

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

Arati Pandey<sup>1</sup>, Shraddhesh Kumar Tiwari<sup>2\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Corporal punishment is use of physical force with intention of causing a child to experience pain but not injury, for the purpose of correction or control children's behavior (Straus 1994). The aim of the study was to investigate the effect of corporal punishment on frustration tolerance. Two measures: corporal punishment scale and frustration tolerance scale were administered on 240 school going children (120 boys and 120 girls). Corporal punishment was devised in three levels as severe, moderate and low; frustration tolerance was assessed in term of time and number of attempt. Results reveal that effect of three levels of corporal punishment is found significant on frustration tolerance in term of both, time and number of attempt. Other demographic variables i. e., gender and family structure was found significant on frustration tolerance in term of time and number of attempt.

**Keywords:** Corporal Punishment, Frustration Tolerance, School Going Children

Parental use of corporal punishment is one of the most controversial topic now a days. It is also an emotionally charged problem in parent child relationships. There are several child rearing practices being adapted in different human societies but no other child rearing topic has elicited as much attention or heated debates as whether parents should engage in punishing their children for promoting socially desirable response. beginning from onset of human civilization and there after educationists, philosophers and many others have argued against it and called for moderation in parental use of corporal punishment (Peisner 1989). Parental corporal punishment is a technique of discipline. Parental corporal punishment used to stop children's misbehaviour immediately. "corporal punishment is the use of physical force with intention of causing a child to experience pain but injury for the purpose of correction or control of the children's behaviour (Straus 1984).

There are few issues parents feel more strongly about than those regarding the discipline and punishment of their children. Although people may use those terms interchangeably, they mean quite different things. Discipline is a process of teaching a child the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Good discipline should be a positive force focusing on what a child is allowed to do. The goal of discipline is to help a child change impulsive,

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, B R D B D P G College Ashram Barhaj Deoria, India

<sup>2</sup>Post Doctoral Fellow, Department of Psychology, D D U Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur, India

\*Responding Author

Received: March 16, 2019; Revision Received: April 1, 2019; Accepted: April 20, 2019

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

random behaviour into controlled, purposeful behaviour and discipline should be reinforced with teaching firmness and reminders. On other hand, punishment is a technique of discipline. It may be physical a spank or slap or psychological disapproval, isolation from others or withdrawal of privilege. The goal of punishment is to inhibit unacceptable behaviour. Children need to be accountable for their own behaviour in order to learn inner control necessary to function as healthy, self disciplined individuals.

A large number of studies have been conducted in the field of parental corporal punishment. Culp and his colleagues (1999) conducted a study on topic “ first time young mothers living in rural communities wing corporal punisjment with their toddlers”. Results show mothers used corporal punishment in attempt to reduce age in appropriate behaviour, especially at meal time and in learning situations. Prevention and early intervention programs are needed to not only to teach expected child behaviour, but also to model and to provide guided practices of effective corporal punishment. Davis (1999) examined corporal punishment cessation: Social context and parental experiences. Findings based on thses data suggest that cultural inducement aand social support may be important a learning alternatives of disciplinary technique in explaining parents cessation efforts. Bounrind, Larzelere and Cowam (2002) examined effects of ordinary physical punishment. The author suggest that undesireable child outcomes are associated with corporal punishment because the construct marks inept harsh parenting and concluded that although the harmful effecct of physical abuse and other extreme punishment are clear, a blanket injunctions against spanking is not justified by the evidence parental by Gershoff.

Frustration tolerance refere to the amount of stress one can tolerate, before his integrated functiuoning is seriously impaired. Thus frustration tolerance refered to the capacity of the individual to show persistence in efforts despite repeated failure and antagonistic environment (Rai and Gupta 1988). The concept of frustration tolerance, however, has an important bearing upon the dynamics of human personality in as much as it indicates the importance of the ‘modes of the response ‘ to frustrating situations, no matter wether natural or artificially induced (Malvia, 1977). Rosenzweig (1944) has introduced the concept of frustration tolerance to designate observed differences. The term ‘frustration tolerance’ has come into wide spread psychological usages to refer to the limit of the tension, any person canstand without becoming disorganized. All individual at one time or another, in greater or lesser amount of stress one can tolerate before his his integrated functioning is seriously impaired. Frustration occures when a person is unable to reach a desired goal on account of some barrier or other, or the absence of the desired and appropriate goals. Barriers may be external such as wars, droughts, earthquack, storm and fire etc. Economic frustration can also thwart the achievement of desired goals and and may creat frustration. The source of frustration may be interanal also, resulting from his own incapacity and inadequacy. Inability to achieve one’s goal may also lead to self devaluation and inferiority.

A great deal of researches related to frustration tolerance mostly on animals, have been done by a number of psychologist like Lashley (1930), Elliot (1932) and others. Thses studies suggest that frustration is the primary factor in the production of “abnormal fixation” or “regression”. There are other numerous studies regarding frustraion aggression and frustration reaction but studies realted to frsutration tolerance is few. In thses studies investigators try to highlight the effect of a number of variables upon frustration tolerance as subject related variables like age, sex, personality traits, and sociocultural variables, socioeconomic status, environmental variables, task characterstics variables and other. Feiring and Lewis (1979) found that age has significant effect on frustration tolerance. Malavia

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

(1977) indicates that adolescents are found to be more aggressive than adults. Normal adults like wise shows great individual variation in the frustration tolerance. Rai and Gupta (1988) states that sex affects the frustration tolerance. According to them female have to shown higher frustration tolerance than males. Malvia (1977) has also similar views. She has concluded that women are less aggressive as compared to men. Both learning and biological factors seems to play some part in producing this differences. Women have fairly strong wish to confirm to the cultural definition to their sex role, which discourage them to behave aggressively. Female students become relatively anxious of guilty as a result of aggressive responses. So, they show more frustration tolerance than men, but Rani (1989) states that no differences exist in reaction to frustration of men and women. she further explains the differences may be due to differential social restraints for men and women. Keeping this view in the mind, objectives of the study are as followed:

1. To investigate the effect of degree of corporal punishment, i.e., severe, moderate and low on frustration tolerance in school going children.
2. To explore the impact of sex (boys and girls) on frustration tolerance in children.
3. To study the effect of family structure on frustration tolerance in school going children.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### *Selection of subjects*

At the preliminary stage, 3000 students were selected from the school going boys and girls of Meerut city on the basis of their access and availability. The subjects were boys and girls students of VI to VII classes between the age range of 9 to 10 years. Before the administration of test, the investigator contacted the concerned authorities and members of the staff of educational institutions for their whole hearted help and cooperation in the administered of research tool connected with study.

#### *Sample*

A sample of 240 (120 boys and 120 girls) subject were selected from different educational institutions of Meerut city on basis of their scores on parental corporal punishment scale. Out of total sample of 240 subjects, there were 120 boys and 120 girls. One hundred twenty subjects of each sex group included 60 subjects from joint family and 60 subjects from individual family. These 60 subjects of each family structure consisted of three levels of parental corporal punishment i.e., severe, moderate and low (20 subjects from each level of punishment).

#### *Measures*

**Parental Corporal Punishment Scale:** it is developed by Dr. Manjula Gupta, Prof. S. N. Rai and Poonam Sharma. Scale has 60 items in which 46 positive items and 14 negative items. Responses were taken by "Yes" and "No" answers. If a child answered yes is given '1' mark and if answered no is given '0' mark for positive items. In case of negative items '1' score was given if subjects responded no and '0' score for yes response. Thus, the maximum score will be 60 while minimum could be zero. On the same procedure, one score for each individual subject is obtained. In the manner separate score for all 3000 subjects were obtained and on the basis of these score  $Q_1$  and  $Q_3$  values were calculated. Subjects below  $Q_1$  scores were labeled as low punishment group. Above  $Q_3$  were labeled as severe punishment group and between  $Q_1$  and  $Q_3$  as moderate punishment group

**Frustration Tolerance Test:** It is constructed by Prof. S. N. Rai (1988). This test is prepared as a puzzle form with four puzzles. The subjects were asked to sit comfortably and instructed them. After making instruction clear, the subject is asked to start the work. When

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

they start the work, stop watch is also started. Subject's work is observed through out from a distance so that he may not feel disturbed. If the subjects works on first puzzle up to 10 minutes, he/ she asked to move to the next puzzle since the time is up and 10 minutes time is noted. If he moves before 10 minutes, the time he have given to first puzzle is noted. Some times subjects says he has solved the puzzle. At that time stop watch is stoped and he is asked to draw a figure before the experimenter. Certainly, he has drawn in a wrong manner since the first and third puzzle are insoluble. The mistake is pointed out and if the subject tries again to draw the figure, stop watch is started again and both the tims, for that puzzle are added and noted. Then the subject moves to the second puzzle which is soluble. No time is noted for this puzzle. Then subjects moves to the third puzzle, for this puzzle exactly the same procedure is follwed which has been followed for the first puzzle and this puzzle is also noted down. Then the subject solves the fourth piuzzle which is soluble time for this puzzle is noted. After this subject is thanked for his cooperation in the experiment.

### *Procedure*

After establishing good rapport with subjects, a very coopertave and healthy environment was created in all setting of data collection. Teacher's help was taken for establishing good rapport. The subjects were assembled in a small groups of 10 each, and were asked not to be turn the first page of research tools unless told to do so. First of all subjects were asked to give their biodata and other necessary querries given on the cover page of the tools. Then, the instructions were read verbally and subjects were asked to follow the instructions. They were also encourage to clear their doubt if any they had. After these preliminaraiies, they were asked to start. The researcher supervised the administration vigilantly. In all the administrations it was especially seen to that all the subjects had completed the research tools items of the tool along with their complete biodata accordance with specific instructions. After this the all booklets were throughly checked for completion, collected and kept in envelopes. In the end, each subject aws thanked for his/her heartly cooperation. This procedure was followed in collecting the whole data from all 240 subjects.

## **RESULTS**

The study comprises three independent variables. The first independent variable called punishment has been designed with three levels, severe punishment, moderate punishment and low punishment. The second independent variable namely sex devised in boys and girls. Third independent variable i.e., family structure have been distincted two level joint family and individual family. Above mentioned three independent variables effect were assessed on frustration tolerance. Frustration tolerance was scored in term of time and in term of attempt. the performnce of individual subject on the frustration tolerance experment has yielded two set of data (a) time devoted by each subject on the two insoluble piuzzless i.e., puzzle number 1 and 3. (b)Number of attempts made in trying to solve the insoluble puzzles i.e., puzzle number 1 and 3. In order to find out the effect of three independent variables on frustration tolerance, the data were alalyzed seperately by using three way analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique. for mean comparison the Newman Keuls Test has been selected. the data indicating the sum of scores bsd on 20 observations each for 12 cells, 3 types of parental corporal punismnet i.e., severe, moderate and low punishment x sex, i.e., boys and girls x family structure, i.e., joint family and individual family are presented in table-1.

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

**Table-1** the sum of obtained frustration tolerance scores for punishment, sex and family structure in term of time

Parental Punishment	Severe		Moderate		Low	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Joint Family	6446	5118	4222	3956	3718	3591
Individual Family	6660	5702	4446	3940	3891	3881

Further more, each independent variable, mean and total mean frustration tolerance scores in term of time were calculated. The computed means are given in table 2.

**Table-2: Mean and total mean scores of frustration tolerance in term of three independent variables.**

Punishment		Sex		Family structure	
Level	Mean	Level	Mean	Level	Mean
Severe	299.07	Boys	244.85	Joint Family	225.42
Moderate	207.05				
Low	188.51	Girls	218.23	Individual family	237.66

In order to find out the effect of three independent variables on the dependent variable called frustration tolerance in term of time the data presented in tabular form and same were analyzed using three way analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique.

**Table-3: Summary of ANOVA for frustration tolerance in term of punishment, sex and family structure.**

Source of Variance	Sum of Scores	df	Mean square	F
Punishment	560968	2	280484	200.65 <sup>**</sup>
Sex	42533	1	42533	30.42 <sup>**</sup>
Family Structure	8991	1	8991	6.43 <sup>**</sup>
Punishment x Sex	30473	2	15236.5	10.89 <sup>**</sup>
Punishment x Family Structure	2189	2	10945	7.82 <sup>**</sup>
Sex x Family structure	255	1	255	0.18
Punishment x Sex x Family structure	2348	2	1174	.083
Error (within treatment)	318710	228	1397.85	

Note: <sup>\*\*</sup>p<.01

The effect of corporal punishment was found significant [F (2,228)=200.65,p<.01] on frustration tolerance in term of time, it leads us to conclude that parental corporal punishment is an important influential factor in frustration tolerance. respective mean scores suggest that severe punishment group have got highest score in comparison to moderate and low punishment.

The effect of sex was found significant [F(1,228)= 30.42, p<.01] on frustration tolerance in term of time. this clearly shows that sex of the subject was potent factor in influencing frustration tolerance. mean scores states that boys scores are higher than girls. In context of family structure, mean scores for subjects belonging to individual family was much higher than the mean score of subjects belonging to joint family. It is evident that subjects associated with individual family are more frustration tolerant than the subject belonging to joint family. Family structure effect was found significant [F (1,228)= 6.43, p<.01] on frustration tolerance in term of time. the interaction effect of levels of punishment and sex were found significant

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

[F(2,228)=10.89,  $p < .01$ ] on frustration tolerance. Again, the interaction effect of punishment and family structure were found significant [F(2,228)=7.82,  $p < .01$ ] on frustration tolerance.

In order to find out the effect of three independent variables on frustration tolerance, the data obtained in term of number of attempts were analyzed by using three way analysis of variance (ANOVA). For mean comparison where F value was found significant the Newman-Keul Test was applied to locate the significant mean differences. The data indicating sum of the scores based on 20 observation each, for 12 cells- three level of punishment, i.e., severe, moderate and low, two level of sex i.e., boys and girls, joint family and individual family are presented in table 4.

**Table-4** Sum of obtained frustration tolerance scores for severity of punishment sex and family structure in term of number of attempts.

Punishment	Severe		Moderate		Low	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	boys	Girls
Joint Family	158	165	169	179	185	188
Individual Family	207	207	208	223	226	227

Mean values at the different level of the three independent variables were calculated. Mean values of frustration tolerance scores in term of number of attempts for the three independent variables are given in table 5.

**Table-5** mean of frustration tolerance scores for degree of punishment, sex and family structure. in term of number of attempts.

Punishment		Sex		Family Structure	
Level	Mean	Level	Mean	Level	Mean
Severe	9.21	Boys	9.60	Joint Family	8.70
Moderate	9.73	Girls	9.90	Individual Family	10.81
Low	10.32				

**Table-6** Summary of analysis of variance of frustration tolerance scores in term of number of attempts.

Source of Variance	Sum of Scores	df	Mean square	F
Punishment	49.55	2	24.77	21.72**
Sex	5.39	1	5.39	4.72*
Family Structure	268.81	1	268.81	235.79**
Punishment x Sex	3.2	2	1.6	1.40
Punishment x Family Structure	0.8	2	0.4	0.35
Sex x Family structure	0.06	1	0.06	0.05
Punishment x Sex x Family structure	0.97	2	0.48	0.42
Error (within treatment)	260.19	228	1.14	

Note: \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

The effect of parental corporal punishment was found significant [F(2,228)=21.72,  $p < .01$ ] on frustration tolerance in term of number of attempts. respective mean scores suggest that subjects associated with low degree of punishment have got highest frustration tolerance and those of subjects having severe degree of punishment the least frustration tolerance.

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

The second independent variable sex has been found significant effect [ $F(1,228)= 4.72, p<.05$ ] on frustration tolerance in term of number of attempts. mean table reveal that girls have higher frustration tolerance scores as compared to boys, which means that they have more capacity to tolerance to frustration than their counter parts.

The effect of family structure was found significant [ $F(1,228)=235.79, p<.01$ ] on frustration tolerance in term of number of attempts. respective mean scores shows that subjects belonging to individual family have the highest frustration tolerance scores than the subjects of coming from joint family.

### DISCUSSION

Parental corporal punishment has been found to significantly affect frustration tolerance of subjects both in term of time and in term of number of attempts., which means that the performance of the three treatment groups viz. severe, moderate and low was distinct. The findings thereby conform with the hypothesis that the subjects of three punishment group category will exhibit different degree of frustration tolerance. In this study investigator has found that children of severe parental punishment have shown highest frsutration tolerance while the children of low parental punishment group have least frustration tolerance. Now the question arises, why do children who get severe parental punishment show maximum frustratio tolerance. this finding may be explaine in term of habituation. Children who get parental punishment more frequently must be getting used to such parental treatment. this excess exposure of parental punishment might have lost its effect in controlling and shaping the behavior of such children. But the same is not the case with children who receive low punishment children with low might be more alert to avoid such unpleasant experience through their behavior punishment.another reason might be difference in perceived poarental expectation. Children who receive sever parental punishment might be perceving high parental expectation regarding their performance. Such poessure is not perceived by the children who receive low parental punishment. Therefore our findings regarding the effect of degree of corporal punishment on frustration tolerance is quite explainable and logical.

Family structiure of the choldren in which they are living has been found as potent variable to affect significantly frustration tolerance both in terms of time spent on unsolvable puzzles and number od attempts. in term of tiome it has been found that children of joint family has less, frustration tolerance than the children of individual family. similarly, children of joint family also differ on number of attempts from children of individual family. Thus our findings regarding the family structure variable demonstrate that children of individual; family are more frustration tolerant in comparison of children of joint family. Now the question arises, why do children of joint family and individual family differe in their frustration tolerance? one possible reason might be the difference in loneliness. Children living in joint family are more socialized due to large possibility of social interactions. This extended social interactoin may lead higher expectation from other peer group which as result might be influencing their frustration tolerance. When some one has high social expectation, he/she might be low in frustration tolerance. But when we look at children of individual family then we find that these children show more frustration tolerance. Children of individual family do not experience frustration as faced by the children of joint family structure. Another point is that frustration tolerance is also influenced by the task or importance of the task. If the goal is perceived important one may tolerate more frustration but when the task is simple or not challenging the frustration tolerance may increase. Therefore the difference is frustration tolerance of children of joint family are justifiable.

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

Our findings is that the variable of sex significantly affects frustration tolerance both in term of time as well as number of attempts and, that boys have higher frustration tolerance than girls. Thus the findings fully confirm to the hypothesis that there would be significant difference in the degree of frustration tolerance of male and that female will exhibit lesser frustration tolerance than male. Boys are trained to be active, achieving, aggressive, independent, ambitious and rational whereas girls are socialized to be passive nurturing, dependent, responsive and emotional. In Indian families women have a strong desire to conform to the cultural definition of their sex roles. Indian society has remained a male dominated society where women have been expected to play a secondary role only and to refrain from aggressive behavior. Women have remained dependent on male members viz. the further husnabd, the brother or the son in various phases of their lives in the Indian society. Some biological factors also contribute to male domination. Women can thus be classified under the deprived category. In the past, even education and considered to be the right of males only.

The vary structure of society and the social milieu does not allow the female to have high aspiration and their goal descrepancy is likely to remain moderately low. They have to undergo much more experience of frustration because of their secondary position in society and specific role expectations. Parental expetation are not in the field of compititiveness for the female but only in the domestic field in which they become adept as they help their mothers in the same since their very childhood. Girls have more ego strength therefore more impulseorientation. Thus, findings if the present investigation is consistent with the structure of the Indian society.

### REFERENCES

- Baumreinda, diana, Lazelere Robert & Cowann Shelepa (2002). Ordinary physical punishment: Is It Harmful? Comment on Gernoff, Journal of Genetic Psychology 1996 (Jan) vol.160(2).2004
- Culp, Rexe, Culp, AnneMc-Donald Dengler (1999), First time young mother living in rural communities using corporal punishment with this toddlers, 1999, Journal of Community Psychology Vol.27(4), 503-509.
- Davie, Phillip W.C. Geogia State (1999), Corporal punishment Cessotion: social context and parent experience, Journal of Interpersonal violence, Vol 14 (5), 492-510.
- Fiering, G., & Lewis, M. (1979).sex and age difference in young children's reaction to frustration: A further look at the Goldberg and Lewis subjects. Child development, 50, 848-853.
- Lashley, K.S. (1930). The mechanism of vision: I.A. method for rapid analysis of pattern vision in the rat. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 37, 453-460.
- Malviya, D. (1977). Reaction to frustration, Research Foundations. New Delhi. D. K. Publishers.
- Peisne, E. S. (1989). To spate or not to spare the rod: A cultural historical view of child discipline. In J. Valsiner (Ed). Child Development in Cultural Context (pp.111-141) Lewiston, N. Y. :Hogrefe and Huber.
- Rai, S.N. (1988). Manual for Frustration Tolerance, ankur Psychological Agency, Lucknow.
- Rani,M.U. (1989) The effect of age and sex on reaction to frustration. Psychological Studies, 34(3), 198-203.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1944).An outline of frustration theory, in J.McV. Hunt (Ed).Personality and Behavior Disorders. Vol.I, New York, Chapt II, 379-388
- Straus, M.A. (1984)Beating and devil out of them: corporal punishment in Americal Families. New York : Lexington Books.

## The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children

### ***Acknowledgements***

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed in ensuring this paper in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be mentioned.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The authors carefully declare this paper to bear not conflict of interests

**How to cite this article:** A Pandey, S K Tiwari. (2019).The Effect of Corporal Punishment on Frustration Tolerance in School Going Children.*International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(2), 10-18. DIP:18.01.003/20190702, DOI:10.25215/0702.003