CHAPTER – I
INTRODUCTION
&
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There has been a controversy about the basic nature of human beings. Some people are basically self motivated, while some give more emphasis on the altruistic dimension, but it is sure that according to Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest every body is struggling for his own existence. It gives a different shade to the behaviour of individuals; sometimes they like to provide help while sometimes they like to seek help from others. It is realized
that the present day society would not been have existed and developed and even no civilization could be if the individual has no altruistic tendency. In fact the positive aspects of human beings give a meaning and significance to human life. But some times as it is a tough time, when it has become difficult to run with the society for the individual so the frustration is also an important phenomena dominating the individual behaviour and playing significant role in human life in different process as adjustment and its a importance is growing more and more in modern time. So first it is essential to understand the nature of frustration.

NATURE OF FRUSTRATION

Frustration is an important phenomenon because of its close relation for the understanding of normal and abnormal behaviour, its inevitability in human life, its role in human adjustment and its growing importance in the modern times. A number of Psychology tried to define this term. Trotter and Mc Connel (1978) defined that “Frustration, means to do something in vain.
Anything that prevents you from achieving a goal is likely to give you a strong feeling of frustration.”

According to Sargent (1948) “frustration state may be characterized as an unpleasant emotional state.” So it is understood that frustration is an intervening construct of a vaguely emotional or motivational characteristic. Frustration has been defined in many ways by different psychologists, but all of them agree on its general nature, while defining frustration, they emphasized that one of the principal characteristic of the human behaviour is that it is motivated or goal directed. There is some driving force or motivation behind all behaviour, which activates the individual for achieving the goal, when motivated behaviour is blocked by an obstacle, tension is produced and it lasts as long as the barrier is present. But frustration occurs only when the organism meets hindrances which are difficult or impossible to overcome (Malavia, 1977).

In general terms, frustration occurs when a motivated organism, striving to achieve a desired goal, is blocked or impeded
in its progress toward that goal. In other words, when progress toward a motivated behaviour is blocked by an insurmountable barrier, before achieving its goal, and underlying tension unresolved, it result in frustration. This fact has been presented by all psychologists as follows in fig.1.

![Fig. 1 Diagram of frustration](image)

It is clear that frustration occurs when a motivated organism is blocked from achieving its goal. I shows that even after repeated efforts, the goal is not achieved due to insoluble barriers.
Frustration is an emotional state resulting from being blocked (Sanford 1961). Dollard et.al (1939) postulated that frustration is an interference with the occurrence of an instigated goal, response at its proper time in the behaviour sequence. Thus frustration is the blocking of behaviour before it can culminate in the achievement of the goal (Epsteing & Shontz, 1971).

Frustration involves the thwarting or blocking of a person’s motives, needs, drives, purposes or goals, some psychologists place greater stress upon the thwarting than upon the individuals reactions to it. Rosenzwig (1944) defined this term as follows: “Frustration occurs whenever the organism meets a more or less insurmountable obstacles in its route to the satisfaction of any vital need.”

These definitions cover the frustration when the path to the goal of the active need is blocked. The primary frustration involves the sheer existence of an active need and the secondary frustration consists of the obstructions in the path to the goal of active need.
Symonds (1946) defined frustrations as: “The blocking or interference of the satisfaction of an aroused need through some barrier or obstruction.”

The above definition also supports the view that frustration occurs whenever the needs are blocked. Maslow (1941) “insisted that frustration involves two concepts deprivation and threat to the personality.”

According to Britt and Janus (1940): “The frustrating situation may be analysed in terms of barrier or obstruction, and interference with goal attainment and of reward expectation. Thwarting is not limited to the individual’s activity in progress, but also reacts to that which he is expecting or to which he is looking forward.”

All above definitions thus tend to agree upon one common fact that frustration is a mental state caused by the motivated behaviour being blocked by some obstacle.
There are some situations, when an individual fails to achieve his goal and may start suffering from the feeling of failure and it creates anxiety and if it is prolonged the person may start feeling frustration. Krech et.al. (1982) established that he may start to defend his self conception and warding off threats to self esteem and therefore may develop such response traits of aggressiveness, unsociability etc.

Frustration effect is visible in three forms on the behaviour of an organism one is inhibitory avoidance response, second is excitatory responses and the third more important is reinforcing responses allowing escape from arousing stimuli which is lerarnt. Wolman (1977), Eysenck (1979) tried to explain the phenomenon of frustration through a process consisting of first is frustration situation, the second is frustration state and the last is reactions to frustration. This is unsolvable situation, where one finds it impossible to come out and it creates frustration.
**Sources of Frustration:**

Human wants are thwarted by wars, floods, economic problems, depressions, political upheavals and other events that upset the best-laid plans, and sometimes these also become the agent of creating frustration. Frustration create uncomfortable emotional tensions that force the individual to engage in various tension-reducing activities. There is a variety of reactions to frustration is practically unlimited. The reactions may range from the constructive direct approaches of normal individuals to the mental symptoms of psychotic patients. The two principal direct methods of overcoming obstacles are through increased efforts and variation in mode of attack. If these approaches fail, the third direct course of action consists in changing the goal to one that is more attainable. A premedical student doing unsatisfactory work in his courses may first react by spending more time and effort on his studies. If this does not produce satisfactory results, he may try to improve his grades by changing his study habits, employing a tutor selecting easier courses. If these varied approaches prove
unsuccessful, he may give up his medical goal and transfer to some other course keeping in view his abilities.

The feelings of inferiority is also an important source of frustration. When increased efforts and variation in attack fail and substitute goals are unavailable, unacceptable, individuals often react by developing feeling of helplessness and inadequacy. This emotionally distressing state of mind, popularly known as the inferiority complex, is especially prevalent among individuals who attribute their failure to attain life objectives to personal inadequacies or defects. An inferiority complex is a form of self-criticism usually involving fear of social approval.

The specific situation that bring about frustrations are of course, endless but they can generally be put in to four main categories of sources: (a) Man’s Physical environment. (b) Man’s biological limitations, (c) The complexity of man’s psychological make up. (d) The nature of man’s social environment.

(a) The Physical Environment:
The block lie in restrictions imposed by external environment. Physical environment may frustrate us drastically, through rainfall, earthquakes, famines, floods and others. It also provides innumerable hindrances – the traffic jam, the uneven road, load noises and so on Rosenzweig (1938-39) termed it externalprivation.

(b) The Biological Limitations:

These obstructions lie in the biological limitations of the individual himself in his motor and mental incapacities. The blocking agent lies within the individual and his own deficiencies prove barrier. In other words, a man, for example, may be cripple and hence unable to achieve the fame, he desires as an athlete. Rosenzweig States this as internalprivation.

(c) The Social Environment:

The social environment is probably the most important source of deep and persistent frustration and the most
significant for social behaviour. Such frustrations are also the most resistant to remedy. Society surrounds the individual with all sorts of mores, regulations, rituals and taboos, which frequently serve to build up more or less impermeable barriers to the ready satisfaction of his need and demands. It sets up an economic system requiring that man satisfy essential needs though money and then makes the acquisition of money a difficult and at times, impossible act. It sets up social caste and class systems, Preventing or hindering free social locomotion, so that a member of one caste or class may be thwarted in his desire to become a member of another and to acquire to become the privileges of that caste.

The role of society and cultural mores in frustration is at times all important. In that the very needs which a particular culture itself induces are thwarted by the structures and institution of that society, Horney (1945). One of the Neo-Freudians emphasizes the significance of social milieu in frustration causing neurosis.
(d) Psychological Complexity:

Man is not subject to one stimulus at a time or required to make only one response at a time. He is remarkably complex, existing at every moment in a number of simultaneous overlapping Psychological situations. The richness of the Psychological field makes possible the arousal of many needs and demands at the same time these needs and demands often compete and conflict but the nature of the situation is such that the satisfaction of one need or demand may mean the disruption of others. We can conceive of some conflicting motivational tendencies being, are used by two equally attractive or equally repulsive objects in environment Sanford (1961).

Freud (1933) was the first, who tried to establish the causal relationship between frustration and behaviour disorders. Today is the very complex time so it is impossible for the individuals to achieve all the aims and fulfill their desires. So it is very natural that frustration takes place in the individual when one fails in adjustment with the existing environment (Menani and Saxena, 1988).
Frustration is never ending process. A number of psychologists have focused on the importance of frustration in constructive side. It is found that it may increase the strength of motive to go ahead with doubled efforts.

Some research have suggested that frustration acts like a drive (Amsel and Roussel 1952) one of the most basic reaction to frustration is an attack on the barrier that blocks to the goal. Sometimes it seems to lead to aggressive behaviour (Dollard, et al, 1939).

Reactions to Frustration:

Frustrating situations are threatening to the individuals. So they try to defend themselves and these reactions to frustration are described by Psychologists as defense mechanisms, which are used by the subject to protect himself against the threats (Malavia 1977).

Kresh and Crutchfield (1962) classified these reactions to frustration in two categories one is adaptive and the other one is maladaptive. The person adopts the adaptive reactions, when the
achievement of a goal is blocked, so tries to overcome the barriers. It creates an insight in the individual and found significant in understanding of social behaviour.

The frustration and aggression are in the category of maladaptive reactions. The reactions adopted may be of several types as one way is where the individual make responsible to others. The second is he fears to blame others, so starts blaming himself and the third may be when he fears loss of love, so refuse to blame any one or anything. Rosenzweing (1934) called all these reactions as defensive in nature, so these will affect the tolerance power of an individual to the frustrating situation.

An individual’s reaction to the frustrating situations depend upon various factors. Several factors act together which make a person to behave in a particular way and it becomes the basis to differentiate in personality of individuals. It depends on the individual’s tolerance power. Some organism have frustration tolerance to the degree that they continue their efforts till they achieve the goal while some can think that they can shift over their
goal who have less degree of frustration tolerance how much a person will be frustrated in his life, it depends on the organisms so it is essential to know how psychologists have defined this term frustration tolerance.

**NATURE OF FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE**

*Krech et-al (1982)* had the view that the entire society can have the basic wants blocked by the characteristic of physical environment but how much frustration one can bear; individual differences are found in tolerance.

The term frustration tolerance refers to the amount of stress one can tolerate, before his integrated functioning is seriously impaired. Thus, frustration tolerance refers to the capacity of the individual to show persistence in efforts despite repeated failures and antagonistic environment (*Rai & Gupta, 1988*).

Frustration-tolerance is a part and parcel of life. This is a feature of wholesome personality (*Tallent, 1978*). Often the individuals do not have sufficient capabilities to achieve the goal
and sometimes the society sets up norms, so high which block the satisfaction of the individual needs. There is a level, beyond which the tension and unpleasantness of frustration result in disruptive behaviour. This level varies depending very much on the person. In the very same circumstances, one individual will be able to take a higher level of frustration while the other individual may start showing disruptive behaviour, it depicts about an individual's personality. Once the level of tension exceeds a person’s frustration tolerance level may either increases and several maladjustive behaviour may appear. A very commonly observed consequence of such frustration is regression, which is a return to earlier and less mature ways of trying to reach the goal on or of reacting to the blocks. It has been seen that many adults, when frustrated beyond their tolerance level even if only temporarily it result to such childish patterns as crying or adopt a pattern which did work, or did get them their way as of picking an inanimate object which was frustrating them at the moment, as though the object deserved punishment for blocking their drives.
The concept of frustration tolerance has an important effect upon the dynamics of human personality as it plays a significant role to decide the modes of responses to the frustrating situation, not matter whether it is natural or artificially induced (Malavia, 1977). Rosenzweig (1944) introduced this concept first. This term is used to refer to the limit or tension and stress because there is no individual, who has never tolerated the frustration in his life, the degree of frustration may be less or great. It results in life due to failure in examination, affairs and mainly due to loss of status so frustration tolerance becomes essential to maintain the normality in life.

Rosenzweig (1944) defined this term frustration tolerance as “an individuals capacity to with stand frustration without failure of psychobiological adjustment i.e., without resorting to inadequate modes of frustration tolerance response.”

Frustration tolerance has cognitive, emotional and co-native aspects. On the cognitive or intellectual plane it denotes some form of delayed reaction (Hunter, 1913). While on the emotional or motivational plane it implies the capacity to post pone gratification and on the co-native level it is an index of an aspiration, an urge.
In the words of Rosenzweig (1944). *Inadequate mode of ego defense is similarly found in the state of low frustration tolerance independent of organic injury.*

The restrictions placed on behaviour by the rules of society constitute are always the important source of frustration. In satisfying our manifold desires, our actions must be in conformity with the accepted moral and social code of our culture. Sometimes the members of minority groups and person born on the wrong side of the tracks often find it difficult to attain their life goals because of discriminatory social and economic barriers and it can create frustration among them.

There are individual differences, in frustration tolerance depending upon the individuals, training, socialization and general personality make-up and the nature of the stress situation. If the stress is excessive, it would bring about greater disorganization in personality and would naturally make the responses inadequate. If, on the other hand, the stress situation is within specified limits, the responses of the individual would be adequate and would be reflective of his tolerance.
obviously, the normal individual may possess high frustration tolerance. It can be presented in fig. 2 as follows:

![Diagram of Frustration Tolerance](image)

**Fig-2. Diagram of Frustration Tolerance**

It is clear from the above diagrammatically representation that organism put their best efforts though obstacles are there but ultimately achieve his goal.

While according to the behaviouristic theory the cognitive aspects of frustration tolerance is geared to the motivational and cognitive phases. So the capacity for symbolic thinking in behavioural terms is a necessary correlate for the ability for delayed gratification. It is established that this capacity for delay at both levels is symbolic of thinking and gratification is a prerequisite of frustration tolerance and appears to increase with maturation.
If a person is not able to tolerate frustration, it leads to maladjustment and the person may indulge himself in anti-social behaviour and may not believe in altruism. Rai and Gupta (1988) established in the study that most neurotics and psychotics are found to be deficient in their capacity to tolerate frustration as is clear with the diagram as follows. Human beings can tolerate certain level of tension, beyond which they lose efficiency. Every human being has a breaking point—a tension tolerance limit. The person who discontinue his efforts may be said to have less frustration tolerance. Diagrammatically it can be represented in the following manner.

![Diagram of the frustration non-tolerance](image_url)
Maier (1949, 1956), has presented that frustration instigated behaviour is neither motivational nor goal oriented, and not even adaptive. He thus sets up a dichotomy between motivated behaviour and frustrated behaviour which is fixated or stereotyped, abnormally resistant to modification, and without a goal.

**FACTORS AFFECTING FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE**

How an individual reacts under certain frustrating situations depends upon a large number of factors which are not always apparent. There are varieties of reaction to frustration, depending upon several factors and also upon the immediate internal and external environment of the individual. Several factors act together with different degrees at different times which make a person behave in a particular way under frustrating situations. In spite of differences, it can be assumed that each individual has a characteristic way of reacting to, or behaving in, or dealing with frustrations. These characteristic ways of reactions to frustrations can be a function of personality variables and social variables. (Rosenzweig, 1939).
Frustration tolerance may vary from one culture to other as in some cultures children are brought up in this way that they are taught to tolerate frustration more than other. It is also found that age, sex, living area and most important different pattern of personality of the individual affect the frustration tolerance, which will be discussed in the review chapter.

**NATURE OF ALTRUISM**

Frustration tolerance often leads to insight and reorganization of paths to the goal, and the impotent aspect of the effect of frustration sometimes, i.e., blocking is of such significance for the person that the experienced blockages by the person in his daily life not always work as hindrance in their effects, as an individual may try to compensate his frustration by involving himself in helping others. So the researcher has selected this important aspect of social behaviour i.e., Altruism along with frustration tolerance in the present study. **Campbell (1965)** believed that man has both motives one is jealousy and the other is altruistic motive. Although Campbell argument has confused two separate issues. One issue is
related to whether there is any genetic basis that facilitates group survival, the other issue relates to whether hedonic satisfaction can account for such altruistic behaviour but it is sure that altruism is a self-sacrificing behaviour.

Besides disapproved reactions, the individuals are capable of independent self-sacrificing behaviour and some times under take dangerous altruistic acts for no apparent social or material gain. There is a need to discuss the situational determinants of altruism. It has been suggested that in interpersonal relationship there is a number of social standards regulating the performance of individuals to benefit others. A cultural norm of reciprocity is a social responsibility norm, which describes that the individual should help other people who are dependent upon him and need his assistance and a social exchange norm also work so that people help other people primarily to receive benefits in return. Research is in progress in which attempts are made to illuminate the conditions under which the different norms operate, for example Berkowitz and Daniels (1963) demonstrated the studies on social
responsibility norm and have revealed that individuals exert greater efforts to help a highly – dependent than a less dependent person, although no direct return in benefits or rewards is anticipated.

Altruism is not a very new concept but it emerged with the civilization. In the 19th century Auguste Comte a famous French sociologist adopted this term. No one can deny this fact that selfishness is the basic tendency which is found not only in animals but in human beings also. It does not mean that no one has the altruistic attitude but human beings have positive attitude also, which provoke them to help other without any expectation of reward and recognition. First it is essential to know what Psychologists mean with this term Altruism. It is a behaviour which is carried out by the individuals to help others without any expectation.

The term Altruism is related to a lot of kinds of behaviour those are as helping behaviour, prosaically behaviour, this kind of heeling is that behaviour in which the individuals help one another but whose primary intention is the attainment of external rewards e.g., social recognition, and the civilm’s gratitude. Obviously, it is
difficult to discern altruism from instrumental helping by merely observing a single instance of helping behaviour.

There are interesting similarities between hurting and helping. Both areas have stimulated great interest among researchers, students and the general population. The notions of instrumental helping and instrumental aggression suggest that the same motive may lie behind these two quite different behaviours.

Psychologists used the term Prosocial behaviour in contrast to antisocial behaviour. Brayan and Walback (1970) tried to define this term as follows: “Altruistic behaviour refers to those behaviour intended to benefit another but which appears to have a high cost to the actor with little possibility of material or social reward.”

It is clear from the above definition that the ultimate form of the act as defined here is that in the help in response, the helper’s identity is not disclosed. Campbell (1972) used the term to indicate the positive social aspect of the behaviour. Wispe and Cohen (1972) also had the similar opinion that altruism refers to the positive aspect of one’s personality. In the Oxford Dictionary,
altruism has been defined as “devotion to the welfare of others.” The social Psychologists included all the acts done for charity purpose included in the category of “prosocial behaviour” used for helping behaviour as well as for “Altruism”. **Latane and Darley (1970)** pointed out “that altruistic behaviour does not mean just doing one act of help, but a series of helping activities, which really help any person in need.” Therefore it seems that altruism may better be defined in terms of the behaviour itself.

**Macaulay and Berkowitz (1970)** Succinctly defined altruism as “behaviour carried out to benefit other without anticipation of external rewards. The ultimate form of the act as defined as a helping response in which neither the victim nor anyone else was aware of the helper's identity.”

The more interesting fact has emerged that people help to those people whom do they like. Some people morally like to get help only if they need it. It is quite obvious that a member of the family who might be in trouble will receive quick assistance but however, it is quite clear that strangers amy or may not be helped
even if their need seems urgent. It is not surprising, then, that some research efforts have shown that greater help is given to those who are liked than to those who are disliked. Goode (1971) had the view that these actions will also be included in the category of altruistic behaviour. Stang and Wrightswan (1981) defined prosocial behaviour which is used for altruism. “Prosocial behaviour may be defined as voluntary behaviour performed with the intention to benefit, other person or a group of persons.”

It means that altruism is an internal attribution of disposition to help one another. It is also very common that people help to those person whom do they like. But it is quite different in the case of family members. They get immediate help whenever they require. So it is clear that altruism is carried out without expectation of personal gain. Social psychologists established the fact that there are certain conditions, which must exist if any altruistic behaviour take place Horney (1960) explained some characteristics of altruism. These are as follows:

1. The participants must be in a state of drive.
2. There must be a goal or goals which the participant anticipate can be reached.

3. The participants must have the effect of increasing the likelihood that a common goal will be achieved.

4. The most important in Altruism is the emotional feeling, along with components of a sympathetic and friendly character.

Altruism like any form of cultural induced conduct is conditioned with the dominant values of the total culture and the individual who is altruistic responds to a culturally determined goal. Altruism is a value of society and altruistic individual responds to the norms, which operate in their specific culture. It is not an inherent trait but a mode of behaviour imposed upon them by the social emphasis of their culture. A prominent feature of modern social life is that every individual is interdependent. The person takes actions that affect others as well as himself and at the same time, his own satisfaction and well being depends on actions taken by a large number of other
persons. Altruism is that important action which individuals take in interdependent situation.

Altruism and co-operation are two major types of pro-social behaviour’s co-operation is a pro-social behaviour that contributes to the attainment of natural goals. Altruism differs from the co-operation in that; Altruism is carried out without expectation of personal gain. So it is clear that altruism is an activity, which is done without any personal interest.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of relevant literature is divided two parts.

1. Studies related to frustration tolerance.
2. Studies related to Altruism.

STUDIES RELATED TO FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE

It is universally accepted that the frustration has always been inevitable in human life. It’s inevitability consists in the fact that the frustration is closely related with the problem of adjustment and can change personality development and it’s growth (Karen & Weitz, 1955). Every organism grows, and this process of growth is nothing but a series of modifications in the structure and size of the organism (Alexander, 1944). Every new phase of the growth process involves frustration requiring new adjustments. Frustration is a never ending process of dealing with human adjustment. In other words, because of organic growth and changing external conditions, frustration is an integral part of life and therefore has got an important place for all living beings.
A number of studies have been conducted by many psychologists like (Freud, 1933; Wright, 1937; Alexander, 1944; Karen & Weitz, 1955; Sanford, 1961; Kreech and Crutchfield 1962) and many others and they tried to have focus on the importance of frustration towards constructive part in life of human beings.

The frustration may spur an individual towards greater and more well organized efforts, to determine to achieve ultimate success and satisfaction. As Wright (1937) also expressed that it may increases the strength of motive and redoubles the efforts to go ahead with the blocked line of activity.

Murphy (1947) has pointed out the effects of frustration in moulding personality. The studies of frustration have been particularly useful in connection with personality studies and behaviour disorders. In the experimental studies the psychologists have also tried to find out the effects produced by frustration on the individuals behaviour. Whether frustration plays a constructive or destructive’ role in life, depends upon the way in which individual
reacts to the frustrating situation. The individual can stand a great deal of severe frustration without breaking down under the stress and they are said to have high frustration tolerance. The term ‘breaking down’ and ‘go to pieces’ indicate maladaptive reaction to frustration, where the individual response is inadequate for dealing with frustration situations. Different individuals show marked differences in the degree to which they are able to tolerate frustration.

How an individual reacts under certain frustrating situation depends upon a large number of variables which are not always visible as there is a variety of reactions to frustration, depending upon several factors and also upon the immediate internal and external environment of the individual where they live. Several factors act together with different degree at different times which motivate a person to behave in a particular way under frustrating situations. In spite of differences, it can be assumed that each individual has a characteristic way of reacting to, or behaving in, or dealing with, frustrating situation. These characteristic ways of
reaction of frustrations can be the function of personality variables and social variables. (Rosenzweig, 1938-39).

A number of studies were conducted on frustration but the most of studies were conducted with animals by a number of psychologists like (Lashley, 1930; Elliot, 1932; Krechvesky and Honzik, 1932; Gihousen, 1933’ Ellis, 1933; Diamand, 1934; Muenzinger, 1934; Maier and Schncirla, 1935; Bruner, 1937; Sanders, 1937; O’Kelley and Steckle, 1939; Maier and Blosser, 1940; Jackson, 1941; Kleemeier, 1942; Maslow, 1943; Klee, 1944; Tusbuchi and Jenkins, 1969; Malavia, 1977; Rai and Gupta, 1988). They established in all above studies that frustration is one of the important primary factor to evoke abnormal behaviour. Most of the studies were conducted on frustration, frustration aggression and frustration reaction, but very few studies have been conducted with frustration tolerance. In the following section an attempt has been made to discuss the factors which affect frustration tolerance.
These characteristics of the subject which include sex, age, intelligence and personality are found important in frustration tolerance. A brief review of the studies related to the above mentioned characteristics of the individual on frustration tolerance is discussed here as follows:

**Religiosity:**

The anxiety, religiosity, rigidity, role expectation and motives like need for affiliation and recognition all these are accepted as traits of personality which affect frustration tolerance. Psychologists have tried to investigate the effect of these factors and found that religiosity plays an important role in tolerance. (Nadine, 1984; Beer, 1989; Lyonski and Andrews, 1990). Religiosity is one of the important aspect of personality which is selected in the present studies so the review is discussed here in this section. Inspire of a lot of differences it is assumed that each individual ahs a characteristic way of reacting to or behaving in dealing with frustrations. These characteristic ways of reactions to frustration may be the result of social variables and religiosity may be one of
these factors (Rosenzweig 1938, 1939). Religion is a powerful institution which plays important role in shaping of social behaviour. Kordiner (1960) established that religion plays an important role in childhood, adulthood and even in old age as this is the time that family provides the base to formulate social values. Though being religious is different from having a ‘religion’ but these two terms are closely related with each other. Shika and Verma (1971) found that religion serve as a means of expressing emotional disturbances, as a source of stress, as a means of social acceptance and social conformity.

Gender:

Psychologists conducted the studies to investigate the effect of gender on frustration tolerance and found it an important variable affecting frustration tolerance (Berkowitz et.al 1952; Rosenweing 1969; Feiring and Leuis 1979; Rani 1989). In a study Rai and Gupta (1988) found that females are higher in frustration tolerance then males. Malavia (1977) established that females are less
aggressive than males as they are trained in this way so they have high frustration tolerance than males.

Initial research reported differences in the attribution made about men verses women that sex role stereotypes provide exceptions of higher performance by men than by woman. Deaux (1976) emphasized the importance of such exceptions in inferring personal attributes. People accept men to be more competent and successful and this is credited to their personal abilities (Deaux and Farris. 1977; Zuckerman, 1979). Earlier findings were; consistent with sex-role stereotypes; women were found less self centered while male give more credit to themselves for their accomplishments (Levine et all, 1967) found in the study that women were more willing than men to accept blame for failure or inappropriate behaviour. In a study conducted by Rani (1989) it was established that no difference exist in reactions to frustration of men and women on the other hand.

Malavia (1977) established that learning and biological factors seem to play important part in producing frustration
tolerance. Women have a fairly strong wish to confirm to the cultural norms as expected from the according to their sex role which discourages them to behave aggressively. Females become relatively anxious, guilty as a result of aggression because in Indian families, they are trained to feel ashamed over their aggressive response, so they show more frustration-tolerance than men.

**Religious Groups:**

Though the caste is an important base of categorization of societies in India, but it is also found that people of one religion are in close relation to one another. Caste is a substitute for ‘Verna’ an essential adjunct of Hindu religion. Effects of case have been investigated by the psychologists in relation to a variety of factors as achievement and intelligence (Pandey 1970) attitude (Toha and Shrivastave, 1971) have observed that poor Harijan children are found low in frustration tolerance where as the rich Brahmin children highest in frustration tolerance Da (1973) reported that in India high caste enhances cognitive competence. The investigator tried to investigate the effect of various factors on frustration
tolerance as anxiety, self concept ambiguity but very few studies have been conducted on religion group. Malavia (1977) conducted a study to investigate the reaction of Hindu and Non Hindu subjects and revealed that individual’s reactions are not determined by this fact that they belong to Christianity, Muslim, Sikhism and Hindu Religion.

Richard (2004) Examined the effects of parenting. Family process and peer influences on the development of religiosity in adolescent behaviour and indicated that the religiosity was positively associated with parenting while, Burdette and Hill (2005) conducted a number of studies and reported that the members of conservative protestant churches tend to be less tolerant. Salesmen and Carlson (2005) explored the link between religiousness and frustration. Elisusen and Loyd (2005) found a close association between religiosity and frustration tolerance in females on the other hand Kilians (2005) found a negative correlation.
Personality:

The difference in personality affect frustration tolerance is established that the persons who are happy and cheerful more social are found high in frustration tolerance in comparison to those who are less social. Droto et al. (1981) tried to compare the difference in adjustment pattern of children and adolescent and found that adolescents found difficulty in adjusting with frustrating situation than did peers. Rosenzweig, 1944; Murphy, 1947; Marquart, 1948; Sherman & Jost 1952; Stafford and Hsu, 1958); Stolorow & Harrison, 1975; Malavia, 1977 ; Weinberg, 1977 Ickes et al., 1979; Rai and Gupta, 1987). They established that frustration tolerance varies due to difference in personality trains Rai (1988) found in a study that extroverts have more frustration tolerance than introverts.

There are some studies available on the relationship of frustration tolerance to personality traits, parental attitudes, and early life experiences etc. Thompson (1977) found that parenting attitude has positive relationship with frustration tolerance. The
perception of loving and accepting parental behaviour were positively related to the degree of frustration tolerance. Donoghue, Carolyn, Dill (1974) tried to study the effect of parenting on dependence-independence in children and found that authoritarianism was negatively related to independent behaviour in children; and the restrictiveness of parents is positively related to depended behaviour in children. Neki (1976); Glass, Singer and Pannebaker (1977) have shown that Type A persons show more dexterous effects on frustration tolerance that the person who are Type B.

The relationship of early life experiences with frustration tolerance has been investigated by Korchin and Ruff (1964), as in their performance under stress they showed little or no impairment, though they were intelligent, successful, highly controlled it may be that their background enabled them to bear stress. Durability to face the tolerance may be related to the factors of heredity, early experience and later learning process.
The studies on frustration have been particularly useful in connections with behaviour disorders. Frustration lies at the root of all behaviour pathology. There is a number of studies showing that neurotics have low frustration tolerance. (Sherman and Jost, 1942; Cameron, 1947; Murphy, 1947).

Age:

Only few studies are available on the relationship of age to frustration tolerance. L. Rosenzweig (1944) has shown that frustration tolerance tends to increase with age and there is some sort of optimum level of frustration that an individual should experience at particular developmental level in order to attain maximum frustration tolerance, while Grinder & Spegel, 1945; Hollendberg & Sperry, 1951; Rao and Ramal-ingaswami, 1974; Malvia, (1977); Fiering & Lewis 1979; and many other have found that age has a significant effects on frustration tolerance, Paree (1964) however, using P.F. Test, found that there is a definite trend of decreasing frustration tolerances with increasing age.
**Socio cultural Variables:**

Above discussion shows that the variables related to individual as age, sex, culture and the personality traits are found significant to determine frustration tolerance but the importance of social and cultural factors can never be denied. These factors are also significant to determine frustration tolerance. It has been also established by the investigators that the reaction to frustration depend much upon ego structure of the individual *(Marquant 1948, Mc Carry and Weaterly 1969, Nancy 1984, Rai 1988).* The mother is found important in development of the frustration tolerance *Malavia (1977), Cord et. al (1961)* found that aggressive reaction is the outcome of social environment like maternal attitude toward the boy. The attitude of parents, teachers, and their peers also have an influence on the ability of the children to tolerate frustration *(Thompson, 1977, Stanely, Mobel and Esthen et. al 1996).* They conducted a study with male industrial workers and found that there is medicating role of personal beliefs and playing very significant role in lower frustration tolerance.
Socio-Economic Status:

It was established by the psychologists that the subjects of lower status have more aggressive in comparison to the subject of higher and average status (Allison and Hunt, 1959, Berkowitz 1962). In a study conducted by Rai (1988) it was established that frustration tolerance varies from rural to urban area. He further expressed that on account of urbanization and westernization environmental stress have increased so capacity to tolerate frustration has also increased. Bobu and Lieasi (1989) found education important in tolerance.

In some cultures children are kept in such an atmosphere where they learn to tolerate frustration more than the children of other cultures. Tsubouchi & Jenkins, (1969) have established culture’s effects on frustration tolerance in their studies and this findings was confirmed by the Psychologists Reck, Mc-Carry and Weatherly 1969, Pareek 1988; and Rai 1988, Agarwal and Verma (1987) they found in the studies that urban and rural mothers follow the different procedure in training the children for
aggressive behaviour. The mothers belonging to rural background follow such training process for their children so that they may be able to sort out the problems as aggressive behaviour in children. They have found that frustration tolerance varies from culture to culture, while Malavia (1977) postulated that how a person will react, it depends on his ego structures, because the ego is molded out by the culture. Mother plays a significant role in the development of frustration tolerance, as it is the special characteristic of Indian culture that it discourages the development of aggressive pattern in the child.

Rosenzweing (1944) had established that frustration tolerance increase with age; but he further found that there is some sort of optimum amount of frustration that an individual should experience at a particular development level in order to attain maximal frustration tolerance.

Thompson (1978) has provided the findings on frustration-tolerance as related to cultures of different setting. The findings indicate that in some cultures where children are kept in such
atmosphere where they learn to tolerate frustration more than the children of other cultures. Pareek (1988) provided the study on culture and development, and indicated that the various features are related to the variety of characteristics of their culture, to which they belong.

**Situational Variables:**

A large number of experiments have been conducted to find the effect of situational factors on frustration tolerance (Wright 1937) Mc farlane 1939, Glass and Singer 1973, Aminev 1986, Aggarwal and Rai). They had the view that situational factors play significant role to determine frustration tolerance and it increases with the predictability and perceived control of the stressor (Glass and Singer, 1973) and the quality of stressor also affects the ability to tolerate frustration (Rai 1988). In a study conducted with infants Ricker, Stifter, Cynthia (1996) Wohlwill et.al. (1976) have expressed that if the distraction is suitable and it interferes in the achievement to desired goal it will create frustration in the individual established that infants behaviour is indicative of the fact
that they continue their behaviour to a limit and change it in a frustrating situation.

**Task Characteristic Variables:**

If the task is simple, it will not create frustration. Frustration tolerance decreases as the level of task difficulty increases (Amsel, 1958, Andreanska, 1974; Kneek, 1976, Manani and Saxena, 1988). Feeling of frustration is high when the person thinks that the things are not working out as planned (Goode, 1978). McCord et.al. (1961) Postulated that aggressive reaction is the outcome of social environment like maternal attitude towards the child, parental attitude, their supervision, the strength of maternal religion and the kind of culture. The attitudes of parents, teacher and their peers also have an influence on the ability of the children to tolerate frustration (Thompson, 1977)

There are evidences that people belonging to different localities differ in many respects such as machievellinism (Gupta, 1985); Altruism (Singh, 1984); achievement need (Rosen, 1956; and Veroff, Atkinson, Feld and Gurin, 1960; Desai and Trivedi;
1972; Chaudhery, 1971; Mehta & Mehta, 1974; Ojha and Jha, 1979); level of aspiration (Rath 1972, 1974 a; Misra & Tripathi, 1978 b); anxiety (Shanmugam, 1957); Self concept (Sharma, 1975); time orientation (Agarwal and Tripathi, 1980; Simmel 1963).

Reinforcement affects positively to the frustration tolerance. Nelson (1969) found in a study if the person is rewarded for showing tolerance to frustration his capacity to tolerate frustration increases. Dyek (1973) also confirmed the above findings that success at any task affects the frustration tolerance behaviour in an increasing way. Michael, Seymons and Rober (1995) indicated the biological base to deal with frustration and found reward as significant to develop frustration tolerance. Frank (2003) has recently drawn attention to the fact that tolerance appears to be less domain-specific in some cultures and this findings was supported by Samson (2004). Bruner and Pierce (2005) found in a study that perceived overlap among in group membership would be negatively related to in group inclusiveness and tolerance for out groups and
the individual with high overlap would be less tolerance in accepting of out groups Strebel and Myers (2004) found in a study that even the probability of making a decision is significantly lower when the consumers are frustrated.

It is clear from the above discussion that which one finds easily tolerable may be completely intolerable to another person i.e., different individuals exhibit marked differences in the degree to which they are able to tolerate frustrating circumstances, so wide variations appear in the same individual at different times and under different kinds of stress. People who can stand great deal of severe frustration without breaking tolerance, some people can take it, easily and some go to pieces of breakdown’. The term breaking down indicate maladaptive reactions to frustrating. Such reactions interfere with one’s adjustments so it will affect the altruistic behaviour of the individual. It has been seen that how altruism influences the changes over time even in the situations ownership becomes when dispersed among family members and generation.
STUDIES RELATED TO ALTRUISM

Psychologists conducted a number of studies, which lead to think that altruism is a complex product of environmental factors while learning theorists believe that this behaviour is fixed through reinforcement and human beings learn to receive and reciprocate altruistic behaviour in the interaction with social environment. There is a lot of variables which affect altruism, so here in this section the studies related to Altruism are reviewed. Altruistic behaviours exist in every society. Gearther (1991) established the fact that this behaviour is important in the development of the individual alongwith society.

Miller (1951) believes that altruism is a “learned” drive”. If it is a learned drive, then social factors are responsible for such a behaviour. Some social scientists have emphasized the effects of “social Norms” in altruistic behaviour, attitudes and beliefs that are formally or informally established as appropriate by greatly across societies and culture. (Cohen, 1978, Armand and Pepitone, 1975).
Religiosity:

Though, the studies has been under taken to investigate the social factors related with altruism but few psychologists tried to investigate the effect of religiosity on altruism. It is a well known fact that being a Hindu or Muslim does not affect altruism as it is a learned behaviour from the environment given in family, social religion and political surrounding. Tyagi (1988) found that the person having high social values are more altruistic. These social values one learnt, are derived from the cultural, social and moral values and these values are the by product of one’s religions faith. Every religion has some universal values and some are very specific related with a particular religion.

Religion is a powerful institution which plays important role in shaping of social behaviour. Kardiner (1960) established the importance of religion but the impact of religion on cultural values and social change is also important. A large number of studies have been conducted to understand the personality and behaviour
variables of religious individuals. The term ‘religiosity’ refers to religious faith.

Galloway (1956) defines “religiously’ as ‘faith in a power’ beyond one’s self where by one seeks to satisfy emotional needs and gain stability in life, which is expressed in worship and service.”

Apparently, being religious’ is different from ‘having a religion’. One may belong to a religious group but may not be actually religious. It is difficult to identify a person as religious simply from his behaviour. In fact, religiously has three important aspects: theoretical, practical and emotional. Theoretically it refers to individual’s faith in god which inspires a person to be loving and being just. Experiences and belief in God constitute the core of the theoretical aspect of religiously the constitutes of individual’s faith in observance of ethical and moral duties and rituals which differ in different religious. Reviews of literature relating religious practices indicate that the behavioural dimensions of religious persons are almost same in different religions such as prayer, considering good or bad act (paap or punya) observing rituals, sacrifice, tolerance etc
as religious values, Emotional aspect is reflected in the feeling of delight, pleasure and satisfaction in observing religious practices.

**Gender:**

Studies on human altruistic behaviour reveal that helping behaviour is related with several variables such as family pattern, social values and mental set etc. It has been found that girls are more sympatric and helpful than boys (Shrivastave and Gupta, 1982). Similar findings are reported by King, Bernett, and Oconner (1982). But Zelding Small and Savina (1983) found no significant difference in helping behaviour of boys and girls with regard to intelligence. Helping behaviour is frequently found in the person who live in simple environment. Amato and other (1982) found that helping behaviour was higher in town than in the cities.

Heilman and Cohen (2005) hypothesized that altruistic behaviour enhances in a work setting in male but it would diminish the favorability in females. Altruism is thought to be less optional for female than for male. These results suggest that gender stereotypic regarding how male and female should behave results in
different evaluative reaction to the some altruistic behaviour depending on the performer’s sex Wink and Harsen (2005).

Religion:

Different religions differ in their theoretical and practical aspect. However, the dimensions may be common to most of the religions in the world. Religious phenomena are multidimensional. King and Hunt (1975) identified a large number of factors important in religiously. Allport (1967) says that there are two dimensions intrinsic and extrinsic. The extrinsically religious person use religion as a means of obtaining security or status. Where as the intrinsically religious person internalizes beliefs regardless of social pressure.

According to Spila and Werna (1971) religion may serve as a means of expressing emotional disturbance, as a source of stress, as a means of social acceptance and conformity or as a means of growth and fulfillment. Brown and Magai (2005) recently suggested on the basis of study that this behaviour may be based on evolutionary process, it was identified by John (2005).
**Burt (2004)** established in a study that an empathically medicated, Kin-ship altruism impulse is a part of the human genetic heritable, and that one of the function of the religion is to extend the range of this impulses. However it is seen that religion does not always succeed.

**Hordy and Cazlo (2005) established** in the study that religiosity was a significant positive predictor of kindness as well as of altruistic behaviour. **Abi-Kim and Takauch (2004)** tried to find out the effect of religious affiliation and spirituality on altruism and found that high religiosity was associated with more help seeking. The present study is designed to explore the effect of religiosity on altruism.

**Culture:**

**Mead (1935)** found that Arapesh adults loved and cherished their children and this closeness and empathy were carried out by them into their adult hood. The Mundugamor Society stressed independence and self seeking behaviour so they show little love or affection toward their children and also conducted that little training
may develop empathy in their children and it will help them to develop empathy in their children and it will help them to develop empathy in their children and it will help them to develop into adults who would not wish to help others. Early development of empathy is an important cultural factors in prosaically behaviour (Cohen, 1978). The differences is Social responsibility norms provide another explanation for variation in altruistic behaviour. This responsibility norms may cause individual to criticize people who deviate from a defined standards for the group. It may also lead to helping behaviour.

A number of studies were, demonstrated to find out for the basic personality characteristics of altruistic people (Staube, 178-1979) and suggested that some personality characteristics may predispose people to help. But the act of helping is mediated by a number of factors i.e., social norms, values and belief, sex differences, psychological state and cultural factors etc,. This may be the cause that in a study conducted by Juel (1993), it was found that Extroverts are more altruistic than Introverts.
Age:

The social science literature on the peaceful societies would not disagree with this conclusion that some of people prefer to bring up their children in non violent and non competitive ways. Infants and very small children are cherished by parents, in the way that their all needs are satisfied as quickly as possible, but when they reach at the age of two or three years there is variation in the different societies as parenting, some bring up their children with love and care but not necessarily in all the cases as the time when another baby is born, the status of the child abruptly plunges from being the center of every one’s attention and the child starts feeling himself very insignificant member. It can affect the development of a child, but until the age of four or five years the child soon leans to adhere to the social rules, play quickly, without fighting (Garner 1966, 1972).

Bannett (1967) Established that the Hutterites community teach their children to be loved and enjoyed, but even as infect the child is expected to adapt to the work schedule and the result is that
children quickly learn to be happy with the group. Children while can no longer scream lustily they are taught to be quiet around adults and even have to cry quietly. They are reactly dismissed from activities, when adults or older children do not want them around (Hostetler & Huntington, 1967). In this kind of environment, children quickly adopt the altruistic values, which is very essential aspect for their life.

The psychologists have the view that the altruism is affected by age as several findings confirmed the assumption that altruistic behaviour increases with increase in age during the first ten years of life very fast and it is at peak at the age of 7(Ugurelsemim 1952), shown in the study that it is positively correlated with increase in age confirmed by (Handson and Gross, 1959; Kagan and Madsen 1971; Bhatnagar and Shrivastav 2002). The most of the studies were performed in the laboratories, while very few studies have been conducted with adults. Christi, Susan, and Hamer (2003) investigated in the study with young adolescents and suggested that youth did not emphasized on such behaviour as standing up ofor
other, encouraging others being humorous and helping, while these emerged as an important component of altruism.

**Jenifer, Smith and Sandi (1996)** found that who had a high level of knowledge were rather more altruistic **Daniel (1993)** designed a series of experiments to test the empathy altruism hypothesis against various egoistic alternatives leading to the tentative conclusion that feeling empathy for a person in need does indeed evoke altruistic motivation to help that person. **Bowles, Rober and Rehr (2003)** found in a study that reciprocity is a predisposition to co-operate with others and to punish those, who violate the norms of co-operation.

**Situational Factors:**

**Goodstand (1971)** had the view **Schopler and Matthew (1965)** have found in a study with college students that they will provide another person with greater help when they are led to believe that the person’s dependence is due to uncontrollable environment or external factors rather than “controllable” personality or behaviour factors. The observation of what other do
in the situation is another determinant of altruistic behaviour. **Bryan and Test (1967)** have found that a lady in distress is helped more often if the individuals observe an example of altruistic behaviour immediately before encountering the person who needs help. This concern with the situational determinants of altruistic behaviour is an encouraging sign in social psychology as it puts man’s possibilities for both constructive and destructive behaviour in proper perspective. It shows that man has the capacity for altruism as well as the tendency to share responsibility. Moreover, it reflects an increasing concern with the significant problem of day-today social interaction, together with the application of sophistication techniques and methods to shed light on these problems.