

Analysing the Influence of Deprivation on Basic Human Needs, Adjustment Strategies, and Reactions to Frustration: A qualitative assessment with literature review

Chandani Kumari^{1*}, Dr. Niranjana Prasad Yadav²

¹ Research Scholar, University Department of Psychology, TMBU, Bhagalpur – 812007

² Associate Professor, University Department of Psychology, TMBU, Bhagalpur

Abstract - India is a country with significant economic, social, and cultural differences. Some people benefit from their ancestry, social rank, financial stability, and geographic location, whilst others suffer from a number of disadvantages. As a consequence, males suffer from major psychological impacts as a result of deprivation, which psychiatrists are clearly worried about. Psychologists may help create intervention approaches for its resolution by examining the psychological concomitants and repercussions. Psychologists, on the other hand, have showed little interest in researching this element of deprivation, preferring to concentrate on the consequences of other forms of deprivation on animals and humans, including as sensory deprivation, parental deprivation, and physiological need deprivation (food, water, and sex deprivation).

In this paper, qualitative assessments are made through literatures review and studies conducted in earlier phases to understand the influence of deprivation on Basic Human Needs, Adjustment Strategies, And Reactions to Frustration. At the last section of the paper it is found that there is a significant difference in cognitive capacities, IQ, personality, motives, and ambitions between impoverished and non-deprived people. These inequities existed in both civilizations.

Keywords - Economic situation, Human Needs, and social inequalities.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Our physical environments, economic situations, and social relationships all contribute to the formation of our personalities. Some members of society have the good fortune to have their essential physical and psychological needs addressed, whereas other members of society do not. Some people in society are considered lucky. As a direct consequence of this, the concept of environmental deprivation comes into being. In terms of economics, society, and culture, there is a large gap between the rich and the poor in India. Some people have advantages because of their ancestors, their social standing, their financial stability, and where they live, whereas other people have disadvantages for a number of reasons. Ancestors are one factor that may provide people benefits. As a consequence of this, deprivation has major psychological implications for males, which is clearly something that psychiatrists are worried about. By analysing the psychological causes and repercussions of the problem, psychologists may be able to contribute to the creation of intervention strategies that are aimed at its resolution. However, psychologists

have generally shown little interest in studying this aspect of deprivation. Instead, they prefer to focus on the effects of other types of deprivation on animals and humans, such as sensory deprivation, maternal deprivation, and physiological need deprivation. Examples of these types of deprivation include: (food, water, and sex deprivation). However, since the beginning of the seventh decade of the twentieth century, psychologists have taken an interest in the field of socioeconomic and cultural deprivations, and there has been a significant rise in the amount of psychological research conducted on poor and culturally deprived populations all over the world. On the one hand, a growing awareness of the urgent need to improve the lives of the poor led to the development of these research projects. On the other hand, a growing interest among social scientists in understanding the impact of the derivational environment on behavioural and social processes led to the development of these research projects. The development of social psychology became an important subfield of psychology served as a driving force behind the rise in interest in the field. It is necessary to study human behaviour in the

context of the whole socioeconomic environment, taking into consideration the dynamic interaction of a great number of socio-psychological factors. Another factor that contributed to the growth of interest in the study of deprivation was the realisation of the political significance of underdeveloped and underprivileged countries. As long as people are separated into affluent and underprivileged sections around the world, there will be no sustainable peace. The psychological state of the people in the poor countries is bound to generate tension, conflict, and finally war. Psychologists have been driven to explore the human cost of deprivation as a consequence of the unrest and discontentment that has arisen among deprived segments of populations in both developing countries and societies that are already prosperous. Because a significant portion of the population in developing countries like India is underprivileged and suffers from social and cultural deprivations, the study of the psychological repercussions of deprivation has to be given a special attention in these countries.

In this paper, we tried to understand the factors which are responsible for deprivation on basic human needs, adjustment strategies, and reactions to frustration in our country.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To assess the extent to which deprivation is related with basic human needs, strategies of adjustment and reactions to frustration.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Studies conducted in Western countries and Indian communities demonstrate striking variations in the cognitive capacities, IQ, personality, motives, and ambitions of deprived and non-deprived groups respectively. These disparities were found in both societies. According to Scarr, Caparulo, Fredman, Tower, and Coplan's (1983) findings, children from economically disadvantaged minority groups in both the United States and Europe, the majority of whom are people of colour, obtained lower scores and performed less well in school than the average child from the majority group in that country. This was found to be the case in both countries. Haywood (1967) found that social and economic deprivation had a negative impact on the development of intellectual and other cognitive capacities in those who were exposed to it. It has been shown that living in poverty for an extended period of time leads to a continuous fall in IQ (Jordan, 1963). Children who were raised in families with low incomes had a higher risk of having their cognitive development lag behind that of children who were raised in families with middle or high incomes, according to the findings of a number of studies that were carried out over the course of several decades (McWayne, 2004). Students from lower social classes and higher social classes were given an intelligence test, and when their results were compared, it was found that participants from lower socioeconomic status (SES) scored less well than individuals from

higher SES (Croizet & Dutrevis, 2004). The circumstances of physical and cultural deprivation imposed by poverty are sufficient to explain the social class difference in cognitive function, according to research investigations that brought out this fact. There is a correlation between poverty and a lack of proper nourishment, health care, suitable living circumstances, and educational opportunities. The cumulative effect of these elements has an effect on the children's scores on IQ tests (Hetherington & Parkey, 1986). It has been shown in a few studies carried out in India that people who come from lower social classes and live in rural regions have a lower level of intellect when compared to those who come from higher social classes and live in urban areas. In addition, Mathur, Mehtani, and Mathur (2008) discovered that subjects of both sexes who came from middle income groups performed better on the general mental ability test (GMAT) and demonstrated significant differences with regard to analogy, classification, number series, reasoning problems, and absurdities. Deprivation has been shown to have a deleterious impact on cognitive differentiation, as reported by Tauvab and Tarannum (1998). In an earlier study, Majeed and Ghosh (1983) investigated the effect of ethnicity, social class, and residential background on cognitive differentiation. They came to the conclusion that social class had a strong independent effect on cognitive differentiation, whereas residential background worked in conjunction with the effect of social position to moderate the effect of environmental deprivation. There have been a number of research conducted in other countries that investigated the link between socioeconomic status and personality characteristics. Dohrenwand and Dohrenwand (1965) analysed 22 studies that looked at the mental illnesses of adults and found that in 18 of those studies, a greater frequency of mental disorder was observed in low-income groups. This finding was based on the fact that the researchers assessed 22 different studies. According to the findings of Langer, Herson, Green, Jameson, and Coff (1970), a kid who comes from a family with a low socioeconomic position has more than double the likelihood of having psychological impairments as children from families with higher socioeconomic rank. The authors of the 1963 study, Langer and Michael, observed a correlation between socioeconomic position and mental health. People from lower social classes reported higher levels of feelings of futility and alienation compared to those from higher social classes and those in the middle class. Mohanty (1980) observed that adolescents who were socially deprived were more nervous and worse adjusted in the areas of family life, health, social relationships, and emotional well-being. It has also been shown in a number of research that are more recent that having a low socioeconomic position is connected with having poor mental health (Ardington & Case, 2010; Hudson, 2005; Sontakke, 2013).

Moreover, studies have shown that variations in aggression or antagonism are associated with

socioeconomic status. Youngsters from lower socioeconomic classes tend to exhibit more aggressive behaviour than children from higher socioeconomic classes. Sigel (1965) has produced evidence that children from families with lower socioeconomic status are more aggressive than children from families with higher socioeconomic status at all grade levels. Verma (1980) used TAT cards to conduct research on schoolchildren ranging in age from 6 to 9 years and discovered that children from poor socioeconomic status were more likely to engage in aggressive behaviour. According to the findings of earlier research, people in the middle class are more likely to direct their hatred inwards than those in the lower classes, who are more likely to display their hostility via overt acts of violence. In a subsequent research, Pramanick (1996) also found that adolescents from lower class homes had higher levels of animosity compared to those from middle class and upper class families. One might draw the conclusion from these findings that the stress of daily living contributes to an increase in aggressive behaviour among children from lower-income families. In addition, the ways in which children are taught to respond to aggressive behaviour contribute to the formation of class inequalities in aggressive behaviour. It is a common observation that families from the middle class are better at preventing their children from acting aggressively, while families from lower classes exert less control over how their children express their anger and aggressiveness.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is qualitative and descriptive in nature. Various review of literature are done to conclude the final results of decided objectives. Literatures are downloaded from reputed journals and indexed in web science or Scopus. Further with the help of literature survey factors of indicators will be explained to understand the key reasons of the depriving social position of the Indian families.

ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE AND STUDIES

From the literature review, here the precise constructs are carved out and explained in simple and shorten way. As per the literature, Studies in Western nations and Indian communities show substantial differences in poor and non-deprived populations' cognitive abilities, IQ, personality, motivations, and goals. Both civilizations had these inequalities. Scarr, Caparulo, Fredman, Tower, and Coplan (1983) found that economically disadvantaged minority children in the U.S. and Europe, most of whom are persons of colour, did worse in school than the typical kid from the majority group. Both nations agree. Haywood (1967) discovered that social and economic hardship hurt intellectual and cognitive development. Long-term poverty causes a steady decline in IQ (Jordan, 1963). Low-income children have a greater chance of cognitive development lagging behind middle- or high-income children, according to decades of research

(McWayne, 2004). Worse socioeconomic level (SES) students scored lower on an IQ test than higher SES students (Croizet & Dutrevis, 2004). According to study, poverty's physical and cultural deprivation explains the social class disparity in cognitive performance. Poverty is linked to poor nutrition, health care, housing, and education. The sum of these components affects children's IQ scores (Hetherington & Parkey, 1986). Studies in India have indicated that persons from lower social levels and rural locations had less intelligence than those from higher social classes and metropolitan areas. Mathur, Mehtani, and Mathur (2008) found that middle-income participants of both sexes fared better on the GMAT and showed significant differences in analogies, categorization, number series, reasoning difficulties, and absurdities. Tauvab and Tarannum found that deprivation hinders cognitive differentiation (1998). Majeed and Ghosh (1983) previously examined the effects of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and residence on cognitive difference. Social class exhibited a large independent influence on cognitive differentiation, but residential context functioned along with social status to reduce the effect of environmental deprivation. Other nations have studied the relationship between socioeconomic position and personality. Among 18 of 22 investigations on adult mental disease, Dohrenwand and Dohrenwand (1965) reported a higher prevalence of mental disorder in low-income groups. This conclusion was based on 22 investigations. Langer, Herson, Green, Jameson, and Coff (1970) found that children from low-income homes are more likely to have psychological deficits. Langer and Michael (1963) found a link between socioeconomic status and mental health. Those from lower social groups expressed greater degrees of futility and alienation than those from upper and medium social strata. Mohanty (1980) found that socially isolated adolescents were more tense and had worse familial, health, social, and emotional adjustment. Several recent studies have linked low socioeconomic status to poor mental health (Ardington & Case, 2010; Hudson, 2005; Sontakke, 2013). Moreover, research link variances in aggressiveness to socioeconomic class. Aggressive behaviour is more common in youngsters from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Sigel (1965) found that children from lower socioeconomic homes are more aggressive than children from better socioeconomic families at all grade levels. Verma (1980) utilised TAT cards to study 6 to 9-year-old students and found that disadvantaged children were more violent. According to previous studies, middle-class individuals are more inclined to harbour resentment than lower-class people, who are more likely to express their antipathy via violence. Pramanick (1996) observed that lower-class adolescents exhibited greater levels of antagonism than middle- and upper-class adolescents. These data suggest that everyday stress increases violent behaviour in low-income youngsters. The way youngsters are trained to react to aggression also contributes to

class differences in violent behaviour. Middle-class households are better at stopping their children from behaving aggressively than lower-class ones.

Lower-class adolescents were more antagonistic than middle- and upper-class adolescents.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

- 1- There is a substantial difference in poor and non-deprived populations' cognitive abilities, IQ, personality, motivations, and goals. Both civilizations had these inequalities.
- 2- Economically disadvantaged minority children in the U.S. and Europe, most of whom are persons of colour, did worse in school than the typical kid from the majority group.
- 3- Low-income children have a greater chance of cognitive development lagging behind middle- or high-income children, according to decades of research.
- 4- Poverty's physical and cultural deprivation explains the social class disparity in cognitive performance. Poverty is linked to poor nutrition, health care, housing, and education. The sum of these components affects children's IQ scores
- 5- Persons from lower social levels and rural locations had less intelligence than those from higher social classes and metropolitan areas.
- 6- There is a higher prevalence of mental disorder in low-income groups.
- 7- Middle-class individuals are more inclined to harbour resentment than lower-class people, who are more likely to express their antipathy via violence.
- 8- Lower-class adolescents exhibited greater levels of antagonism than middle- and upper-class adolescents.

CONCLUSION

There is a significant difference in cognitive capacities, IQ, personality, motives, and ambitions between impoverished and non-deprived people. These inequities existed in both civilizations. Economically disadvantaged minority children in the United States and Europe, the majority of whom are people of colour, performed worse in school than the average child from the majority group. According to decades of studies, low-income children are more likely to fall behind middle- or high-income children in cognitive development. The physical and cultural deprivation caused by poverty explains the social class discrepancy in cognitive function. Poverty is associated with inadequate nutrition, health care, housing, and education. The total of these factors influences children's IQ scores. People from lower social groups and rural places exhibited lesser IQ than those from higher social classes and urban areas. Low-income populations have a greater frequency of mental disorders. Middle-class people are more prone to harbour anger than lower-class people, who are more likely to vent their displeasure via violence.

REFERENCES

1. Ardington, C. & Case, A. (2010). African national income dynamic study. *Journal of Studies in Economics and Econometrics*, **24**, 3.
2. Croizet, J. C. & Dutrevis, M. (2004). Socio – economic status and intelligence: Why test scores do not equal merit? *Journal of Poverty*, **8**, 91 – 107.
3. Dohrewand, B. P. & Dohrewand, B. S. (1965). The problem of validity in field studies of psychological disorder. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, **1**, 585 – 610.
4. Goebal, B. L. & Brown, D. R. (1981). Age differences in motivation related to Maslow's need hierarchy. *Developmental Psychology*, **17**, 809 – 815.
5. Haywood, H. C. (1967). Experiential factors in intellectual development: The concept of dynamic intelligence. In J. Jubin and G. Jervis (Eds.), *Psychology of mental development*. New York: Crune.
6. Hetherington, E. M. & Parkey, R. D. (1986). *Child psychology (3rd ed.)*. United Kingdom: McGraw Hill International.
7. Hudson, C. G. (2005). Socio – economic status and mental illness: Tests of social causation and selection hypothesis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, **75**, 3 – 18.
8. Jordon, A. M. (1963). Parental occupations and children's intelligence scores. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **17**, 103 – 107.
9. Langer, T. S., Herson, J. H., Green, E. L., Jameson, J. D. & Coff, J. A. (1970). Children of the city: Affluence, poverty and mental health. In V. L. Allen (Ed.) *Psychological factors in poverty*. New York: Academic Press.
10. Langmeier, J. & Matejeck, Z. (1975). *Psychological deprivation in children*. New York: Holsted.
11. Majeed, A. & Ghosh, E. S. (1983). Effects of ethnicity, social class and residential background on cognitive differentiation. *Psychological Studies*, **28**, 13 – 17.
12. Maslow's, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
13. Mathur, Meena, Mehtani, Rajnish, R. & Mathur, Monika (2008). Impact of gender, age and social class on mental ability performances of children in 7 – 11 years. *Behavioural Scientist*, **9**, 47 – 53.
14. McWayne, C. (2004). A multivariate examination of parent involvement and the social and academic competencies of urban kindergarten children. *Psychology in the Schools*, **41**, 363 – 375.
15. Mohanty, B. (1980). The effect of socio – cultural deprivation on some psychological

- characteristics, *Psychological Studies*, 25, 113 – 117.
16. Ojha, H. (2005). Taken form “**Psychological manifestations of ageing and deprivation**” (UGC Research Project). T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
 17. Pareek, U. (1982). **Role picks (O)**. Ahmadabad: Navin Publication.
 18. Pramanick, Meena (1996). Socio-economic status and personality. *Psychological Studies*, 41, 77-79.
 19. Scarr, S., Caprulo, B. K., Fredman, B. M., Tower, R. B. & Caplain, J. (1983). Developmental status and school achievement of minority and non minority children from birth to 18 years in British Midlands town. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 1, 31 – 48.
 20. Sigel, R. S. (1965). An exploration into some aspects of political socialization: School children’s reactions to the death of president. In W. Wolfenstein and G. Kliman (Eds.), **Children and the death of president**. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
 21. Singh, L.B. (1991). **A strategy of adjustment questionnaire**. Unpublished Manuscript, Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
 22. Sinha, D. & Malviya, S. (1968). **Reactions to Frustration Scale**. Department of Psychology, Allahabad University, Allahabad.
 23. Sontakke, Jayshree (2013). Gender and socio – economic status differences in mental health. *Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education*, 44, 88-90.
 24. Tauvab, Md. & Tarannum, Rijwan (1998). Effects of deprivation on cognitive differentiation. *Indian Journal of Psychological Issues*, 6, 52 – 64.
 25. Verma, M. (1980). Socio – economic factors and development of aggression in children. *Social Change*, 9, 13 – 17.

Corresponding Author

Chandani Kumari*

Research Scholar, University Department of Psychology, TMBU, Bhagalpur – 812007