



AN INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS YOGIC MEDITATIONS ON RESPONSES TO FRUSTRATION AMONG WORKING FEMALE PROFESSIONALS

Dr. Mukesh Chaudhari

Associate Professor, Dept. of Physical Education
C. L. Jain College, Himayunpur, Firozabad, India.

ABSTRACT:

The primary target of present review was to analyze the impact of three strategies for relaxation in particular 1) Hatha Yoga-discontinuous fasting, 2) Aerobics and sauna shower and 3) General relaxation on dissatisfaction level among female professionals in the age gathering of 21 to a long time from various educational institutions of Maharashtra, India. An example of 80 female yoga and fitness devotees (28 in Hatha Yoga and irregular fasting bunch, 21 overall relaxation bunch and 31 in vigorous exercise and sauna shower bunch) in the age gathering of 21 to 27 years were being read up for quite some time. Responses to Frustration Scale (RFS) developed and normalized by Dr. B.M. Dixit and Dr. D.N. Srivastava (2004) was being executed. Descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation ANOVA was utilized with the assistance of SPSS 25 factual bundle. The discoveries uncovered that there was critical primary impact for the strategy/procedure of relaxation utilized on degree of disappointment. Various examination was being done further in which the Hatha Yoga/fasting bunch was found to have fundamentally lower level of dissatisfaction at $p>0.1$ on aggression, fixation, regression, resignation and in total score in comparison to general relaxation group gathering and vigorous exercise/sauna shower bunch. Further the heart stimulating exercise/sauna shower bunch was viewed as better compared to general unwinding bunch on degree of dissatisfaction ($p<.01$).



KEYWORDS: Reaction to frustration, hatha yoga, aerobics, general relaxation

INTRODUCTION

Emotional disturbances among the young in the current times may bring about numerous psychosomatic issues like nervousness, strains, dissatisfactions and enthusiastic unsettling influences in everyday life. Disappointment is the one of these significant responses to stresses and is a typical

however less talked about and concentrated on enthusiastic reaction. A few scientists have related this to outrage and dissatisfaction emerging from the apparent protection from the satisfaction of individual requirements, wants and assumptions. The more noteworthy the obstruction, the more the disappointment is probably going to be. Inside disappointment might emerge

from failure to accomplish individual objectives and wants, instinctual drives and needs, or managing apparent lacks, for example, a vocation objective, lock down because of some pandemic, powerlessness to play sports because of injury, et cetera. Outer reasons for disappointment include conditions outside a singular control, for example, stalling out up in a tight spot while going for a significant work or test

or some troublesome errand that is time bound and excessively overbearing. Individual contrasts have a significant influence in adapting to dissatisfaction contingent on one's genetic factors, level of schooling, culture and orientation to give some examples. A few people might take part in inactive forceful conduct, making it hard to distinguish the first cause(s) of their disappointment, as the reactions could be backhanded. Dissatisfaction has been characterized as the mental state which results from the hindering of an objective coordinated movement (Kisker, 1964) [3]. With the end goal of this review, we have embraced the accompanying assertion of disappointment. It is the sensation of being impeded in fulfilling a need or achieving an objective that the individual sees as critical. An illustration of blockage of persuasive energy would be the situation of a trooper who needs downtime to proceed to take care of his sickly relative yet is denied authorization by his/her boss. No doubt, the disappointed individual might turn to less versatile strategies for attempting to arrive at the objective. He/she may, for instance, assault the hindrance actually, loudly, or both. At the point when an individual's endeavoring are impeded either by snags that square advancement toward an ideal objective or by nonappearance of a suitable objective, disappointment happens. Frustrations are regularly especially hard for an individual to adapt to on the grounds that they can prompt low confidence, causing the person to feel that the person in question has bombed here and there or is awkward to deal with the undertaking or challenge.

The responses to disappointment and its sub scales as concentrated here are otherwise called Defense Mechanisms. These protection systems are purported as they attempt to guard people from the mental impacts of an impeded objective. At the point when a few workers get disappointed, they become strained and touchy. They experience an uncomfortable inclination in their stomach and furthermore may show different other resulting or equal responses of dissatisfaction. Following are the different sorts of responses to disappointment:

1. **Resignation:** otherwise called withdrawal. Practices like requesting to change the PhD administrator or leaving a place of employment.
2. **Fixation:** Attaching oneself in an un sensible or overstated manner to some individual or captured enthusiastic advancement during youth or juvenile level. In this the individual may hold his/her elderly folks for his/her concerns, without having a profound understanding.
3. **Aggression:** implies the expectation of hurting the others (living or non-living like reaching a stopping point or driving wildly. It is one of the most industrious and continuous reactions to dissatisfaction.
4. **Regression:** this is considered as a disturbing stage. For instance, acting in a juvenile and infantile way and creating self-centeredness (to feel frustrated about oneself).
5. **The primary objective** of the study was to compare the physically active groups amongst themselves for their reactions to frustration and its sub-scales.

PROCEDURE

The primary goal of present review was to look at the impact of three strategies for relaxation to be specific

- 1) Hatha Yoga-irregular fasting,
- 2) Aerobics and sauna shower and
- 3) General relaxation on disappointment level among female professionals in the age gathering of 21 to a long time from various instructive organizations of Maharashtra. An example of 80 female yoga and wellness fans (28 in Hatha Yoga and discontinuous fasting bunch, 21 overall relaxation bunch and 31 in vigorous exercise and sauna shower bunch) in the age gathering of 21 to 27 years were being read up for quite some time. Research question-Does the kind of action rely upon the responses to dissatisfaction?

Accordingly - "The primary target of study was to analyze the three gatherings (N=80).

- 1) Hatha yoga-fasting (45 minutes yoga class and time limited fasting-16:8) bunch (28),
- 2) Aerobics - sauna shower (30 minutes low to direct power and 15 minutes sauna shower) bunch (18),

3) General relaxation (rests in shavasana and 45 minutes directions to concentrate through and through) bunch (21),

Disappointment level was estimated utilizing RFS scale (pre-post) among female specialists from various educational institutions of Maharashtra. Online classes during CORONA lockdown were led. Directions for add-on meditations were additionally given on the web. Responses to Frustration Scale (RFS), built and normalized by Dr. B.M. Dixit and Dr. D.N. Srivastava (2004) [1] was being executed. This scale covers four responses specifically animosity, renunciation, obsession and relapse to satisfy the developing needs of the analysts occupied with the estimation of response to dissatisfaction. It comprises of 40 things out of which every response to disappointment has 10 things similarly separated into positive and negative things. The test things are given as basic explanations six elective reactions

Table 1: Shows item distribution in the various reactions to frustration.

Item distribution in RFS				
S. No	Reactions to Frustration	Si. No. of Positive Items	Si. No. of Negative Items	Total
1	Aggression (AGG)	1-5	21-25	10
2	Resignation (RES)	6-10	26-30	10
3	Fixation (FIX)	11-15	31-35	10
4	Regression (REG)	16-20	36-40	10=40

RELIABILITY

The test has sufficient degree of reliability. The reliability of the RFs was determined by two methods – test-retest method and method of internal consistency. The test-retest reliability of the test ranges from 0.62 to 0.82 and the internal consistency reliability ranges from 0.61 to 0.78. All these reliability coefficients use high and significant

VALIDITY

The scale was validated against NairashyaMapa by Chauhan (1972), Verbal Frustration Test by Muthayya (1976) and Situational Test of Frustration by Malviya (1977). The validity against different criteria ranged from 0.42 to 0.80. Obtained correlation coefficient was found significant, providing evidence for sufficient degree of validity coefficient.

Table 2: Norms for interpretation of frustration level response

Percentile	Agg	Res	Fix	Reg	Total	Interpretation
100	39	44	45	44	159	Very High Frustration
95	35	38	39	42	130	
90	32	32	35	39	121	
80	28	29	33	36	115	
75(Q3)	27	28	32	34	113	High Frustration
70	26	27	31	32	110	
60	24	26	29	31	107	
50 (Md)	23	24	27	30	104	Average Frustration
40	21	23	25	28	101	
30	20	21	23	26	96	Low Frustration
25(Q1)	19	20	22	23	94	Very Low Frustration
20	17	19	21	21	91	
10	14	15	16	19	84	
5	11	13	12	16	72	

HYPOTHESIS

- Is there a main effect for type of activity being practiced by the subjects? That is, do practitioners group differ significantly in their frustration level?
- If yes then and which group is better than the other and to what extent.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Graphic insights table-3 shows that the mean and standard deviation esteems for Hatha yoga and relaxation bunch on hostility variable was 18.82 ± 2.19 , for heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch on animosity variable it was 20.25 ± 1.18 , for general relaxation bunch on hostility variable it was 20.25 ± 2.08 . Mean and standard deviation esteems for Hatha yoga and relaxation bunch on obsession was 22.96 ± 2.00 , for vigorous exercise and relaxation bunch on obsession variable it was 25.22 ± 1.96 , for general relaxation bunch on obsession variable it was 27.04 ± 2.45 . Mean and standard deviation an incentive for Hatha yoga relaxation bunch on relapse variable was 25.57 ± 2.70 , for heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch on relapse variable it was 29.06 ± 2.74 , for general relaxation bunch on relapse variable mean and standard deviation esteems was 31.42 ± 3.12 . Mean and standard deviation an incentive for hatha yoga relaxation bunch on renunciation variable was 20.96 ± 2.04 . For high impact exercise and relaxation bunch on abdication esteem it was 22.83 ± 1.84 , for general relaxation bunch on renunciation variable mean and standard deviation esteem was 23.95 ± 2.26 . Mean and standard deviation worth of hatha yoga relaxation bunch on absolute degree of dissatisfaction was 88.32 ± 5.35 , for relaxation and heart stimulating exercise bunch on complete degree of disappointment variable mean and standard deviation esteem was 97.38 ± 6.25 . Mean and standard deviation for general relaxation bunch on complete degree of dissatisfaction variable was 103.38 ± 7.78 . These underlying measurements (introduced in table-3) recommend that the Hatha yoga and relaxation bunch was superior to the next two gatherings on every one of the factors of response to disappointment. Comparably the heart stimulating exercise with relaxation bunch was superior to the overall relaxation bunch on all the five response to disappointment factors.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics showing mean and standard deviation of type of activity & level of frustration sub factors

Reaction to Frustration variable	Type of Activity	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Aggression	Hatha Yoga rel	18.821	2.1951	28
	Aerobics &rel	20.258	1.1823	31
	General Rel	20.952	2.0850	21
	Total	19.937	2.0084	80
Fixation	Hatha Yoga rel	22.964	2.0089	28
	Aerobics &rel	25.225	1.9614	31
	General Rel	27.047	2.4591	21
	Total	24.912	2.6394	80
Regression	Hatha Yoga rel	25.571	2.7001	28
	Aerobics &rel	29.064	2.7439	31
	General Rel	31.428	3.1236	21
	Total	28.462	3.6420	80
Resignation	Hatha Yoga rel	20.964	2.0454	28
	Aerobics &rel	22.838	1.8456	31
	General Rel	23.952	2.2688	21
	Total	22.475	2.3383	80
Total Level of Frustration	Hatha Yoga rel	88.321	5.3545	28
	Aerobics &rel	97.387	6.2539	31
	General Rel	103.381	7.7812	21
	Total	95.787	8.7217	80

Table 4: Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power ^d
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	1.00	4355.674 ^b	4	74.00	0.00	0.996	1.00
	Wilks' Lambda	0.00	4355.674 ^b	4	74.00	0.00	0.996	1.00
	Hotelling's Trace	235.44	4355.674 ^b	4	74.00	0.00	0.996	1.00
	Roy's Largest Root	235.44	4355.674 ^b	4	74.00	0.00	0.996	1.00
Type of activity/relaxation method used	Pillai's Trace	0.49	6.059	8	150.00	0.00	0.244	1.00
	Wilks' Lambda (λ)	0.51	7.298 ^b	8	148.00	0.00	0.283	1.00
	Hotelling's Trace	0.94	8.571	8	146.00	0.00	0.320	1.00
	Roy's Largest Root	0.93	17.505 ^c	4	75.00	0.00	0.483	1.00
a. Design: Intercept + type of activity/relaxation method used								
b. Exact statistic								
c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.								
d. Computed using alpha = .05								

Table-4 presents four lines of data, each of which represents a calculation for multivariate significance (we are concerned only with the outcomes reported in the 'Type of activity/relaxation method used'; we ignore 'Intercept'). Wilks' Lambda (λ) was the best option here as we have three groups. That line of data is highlighted in yellow in table-4. We have a significant multivariate effect for the combined dependent variables of reaction to frustration in respect of the type of activity/relaxation method adopted: $\lambda = 0.51$, $F(8, 148) = 7.298$, $p < .001$).

Table-5 suggests that all the five dependent variables differed significantly in respect of the independent variable (Type of relaxation method used): Aggression: $F(2, 77) = 29.846$, $p = .000$; Fixation: $F(2, 77) = 102.526$, $p = .000$; regression: $F(2, 77) = 215.088$, $p = .000$; Resignation: $F(2, 77) = 56.92$, $p = .000$; Total level of frustration: $F(2, 77) = 1425.487$, $p = .000$.

Table 5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power ^f
Corrected Model	Aggression	59.692 ^a	2	29.846	8.873	0	0.187	0.967
	Fixation	205.051 ^b	2	102.526	22.86	0	0.373	1
	Regression	430.017 ^c	2	215.008	26.795	0	0.41	1
	Resignation	113.840 ^d	2	56.92	13.778	0	0.264	0.998
	Total Level of Frustration	2850.973 ^e	2	1425.487	34.752	0	0.474	1
Intercept	Aggression	31177.29	1	31177.29	9269.101	0	0.992	1
	Fixation	48971.75	1	48971.75	10919.29	0	0.993	1
	Regression	64080.04	1	64080.04	7985.75	0	0.99	1
	Resignation	39715.68	1	39715.68	9613.358	0	0.992	1
	Total Level of Frustration	723001.3	1	723001.3	17626.28	0	0.996	1
Type of activity/relaxation method used	Aggression	59.692	2	29.846	8.873	0	0.187	0.967
	Fixation	205.051	2	102.526	22.86	0	0.373	1
	Regression	430.017	2	215.008	26.795	0	0.41	1
	Resignation	113.84	2	56.92	13.778	0	0.264	0.998
	Total Level of Frustration	2850.973	2	1425.487	34.752	0	0.474	1
Error	Aggression	258.995	77	3.364				
	Fixation	345.336	77	4.485				
	Regression	617.871	77	8.024				
	Resignation	318.11	77	4.131				
	Total Level of Frustration	3158.414	77	41.018				
Total	Aggression	32119	80					
	Fixation	50201	80					
	Regression	65857	80					
	Resignation	40842	80					
	Total Level of Frustration	740029	80					
Corrected Total	Aggression	318.687	79					
	Fixation	550.388	79					
	Regression	1047.887	79					
	Resignation	431.95	79					
	Total Level of Frustration	6009.388	79					
a. R Squared = .187 (Adjusted R Squared = .166)								
b. R Squared = .373 (Adjusted R Squared = .356)								
c. R Squared = .410 (Adjusted R Squared = .395)								
d. R Squared = .264 (Adjusted R Squared = .244)								
e. R Squared = .474 (Adjusted R Squared = .461)								
f. Computed using alpha = .05								
Table 6: Post hoc Test showing Multiple Comparisons on method of Relaxation used								

Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variables			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Aggression	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	Aerobics & Relaxation	-1.4366*	0.478	0.01	-2.58	-0.29
		General Relaxation	-2.1310*	0.529	0	-3.4	-0.87
	Aerobics & Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	1.4366*	0.478	0.01	0.29	2.58
		General Relaxation	-0.6943	0.518	0.38	-1.93	0.54
	General Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	2.1310*	0.529	0	0.87	3.4
		Aerobics & Relaxation	0.6943	0.518	0.38	-0.54	1.93
Fixation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	Aerobics & Relaxation	-2.2615*	0.552	0	-3.58	-0.94
		General Relaxation	-4.0833*	0.611	0	-5.54	-2.62
	Aerobics & Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	2.2615*	0.552	0	0.94	3.58
		General Relaxation	-1.8218*	0.599	0.01	-3.25	-0.39
	General Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	4.0833*	0.611	0	2.62	5.54
		Aerobics & Relaxation	1.8218*	0.599	0.01	0.39	3.25
Regression	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	Aerobics & Relaxation	-3.4931*	0.739	0	-5.26	-1.73
		General Relaxation	-5.8571*	0.818	0	-7.81	-3.9
	Aerobics & Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	3.4931*	0.739	0	1.73	5.26
		General Relaxation	-2.3641*	0.801	0.01	-4.28	-0.45
	General Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	5.8571*	0.818	0	3.9	7.81
		Aerobics & Relaxation	2.3641*	0.801	0.01	0.45	4.28
Resignation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	Aerobics & Relaxation	-1.8744*	0.53	0	-3.14	-0.61
		General Relaxation	-2.9881*	0.587	0	-4.39	-1.59
	Aerobics & Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	1.8744*	0.53	0	0.61	3.14
		General Relaxation	-1.1137	0.574	0.13	-2.49	0.26
	General Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	2.9881*	0.587	0	1.59	4.39
		Aerobics & Relaxation	1.1137	0.574	0.13	-0.26	2.49
Total Level of Frustration	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	Aerobics & Relaxation	-9.0657*	1.67	0	-13.06	-5.08
		General Relaxation	-15.0595*	1.849	0	-19.48	-10.64
	Aerobics & Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	9.0657*	1.67	0	5.08	13.06
		General Relaxation	-5.9939*	1.81	0	-10.32	-1.67
	General Relaxation	Hatha Yoga Relaxation	15.0595*	1.849	0	10.64	19.48
		Aerobics & Relaxation	-5.9939*	1.81	0	-10.32	-1.67

		Aerobics & Relaxation	5.9939*	1.81	0	1.67	10.32
Based on observed means.							
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 41.018.							
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.							

Since we had three gatherings for our autonomous variable, post hoc test was being utilized to investigate the wellspring of the huge distinction. Table-6 presents the post hoc tests utilizing the Tukey HSD result.

- 1) Table-5 and 6 shows that on animosity variable, the Hath yoga relaxation bunch was having fundamentally less extreme response to dissatisfaction when contrasted with vigorous exercise and relaxation bunch ($p = .01$) and the overall relaxation bunch ($p = .00$). There was no critical distinction among high impact exercise and relaxation bunch versus general relaxation bunch ($p=0.38$) on animosity.
- 2) On obsession variable Hatha yoga relaxation bunch showed essentially less extreme response in examination with heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch ($p = .00$) and general relaxation bunch ($p = .00$). There was fundamentally lower obsession level among high impact exercise and relaxation bunch than general relaxation bunch ($p=0.01$).
- 3) On relapse variable Hatha yoga relaxation bunch showed essentially less extreme response than heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch ($p = .00$) and same concerning the overall relaxation bunch ($p = .00$). There was altogether lower relapse level among heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch than general relaxation bunch ($p=0.01$).
- 4) On renunciation variable Hatha yoga relaxation bunch showed essentially less serious response than heart stimulating exercise and relaxation bunch ($p = .00$) and lesser than general relaxation bunch ($p = .00$). There was no huge distinction on abdication level among high impact exercise and relaxation gathering and general relaxation bunch ($p=0.13$).
- 5) Total worth of level of dissatisfaction variable of Hatha yoga relaxation bunch was fundamentally not exactly the high impact exercise and relaxation bunch ($p = .00$) and furthermore essentially not exactly the overall relaxation bunch ($p = .00$). There was likewise huge lower all out dissatisfaction level among high impact exercise and relaxation bunch when contrasted with general relaxation bunch ($p=.00$).

Exceptionally restricted firmly related investigations were found upon writing audit. To cite two of the most reasonable ones, Parthasarathy S et al. (2014) [4] in their review on Effect of Integrated Yoga Module on Selected Psychological Variables among Women with Anxiety Problem observed that the chose yoga and asanas diminished nervousness and disappointment scores yet treatment with an incorporated yoga module brought about huge decrease of tension and dissatisfaction in ladies, and yoga as a coordinated module altogether further developed uneasiness scores in young ladies with demonstrated nervousness with no evil impacts.. Most examinations were of bad quality. For wretchedness results, hatha yoga didn't show a huge impact when contrasted with treatment to the surprise of no one, a general impact size of Cohen's $d - 0.64$ (95% CI = - 1.41, 0.13) or to all dynamic benchmark groups, Cohen's $d - 0.13$ (95% CI = - 0.49, 0.22). A sub-investigation showed that yoga significantly affected the decrease of gloom contrasted with psycho schooling control gatherings, Cohen's $d - 0.52$ (95% CI = - 0.96, - 0.08) however not to other dynamic benchmark groups, Cohen's $d 0.28$ (95% CI = - 0.07, 0.63) Regarding uneasiness, hatha yoga had no critical impact when contrasted with dynamic benchmark groups, Cohen's $d - 0.09$ (95% CI = - 0.47, 0.30). The I2 and Q-measurement uncovered heterogeneity among correlations. Subjective examinations recommend some guarantee of hatha yoga for ongoing populaces. The scientists further said that the capacity to make firm inferences is restricted by the outstanding heterogeneity and bad quality of the greater part of the included examinations. In view of this admonition, the consequences of the this meta-examination propose that hatha yoga doesn't have impacts on intense, persistent as well as therapy safe state of mind and tension issues contrasted with therapy to no one's surprise or dynamic benchmark groups. Notwithstanding,

when contrasted with psycho schooling, hatha yoga showed more decreases in gloom. The specialists said plainly more top notch examinations are expected to propel the field.

CONCLUSION

Main effect of type of method/technique being practiced on frustration level is highly significant means that the 3 groups differ in their frustration level. In summary, the multivariate analyses indicated that the Hatha yoga group differed significantly in respect of frustration level; those dependent variables were not too highly correlated. Subsequent univariate analyses showed that there were significant effects for type of relaxation method adopted on level of frustration and (separately) in respect of scores. Tukey post hoc analysis suggested that Hatha yoga group were significantly less frustrated than aerobics and general relaxation groups, and that aerobics group was significantly less frustrated than general relaxation group but the frustration response was not better than that of Hatha yoga group. Below is the graphical representation of scores of all the 3 groups (independent variables) on 5 levels of frustration

REFERENCES:

- 1) Dixit BM, Srivastava DN. Reactions to Frustration Scale. National Psychological Corporation, Agra 2004.
- 2) Freud S. New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis. New York, Norton, 1933.
- 3) Kisker GW. The disorganized personality. McGraw-Hill 1964.
- 4) Parthasarathy S, Jaiganesh K, Duraisamy. Effect of Integrated Yoga Module on Selected Psychological Variables among Women with Anxiety Problem. West Indian Med J 2014;63(1):78-80. doi:10.7727/wimj.2012.054
- 5) Stagner R. Psychology of Personality, (3rd Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill, 1961.
- 6) Vollbehre NK, Bartels-Velthuis AA, Nauta MH, *et al.* Hatha yoga for acute, chronic and/or treatment-resistant mood and anxiety disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis [published correction appears in PLoS One 2019;14(5):e0216631. PLoS One 2018;13(10):e0204925. Published 2018 Oct 1. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0204925