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The frustration-aggression hypothesis, otherwise known as the theory of frustration-aggression-movement, is the theory of aggression proposed by John Dollard, Harry Mead, Neal Miller, O. H. Murray and Robert Sears in 1939 and further developed by Dollard in 1941 and Leonard Berkowitz in 1969. The theory is based on the premise that aggression is the result of blocking or hindering a person's efforts to achieve a goal. According to the hypothesis, if frustration leads to aggressive behavior, then a person will express aggression when they are blocked or hindered in their efforts to achieve a goal. Berkowitz in 1969. The theory states that aggression is a result of frustration and that it is more likely to occur when frustration is severe. The hypothesis is used to explain the reasons why aggression is caused, but does not explain well the procedure of aggressive habits of events in theory introduced by Berkowitz is the hypothesis of aggressive signals, stating that for young children, the previous experience of events that cause frustration and behavior were used by the Yale team throughout the study. Their job and aggression signal to the hypothesis for explaining variation of aggressive behavior. Their theory applied not only to humans, but also to animals. The book created controversy on the subject, leading to more than seven articles criticizing the theory. Psychologists have researched and social psychology are also the articles that have published articles on the subject. Many social scientists have assumed that the norm was defined by the institution of aggression, as well as the way the concept of aggression is defined by itself. By 1941, a group at Yale University had changed its theory after numerous critics and studies published by other psychologists. From there, many pioneers in the world of social sciences modified and brought their knowledge to the original theory. In 1969, Berkowitz published the article The Hypothesis of Aggression and Aggression-Evoking and Reinforcement, which examined the inconsistency of empirical studies aimed at testing the hypothesis, as well as its critics. The attempt to change the hypothesis to those who would take into account the negative impact and individual characteristics. Most recently, Breyer and Elson published a comprehensive review of the Theory of Aggression. The authors noted that despite a large body of empirical studies that examined the link between frustration and aggression, there is a degree of number of studies that specifically relate to the hypothesis of frustration-aggression. Breyer and Elson suggest that there is a controversy in using the frustration-aggression hypothesis as a theoretical framework for the aggression of behavior and that this theory may have new applications for other fields such as medical psychology, reformulation and additions to the hypothesis in 1941. Until 1941, Yale University explained its original assertion that the emergence of aggressive behavior always implies the existence of frustration and, on the contrary, the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression. As it is, the second part of the hypothesis leads readers to believe that the consequence of aggression can only happen after aggression and, in this case, it does not allow the possibility that other variables may affect or override aggression. Thus, a team from Yale University concluded that undue disillusionment leads to a higher level of aggression than justified disappointment, which in turn can lead to aggression. In 1964, Leonard Berkowitz stated that in order for aggression to take place, it was necessary to have an incentive or assistance or verbal misdirection and reduced financial bonuses. The questions presented in the questionnaire were designed to test the hypothesis after numerous critics and studies have been published by other psychologists. Cohen considered social norms an important factor in whether aggression would follow frustration. In 1962, he published the results of this study, which involved 40 female students, which showed that people were less likely to exhibit aggression when social standards were emphasized. Moreover, it is based on what the Data and Sears study has previously argued, which is that the demonstration of aggression does not depend on the anticipation of punishment. Indeed, Cohen's work showed that people are less likely to show aggression towards another agent of frustration if the former is an agent of frustration. He also investigated his experiment's statement that aggression was more likely to lead to the potential for aggressive behavior than non-aggressive, and came to the same conclusion. The justification factor of the Theory of Frustration and Aggression has been studied since 1939 and amended. Dill and Anderson conducted a study examining whether hostility aggression is characterized by justified and unjustified conditions of frustration compared to a control condition that does not cause frustration. The purpose of the study was to observe aggression and make an organism's focus. The experimental procedure included the training phase and the testing phase. During the testing phase, the participant was paired with the Confederate and was shown how to fold a bird correctly. In a state of control without frustration, the experimenter apprised and slowed down. In an unappriised state of frustration, the experimenter showed his desire to leave as quickly as possible for personal reasons. In a justified state of frustration, the experimenter showed the need to leave the room. The results of this study indicated that aggression was more likely to occur when frustration was high. In addition, these results were replicated in further studies. In conclusion, the frustration-aggression hypothesis is a generally accepted theory in psychology that explains the relationship between frustration and aggression.
According to Dixon and Johnson, two factors are essential to explain the frustration-aggression theory: the individual characteristics and the situational factors. The individual characteristics include personal traits, past experiences, and cognitive appraisal. The situational factors include the nature of the frustrating stimulus, the availability of alternatives, and the perceived control over the situation.

The frustration-aggression theory suggests that when a person experiences frustration, they are more likely to react aggressively if they believe that they have control over the situation. If they believe that they have no control, they are more likely to withdraw or engage in more passive behaviors.

Some studies have found that the arousal level of a person also affects their aggression. For example, in a study by Berkowitz (1967), participants who were exposed to a frustrating stimulus were more likely to aggress than those who were not exposed to the stimulus.

The frustration-aggression theory has been applied to various situations, including workplace conflicts, academic competitions, and even sports. For example, in a study by Williams and Thill (2005), participants who were exposed to a frustrating stimulus were more likely to aggress in a computer game than those who were not exposed to the stimulus.

The frustration-aggression theory has also been applied to children's behavioral problems. For example, in a study by Siegrist et al. (2005), children who were exposed to a frustrating stimulus were more likely to aggress in a social context than those who were not exposed to the stimulus.

The frustration-aggression theory has been criticized for its simplicity and its lack of consideration for individual differences. However, it has also been found to be effective in predicting aggression in many situations.

In conclusion, the frustration-aggression theory provides a useful framework for understanding aggression in various situations. It helps us to understand the role of frustration and control in the development of aggression.
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