

# REACTIONS OF CHINESE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TO ROSENZWEIG'S PICTURE-FRUSTRATION STUDY<sup>1</sup>

CHIEN-HOU HWANG

## INTRODUCTION

No one in this world can ever expect to have all his needs fulfilled. From time to time, his progress toward a certain goal may be blocked, delayed or interfered with. In other words, he may encounter frustrations of some kind. The sources of frustration may be classified into the following categories:

1. Obstacles in the physical world—This refers to any real and objective obstacle exists in the environment. For instance: a speaker may find the microphone out of order or a group of young people who are going for a picnic may find the road is blocked by a road-slide. Natural disasters may also become barriers.

2. Limitation of one's ability, physical or mental—In these cases, the goal is beyond the capacity of an individual. A child may find the candy-box is placed in a high place beyond his reach; a boy may find himself baffled by someone who looks bigger and stronger than himself; or a student may find the mathematics too difficult for him and he can hardly understand the method to solve the problems.

3. Obstacles due to the psychological make-up of an individual—In many occasions, personal attitude toward or value systems in regard to some matters may prevent him from reaching his goal though there is no obstruction otherwise. Prejudice against somebody or special fears toward certain objects are frequently found examples. Conflicts are also important causes of frustration. To make a choice between two jobs sometimes creates a very difficult problem to an individual.

4. The social environment may become an obstacle—This refers to the laws, regulations, mores, customs and taboos, that exist in a given culture. Not infrequently these stand in one's way which leads to satisfaction of a certain need. For example, some religious groups have regulations in regard to food-habit, to marriage or to practices of birth-control.

When an individual is frustrated, a tension state will be created, a person will become confused, baffled, and annoyed. He will thus try to find some way of adjustment, attempt to dissolve the aroused tension. Of course, there are a great variety of responses that may be adopted as tension-reduction mechanisms with immense individual differences.

In a study of refugees from Nazi Germany, Allport and his associates (1953)<sup>1</sup> classified the reactions to frustrations into nine categories:

1. Resignation and other defeat reactions.

---

1. This study is supported by a research grant from National Council on Science Development, 1967-1968.

2. Adaptation of temporary frames of reference
3. Heightened in-group feelings.
4. Shifts in level of aspiration.
5. Regression and fantasy.
6. Conformity to the regime.
7. Changes in philosophy.
8. Planning and direct action.
9. Aggression and displaced aggression.

Dollard and others proposed the so called the frustration-aggression hypothesis (1939). They felt that the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression and that the occurrence of aggression presuppose the existence of frustration. This seems to be an over-generalized conception and one of the authors soon amended the theory by saying that aggression is but one of the ways reacting to frustration. He maintained, however, that aggression is always caused by frustration (Miller, 1941).

Rosenzweig (1941) classified the reactions to frustration according to whether the fate of a frustrated segmental need or the fate of the personality as a whole is considered. The former occurs invariably after frustration (need-persistent) while the latter occurs only under conditions of ego-threat (ego-defensive). Furthermore, he divided the reactions based on their directions of aggression:

1. Extrapunitive responses—Those in which the individual aggressively attributed the frustration to someone or something in external world, avoiding blaming oneself. The associated emotions are anger and resentment.

2. Intropunitive responses—Those in which the individual aggressively attributes the frustration to himself. This is perhaps a consequence of inhibition of its outward expression. Associated emotions are guilt and remorse.

3. Impunitive responses—Those are situations in which the aggression does not supply the motivating force; instead, more socially directed drives are at work. The frustrating situation seems to be overlooked (gloss over) and the emotional reaction repressed; neither oneself nor another person is blamed.

Following the above-mentioned theory, Rosenzweig developed in 1945 a test to study the reactions to frustration. He named it Picture-Frustration Study which has been regarded as a projective technique. It has been used by a good number of psychologists in their researches related to the problem of frustration. This test is the main instrument used in the present study.

## THE PROCEDURE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

### 1. The Material Used for the Study

In the present study, Rosenzweig's Picture Frustration Study (The P-F Test) (1947) has been used. This is a projective test with a booklet containing twenty-four cartoon-like drawings which represent incidents of everyday life. In each of

the drawings, there are two main characters, one of them is saying something of frustrating significance to the other individual. The subject is asked to write down the verbal response that would be made by the second person involved (Rosenzweig et al. 1947). It is a test easy to administer and subjects often find it interesting to work on it. They are usually told to work as fast as possible and most of them can finish the task in 15-20 minutes though some cautious persons may need more time to do it.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the reactions of Chinese university students to the P-F Test. The Test had been carefully examined before it was put to use in the present study. All the cartoons have been re-drawn so that the figures would look like Chinese rather than westerners; other related elements are also modified in the same manner.

In fact, several items have been completely revised (Items 8, 9, 19 and 23) because the original themes are not common in Chinese culture. An example is added on the cover of the booklet to show the proper way of making responses.

## 2. The Subjects

The subjects participated in the present study are students from National Taiwan Normal University, mostly freshmen. The test was given during the class period of Introductory Psychology and it was the instructor of that class who administered the test. This arrangement, based on past experience, often gain good cooperation from the students. 320 students participated the study with 134 men and 186 women.

## THE RESULTS

The P-F records of the Chinese university students are scored according to the procedure and instructions set by Rosenzweig. The results are given in the following:

### 1. Responses to Each Cartoon of the P-F Study

One would expect that people will give a good variety of responses to each of the cartoons. However, when the responses are scored, there appears to be a tendency that most of the response to one drawing fall in a certain category of scoring suggested by Rosenzweig. For instance, over 74% of the male subjects give impunitive response (M) to Cartoon I and 82% of them show intropunitive responses (I) to Cartoon II. Table 1 presents an analysis of scores of male subject on all 24 cartoons while those of females are given in Table 2.

One may also notice that the differences between male and female subjects are neglectable in this study. Among the 264 comparisons, only 3 show difference at  $P < 0.01$  level and 12 at  $P < 0.05$  level while all rest of them do not show significant differences. When there is sex difference, it seems that girls tend to be more intropunitive and less extrapunitive than the boys in relating to certain cartoon-situations.

Table 1. Reactions to Individual Cartoon (Male N=134)

Reaction Cartoon No.	E'%	I'%	M'%	E%	I%	<u>E</u> %	<u>I</u> %	M%	e%	i%	m%
1	2.99	0.75	6.72	7.46	2.24	0	0	74.63	20.90	0.75	0.75
2	11.94	5.97	0	0.75	82.09	0	0	0	0	46.27	0
3	41.79	8.96	2.24	8.21	4.48	7.46	0	14.18	9.70	14.93	0
4	6.72	2.24	2.99	10.45	8.96	0	0	39.55	7.46	15.67	29.10
5	5.22	1.49	2.24	23.13	21.64	1.49	0	1.49	6.72	63.43	1.49
6	20.90	2.99	3.73	2.99	17.16	0.75	1.49	0.75	8.21	50.75	2.99
7	17.16	2.24	2.24	26.87	4.48	0.75	0.75	14.93	14.93	1.49	22.39
8	7.46	11.19	1.49	0.75	5.22	0.75	0	14.18	20.90	17.91	23.88
9	11.94	6.72	2.24	2.24	2.24	0	0	2.99	6.72	70.15	0.75
10	1.49	1.49	1.49	40.30	2.99	50.00	0.75	0.75	1.49	0.75	0
11	0.75	0	2.24	24.63	0.75	1.49	0	54.48	28.36	0	0
12	16.42	0	4.48	23.88	0	0.75	0	8.96	16.42	27.61	4.48
13	7.46	0.75	1.49	36.57	0.75	0	0	10.45	55.22	7.46	3.73
14	4.48	0	0.75	28.36	0.75	0	0	55.22	0	4.48	30.60
15	9.70	2.24	2.99	6.72	18.66	4.48	0	47.76	6.72	0.75	2.24
16	2.99	2.24	0	26.87	32.84	9.70	22.39	0.75	1.49	2.99	0
17	13.43	26.87	1.49	7.46	23.13	5.22	0	0	1.49	36.57	1.49
18	5.22	2.24	8.21	2.99	1.49	0	0	10.45	22.39	24.63	26.12
19	0	2.99	0	4.48	50.00	2.99	21.64	0.75	5.97	26.87	2.24
20	0.75	0	0	12.69	15.67	0	0	70.15	0.75	0.75	0
21	0	53.73	1.49	4.48	14.18	0	0	0.75	0	60.45	0
22	5.22	7.46	2.99	26.87	51.49	0.75	0	2.99	0.75	0	0
23	29.10	2.99	0.75	22.39	2.24	0	0	4.48	10.45	14.18	16.42
24	1.49	0.75	3.73	9.70	0.75	0	0	74.63	10.45	14.18	5.97

Table 2. Reactions to Individual Cartoon (Female N=186)

Reaction Cartoon No.	E'%	I'%	M'%	E%	I%	<u>E</u> %	<u>I</u> %	M%	e%	i%	m%
1	1.61	1.61	8.06	3.76	2.15	0	0	82.80	11.83*	1.08	0
2	9.68	2.15	0	2.15	76.34	0.54	1.08	1.61	0.54	44.62	0
3	43.01	8.06	2.15	5.91	6.99	2.15*	0	9.14	12.90	23.12	1.08
4	6.99	0.54	3.76	4.84	10.22	0	0	39.25	6.45	27.42*	32.26
5	5.91	0.54	0.54	25.27	19.35	1.61	0	0.54	5.91	72.04	0.54
6	13.44	4.84	2.69	1.61	19.35	0	2.69	1.08	6.45	60.75	1.61
7	13.98	2.15	1.08	25.81	5.91	0	1.08	23.12	12.37	3.76	18.82
8	13.98*	10.22	4.30	3.23	8.60	0	0	11.83	18.28	20.43	15.59
9	9.68	6.45	1.61	4.30	6.99*	1.61	0	1.08	7.53	67.74	0
10	2.69	0	2.15	36.56	2.69	50.54	1.61	1.08	0.54	0	0
11	2.15	0	3.23	25.27	0.54	0	0	64.52	26.88	0.54	0
12	21.51	1.61	4.30	25.27	0	1.08	0	8.60	11.83	31.72	6.45
13	8.06	0.54	0	31.72	1.08	0	0	9.14	53.76	4.84	3.76
14	6.99	0	2.69	21.51	0	0	0	55.91	0.54	11.29*	34.41
15	10.22	2.15	2.69	9.14	22.04	8.06	0	38.17	2.69	1.61	2.15
16	0*	1.61	0.54	11.83*	44.62*	6.99	30.65	1.08	1.08	6.99	0
17	8.06	23.66	0.54	5.91	30.65	5.91	1.61	0.54	1.08	37.63	3.76
18	5.91	5.91	9.14	1.61	1.08	0	0	6.45	25.27	32.80*	18.28
19	2.15	2.15	0	2.15	45.70	2.69	15.05	3.23	2.15	39.78*	0.54
20	2.69	0	0.54	10.75	22.58	1.08	0	61.83	1.61	2.15	0
21	0.54	54.30	0.54	5.91	12.90	0.54	0	0.54	0.54	62.37	0
22	3.76	6.99	2.69	27.96	45.16	1.08	0	10.22*	1.61	0	0.54
23	32.26	9.68*	0.54	19.89	9.68*	0	0	2.69	14.52	11.29	7.53*
24	3.23	0.54	4.30	8.06	0.54	0	0	80.11	8.60	18.82	2.69

\*Significantly differ from the corresponding figure of the Male Subjects

## 2. The Major Scoring Categories

When the frequency of occurrence of each of these major factors are entered in the scoring blank designed by Rosenzweig, it becomes convenient to calculate the percentages of each of the types of responses as well as the directions of aggression of an individual. Their central tendencies are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Direction of Aggression and Types of Reaction of Chinese Subjects

Reaction	MALE		FEMALE		t
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
E %	35.84	14.05	33.11	13.19	1.77
I %	37.40	10.53	41.36	10.25	— 3.45***
M %	28.30	10.20	26.95	8.95	1.24
O-D %	16.72	8.93	16.44	8.94	0.27
E-D %	52.25	9.66	51.60	9.11	0.60
N-P %	32.88	11.83	33.60	11.29	— 0.55

\*\*\*Difference Statistically significant at  $P < 0.01$  level

Since the scores of male and female subjects are listed together, one can see clearly that there is no significant sex difference in all but one of the six factors. The only exception is that girl tend to give more intropunitive responses when they are frustrated. Bernard (1949) once found that a greater degree of outwarded aggression is attributed to the male than to the female. The same tendency is found in the present study but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 4. Reactions of Chinese vs. American Norms by Rosenzweig

Reaction	Chinese		Americans		t
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
Male subjects					
E %	35.84	14.05	45	13.3	— 6.14***
I %	37.46	10.53	28	8.25	8.96***
M %	28.30	10.20	27	9.45	1.21
O-D %	16.72	8.93	20	7.8	— 3.55***
E-D %	52.25	9.66	53	11.3	— 1.08
N-P %	32.88	11.83	27	10.3	4.81***
Female subjects					
E %	33.11	13.19	45	13.1	— 9.12***
I %	41.36	10.25	28	6.6	15.33***
M %	26.95	8.95	28	10.2	— 1.11
O-D %	16.44	8.94	22	8.1	— 6.54***
E-D %	51.60	9.11	52	10.2	— 0.42
N-P %	33.60	11.29	26	10.3	7.06***

\*\*\*Difference statistically significant at  $P < 0.01$  level

### 3. Comparison of the Data of Present Study with the Results Found in Other Cultures

To investigate the possible cultural difference in reactions to frustration, we have compared the results of the present study with Rosenzweig's normative data (1947) and those reported by Japanese researchers. (Sumita, et al. 1957).

In Table 4, it is indicated that Chinese boys show definitely less extrapunitive and more intropunitive responses to frustrating situations than their American counterparts. Meanwhile, Chinese boys seem to be significantly less occupied by the obstacles or barriers than Americans, but they are more need-persistent than the latter. These trends exist among the female subjects as well.

The data of this study have also been compared with the norms of Japanese subjects established by Sumita and his associates (Table 5). Significant difference is found in almost every category between scores of Chinese and those of Japanese. Chinese people, in general, give less extrapunitive and impunitive responses, but more intropunitive ones to frustrating situations. Unlike Japanese subjects, Chinese university students do not put so much emphasis on obstacles they confront with, but tend to be more persistent in regard to need-fulfillment. Chinese girls, in general, do not give so many ego-defensive responses as Japanese women do.

Table 5. Reactions of Chinese Students vs. Japanese Norms

Reaction	Chinese		Japanese		t
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
Male subjects					
E%	35.84	14.05	40.3	13.1	- 3.47***
I%	37.46	10.53	27.0	7.92	11.12***
M%	28.30	10.20	33.1	7.70	- 5.17***
O-D%	16.72	8.93	24.8	9.60	- 7.81***
E-D%	52.25	9.66	51.3	10.00	1.07
N-P%	32.88	11.83	23.1	11.3	7.08***
Female subjects					
E%	33.11	13.17	35.8	13.3	- 2.43*
I%	41.36	10.25	30.8	7.32	13.06***
M%	26.95	8.95	32.7	9.20	- 7.60***
O-D%	16.44	8.94	23.5	9.43	- 9.29***
E-D%	51.06	9.11	54.7	10.1	- 3.95***
N-P%	33.60	11.29	21.7	11.1	12.61***

\*Difference statistically significant at  $P < 0.05$  level.

\*\*\*Difference statistically significant at  $P < 0.001$  level.

### 4. The Analysis of Sub-Scores

Rosenzweig has suggested nine main scoring categories and their meaning can be easily shown in the following box:

	Extrapunitive	Intropunitive	Impunitive
Obstacle-Dominant	E'	I'	M'
Ego-Defensive	E	I	M
Need-Persistent	e	i	m

For the present study, the mean of these scores are given in Table 6 along with Rosenzweig's normative data.

A quick glance of Table 6 reveals that E, I and M have about the same magnitude. This indicates that in defending oneself, only one third of the responses tend to be aggressive toward external objects while in majority of the cases, either the blame is directed toward oneself or the frustration is glossed over and the expression of aggression is evaded.

Table 6. The Sub-category Scores of Chinese and Americans Subjects

Reaction	MALE			FEMALE		
	Chinese	U. S.	t	Chinese	U. S.	t
E' Mean	2.31	2.0	1.76*	2.26	2.2	0.41
S.D.	1.50	1.39		1.50	1.48	
E Mean	4.50	6.6	— 7.48***	4.04	6.5	— 9.91***
S.D.	2.35	1.39		2.28	2.75	
e Mean	2.37	2.0	2.52*	2.19	1.8	2.83**
I' Mean	1.48	1.3	1.58	1.42	1.3	1.21
S.D.	1.10	1.97		1.09	0.87	
I Mean	3.81	2.6	7.83***	4.08	2.6	10.21***
S.D.	1.46	1.37		1.66	1.18	
i Mean	4.22	2.6	7.69***	5.19	2.6	13.15***
M' Mean	0.78	1.4	— 6.61***	0.78	1.6	— 9.23***
S.D.	0.81	1.06		0.75	1.05	
M Mean	4.78	3.2	8.15***	4.70	3.1	9.27***
S.D.	1.87	1.65		1.76	1.71	
m Mean	1.81	1.8	0.08	1.35	1.8	— 2.19*
S.D.	1.14	1.25		1.08	1.23	

\* Difference significant at  $P < 0.05$  level.

\*\* Difference significant at  $P < 0.01$  level.

\*\*\* Difference significant at  $P < 0.001$  level.

In an attempt to overcome the frustration, Chinese people tend to lay most of the responsibilities upon themselves; thus it is noticeably higher 'i' than both 'e' and 'm'. In all these cases, significant difference exists between Chinese and American subjects.

##### 5. Comparison with Reactions of a Delinquent Group

The P-F Test has also been given to 163 delinquent boys of a reformatory school. Their scores are compared with those of university students. Contrary to general belief, the delinquents are not different significantly from the students in regard to the directions of aggression. As far as the types of reaction are

concerned, similarity seems to be more impressive than the difference which occurs only in the case of ego-defensiveness (Table 7).

Table 7. Reactions of University Students Compared with those of Delinquents and Criminals

Reactions	Students		Delinquents		t
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
E %	35.84	14.05	34.79	13.81	0.64
I %	37.46	10.53	38.48	10.92	— 0.80
M %	28.30	10.20	28.35	9.83	— 0.04
O-D %	16.72	8.93	18.32	7.62	— 1.60
E-D %	52.25	9.66	49.55	11.07	2.21*
N-P %	32.88	11.83	33.66	10.51	— 0.53

\* Difference significant at  $P < 0.05$  level.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Applicability of the P-F Test among Chinese Subjects

Although this is the first study for the application of the P-F Test in China, all the students who took the test appeared to enjoy it and were very cooperative during its administration. With an example on its front page, the Test can be given with simple instruction. This test was also included in a battery with other instruments such as CPI, TAT, and Progressive Matrices Test for Chinese Family Study Program\*. The tests were given to a sample of general population in Taipei. It was found that the P-F was the best welcomed test. Hence, there seems no problem in using this test in China provided a local norm can be established.

### 2. The Problems of Cultural Factors

The result of the present study is found different significantly from the normative data provided by Rosenzweig. This is not at all surprising because of the existed cultural differences. The P-F Test is not a cultural-free instrument and in fact, it seems to be very sensitive to cultural factors. Lyon and Vinacke (1955) found that Hawaiians react to P-F different from the "mainland" Americans. McCary (1956) also noticed that there are differences in both the direction of aggression and in the types of responses between Northern and Southern Americans. He then suggested that "separate normative data should be obtained for various geographical, racial and sex groups". If differences exist within the American culture itself, one would naturally expect even greater difference between American subjects and Chinese people.

We all realize that to all human beings, frustration is an essential and usual experience. What we are primarily concerned with is not the frustration itself, but one's reaction to it. In most cases, such reactions are learned and so culturally

determined. Among the traditional teachings of Chinese classics, a good deal of emphasis has been given to frustration tolerance. It is generally thought that a great man is brought up through hardships and frustrations. This concept is best illustrated in a paragraph said by Mencius:

"Shun rose from among the channelled fields. Fu Yueh was called to office from the midst of his building frames; Chiao-ko from his fish and salt; Kwan I-wu from the bands of his gaoler; Sun-shu Ao from his hiding by the sea shore; and Pai-li Hsi from the market place."

"Thus, when Heaven is about to confer a great office on any man, it first exercises his mind with suffering, and his sinews and bones with toil. It exposes his body to hunger, and subjects him to extreme poverty. It confounds his undertakings. By all these methods it stimulates his mind, hardens his nature, and supplies his incompetencies."...."From these things we see life springs from sorrow and calamity, and death from ease and pleasure." (Mencius, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, Ch. 15.)

Deeply influenced by this philosophy, Chinese people have long been encouraged to tolerate frustrations as much as they can. This may explain at least partly the low percentage of O-D in this study. Chinese people are often taught to restrain themselves from blaming others because it has been said that "The superior man does not murmur against Heaven, nor grudge against men." (Mencius, Bk. 2, Pt. 2, Ch. 14.) Thus they tend to be less expunitive and consequently, they show a greater trend in directing their aggression inwardly against themselves.

According to Mencius, when a great man is treated with perverse and unreasonable manner, all he would do is to turn round upon himself, examining if he is wanting in benevolence or in propriety. (Mencius, Bk. 4, Pt. 2, Ch. 28.) Self examination has been very much emphasized in Chinese philosophy. Tseng-tzu, one of Confucius' disciples, once said that he daily examined himself on three points: faithfulness in working for others, sincerity to friends, and diligent in lessons. (Analects, Bk. 1.). Trained in this manner, it seems understandable that Chinese subjects are more intropunitive than westerners.

### 3. Test Results as Predictors of Overt Behavior

The fact that in this study, no difference has been found between the university students and the delinquents is worth noticing. People often expect that the delinquent group would be more expunitive as they tend to be aggressive toward their environment. On the other hand, they seem to have a weak super-ego with less guilt feelings; consequently less intropunitive. But the present study does not yield such a result. This brings up two questions: (1) How does the P-F Test reactions related to the overt behavior at corresponding situations? (2) Is there really any difference between delinquents and controls in their reactions to the P-F Test?

A personality test is always expected to be a predictor of related overt beha-

vior. This is what test validity means. The question whether the P-F Test is a satisfactory predictor to overt behavior has been studied by several researchers. A review of their studies seems to yield unfavorable conclusions.

Mehlman and Whiteman (1955) studied the relationship between three pictures of the P-F and their corresponding behavior situations. They found that the correlations were such as could be secured on a chance basis alone. Holzberg and others, (1951, 1952) after having found no recognizable patterns of reactions to frustrations in delinquents and criminal population, concluded that the P-F Test does not appear to be related to aggressions in overt behavior. Instead, the Test seems to be a measure of fantasied aggression. Winfield and Sparker (1953) made a study on those who attempted suicide and found that those subjects were not more intro-punitive than controls. This again is contrary to general belief.

Like those abovementioned scholars, the present author is also somewhat pessimistic in regard to the use of P-F Test as a predictor of overt behavior. In developing the P-F Test, Rosenwzeig felt that it could be used as a projective test and that a subject would identify himself with the frustrating figure in the cartoon. That is certainly possible, but cannot be guaranteed. There is also a chance that the subject may identify with the frustrator instead. Or the reaction is made as partly a result of reasoning instead of an unconscious process of projection. In the case of Rorschach or TAT, the subject usually does not know the significance of his responses nor the way that they are interpreted. Hence, he has no way to control his responses and the chance of faking is therefore limited. But the cartoons in the P-F Test are not so ambiguous as the inkblots and so the desirability of ones responses is not thoroughly covered. In other words, the factor of social desirability is not well controlled. The subjects than would have a tendency to react in such a way that is acceptable to himself according to the social standard. It would be natural for Chinese people to give more I's and less E's in test situations. In everyday life situation, things will be different as frustration often would arouse emotional reaction which require some way of relief; and aggression would be a quick outlet. Hence, one would expect more aggressive responses in actual life situations than in test situations.

In regard to the second question, most of the previous researchers have not found significant difference between delinquents and normal subjects (Iyon & Edgar, 1955; Norman & Kleinfeld, 1956). Fry (1949) even found that the prisoners less ext-punitive but more intro-punitive than College boys. Similar result has been also found in the present study. These should, perhaps, not be regarded as mere coincidence.

As we all know, most of the delinquent or criminal behavior conducts are not caused by ignorance concerning the undesirability of such behavior. The offenders in general have no difficulty to tell right from wrong. This is particularly true for inmates of an institution because of the rigid discipline by which they are

controlled. They may not accept willingly the moral and behavioral standard set by the authorities, but often they will try to impress the latter that they are "reformed" or well-behaved. In the P-F Test, they will give socially acceptable responses just as normal subjects or even do it in an exaggerate manner. Thus People do not find difference between the delinquent and normal subject and sometimes the difference is in reverse with what is expected. It is therefore thought that the P-F Test would not be a useful instrument for either prediction or diagnosis of delinquent behavior.

### SUMMARY

1. A revised form of Rosenzweig's P-F Test has been given to 320 Chinese university students. The general tendency of their responses are analysed according to the procedure suggested by Rosenzweig.

2. It is found that females subjects show greater tendency on intropunitiveness. Besides this, however, there is no sex difference concerning the responses to frustrating situations.

3. The male students do not differ from subjects in reformatory schools in either the direction of aggression or in the types of responses except that the normal group show greater ego-defensive tendencies.

4. The reactions of Chinese subjects are greatly different from the norms established by Rosenzweig and those published by Japanese scholars. Chinese subjects are far more intropunitive and significantly less extrapunitive when they are confronted with frustrating situations. It is suggested that such differences are due largely to cultural factors. Because of cultural differences in responses to P-F Test, norms for various cultural groups are necessary. However, the Test does not seem to be a very valid predictor of related overt behavior.

### REFERENCES

- (1) ALLPORT, CORDON W., BRUNER, J. S., and JANDORF, E. M.: "Personality Under Social Catastrophe: Ninty Life Histories of the Nazi Revolution" in Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, eds. *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture*, 2nd rev. ed., New York, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1953, pp. 436-455.
- (2) BERNARD, JACK: The Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study: 1. Norms, Reliability, and Statistical Evaluation. *J. Psychol.*, 1949, 28, 325-332.
- (3) DOLLARD, J., DOBB, L. W., MILLER, N. E., MOWRER, O. H. and SEARS, R. R.: *Frustration and Aggression*, New York, Yale University Press, 1939.
- (4) FRY, FRANKLYN D.: A Study of Reactions to Frustrations in 233 College Students and in 207 Inmates of State Prisons. *J. Psychol.*, 1949, 28, 427-438.
- (5) HOLZBERG, J. D. and HAHN, F.: The Picture-Frustration Technique as a Measure of Hostility and Guilt Reactions in Adolescent Psychopaths. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1952, 22, 776-795.
- (6) HOLZBERG, J. D. and POSNER, R.: The Relationships of Extrapunitiveness on the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study to Aggression in Overt Behavior and Fantasy. *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat.*, 1951, 21, 767-779.

- (7) KARLIN, LAWRENCE and SCHWARTZ, MILTON M.: Social and General Intelligence and Performance on the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1953, 17, 293-296.
- (8) LAGGE, JAMES: *The Chinese Classics*: 1. Confucian Analects, 2. The work of Mencius.
- (9) LYON, WILLIAM and VINACKE, W. EDGAR: Picture-Frustration Study Responses of Institutionalized and Non-institutionalized Boys in Hawaii. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1955, 41, 71-83.
- (10) MCGARY, J. L.: Picture-Frustration Study Normative Data for Some Cultural and Racial Groups. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1955, 18, 194-195.
- (11) MEHLMAN, BENJAMIN and WHITEMAN, STEPHEN LEE: The Relationship between Certain Pictures of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study and Corresponding Behavior Situations. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1955, 11, 15-19.
- (12) MILLER, N. E.: The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1941, 48, 337-342.
- (13) NORMAL, RALPH D. and KLEINFELD, CERALD J.: Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study Results with Minority Group Juvenile Delinquents. *J. Gen. Psychol.*, 1958, 32, 61-67.
- (14) ROSENZWEIG, S.: Need-Persistent and Ego-defensive Reactions to Frustration as Demonstrated by an Experiment on Repression. *Psycho., Rev.*, 48, 1941, 347-349.
- (15) ROSENZWEIG, S., FLEMING, E. E., and CLARKE, H. J.: Revised Scoring Manual for the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. *J. Psychol.*, 1947, 24, 165-208.
- (16) SUMITA, KATSUMI, KATSUZO HAYASHI, and TSUYOSHI ICHITANI: *Revised Manual of P-F Study (in Japanese)*, 1957.
- (17) WINFIELD, DON L. and SPARKER, P. J.: Preliminary Report of the Rosenzweig P-F Study in Attempted Suicides. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1953, 9, 379-383.

## 我國大學生對於挫折情境反應的分析

黃 堅 厚

### 摘 要

本研究係利用美國羅森茲維克氏 (S. Rosenzweig) 所編 Picture-Frustration Study (簡稱 P—F Test) 探討我國大學生對於挫折情境的反應情形。

羅氏認為挫折情境，每易引起攻擊性反應，且可分為三種情形一為「責人反應」(攻擊或譴責他人或外界事物)；一為「責己反應」(引咎於己或內愧之感)；一為「免責反應」(對所遇挫折採不加追究態度)。同時其反應的性質或為強調障礙之存在；或則重視自尊心之防衛；或則力求補救措施，藉可滿足本身需要。

本研究進行時，曾先將羅氏之 P—F Test 依照我國社會文化情況予以修訂，定名為「修訂逆境對話反應圖冊」其中包含卡通式圖畫二十八幅，(較羅氏原有測驗新增四幅，但新增者之分析未列本報告內)。受試者為我國大學生320人，其反應均依照羅氏設計之方式予以分析。

根據本研究所得結果，我國女性大學生所表現之責己反應較男性為多；惟除此之外，即無其他顯著的性別差異。

在將本研究之結果與羅氏所提供之美國常模及日本學者所製訂之日本常模相比較時：我國大學生所表現之「責己反應」顯較為多；而「責人反應」則遠較為低。此種差別，似係受文化因素之影響。蓋我國向崇「不怨天，不尤人」觀念，遇有挫折，恒主以「反求諸己」態度對之；如是對逆境乃多有順受之反應。

本研究中曾以同一測驗施之於省立桃園少年輔育院之學生及監所之受刑人，發現彼等之反應與男性大學生無顯著差異；惟一般大學生之自我防衛反應稍高而已。此與吾人所預料者不甚符合。根據此項結果，吾人似可推斷：羅氏之 P—F 測驗或不宜用作直接衡量外表行為之工具。