reference to studies carried out by Rosenzweig himself (1935, 1938) and those by Dollard (1939). Rosenzweig suggested that reactions to frustrations may be of two types: need-permissive and ego-defensive. The types of reaction namely obstacle- dominance, ego-defence and need-persistence may be briefly defined as under-

OBSTACLE-DOMINANCE

The barrier which causes frustration to the subject comes up prominently in the response in the form of stress on its intensity.

EGO-DEFENCE

The response of the subject is mainly dominated by his ego and the subject either puts the blame on some one else, assumes the blame or finds himself unable to locate the source of frustration.

NEED-PERSISTENCE

The response in the nature of solving the problem present in the frustrating situation and the reaction is in the form of demanding the help of some other person in the solution, of placing the subject himself under obligations to make the necessary corrections.

METHOD

TEST MATERIAL

The children's form Rosenzweig's P.F. study as adapted to Indian conditions (Uday Pareek, 1959) was used. The 24 cartoon like situation depicting some kind of a frustrating situation in which an

adult or a child was involved comprised the tool of the study. The subjects wrote answers on the standard examination blank in groups of not exceeding ten. Each group administration took about 30 minutes time. Subjects reactions obstacle-dominance, ego-defence, and need-persistence were studied and analysed according to Pareek (1959) Manual for P.F. Study.

SAMPLE AND ADMINISTRATION

The sample of subjects (N=200) was drawn from various schools and colleges at Aligarh. The age range of the subjects was from 9 to 13 years, both sexes and both Hindus and Muslims inclusive. The factorial design was '2x2', where the variable of sex and religion were represented by two groups. There were 100 Hindu and 100 Muslim subjects and so also the number of boys and girls was 100 each.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

To find out the differences in the reaction of the frustration among school going boys and girls, analysis of variance and t-test were used, the results of which are presented in tables 1-5.

As for obstacle-dominance, girls and boys have shown significantly different patterns, the latter emphasizing more the barrier causing situation. The implication of this observation may be that when faced with a difficult and trying situation with impediments in the course to the goal, the boys get preoccupied to a greater degree so that their behaviour remains dominated by the frustrating obstacle till these are some how resolved. Girls, on the other hand probably take the obstacle in a light vein and in their responses there is only a causal mention of barriers. On need-persistence girls have scored higher than boys indicating that they are more concerned about the solution of the frustrating problem. It may be assumed that they, as compared to boys focus more on ways of dealing and removing the barriers rather than laying emphasis on the existence of these barriers.

Differences of religions show up significantly in need-persistence, whereas in obstacle-dominance and ego-defence no such differences exist. Though the difference between Hindu and Muslim subjects on obstacle-dominance is not significant to the extent of .05, there is a difference between the two at .01 level which indicates a higher tendency among Muslim subjects to be more obstacle-oriented than the Hindu subjects.

Table 1: Showing the results of analysis of variance for the type of reaction (Obstacle-dominance)

Sources	df	Ss	Ms	F	P
A Religion	1	40	40	3.72	N.S.
B Sex	1	31.5062	31.5062	2.93	N.S.
A.B.	1	5.5442	5.5442	.52	N.S.
Within	156	1675.644	10.74		
Total	159	1752.69	87.79		

Table 2: Showing the results of analysis of variance for the type of reaction (Ego-defence)

Sources	df	Ss	Ms	F	P
A Religion	1	5.499	5.499	.61	N.S.
B Sex	1	12.939	12.939	1.43	N.S.
A.B.	1	58.292	58.292	6.46	<.05
Within	156	1409.298	9.03		
Total	159	1486.03	85.76		

Table 3: Showing the results of analysis of variance for the type of reaction (Need-persistence)

Sources	df	Ss	Ms	F	P
A Religion	1	16.25625	16.25625	5.76	<.05
B Sex	1	21.025	21.025	7.46	<.01
A.B.	1	3.025	3.025	1.07	N.S.
Within	156	440.16875	2.82		
Total	159	480.48	43.13		

Table 4: Showing the results of critical ratio indicating the significance between boys and girls on the type of reaction

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.D.	C.R.	P
Obstacle-dominance	Boys	100	8.09	3.14	.521	2.42	<.05
	Girls	100	6.83	3.37			
Ego-defence	Boys	100	10.5	3.05	.438	1.23	N.S.
	Girls	100	11.04	2.38			
Need-persistence	Boys	100	1.30	1.19	.225	3.25	<.01
	Girls	100	2.03	1.59			

Table 5: Showing the values of critical ratio indicating the significance of difference between Hindu and Muslim Ss on the type of reaction

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.D.	C.R.	P
Obstacle-dominance	Hindu	100	6.78	3.23	.512	1.95	>.10
	Muslim	100	7.78	3.17			
Ego-defence	Hindu	100	11.08	2.75	.436	1.47	N.S.
	Muslim	100	11.44	2.70			
Need-persistence	Hindu	100	1.99	1.76	.229	2.79	>.01
	Muslim	100	1.35	1.01			

Probably the very personality structure of the Muslim is obstacle oriented which presumably is at work retarding their goal oriented activity. They seem to be conditioned to over-emphasize their frustrating barriers because perhaps it is deemed economical on their part in the sense that it provides a pretext for them to retaliate these problems for other ends.

Whereas on obstacle-dominance Muslim subjects are higher, on need-persistence it is Hindus. It seems to be a plausible observation on account of the complementary nature of the two sub-dimensions of obstacle-dominance and need-persistence. Muslims are higher on obstacle-dominance and Hindus on need-persistence, showing that the former are problem oriented whereas the latter are solution-oriented. Their (Hindus) prime need, in a frustrating condition, is to cope with or come out rather than harping on the frustrating itself without showing any inclination to its solution (as is the case with Muslim Ss).

REFERENCES

1. Dollard J.: Frustration and aggression. Yale Univ. Press.
2. Pareek Udai (1959): Rosenzweig picture- Frustration Study- A review, Psychol. News Letter, 10: 89-105.
3. Rosenzweig Saul (1935): Types of reaction to frustration. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 29: 298-300.
4. Rosenzweig Saul (1938): Frustration as an experimental problem, Character and Personality, 7: 126-128.

How to cite this article:

Chauhan M.B. (2016): A Comprehensive Study of Reaction Types on Frustrating Experience among School Children. Annals of Education, Vol. 2[1]: March, 2016: 167-169.