CHAPTER-II

PROBLEM AND METHOD

The review of the studies on frustration tolerance and altruism has shown that there is an utter dearth of studies related with the effects of culture, gender, locale etc. on frustration tolerance and altruism. In the present section an attempt is made to select the few problems which are still unsolved and need further investigation. So, it is in the fitness that a fresh attempt is being made to explore the frustration tolerance and altruism as a function of religiosity, gender in different religious group. So the following problems have been under taken in this study:

Major Problems:

The first main problem of the present study is selected to find out the effect of religiosity on frustration tolerance and altruism. The behaviour of an individual is closely related wqith frustration tolerance, but most o f the pioneer studies on frustration were
limited to animal behaviour Lashley (1930), Krech and Honzink (1932), Gill Housen (1933), Muenzinger (1934), Everall (1935), Fletcher (1935), Muenzinger and New comb (1935), Sanders (1937), O’Kelley and Steckle (1939), Miller, Doob, Mower and Sears (1940), Martin (1940), Biel and Kelley (1940), Maier and Gloser (1940), O’Kelly (1940), Steckle and O’Kelly (1940), Maier and Klee (1941), Maier et.al. (1941), Kleemeir (1942), Klee (1944). But these studies helped in understanding frustration tolerance.

Though the experimental studies with human beings have many limitations as some experimental variables cannot be controlled and manipulated effectively with human beings because of their variablility as well as ethical consideration yet quite a number of studies are also available for the aforesaid period, (Mowrer, 1940; Barker and et.al., 1941; Maslow, 1943; Masserman, 1942; Marguis, 1943 and Sears 1943). They established that frustration is an important factor in developing maladaptive behaviour in individuals while frustration tolerance and
altruism indicate the positive aspect of the individuals. Mother’s role is an important factor responsible for the development of ability to tolerate frustration. (Tsubouchi and Jenkins 1969). In some families children are kept in such atmosphere where they learn to tolerate frustration. The attitude of parents, teachers and their peers help the children to develop the ability to tolerance frustration (Thompson, 1977).

Tyagi (1988) found that the social, the culture and the moral values learnt from the society are the by product of one’s own religious faith. Religion is a powerful institution which plays important role in shaping social behaviour. Impact of religion on cultural values is also important. A large number of studies have been conducted to understand the personality traits of religious individuals. Cralloway (1956) had the view that the emotional needs are expressed in worship. Apparently being religious is important in frustration tolerance and altruism. One may belong to a particular religious group but may not be actually religious. It is difficult to identify a person as religious on the basis of religion.
Today on account of urbanization and westernization the environmental stress has increased, so our values has get affected. The review of studies on frustration tolerance shows that frustration tolerance depends some what upon the personality and culture of the individuals. There are so many studies which show that the family plyas an important role in development of the personality. These studies show that family directly or indirectly affect both ways the personality of individual and as well as culture of the society. Family is found important as this is an important social institution it educates the members in development of social values as theoretical, economic and religious values. If an individual is high in religiosity the frustration tolerance may be higher in comparison of that person who is low in religiosity. Though studies have been conducted by psychologists but no one has tried to find out the effect of religiosity on frustration tolerance and altruism. So the first problem of the present study has been selected to find out the effect of religiosity on frustration tolerance and altruism.
Gender is an ascribed characteristic like other factors as age, race, ethnic status and birth place but the variable of gender is unlike other personality variable. Generally sex roles are to be rooted in biology e.g. boys are found more aggressive than girls. But no one should forget that differences in male and female behaviour is also due to role expectations as well as differences in socialization process. The major socializing agents are parents, teachers, friends, and media. Boys are trained to be active, achieving, aggressive independent, ambitious and rational and are encouraged to attain higher education, higher prestige and socialized to compete while girls are socialized to be passive, nurturing dependent prettily responsive, emotional (Jette 1977). Infect sex role has become internalized personality trait (Lee and Gropper, 1974) that varies somewhat with the culture. Western cultures too, set the stage differently for girls and boys (Michail Lewik 1972). Today writers and researchers have come to treat sex role as a significant variable in human development, especially in cultures where sex roles are highly polarized. Some individuals become more rigidly bound to their sex role than do other Bem
Boys are pressured towards autonomy and discouraged from asking for attention (Fasteav 1975). Though females are supposed to tolerate frustration more than male, and Rai and Gupta (1988) found in a study females higher in frustration tolerance than males. So female are more altruism as confirmed in the studies.

Studies on human altruistic behaviour reveal that altruism is related with several variables as family pattern, social values etc. It has been found that girls are more sympathetic and helpful than boys (Srivastava and Gupta 1982). Similar findings are reported by King Bernett and Ocomen (1982). But Zeldin and Savines (1983) found no significant difference in helping behaviour of boys and girls but simple environment has a positive effect on altruistic behaviour.

Rosenzweig (1969) has concluded that frustration tolerance increases with maturation. In a study Rani (1989) indicated that sex has been found to have significant independent effects on frustration tolerance. It was found that no difference exists in reaction to
frustration of men and women. There is a decrease of need persistence and in types of reaction in both men and women.

Apart from the above mentioned few studies there is lack of such studies that can explore the effect of gender on frustration tolerance. Thereof in the present investigation the second problem selected is to study out the effect of gender on frustration tolerance and altruism.

The third major problem of the present study is planned to investigate the effect of religion on frustration tolerance and Altruism. The study of frustration is, of course an elaboration of the study of motivation. Unless a man is motivated, he can not be frustrated (Karen and Weitz 1955). According to a motivational cycle a motive may be biological, social or personal, it can disturb the homeostatic or equilibrium state. But sometimes there are some hindrances or barriers in the attainment of goal and instrumental behaviour to attain the goal is interfered which create a frustration in the individual.
Psychologists working in this area have emphasized disproportionately on the study of variables related to individual differences and they have ignored the importance of social factors. It is a fact that lack of environmental stimulation and cultural constraints may likely to have a significantly adverse effect upon the development of personality. Differential experiences in social settings like home, school, caste, class singly or in combination with other variables have a definite impact on coping style with frustration tolerance, and perceptual competence of the individuals. These will also affect the cognitive actions and coping styles with frustration tolerance and altruism. Altruism and one’s capacity for tolerating frustration has an important beaming on individuals personality development and adjustment to life situations. A significant number of studies have been undertaken but mostly on animal relating to the frustration tolerance, so there is more need to take a fresh view with human beings.

During the last three decades a large quantum of research has been devoted to study the effects of an individual culture, social
class caste socio-economic status on a wide variety of psychological processes like learning but very few studies have been conducted to explore the effects of religion in relation to a variety of factors as motivation, achievement and intelligence (Sharma 1972, Gokul Nath 1970), attitudes (Anant 1972) Srivastava and Tiwari 1967, Muthayya (1971), Das and Panda (1970) have observed that on intelligence tests poor Harijan children obtained the lowest scores whereas the rich Brahmin children obtained highest. Das (1973) has reported that in India high caste and economic prosperity independently enhance cognitive competence other variables like anxiety, needs, self concept tradition laity, learning ability have also been investigated with reference to caste but no attempt has been made to explore the effect of religion on frustration tolerance. So it would be useful while to undertake a study with religion as one of the independent variable to investigate the relationship of religion and frustration tolerance.

It can be inferred from the above studies that frustration is the primary factor not only in the development of abnormal fixation or
regression but also a significant source of emerging drive, which motivates the organism of further action. A Large number of studies have been done on frustration. But it is also required to explore how frustration tolerance and altruism are related.

Staube (1979) tried to search for the basic personality characteristic of altruistic people and suggested that people who are gay, cheerful are high in frustration tolerance and they like to help. Juel (1993) found that Hindus are more altruistic than Muslim. Tyagi (1988) found in a study that person having high social values were found more altruistic. Religion is a powerful institution which plays important role in shaping of social behaviour. A large number of studies conducted to understand the personality and behaviour of children. But no one tried to find out the effect of religion on frustration tolerance and altruism, though it is surprising to not that there are studies which have been conducted by psychologists to find the relationship between frustration tolerance and socio-cultural factors. So the third problem of the study is to explore out the effect of religion on frustration tolerance and altruism. These studies lead
us to believe that helping behaviour is a product of complex environmental factors and the children learn to receive and reciprocate altruistic behaviour. A number of studies have been conducted to find out the effect of caste, local and family pattern. But no psychologists tried to study out the effects of religion on altruism along with frustration tolerance. So the third major problem of the present study is to find out the effect of religion on frustration tolerance and altruism.

The present investigator has selected adolescent period as the area of investigation because of its accepted significance in the total life span of an individual. The investigator firmly believes that the findings would give additional as well as valuable information regarding the functioning of an adolescent mind is that of the young adult. A bulk of studies have been devoted to understand the characteristic behaviour pattern of adolescents in different time periods. Shenkeer and Schild Krout (1975) regarded the age of seventeen to twenty-one as effective period in frustration tolerance. This is the time, when almost personality traits are at the maximum
development, so the values are also get established, means total maturity in the mind, so it is the best time to study out the frustration tolerance and altruism in this age group as, selected in the present study.

**PROBLEMS RELATED TO INTERACTION**

From the above mentioned three major problems, the following problems arose due to interaction of the three variables.

(i) The first problem was to study the interaction effect of religiosity and gender on frustration tolerance and altruism. The question was to investigate if effects of religiosity on frustration tolerance and altruism were the same for male and female or were they different in other words did these two factors (religiosity and gender) work independently for frustration tolerance and altruism or did they interact with each other? If so females high in religiosity are high in frustration tolerance and normal in altruism of vice-versa.
(ii) The second problem of the present study was to investigate the interaction effect of religiosity and religious group. Both religiosity and religion were treated as the main variable, but the further question arose was these two variables independent or did they interact with each other? If they did dependently then to what extent they were related to each other. In other words, at what degree of religiosity were the Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian were the maximum in frustration tolerance and low in altruism or vice-versa?

(iii) The third problem of the present study was to determine the interaction effect of gender and religious group on frustration tolerance and altruism. The gender and religion were treated as main variable, but the question was whether gender and religion had independent effect on dependent variables or whether they interacted with each other? Thus the problem was to ascertain the female of which religion were the most frustration tolerant and least different in altruism on vice-versa.
(iv) The fourth and the last problem of the present study was to know the interaction effects of gender, religiosity and religious group on frustration tolerance and altruism. Did these three variables work independently or interact with one another? If it is found that they worked in interactive manner in affecting the frustration tolerance and altruism, then the problem is to find out the group which was the most frustration tolerant and low in altruism or vice-versa?

**HYPOTHESES**

According to the problem of the study frustration tolerance and altruism, the explanations are needed to account for some results and naturally these can not be accepted with complete confidence in the absence of evidence. However theoretical considerations and previous researches have enabled to formulate the hypothesis which can be tested against the relevant data.
Major hypotheses related to frustration tolerance:

1. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the frustration tolerance of highly religious and low religious subject.
2. There will be a significant difference in the frustration tolerance of the male and female subject.
3. There will be a significant difference in the frustration tolerance of subjects belonging to four different religious groups i.e. Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian subjects.

Hypotheses related to interaction effect:

There may be four more sub hypothesis related to interaction effect.

1. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religiosity and Gender on frustration tolerance.
2. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion and religiosity on frustration tolerance.
3. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion and Gender on frustration tolerance.
4. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion, religiosity and Gender on frustration tolerance.

**Major hypotheses related to Altruism:**

1. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the altruism of highly religious and low religious subject.
2. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the altruism of male and female subject.
3. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in altruism behaviour of Hindus, Muslim, Sikh and Christian subject.

**Hypotheses related to Interaction effect:**

1. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religiosity and Gender on Altruism.
2. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion and religiosity on Altruism.
3. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion and Gender on Altruism.
4. It is hypothesized that there would be a significant interaction effect of religion, religiosity and Gender on Altruism.

**METHOD**

The frustration tolerance and altruism of the people of two categories of religiosity i.e. high and low levels of religiosity among boys and girls belonging to four different religious groups i.e. Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian are studied in two phases of the experiment.

**Experimental Design**

A factorial design of 2 x 2 x 4 with 16 cells was employed. There were hence three independent variables all being between group variables. These were” religiosity level, gender and religious group, the first variable was religiosity level of the subjects. It was varied at two levels viz. high religiosity and low religiosity, the second variable of the study is type of Gender. It was boys and girls. The third factor selected in the study was religious group of the Ss. It was Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian subjects, i.e., RG\text{H}, RG\text{M},
RG_S and RG_C respectively. A schematic representation of the design is shown in table. 1.

So far as dependent variable is concerned there were two dependent variables in this study. The first dependent variable was the degree of frustration tolerance and the second was altruism behaviour of the people.
TABLE 1: A SCHEMATIC REPRESENTATION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

(2×2×4 FACTORIAL DESIGNS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious group</th>
<th>G_M</th>
<th>G_F</th>
<th>G_M</th>
<th>G_F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RG_H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG_M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG_S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG_C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R_H = Religiosity High
R_L = Religiosity Low
G_M = Gender Male
G_F = Gender Female

RG_H = Religious Group Hindu
RG_M = Religious Group Muslim
RG_S = Religious Group Sikh
RG_C = Religious Group Christian
Subjects

For the present investigation two forty Ss of 16 cells (15 Ss in each cell) were finally selected from the total Ss of about three hundred sixty served ad subjects. There were 120 Ss were male and 120 were female divided in two groups; on the basis of religiosity level i.e., high religious and low religious 60 Ss of each group were selected from four types of religious group i.e., Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian 15 Ss of each religion were selected. Thus there were 16 cells, each cell consisting of 15 Ss. The distribution of Ss is presented in Table 2.

Selection of the subject:

In order to find out the subject for the present investigation principals of several colleges of Meerut city were personally contacted with an introductory letter from the Department explaining the purpose of conducting the tests. The students were obtained from the following different colleges and Institute of Advanced Studies.
1. C.C.S. University, Meerut
2. Meerut College, Meerut
3. N.A.S. Degree College, Meerut
4. R.G. (P.G.) College, Meerut
5. I.N. (P.G.) College, Meerut
6. D.N. Degree College, Meerut
7. K.L. Degree College, Meerut
Table - 2
Distribution of subjects according to religiosity, gender and religious groups
Sample of 240 subjects

- $R_H$ = Religiosity High
- $R_L$ = Religiosity Low
- $G_M$ = Gender Male
- $G_F$ = Gender Female
- $RG_H$ = Religious Group Hindu
- $RG_M$ = Religious Group Muslim
- $RG_S$ = Religious Group Sikh
- $RG_C$ = Religious Group Christian
APPARATUS AND MATERIAL:

The researcher has made use of various tools suited for the purpose of the study. A detailed description of these tools is given below.

1. Religiosity Scale to measure the level of religiosity of Subjects.
2. Frustration Tolerance Test Booklet, for the measurement of the degree of frustration tolerance.
3. Stop watch to measure the time of frustration tolerance.
4. Pen or Pencil to draw puzzles.
5. Altruism Scale to measure altruism behaviour of subjects.

Description of the test:

1. Religiosity scale:

A religiosity scale developed by L.I. Bhushan was used to measure the religiosity level so that each individual may be identified on the basis of religiosity. Each statement has five alternative responses based on the pattern of Likert five point scale.
This rough form was used in a pilot study conducted on undergraduate students to locate the defects of the items. If any of the items more difficult from subjects view point, such statements which were responded to either favorably or unfavorably almost invariably or which elicited high proportion of “undecided” response were further eliminated. Altogether 7 statements were rejected on this ground. Besides keeping in mind the difficulties reported by the subjects in understanding the correct meaning of the items, some of them were slightly modified. Thus the preliminary form of the religiosity (R) scale consisted of 77 items. It can be administered both individual and group situation.

Description:

1. Name of the scale – Religiosity Scale
2. Author – L.l.Bhushan
3. Nature – This scale generally can be administered individually, although in case of Students it was used in small groups of 10.
4. Language – Hindi
5. Item – 36 items, out of which 25 were positive and 11 negative items.

6. Reliability - .82

7. Validity - .57

Reliability:

The reliability was calculated using odd even method and corrected by the spearman Brown formula and found reliability coefficient of .82.

Validity:

The two test scores yielded a positive correlation of .57 which was found significant at .01 level and indicated that the test possessed concurrent validity as well.

First of all the religiosity scale was administrated on the each Ss to divide the subjects in two categories, on the basis of religiosity i.e. high religiosity and low Religiosity.
Instructions:

The instruction were written on the front page of scale as follows:

```
Instructions:
The instruction were written on the front page of scale as follows:

Scoring:
R-scale is a five point Likert scale. So, against each item five response categories have been provided. To avoid monotony and ensure sincerity on the part of the respondents, the alternative responses, i.e., “Totally agree”, “Agree”, “Can’t Say”, “Disagree” and “Totally Disagree” are mentioned only at the top of right hand
```
side and against each item five numbers are given in order so that subjects may indicate the response, “Totally Agree” one represent is “Totally Disagree”. The Ss has to encircle the number representing his response to that an item. The response by the subjects values encircled, served as subject’s scores. But for the negative items the scoring is reversed, i.e., for the response “Totally Agree” the Ss gets 1 score for “Totally Disagree” the Ss is awarded 5 score. The religiosity score is the algebraic sum of scores obtained by him on all the different items. The range of possible scores on it is from 36 to 180. Higher score indicating greater degree of religiosity.

2. Frustration Tolerance Booklet

To test the degree of frustration tolerance a scale constructed by Dr. S.N. Rai has been used. This booklet contains four puzzles. The subjects tries the puzzles to solve by drawing the figures with the help of a pen or pencil. In these puzzles two are soluble, i.e., II and IV and two are insoluble puzzles, i.e., puzzle number I and III. The experimenter will measure the degree of frustration tolerance with the help of this booklet.
Scoring:

The scoring of the FRTO experiment was done on two basis:

(a) Time taken to solve puzzle number I and III (in terms of seconds)

(b) Number of attempts made to solve puzzle I and III. The criterion measure is the amount of time spent in soluble puzzles and the number of attempts made for the scoring purpose total time and number of attempts were taken and
mean time and mean number of attempts were calculated for each subject to know his/her frustration tolerance degree. Then the introspective report was taken.

Each subject was tested individually and the data was collected on 240 Ss. Thus each format of the booklet was scored and checked by the investigator.

3. **Altruism Scale:**

**Descriptions of the altruism scale:**

This scale is the Hindi version of Altruism scale developed by Dr. S.N. Rai and Dr. Sawant Singh. This scale measure altruism in four situation educational, play, family interaction and personal security. The scale was used in the present study with the permission of Dr. S.N. Rai.

**Description:**

Name of the scale - Altruism Scale

Author - Dr. S.N. Rai and Dr. Sanwant Singh
The altruism scale has been prepared in Hindi language with 30 items. Each item has three alternative responses. Say altruistic, neutral and egoistic.

In view of the limitations as well as criticism of the techniques and tool used to study altruistic behaviour there was a genuine need to construct a tool to be called altruistic scale for measuring the extent and magnitude of altruism in India. In this scale semi-projective instructions have been used so that the natural/original responses may be secured.
Reliability:

Reliability of the altruistic scale, was determined by test-retest method and found .92.

Validity:

The coefficient of correlations between the scores of teacher-cum-guardian and the scores on Altruistic scale was found to be .63.
Scoring:

Each item of the altruism scale has three response alternatives. One of which is altruistic response which gets ‘2’ scores. The second alternative is a neutral response which gets “1” score and the third alternative is egoistic response which gets “0” score.
The response alternatives are placed in a random fashion so that the tendency to give a particular number of response alternatives could be avoided. The maximum altruism score maybe 60 \((30 \times 2)\) and the minimum score will be zero.

**Procedure:**

Before conducting the experiment with ‘FRTO’ booklet the main variable religiosity level was measured by Religiosity scale. For Establishing good rapport with subjects a very cooperative and healthy environment was created in all the settings of the data collection. For this purpose subjects were requested to provide help in doing arrangement. After categorizing the subjects in two levels high religiosity and low religiosity they were asked to give the information about their age, name and religion etc., they were classified in two religious group i.e., high religiosity and the low religiosity with the help of religiosity scale 120 Ss. Thus the final sample of 120 subjects high religious and low religious selected were told that a second experiment would be conducted in next
visit. The following procedure was used to conduct the FRTO experiment. First of all the instruction were given.

After giving the instructions and making sure that he/she has clearly understood the Ss was asked to work on puzzle number I and the stop watch was started as soon he completed his work. The experimenter observed the Ss throughout the experiment but kept a comfortable distance so as not to disturb the Ss. The maximum time allotted for each puzzle is only 10 minutes. If the Ss was unable to solve the Puzzle and reported his inability before 10 minutes the exact time taken was recorded. If a subject reported that he had drawn the figure he was asked to demonstrate to the investigator. Since the puzzle is not soluble it was evident that the Ss had drawn it is a wrong manner. The error was pointed out to him and if he desired to try again (if 10 minutes are not up) he was allowed to do so and the time taken in both attempts is added. The Ss then moves to puzzle II which is soluble. No time is noted for this puzzle. Then the subject is asked to solve that IIIrd puzzle. Exactly that same procedure is followed as in puzzle number I. time for puzzle number
IV is also not recorded. In the same way the experiment was conducted on each Ss individually on the sample of 120 subjects highly religious and 120 subjects low religious.

After second experiment the subject were given rest for 10 minutes and again they were requested to fill altruism scale. First they were asked to read out the instructions front page of the scale. When they filled the scale it was checked by the researcher and given thanks to the subjects. The data for FRTO and altruism scale in this way was conducted on 120 high religious and 120 low religious subjects out of them 60 were male and 60 were female subjects of four religious groups, Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian each consisting of 15 subjects. Each subject was tested individually.