

"HENRI COANDA" AIR FORCE ACADEMY ROMANIA



SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER AFASES 2013 Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE AND THE DEGREE OF NEUROTICISM OF DEINSTITUTIONALIZED INDIVIDUALS

Camelia DINDELEGAN*, Crina TALPO§**, Florina SERAC-POPA***

* Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Oradea, Department of Psychology, Oradea, Romania and "Dr. Gavril Curteanu" Municipal Clinical Hospital Oradea, Romania,
Individual Psychology Practice Crina Talpoş, Oradea, România, *"Dr. Gavril Curteanu" Municipal Clinical Hospital Oradea, România

Abstract: Being tolerant to frustration is a solution increasingly promoted in the literature, as a prefferential method to deal with the emotional and behavioral reactions. Frustration tolerance implies that frustration is already part of the system.

It is obvious that life in institution gives birth to some frustrations at the level of individual personality of the deinstitutionalized young man; these frustrations will rise deep suffering as a result of the family separation and can also degenerate in neuroticism, deviant or anti-social behaviors. In fact, the core of frustration is in the constellation of psychological factors which turned a negative emotion of low or medium intensity into a high negative emotion which unbalances the psyche through a high power of cognitive, emotional and affective energy.

The number of children who live in institutions until de age of 18 is about 4500 a year, at a national count. Only some of them, especially those with disorders get into adult institutions. The others have no other institutional alternative because they don't have families or relatives.

The general purpose of this study is to identify, clasify and make some psychological personality profiles in the case of deinstitutionalized people in order to establish possibilities for their professional, social and cultural integration through social politics.

Young people who leave the child protection system represent a social category with specific problems and difficulties, being a priority for the general system of heath and welfare in Romania and it requires an immediate intervention.

Keywords: frustration tolerance, deinstitutionalization, neuroticism, implication in activities, young people.

1. INTRODUCTION

Frustration is a negative affective state which appears when the individual finds an obstacle in his way which stops him from satisfying one of his needs. Frustation is one's condition expressed in specific feelings and behaviours, it is caused by invincible objective goals occuring while achieving a goal or solving a problem.

Frustration is in fact the affective experience of failure, perceived in a more dramatic and intense way.

T. Rudica (1981)- underlines that being conscious of a state of deprivation which will create emotional tensions or the need to free from a situation are signs of frustration. Moreover there are times when the subject cannot associate frustration to a certain cause.

Frustration may also appear unmotivated or not sufficiently motivated from an objective point of view. It is specific to persons who interpret reality constrained by selfishness, by their inability to detach from their own emotions and egotic tendencies, which make them believe they have only rights and no duties. This category of persons show *low tolerance to frustration*, because of their egotism, their selfishness, and in order to satisfy their needs they may resort even to illegal attemps.

Because frustration is expressed in a high negative affective tension, the individual may show a disorganized behaviour- anarchic and deviant.

Not every obstacle has a frustrating effect on the child. It was observed the daily work of preschool children in different situations (at home, at the nursery, on the playground) and noticed that although children have encountered different obstacles in the playground activities (restrictions, loss of toys etc), most of the obstacles don't cause the child a problem- i.e it has no frustrating effect.

We may say that, frustration is caused by subjective factors, dependent on the previous experiences the individual had and by his personality.

A notable example in this way is given by Mussen (1961)- a parent's leaving home may cause a big frustration to a child who is highly dependent on this parent; whereas his playmate's superiority and his violent tendency to dominate the playground don't botter him because he is rather passive and withdrawn in the game. Another child who experiences a low depedence on his parent, may not be so affected by his parent leaving home but he should be more affected by a dominant partner in the playground- which can be a strong frustrating factor.

Thus, some children bear more, other bear less frustration, but this does not change the fact that frustration arouses anger which leads to an agressive behaviour.

Yarrow (1948 – as cited Cicchetti, D., 2003) confirms this statement in an experiment involving 60 preschool children.

In the first stage, children were allowed to play freely for 30 minutes and they could be observed by the experimenters through a semitransparent mirror in order to notice any agressive behaviour: hitting with the hand, the foot, threats, injuries etc.

After this stage, children were divided intor 3 groups:

Children from the first group were given tasks they couldn't do- they were frustrated.

Children from the second group were obliged to play with the same toy for 20 minutes because the experimenters assumed that excessive playing leads to a certain state of frustration.

The control group didn't do any of the above mentioned.

Finally, the three groups were invited to play freely back again for 30 minutes and the experimenters noted children's agressive behaviour. In this case, the agressive effect of frustration was confirmed in the case of children from the first two groups. These children manifested more agressive reactions than those from the control group.

1.1. Frustration- agression theory

Frustration- agression theory was one of the most influent in this field. It was proposed by a group of psychologists from Yale University – Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer şi



"HENRI COANDA" AIR FORCE ACADEMY ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK" ARMED FORCES ACADEMY SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER AFASES 2013 Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

Sears – 1939. This theory appeared as a reaction to the freudian theory.

Thus, the theory states that any agression leads to frustration and any agressive behaviour is based on frustration. After the war, many psychologists have shown that agression can be determined by other factors, not only by frustration.

In fact, immediately after the publication of this book, there were many critics which emphasized the fact that frustration doesn't always lead to agression, there are other possible reactions such as apathy, the cry of helpnessness etc.

2. METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

2.1. Hypothesis:

There are significant differencies in terms of working (absence, working under a contract or on a daily basis) in the case of deinstitutionalised people according to the major issues such as: neuroticism and their frustration tolerance.

2.1.1. Variables

Independent variables – involving in the work environment;

Dependent variables

• neuroticism - a1- absent;

```
- a2 - moderate;
```

- a3 - high.

- frustration tolerance c1- absent;
 - c2 moderate ; - c3 - high.

2.1.2. Design

Experimental design: unifactorial intergroup

2.2. Method

2.2.1. Subjects

In order to test the hypothesis and achieve the objectives, the comparative study conducted on a total of 129 was deinstitutionalized people. The group was heterogeneous in terms of employment, gender, background and level of education and included people from both rural and urban areas, people without education or secondary education and people having different characteristics. The subjects are between 18 and 37 years old.

The subjects included in the study were chosen thanks to data provided by ASCO.

All the subjects were involved voluntarily in the clinical trial and in the objective evaluation made according to the two scales.

2.2.2. Materials

Wechsler Test – (D. Wechsler; WAIS- R, 1981)

Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.) (H. Eysenck, S.B.G. Eysenck, 1969).

2.3. Results and their interpretation

2.3.1. Hypothesis. Therea are significant differences in terms of deinstitutionalized persons' involvment in the work field according to their neuroticism and their frustration tolerance.

Table no. 1Comparisons between thedeinstitutionalized persons as for theirimplication in the work environmentaccording to their neuroticism.

Implicati on in the work environ ment			Ne	urotici	sm			
			abs ent	mo der ate	hig h	Pears on Chi- squar e	df	Sig. (2- sided)
	nowhe re	Count	0	6	24			
		Adjust ed Resid ual	-1.3	-1.5	1.6			
	On a daily basis	Count	0	9	23			
		Adjust ed Resid ual	-1.3	2	.8	13.1 35	6	.041
	With a work contra ct	Count	3	12	14			
		Adjust ed Resid ual	2.6	1.7	-2.5			

• As for the neuroticism shown by deinstitutionalized persons, the results presented in Table no. 1 show that there are significant differences between the deinstitutionalized persons in their implication in the work environment accordind to this feature. The significance threshold is p<0.05.

o According to these results, the deinstitutionalized persons who don't have a job or work on a daily basis, ocasionally, show a higher level of neuroticism to those who work legally, with a contract. These results can be explained by the fact that neuroticism is part of the deinstitutionalized persons' personality. This feature of personality is manifested through inability to establish positive relationships with others and the behavioral tendency to disrespect the social values and rules.

Table no. 2Comparisons between thedeinstitutionalizedpersons as for theirimplicationintheworkenvironmentaccording to their frustration tolerance.

✓ The results in Table no. 2 show that there are no significant differences as for the implication in the work environment in the case of deinstitutionalized persons according to their level of frustration tolerance. The significance threshold is p>0.05.

Implication in the work environme nt				ustratio olerance		Pea rso n Chi	df	Sig. (2- side
			nt erate h	- squ are	u	d)		
	Nowhere	Co unt	0	6	25			
	On a daily basis	Co unt	0	7	25	6.9 88	4	.137
	With a work contract	Co unt	1	12	16			

 \checkmark These results are explained by the fact

that deinstitutionalized persons who don't work or simply work on a daily basis have a high level of frustration tolerance- i.e are less tolerant, this being a cause for their inability to enter the work environment, they can't adapt to the rules of an institution. This characterises most the young people who were raised in institutions and now they reject any form of obedience and conformation.

Frustration may also appear unmotivated or not sufficiently motivated from an objective point of view. It is specific to persons who interpret reality constrained by selfishness, by their inability to detach from their own emotions and egotic tendencies, which make them believe they have only rights and no duties. Because frustration is expressed in a high negative affective tension, the individual may show a disorganized behaviour- anarchic and deviant.



"HENRI COANDA" AIR FORCE ACADEMY ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK" ARMED FORCES ACADEMY SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER AFASES 2013 Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

Because of the fact that children had a traumatising childhood in which they developed many frustrations, their refusal to enter the work environment is a desire to escape the conformism of institutionalized childhood.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The children who leave the child protection system represent a social category with specific problems and difficulties, being a priority for the general system of heath and welfare in Romania and it requires an immediate intervention.

As a result of this study, we concluded that deinstitutionalized persons who don't work tend to have health problems and experience solitude.

Neuroticism is a feature which manifests in the case of deinstitutionalized persons who don't work or simply work on a daily basis and it is determined by their inability to establish positive relationships with others and their tendency to disrespect the social rules and values.

Frustration tolerance determines differences between significant the deinstitutionalized childen - i.e those who aren't tolerant prefer moderate activities which imply average difficulty, showing selfprotection abilities manifested only under coordination. on the other hand deinstitutionalized persons having moderate frustration tolerance prefer light activities, the results showing that frustration may also unmotivated insufficiently appear or motivated from an objective point of view.

Consequently, we can say that deinstitutionalized persons who have problems in involving in the work environment show high scores of neuroticism and sometimes their frustration tolerance is rather low.

REFERENCES

- 1. Cicchetti, D., (2003), Development and Psychopatology, Cambridge University Press
- Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E., Mowrer, O.H., Sears, R.T. (1939). Frustration and agression, Yale University Press, New Haven
- Eysenck, H.J., Eysenck, S.B.G. (1969).
 Personality Structure and Measurement. London: Routledge
- 4. Mussen, O., (1961). Some antecedents and consequents of masculine sextyping in adolescent boys. Psychology Monography, 75, No.2
- Rudica, T., (1981). Family before the child's bad behaviors, Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, Bucharest
- Wechsler, D. (1981) Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. Psychological Corporation, New York