

A Study of Frustration Tolerance among Adolescents

AfeefaThaqib¹& Gunjan Dubey²

Abstract

The present study was conducted to find out difference in frustration tolerance among the adolescents in relation to gender, type of family and place of residence. The sample consists of 200 (100 male and 200 female) secondary school students of standard IX from different schools of Malappuram district of Kerala. A self-constructed Scale of frustration tolerance was used to collect data. The result showed that there is no significant difference in frustration tolerance of adolescents in relation to gender and place of residence however frustration tolerance of adolescents is significant in relation to type of family. i.e. adolescents of unitary family have high frustration tolerance as compared to their joint family counterparts.

Keywords: Frustration, Frustration Tolerance, Adolescence

I Introduction

Adolescence is the transition period from childhood to adulthood in which the individual undergoes changes both physically and psychologically. The word adolescence is derived from the Latin word 'adolescere' which means 'to grow' or 'to grow to maturity'. G Stanley Hall (1904) called adolescence as the period of stress and storm. One of the important characteristics of the adolescent period is 'heightened emotionality'. Heightened emotionality is a relative term which means more-than-normal emotionality for a given person. It is the comparison of how the person reacts at a particular time with how he normally or usually reacts. (Bronson. W. C, 1967)

One of the emotion that individual experience during the period of adolescence is frustration. Interference in acquiring one's own desires, goals, wishes are the main source of frustration among adolescents. Sharma (2006), Frustration is a mental condition which is resultant upon our failure to satisfy some motives or the other. Frustration is the feeling of dissatisfaction due to unfulfilled needs or motive or goal. Frustration increases as the strength, urgency or importance of the goal or need or motive increases. Commonly frustration is considered as a negative emotion but sometimes it acts as a motivating agent too.

¹Senior Research Fellow, Department of Education, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.

² Professor, Department of Education, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.

There are many occasions in everyone's life which are responsible for the arousal of frustration. In order to deal with frustration, one must have tolerance to frustration. According to Nugent, Pam M.S. (2013), "Frustration tolerance is the ability a person has to endure the tension and to preserve equanimity when met with obstacles". It is the feature of normal cognitive and affective development. Frustration tolerance plays an important role in the life of adolescents as they are students. If the adolescents are frustrated easily, it will affect their performance, motivation, learning and their overall education. The adolescents who have high frustration tolerance can't be frustrated easily as compared to those who have low frustration tolerance. Adolescents who have low frustration tolerance find difficulty in adjusting to a new and competitive environment.

Mohammed Ajmal (2009) conducted a study to measure the level of frustration among secondary school students in relation to certain demographic variables such as educational stream and sex. The sample consists of 100 students of class X of the city high school (boys) and Girls high school (girls) of AMU. Simple random sampling was used and their age ranges from 15-18 years. Tools used for collection of data is NairashyaMaapa (Frustration Test) by Dr. N.S. Chauhan and Tiwari (1972) and data was analysed using t-test. Study shows that girls are less frustrated than boys.

Pasricha, A (2014) conducted a study to find out the level of frustration among adolescent girls and boys using a sample of 200 higher and senior secondary school students of age group below 13 and above 15 years. For this a frustration test developed by N. S Chauhan and D. Govind Tiwari was used and the data was analysed using t-test. The result of the study shows that there is no significant difference in frustration between adolescent male and female.

Sadhu, H (2014) conducted a study of frustration among the students of higher secondary schools w.r.t their gender. Stratified random sampling was used. Sample consists of 382 students (211 boys and 171 girls). Frustration inventory made by the investigator was used for the collection of data and the data was analysed using t-test. The result shows that gender does not create effect on frustration.

Yadav, P (2017) examined the level of frustration tolerance among girls and boys of senior secondary school students. Sample consists of 100 senior secondary students (50 boys and 50 girls) from Rewari district. The study reveals that 45% of senior secondary students have

high frustration tolerance and out of that girls have high frustration tolerance as compared to boys.

The critical analysis of the reviews in the area of frustration tolerance reveals that no such studies was done which compared adolescence regarding place of residence and type of family among the secondary school students in the state of Kerala. So, the present study was undertaken by the researcher.

II Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study were

1. To study the frustration tolerance among the adolescence.
2. To study the frustration tolerance among the adolescence with respect to
 - (i) Gender
 - (ii) Place of residence
 - (iii) Type of family

III Hypotheses of the Study

Based on the objectives following null hypotheses were framed

Ho_{2.1} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to gender.

Ho_{2.2} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to place of residence.

Ho_{2.3} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to type of family.

IV Methodology

i Population

The population consisted of all the secondary students enrolled in schools in Malappuram district of Kerala during the session 2017- 2018

ii Sample

Sample consisted of 200 (100 male and 100 female) secondary school students studying in class IX from different schools of Malappuram district of Kerala. Descriptive survey was used to conduct the study.

iii Tools used for the present study

A self-constructed tool of frustration tolerance was used for data collection. The tool consists of 40 items under five dimensions – Frustration Management Skills, Reactions to Frustration, Frustration Dodging, Resilience to Frustration and Self-Control. The reliability of the tool was established by Cronbach Alpha which was found to be .807 and content validity was established.

V Data Analysis and Interpretation

Objective 1: The first objective of the study was related with the study of level of frustration tolerance among adolescence. In order to achieve this raw score obtained by the adolescents over frustration tolerance scale were calculated and results were shown in table 1.

Table 1: Level of Frustration Tolerance among Adolescents.

Score	Interpretation	No. of Students	Percentage of Students
156 and above	Extreme Frustration Tolerance	29	14.5%
155-144	Moderate Frustration Tolerance	60	30%
143-132	Moderate Frustration Intolerance	59	29.5%
131 and below	Extreme Frustration Intolerance	52	26%

Interpretation: The table shows that out of 400 adolescents 14.5% have extreme frustration tolerance, 30% have moderate frustration tolerance, 29.5% have moderate frustration intolerance and 26% have low frustration intolerance. The study shows that most of the students are tolerable to frustration.

Objective 2: The objective 2 of the study was to study frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to gender, place of residence and type of family. In order to test this objective following null hypotheses were framed.

Ho_{2,1} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to gender.

Ho_{2,2} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to place of residence.

Ho_{2,3} There exists no difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to type of family

Table 2: t-test comparison of Frustration Tolerance of Adolescents in relation to gender, place of residence and type of family.

Variable	Category	N	Mean	S. D	DF	Calculated t-value
Gender	Male	100	145.69	14.463	198	0.402 ^{NS}
	Female	100	146.52	14.711		
Place of Residence	Rural	144	147.19	13.710	198	1.705 ^{NS}
	Urban	56	143.30	16.335		
Type of Family	Joint	66	140.76	12.750	198	3.765*
	Unitary	134	148.74	14.711		

*Significant at 0.01 level^{NS}Insignificant

Frustration tolerance among adolescence in relation to gender

The mean scores of frustration tolerance among male and female adolescents are 145.69 and 146.52 and S. D are 14.463 and 14.711 respectively. The table value (0.402) is less than the tabulated t-value (1.97 and 2.60 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively) which shows that there is no significant difference in frustration tolerance among adolescent male and female students. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. But the mean value of frustration tolerance shows that the female students have more frustration tolerance than their male counterparts.

Frustration tolerance among adolescence in relation to place of residence

The mean scores of frustration tolerance among rural and urban adolescents are 147.19 and 143.30 and S. D are 13.710 and 16.335 respectively. The calculated t-value (1.705) is less than the table value (1.97 and 2.60 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively) which shows that there is no significant difference in the frustration tolerance among rural and urban adolescent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. But the mean value of frustration tolerance shows that rural have more frustration tolerance than their urban counter parts.

Frustration tolerance among adolescence in relation to type of family

The mean value of frustration tolerance among adolescents of joint and unitary family were 140.76 and 148.74 and their S. D were 12.750 and 14.711 respectively. The calculated t-value (3.766) is greater than the table value (1.97 and 2.60 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively) which shows that there exists a significant difference in the frustration tolerance among adolescents of joint and unitary family and therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The mean value of frustration tolerance shows that the adolescents of unitary family have high frustration tolerance than the adolescents of joint family.

VI Results and Discussion

The ultimate aim of the education is to develop healthy and wholesome personality of the students. Family, School and Society plays an important role in developing frustration tolerance among the adolescents. The present study shows there is no significant difference in frustration of adolescents in relation to their gender. The result similar to the studies conducted by Varghese. N (2010), Kumari, A and Gupta, S (2015) and Priti (2017) which shows that there is no significant difference in frustration tolerance of boys and girls but the girls have high frustration tolerance as compared to their male counterparts. The present study shows that the adolescents of unitary family are more tolerable to frustration than the adolescents of joint family. It may be because of the fact that the unitary family provide more stable environment for the adolescents to grow as the parents provide individual attention, care and love to them. In joint family, there are so many members to the individual when they face problems. So, the individuals in the joint family are incapable of developing frustration tolerance. During the adolescence, the individual faces a number of emotional problems. In the case of joint family, there are a number of members with different opinion which may lead the individual's emotional state more unstable.

VII Educational Implications

The study is conducted to understand the level of frustration tolerance among adolescents and its variation among the adolescents in relation to their gender, place of residence and type of family. The study shows that the students have the ability to tolerate their frustration and there is no significant difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to gender and place of residence, but there is a significant difference in frustration tolerance among adolescents in relation to type of family. Adolescents of unitary family are more tolerable to frustration than the adolescents of unitary family. Family are the primary agents of socialisation. Being the agent of socialisation, family plays an important role in developing personality among their members. So, the parents should be aware of methods and factors for developing impressive and tolerable personality among their members. For this schools can play an important role. Schools should organize counselling programmes for parents and students to make them aware about the mental and physical states of adolescents. The study shows that adolescents of joint family are less tolerable to frustration than that of the unitary

family, it may be due to the presence of too much support from the part of family members or due to different styles adopted by different members of the family. The educational programmes should focus on the affective domains of the students. The curriculum should be planned according to the needs of the students. teachers can play an important role in developing frustration tolerance among their students and the teachers should pay more attention to it.

VIII References

1. Ajmal, M. (2009). A study of effects of social adjustment and frustration over academic achievement of secondary students. M.Ed dissertation, Department of Education, AMU, Aligarh.
2. Atkinson, C. R., Atkinson, L. R., & Hilgard, R. E. (1953). Introduction to Psychology. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.
3. Bronson, W. C. (1967). Adult derivatives of emotional expressiveness and reactivity control: Development continues from childhood to adulthood. *Child Development*.
4. Hall, G. S. (1904). Adolescence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
5. Hurlock, E. B (1978). Adolescent Development. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
6. Kumari, A., & Gupta, S. (2015). A study of emotional intelligence and frustration tolerance among adolescent. *Adv. Res. J. Soc. Sci*, 6(2), 173–180. <https://doi.org/10.15740/HAS/ARJSS/6.2/173-180>
7. Kuppuswamy, B. (1991). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers (P) Ltd.
8. Nugent, Pam M.S., (May 11, 2013). "FrustrationTolerance," in PsychologyDictionary.org. Retrieved from <https://psychologydictionary.org/frustration-tolerance/>, on May 8, 2018.
9. Pasricha, A. (2014). A Comparative Study of Frustration among Adolescent Boys and Girls in relation to their Cognitive Attributes: *IRJMSH*, 5(2), 112-121. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6125421/A_Comparative_Study_of_Frustration_Among_Adolescents_Boys_And_Girls_In_Relation_To_Their_Certain_Cognitive_Attributes_on_09/05/2018.

10. Priti. (2017). A study of relationship between emotional stability & frustration tolerance of senior secondary school students. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Social Science and Humanities*, 1(1), 13-18. Retrieved from <http://ijirssh.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/3.-Priti.pdf> on 11/05/2018.
11. Sharma, N. R., & Sharma, R (2016). *Experimental Psychology*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.
12. Varghese, N. (2010). Frustration Tolerance among secondary school students of Kerala. M.Ed dissertation, Department of Education, University of Calicut, Calicut.
13. Yadav, P. (2017). Study of Frustration Tolerance among Senior Secondary School Students. *International Journal of Research Culture Society*, 1(7), 243-246. Retrieved from <http://ijrcs.rcsjournals.org/wp-content/uploads/201709049.pdf> on 08/05/2018.