

Influence of Socio-economic Status on Frustration among Adolescents in Educational Situations

Dinesh Mohan Sharma
Associate Professor & Head,
Deptt.of B.Ed.
Govt.P.G. College,
Kotdwara, Uttarakhand

Niranjana Sharma
Associate Professor
Deptt.of B.Ed.
Govt.P.G. College,
Kotdwara, Uttarakhand

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to investigate the influence of socio-economic Status on Frustration among adolescents in educational situations. It was assumed that Socio-economic Status is negatively correlated with Frustration among adolescents in educational situations. The sample comprised of 200 adolescents of Meerut city. Seven correlations were obtained to determine the relationship between Socio-economic Status on one hand and Frustration and its six dimensions on the other hand.

It was revealed that socio-economic status is not a very effective factor in adolescent learner's frustration. This observation is borne out by five of the seven insignificant r values. Even the remaining two r values are indicative of a low relationship between the two. These finding are at variance with the hypothesis that there is a low negative relationship between socio-economic status and frustration in educational situations. The hypothesis is, therefore rejected. Socio-economic status therefore fails to exert any significant influence on frustration among adolescent in educational situations.

Keywords:

Introduction

Frustration is caused when an individual fails to find out appropriate response to a stressful situation. Researches on frustration, however, have convincingly demonstrated that individuals vary in their response even under identical stress situations. Frustration is a response to stress situation and this response is influenced by two types of factors, namely, personality characteristics and situational determinants. The first type of factors include such characteristics as achievement, intelligence, creativity, personality traits, anxiety and level of aspiration and the second type of factors cover such situational factors as institution's organizational climate teacher attitude towards children, family's socio-economic status, emotional atmosphere of home and socio-metric status of the students of a classroom group.

Statement of the Problem

The study in hand has attempted to ascertain the influence of socio-economic status on frustration among adolescents in educational situations. There are many social factors which may influence the frustration of adolescent learners. However, the present study had confined itself to examine the Influence of only one social factor, namely, socio-economic status on the frustration of adolescents.

Objective of the Study

The present study has been designed with a view to achieve the objective mentioned as under :

To ascertain the relationship between adolescent learners's socio-economic status and his frustration in educational situations.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis as under was framed in the context of objective of study and related research studies:

Socio-economic status of an adolescent learner and his frustration under educational situations bear low negative relationship.

Definitions of the Terms Used

Socio-economic Status

Refers to the position that an individual or family occupies with reference to prevailing standards of cultural professions, effective income, natural possessions and participation in group activities.

Frustration

Refers to the blocking of an organism's path towards a goal, the goal seeking behavior may be conscious or unconscious.

Survey of the Previous Research Studies

What factors contribute to frustration? Do the causes of frustration differ from an individual's developmental stage to developmental stage or from grade to grade or from culture to culture? What is the impact of frustration on an individual's cognitive, psychomotor and affective development? Can some factors and situations minimize frustration? These questions and the like are questions which have been exercising the minds of those educational research workers who are engaged in probing and analyzing the frustration phenomenon. Studies on frustration have generally been conducted with a view to examine its relationship with such variables as personality traits, intelligence, study habits, socio-economic status and the like and can be categorized as under:

1. Cognitive correlates of frustration behavior
2. Non- cognitive correlates of frustration behavior

Cognitive Correlates of Frustration Behaviour

Cyril Burt seems to be among the pioneers who found the intellectually superior pupils to be relatively more prone to frustration than the intellectually inferior pupils.

Barker, Roger et al (1941). Whiting and John also observed variations in frustration scores with variations in intelligence scores. On the basis of an extensive review of literature of frustration, Losan and Marx (1958) concluded that frustration-aggression is a consequence of the blocking of goal directed behavior and that frustration effects are more intensely felt at the superior level of intelligence than at the inferior level.

Karlin and Schwartz (1957) observed a low relationship between social and general intelligence on the one hand and frustration as measured by Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test on the other hand.

Wagner (1976) studied the effects of frustration produced by errors on tests on child's knowledge, comprehension, application and analysis, cognitive behaviors of the Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational objectives. However, the frustration effects were not found by him to be significantly discriminatory among knowledge, comprehension, application and analysis.

Non-Cognitive Correlates of Frustration Behaviour

Brown and Miller (1965) found that motivation bears a high relationship with frustration and motives of the pupils differ with difference in intelligence levels. In addition to this, they observed the elements of frustration to be different among different intelligence groups of pupils.

Pierce, Robert Lee (1979) attempted to test the hypothesis that demographic characteristics are linked to classes of stressors. An unexpected difference among groups was observed in terms of the type of provoking behavior (Cues to aggression) exhibited by a child and parents typical response to behavior.

Figler (1976) designed a study to ascertain the relationship between frustration and athletic involvement. To measure frustration he used Rosenzweig picture frustration study and to measure athletic involvement he used a questionnaire. Adopting a contrasting group design he compared the mean frustration scores of the high and low groups of subjects of athletic involvement. He concluded that low athletic involvement is associated with frustration.

Forst (1976) studied the effects of three frustration levels on the creative expression of XI and XII grade male and female subjects. Creativity in this study was measured through Torrance Tests of Creative thinking and frustration through Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Study. The tests data were subjected to multivariate analysis at variance which yielded three conclusions. These were: (i) In comparison to female subjects, male subjects score higher on fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration abilities of creativity. (ii) In comparison to high creative subjects, low creative subjects experience more and (iii) these two findings have a direct application to class room situations.

Kuraim (1984) studied the principal factors causing reader frustration in a public library. The study applied a method whereby users of the library recorded availability and non-availability of books they sought. When books were not located by users, an immediate investigation was conducted to determine their status and/or location. For purposes of comparison, another method was also used to measure the availability of books known to be held by the library and that of recently published books. Of all the performances measured of circulation policy and library procedure was found to be the only measure which was poor and mainly responsible for non availability and user frustration.

Neuhaus, Sylvia (1982) investigated the developmental differences in reactions to frustration between normal and learning disabled boys aged six to thirteen. The sample consisted of 46 normal and 44 learning disabled boys certified by a Committee on the handicapped. The Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test was administered to measure frustration. The results were analyzed by utilizing a two-way analysis of variance and a stepwise polynomial regression. The R.P.F. Study measured responses to frustrating social interactions were found to be non-academic in nature.

Govind Tiwari, Kiran Morbhatt and Manorma Tiwari (1978) attempted to find out the effects of personality factors and sex over the mode of frustration by a multivariate complex of 2x2 factorial design. It was a 2x2 factorial experiment whose independent variable of P.F.'s (14 factors of Cattell's Study) and sex remained assigned on two levels (high and low P.F.'s and male and females in sex). The frustration scores were dependent variable.

The investigators concluded that the girls were more frustrated than boys but statistically reserved, detached, critical and cool boys and girls have been more affected by frustration than outgoing, warm heated, enjoying and participation type boys

and girls. It was also concluded that the girls were more frustrated than boys but negligible difference was found.

Figueroa de Cuevara (1978) examined the influence of non-promotion of elementary students to higher grades on frustration. He considered a person to be frustrated if he reported orally or in writing that there was no effective way to accomplish his/her dominant desires or purposes. Any issue to which an individual gives top priority was defined to be a dominant purpose. The study was initiated with the assumption that frustration leads to deviant behaviors' and prolonged frustration leads to a neurotic behavior. The investigator measured frustration with the help of Guevara instrument Scale and non-promoted students were identified with the help of institutional records. Objectives of the study were achieved through Hutchinson Generation of knowledge Methodology. The Study concluded that non-promotion is an important factor in the generation of frustration behavior.

The phenomenon of frustration has been studied in India as well. For Example chauhan and Tewari (1971) and Tiwari and Sharma (1970) found that interest exerts frustration. Rai chaudhari, Jayanti (1988) studied frustration reaction of school children associated with some psycho-social variables. Dabhi, Madhukanta and Ishwarbhai (1989) studied frustration among students of nursing schools in the state of Gujarata in relation to certain variables and its impact on their achievements. Singh (1988) studied frustration in relation to sense of responsibility amongst youth. Shukla (1988) studied frustration in relation to professional Adjustment and teaching efficiency of teachers. Verma, Sanjay Singh (1990) studied Frustration modalities and neurotic Tendencies as a result of perceived parental rejection. Kaur Malkit (2010) studied youth problems in relation to frustration of Muktsar district. Biruntha M. and Muthaiyan R. (2015) studied reasons for frustration among adolescent students in Pudukotti district, Tamilnadu.

From a survey of the above studies it can be safely concluded that several factors contribute to frustration. It can also be asserted with a reasonable degree of confidence that frustration in itself is a factor which influences several behavioral variables. However, the number of studies probing the frustration phenomenon are few and far broad generalization in respect of frustration and therefore suggests the need of a fuller intensive study of the frustration so that it becomes more comprehensible than before.

Method and Procedure

Causal comparative methods seemed to be more suitable for ascertaining the influence of socio-economic status on the frustration of adolescents in educational situations. Hence this method was chosen.

Tools

Socio-economic status Test was used to measure the socio-economic status and Sharma's Frustration Scale was used to measure the Frustration among adolescents in educational situations.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Two hundred male and female adolescents of high school in equal number constituted the sample of the study. The selection of the sample was made with the help of stratified sampling procedure.

Sample Structure

Male X graders		Total	Female X graders		Total
BAV Inter College Meerut	NAS Inter College Meerut		IN Girl's H.School Meerut	KK.Girls's H.School Meerut	
50	50	100	50	50	100
Total : 200 X graders					

Analysis & Organization of the Data

Table-1

Seven correlations were obtained to determine the relationship between Level of Socio-economic status on one hand and frustration and its six dimensions on the other hand which resulted as following:

S.No.	Details of correlation	Value of r
r ¹	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'My school' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y1} = .129
r ²	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'My classmates' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y2} = .058
r ³	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'My Teachers' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y3} = .354**
r ⁴	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'Cocurr. Activities' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y4} = .151*
r ⁵	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'Home Work' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y5} = -.042
r ⁶	Correlation between Socio-economic status and 'Examinations' dimension of frustration	r _{x1 y6} = .015
r ⁷	Correlation between Socio-economic status and Total Frustration Score	r _{x1 y7} = .105

Results and Discussion

The objective of this study was to ascertain the relationship between adolescent learner's Socio-economic status and his frustration in educational situations.

Seven r values have been determined in the context of this objective. The co- relational analysis in respect of these correlations leads to following findings.

1. Relationship between socio-economic status on the one hand and frustration among the adolescent learners in teaching situations designed by teachers (table 1, r₃=.354**) and presented in co-curricular activities (table 1, r₄=.151*) on the other hand, is significant.
2. The correlation between socio-economic status and frustration in various types of educational situations ranges between-.042 to .354**.

3. Socio-economic status does not hold any significant relationship with frustration experienced by adolescent learners in school situations (table 1, $r^{1=.129}$), attitude of classmates towards the adolescent learners under study (table 1, $r^{2=.058}$), nature of homework (table 1, $r^{5=-.042}$) testing conditions (table 1, $r^{6=.015}$) and in fact with overall frustration itself (table 1, $r^{7=-.105}$).
4. By and large, socio-economic status is not a very effective factor in adolescent learner's frustration. This observation is borne out by five of the seven insignificant r values. Even the remaining two r values are indicative of a low relationship between the two.
5. It seems proper to examine the theoretical implications of the study. That socio-economic status exerts a limited influence on adolescent learner's frustration, receives partial support from an earlier finding by Angelino and Shedd, who found a significant difference on the frustration scores obtained through Rosenzweig picture frustration study between two groups of children, one belonging to high socio-economic background, and the other to a low socio-economic status. However, these findings are at variance with the hypothesis that there is a low negative relationship between socio-economic status and frustration in educational situations. The hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.
6. The above hypothesis of the study was framed on the reasoning and general observation that adolescents belonging to high socio-economic status tend to receive more recognition from their teachers, classmates and other school personnel, while the adolescents belonging to low socio-economic status fail to evoke that much of recognition from their teachers, classmates and school personnel as their counter-parts do. It was, therefore, observed that there should be a low negative relationship between socio-economic status and frustration feelings.
7. However, findings contrary to the hypothesis imply, that students hailing from high socio-economic families set up high expectations from their teachers, classmates and other school personnel. In the event of behaviors on the part of teachers, classmates and other school personnel's, to be falling short of the expectations of socio-economically high adolescent learners, a feeling of frustration sets in. Effects of high socio-economic status are more perceptibly experienced by adolescent learners during classroom teaching situations and participation in co-curricular activities. This can be explained in terms of the psychological principle of assertion of superiority owing to high socio-economic status in adolescent group situations. Classroom and co-curricular activities are two contexts where a group situation exists and as such socio-economically better adolescent feel that their superiority in this regard be recognized by their classmates and teachers. When such recognition is not received by them in the group or before the group, they tend to feel frustrated. Since the other

educational situations do not present group comparison, therefore, socio-economic status fails to exert any significant influence.

To summaries, socio-economic status enters frustration phenomenon but only in group situation existing within the school system. It has been established that its contribution to frustration behavior is of a limited value.

References

1. Amsel, A.(1971), "Frustration Persistence and regression", In H.D. Kimmel (Ed.), *Experimental Psychology: Recent Research and Theory*, New York: Academic.
2. Barker, Roger, G. and others.(1941), "Frustration and regression : an experiment with young children", *University of Iowa studies child welfare*, No. 18, pp. 1-34.
3. Biruntha M. And Muthaiyan R. (2015), "Reasons for Frustration among adolescent students in Pudukottai district, Tamilnadu", *Star Research Journal*, Vol.3 Issue II(I).
4. Brown, J.S. and Farber. I.E.(1951), "Emotions conceptualized as intervening variables – with suggestions towards a theory of frustration", *Psychol. Bulletin*, No.48, pp. 465-480.
5. Burt, C."Backward child", *University of London Publication*, Warwickshire, London.
6. Dabhi, Madhukanta Ishwarbhai,(May 22, 1989), "A study of frustration in the students of nursing schools in the state of Gujrat in relation to certain variables and its impact on their achievement," *University News*.
7. Dixit, B.M. (1985),"The interactive Effect of Frustration, Adjustment and sex on Self concept", *Ph.D. thesis in Psychology*, Agra University Agra.
8. Dixit, B.M.& Srivastava,D.N.(1997), "Reactions to Frustration scale ", *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra.
9. Doob and Gross.(1968-76), " Literature on Frustration recorded by Low and Marx (1968)", *Journal of Soc. Psychology*,pp.213-238.
10. El-dreny, Hesscen Abedel Aziz, (1978), " The Effect of Induced Frustration on verbal Dyadic Creativity", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 38, No. 7.
11. *Encyclopedia of Psychology*,Vol.1, Ed.-H.J. Eysenck, London & W. Arnold, Wurzburg R. Meili, Berne, Search Press London,pp.390-393.
12. Figler, Stephen Kenneth,(1976) "Aggressive Response to Frustration Among Athletes and Non-athletes", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 37, Nos.1-2,p.864-A
13. Figueroa-de-Guevaria, Gloria Maria,(1978), "Frustration Among Non Promoted Puerto Rican Elementary School Children", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.38, No.8, p.4567-A.
14. Frost, Kenneth Bradley, " The Effects of there levels of frustration and Sex Differences on figural Creative Expressions of High School juniors and Senior", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.37, Nos.5-6,p.2738
15. Govind Tiwari, Kiran Merbhatt and Manorama Tiwari, (1978) "Personality Factors and Sex as Correlates of Frustration modes', *Journal of*

Remarking An Analisation

- Education and Psychology*, Vol. XXXV, No.4, pp.191-198.
16. Hunt, J.Mc. (1944), "Personality and Behavior Disorders", Ronald, New York.
 17. *International Encyclopedia of Psychiatry Psychology Psycho-analysis and Neurology*, Editor-Ben jamin, Vol.5, produced for Aesculapius Publishers, Inc. New York,by van Nostrand Reinhold Company New York.p.141.
 18. Karlin,S. and Schwartz, H.M.(1957), "Social and General Intelligence and performance on Rosenzweig P.F. Study", *J. Consult Psychology*, pp. 293-296.
 19. Kaur,malkit(2010), "Study of youth problems in relation to frustration of Muktsar District", M.Ed. Dissertation.
 20. Kuraim, F.M. (1984), " The Principal Factors Causing Reader frustration in a Public Library, " *Dissertation Abstracts International*, vol.44, No.9, P.2612-A.
 21. Kusum K. Bhatt and Pattan Zaminshah, (1976), "frustration Tolerance among high and low leadership groups". *Journal of Education and Psyschology*, vol. XXXIV, No. 1.
 22. Loasn, Reed and Marx,(1958) "Frustration-Theory and Experiment", *Conetic Psychology Monogram*,pp.393-464.
 23. Maier, N.R.F.(1949),"Frustration: The study of behavior without a goal" New York, McGraw Hill.
 24. Miller, M.V.(1965), "The students state of mind", in M.V. Miller and S. Gilmore(eds.), *Revolution at Berkely*, Dial Press, New York.
 25. Miller,N.E.(1941), "The Frustration-aggression hypothesis", *Psychological Review*,Vol.38,pp.337-342.
 26. Munroe, Walter S.(1950), "Encyclopaedia of Educational Research", Macmillan, New York.
 27. Neuhaus, Sylvia,(1982), " An Investigation of the Developmental Differences in Reactions to Frustration between Normal and learning Disabled Boys", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.43, no.4, p. 1262-B.
 28. Pierce, Robert Lee,(1979), " Child Abuse : A stress frustration aggression Paradigm", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, A, vol.40.
 29. Raichaudhuri, Jayati,(1989), "Frustration reaction of School Children Associated with some Psychosocial variables", *University News*, Monday, January 30.
 30. Rosenzweig, S.(1950), "Some Problems relating to research on the Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Study", *Journal of Personality*, No.18,pp.303-305.
 31. Ryan, T.J. and Watson P.(1968-69), "Frustrative non reward Theory applied to children's behaviur", *Psychological bulletin*,pp.111-125.
 32. Shaw, M.C.et. al. (1960), "The reaction to frustration of bright high school under achievers", *California journal of Education Research*,11,pp.120-124.
 33. Shukla, S.N. (1988), "A study of frustration in relation to professional adjustment and teaching efficiency among different grade teachers", *University News*, Monday, July 18.
 34. Singh, N.P. (1988), "A study of frustration in relation to sense of responsibility amongst youth", *Prog.Edn. LXIII*(1), 16-21,15.
 35. Singh, R.P. (1979), "A study of Creativity in relation to adjustment, Frustration and level of aspiration ", *Ph.d. Thesis in Education*, Agra University Agra.
 36. Verma, Sanjay Singh,(1990), "A study of frustration modalities and neurotic tendencies as a result of perceived parental rejection", *University News*, April 23, p.32.
 37. Wagner, Tom Lynn, (1976), "The Effect of Frustration on Cognitive Processes", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol.37, Nos. 5-6,p.3433-A.