



## Frustration and Aggression Among Adolescents

### KEYWORDS

Frustration, Aggression, Gender, Socio-economic status.

**Dr. SUHINA CHATTERJEE**

GANAPAT NAGAR, GANAPAT PALACE, BLOCK- 'C'-Q FLAT NO-103 POST-CHUTIA RANCHI, JHARKHAND  
PIN- 834001

**ABSTRACT** *The study was conducted to see the impact of gender and socio-economic status on frustration and aggression of adolescents. For this purpose 320 (160 male and 160 female) adolescents were purposively selected as a sample from different high schools situated in Ranchi district areas. These two groups were further divided according to their parental education and income. The result revealed that females were having higher level of aggression as compare to male adolescents. On the other hand high socio-economic status group of adolescents were more prone to aggression as compare to low socio-economic status group. Result further revealed that there is no relationship between frustration and aggression.*

### Introduction:-

Study of frustration and aggression is helpful to understand the behavior and problem of Indian adolescents. In the last two decades, many reports have indicated that the level of aggression in young people is increasing dramatically. Reasons for frustration and aggression in adolescents are mainly examination, teenage love relationships, peer pressure, demands or expectations of parents and living up to society's expectation. Frustration can have a number of effects. Sometimes people may perceive the sources of frustration to be outside of their control and thus frustration will continuous to build, leading, eventually to further problematic behavior like aggression.

Frustration is an emotion that occurs in situations where a person is blocked from reaching a desired outcome. In general, whenever we reach one of our goals, we feel pleased and whenever we are prevented from reaching our goals, we may succumb to frustration and feel irritable, annoyed and angry. According to **Murphy (1964)** "Blockage of motivated action is called frustration".

Aggression is a hostile motivation which refers to the individual's wish or desire to cause injury or anxiety to others. According to **Shaffer (2002)** "an aggressive act is a form of behavior designed to harm or injure a living being". **Geen (1990)** has defined "aggression as behavior against another that intentionally inflicts harm".

**Berkowitz & Geen (1967)** found that frustration sometimes enhances aggression. **Worchel (1974)** suggest that low levels of frustration usually induce little or no aggression. Gender is a factor that plays a role in both human and animal aggression. **Malik and katyal (1993)** found that males were more aggressive than females. **Tapper and Boulton (2004)** reported contradictory report that female adolescents obtained higher score on the aggression scale than male adolescents.

Socio-economic status also affects the frustration and aggression level. **Pathak and Rastogi (1980)** found that lower class children had a tendency towards inward direct aggression. **Malviya (1977)** found that lower economic status adult male were significantly more aggressive than were the higher adult males.

### Objective:-

To compare the level of frustration and aggression among male and female students.

To compare the level of frustration and aggression between students belonging to high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

To determine the inter-relationships among frustration and aggression in adolescents.

### Hypotheses:-

- Male students will be higher level of frustration score than female students.
- Students belonging to higher socio-economic status will show lower level of frustration.
- Male students will be higher level of aggression score than female students.
- Students belonging to higher socio-economic status will show lower level of frustration.
- Frustration and aggression will be inter-related with each other.

### Sample:-

The study was conducted on a sample of 320(160 male & 160 female) students of different schools of Ranchi District. These two groups were further divided according to their parental education and income. Their age ranged between 16 to 19 years. The stratified random sampling technique was applied.

### Tools:-

- Personal data questionnaire
- Frustration scale by N.S chauhan & Dr. Govind Tiwari (1972).
- Aggression scale by Mathur & Bhatnagar (2004).

### Procedure:-

First of all personal data questionnaire were applied on those selected students who fulfilled the criteria. After that the frustration & aggression scale was administered to the subject with proper instruction. Data was checked and scoring was done with the help of scoring key. The obtained data were tabulated and analysed with the help of mean, SD and 't' and correlation.

**Result and Discussion:-**

In order to test the hypothesis "Male students will have higher frustration score than female students" t scores were computed. Table 1 presents the summary of the statistical findings:-

**Table-1**  
**Table 1 showing means, SD, t-ratio of frustration score on male & female students.**

Group	Number	Means	SDs	Md	't'	P value
Male	160	12.19	2.18	0.1	0.42	NS
Female	160	12.29	2.04			

It is marked in the above table-1 that the male and female group have very little difference in frustration score.

**Table-2**  
**Table 2 showing means, SD, t-ratio of frustration score on high & low socio-economic school students.**

Group	Number	Means	SDs	Md	't'	P value
HSES	160	12.18	1.99	0.13	0.54	NS
LSES	160	12.31	2.22			

\* HSES-High socio-economic status

\* NS- Not significant

**LSES- Low socio-economic status**

Result shows that the mean frustration scores of all the high and low socio-economic groups are almost similar.

**Table-3**  
**Table 3 showing means, SD, t-ratio of aggression score on male & female students.**

Group	Number	Means	SDs	Md	't'	P value
Males	160	185.54	22.92	14.64	4.88	0.01
Females	160	200.18	30.18			

Data reported in the above table-3 that females obtained higher mean (Mean=200.18) aggression score than male students (Mean=185.54). The 't' ratio was found 4.88, which is significant at 0.01 level. So the hypothesis was proved but the findings were not in a hypothesized direction.

**Table-4**  
**Table 4 showing means, SD, t-ratio of aggression score on High & Low socio-economic status group of students.**

Group	Number	Means	SDs	Md	't'	P value
HSES	160	195.17	27.17	4.63	1.50	NS
LSES	160	190.54	27.94			

\*HSES-High socio-economic status

\* NS- Not significant

**LSES- Low socio-economic status**

After analyzing the data table-4 it was found that high socio-economic status group were found more aggression score (Mean= 195.17) than low socio-economic status group (Mean= 190.54). Yet the mean score of the two groups do not differ significantly ('t'=1.50). So the hypothesis that the low socio-economic status group will have higher aggression score than low socio-economic status group rejected due to insignificant finding.

The reason may be that parents of high socio-economic status group of adolescents having higher aspiration and expectation from their children. They exert more pressure for good result which causes aggression. Singh et al., (1990) found that high caste adolescents exhibited greater amount of aggression.

**Table-5**  
**Table 5 showing Inter-correlation between frustration and aggression. Total (N=320)**

	Aggression scale
Frustration scale	-0.04241(NS)

Using product moment method of co-efficient of correlation an attempt was made to explore the inter-relationship between frustration and aggression. Result shows that there is no relationship between frustration and aggression.

**Conclusion:-**

The findings of the present study indicated that:-

- There is very negligible difference in the frustration level of male and female students.
- Frustration is not found to be influenced by socio-economic status.
- Female students obtained more aggression score than male students.
- There was no significant difference between high and low socio-economic status groups of students on their aggression score.
- There is no relationship between frustration and aggression.

**REFERENCE**

Berkowitz, L., & Geen, R.G., (1967). Stimulus qualities of the target of aggression: A further study. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, Vol 1, 5,364-368. Geen, R.G. (1990). *Human Aggression*. Vol 10, Pacific Grove, CA: Brookes/Cole. 321-330. Malik, A., & Katyal, S.,(1993). A comparative study of Frustration in Daughters of working and non-working Mothers. *Indian Psychological Review*. Vol 40, (1)2,9-13. Malviya, D.,(1977). A study not reaction to frustration. *Indian Educational Review*, Vol 1.12(3),71-87. Murphy, G. (1964). *An Introduction to Psychology*. Oxford Book Company. Calcutta. Vol 3, Harper and Row Publishers. New York.15:65-78. Pathak, N. & Rastogi, M.R.,(1980). Direction and Pattern of aggression and self disclosure in low SES adolescents. *Indian Edu. Vol 5 Rev. 19(1)*, 14-19. Shaffer, D.R.,(2002). *Developmental Psychology: Childhood and adolescence Vol 3*,(Wodsworth, Thomson learning). 123-143. Singh, Anoop K., & Pandey, J., (1990). Psychology of poverty. *Indian Journal of Social work*, Vol 4, 51, 623-632. Warchel, S., (1974). The effect of three types of arbitrary thwarting on the instigation to aggression. *J.Person*, Vol 6, 42, 301-318.