

**To Study Frustration Tolerance in Hearing Impaired and  
Non-Hearing Impaired people**

**Ms. Bosky Jadav\* Research Officer for Student Life,  
College of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences, Fiji National University, Suva, Fiji.**

**ABSTRACT**

**Topic:** To study frustration tolerance in Hearing Impaired and Non-Hearing Impaired people.

**Objectives:** The objectives of the present study were as follows:

To find the frustration tolerance level through the Frustration Tolerance Level.

To compare the scores on frustration tolerance between hearing impaired and Non Hearing impaired people.

**Sample:** The sample comprises of Vadodara based N=60 young adults (age- 15-30 years male/female) Hearing and Non-Hearing impaired people. They were individually matched. Both the groups were tested on Frustration tolerance test by Dr.Rai, (1988).

**Result & Conclusion:** The t-test result of time (0.570) errors (0.210) is suggestive of no significant difference between the time taken and the number of attempts made by Hearing Impaired and Non-Hearing Impaired.

## INTRODUCTION

Hearing is vital to every aspect of our daily existence. From the environment of birth, children learn a great deal by using their hearing but most children with hearing impairment, however are not able to participate in this process. They may acquire a good deal of information about the world but miss out on many early and critical opportunities for developing basic communication skills.

The impact of hearing loss on the individual is one of the great areas in human behavior that science has scarcely more than probed gingerly here and there. The overwhelming proportion of research in hearing has centered in its medical and physiological ramifications with heavy emphasis on cause of impairment, prevention, cure, alleviation, and the nature of hearing. Levine (1960).

The very important matter of how man adjusts to such major sensory deprivation has been investigated by only a handful of earnest searchers. Though in recent years it has been an area of interest and attention, psychologists, counselors, teachers, audiologists, medical workers, in fact all diagnosticians and planners finds too many behavior problems of the HI. Levine (1960)

Due to hearing impairment the child becomes unable to hear, speak and acquire language. Communication barriers present problems and make them feel frustrated. In the school setting towards achievement, expectations of HI students are far below that of their potential. This puts young HI individuals at a major disadvantage in competition for professional, higher paying jobs since they are not given equal opportunities. (Kochkin et al 2007) have found that HI children had issues in a number of areas like social interaction, language, communication and education. Another important aspect of the problems of the HI for which the psychologists must be prepared concerns social maturity and its related adjustments and a healthy psychic structure that provides wholesome, well balanced motivation. Polat (2002).

Role of motivation is the most important and underlying all aspiration is the fundamental human need for achievement. To fulfill this need, a person is motivated to direct his behavior toward a goal. All human beings are constantly striving to establish a satisfactory relationship with their environments. Adler (1935). In other words, they are trying to adjust to the environment, fulfill their needs in order to live happily and function effectively. But the process of adjustment or of attaining and enjoying mental health is not always easy Tao Xinhua (2006).

In fact there are barriers or obstacles in satisfaction of needs or desires. These barriers and obstacles cause frustration and produce tension. The feeling results from disparities between what is wanted and what is available. When the level of aspiration exceeds the level of achievement it is likely to experience frustration.

Thus, Frustration is the thwarting of one's desires and a great deal of literature has been devoted to the study of behavior concerning frustration tolerance along with varied variables. In general, frustration tolerance is studied as a reference point in judging one's past performance and improving future performance. However, very few researchers have focused directly on it and utilization of frustration tolerance and its effect on behavior in Hearing impaired people. In the present study an attempt is made to study frustration tolerance level in hearing impaired and non-hearing impaired people.

Frustration tolerance is the ability of a person on a task when frustration occurs due to setbacks and difficulty. Spacapan & Cohen (1983); Motowidlo et al.(1986); Martimportugués-Goyenechea & Gómez-Jacinto (2005); Zhang(2006). Excellent frustration tolerance is necessary for one to be mentally healthy Costa & McCrae(1993); Brackney Karabenick, (1995); Kitzrow(2003); Sun, (2008); Dai (2009). Frustration means maturity as well as shock and it is very important for an individual to correctly identify frustration and deal with it Ripley (1972); Ciaccio (2000) Methods of improving frustration tolerance are rare. Gerra et al. (1993) ; Liu and Zhang (2007); Yan (2009).

Almost everyone would like to rise above his /her present status. While people of all ages aspire to better themselves, aspirations are especially strong during adolescence. But if his/her aspirations are unrealistic, the path may lead to failure and disappointment. Because aspirations are ego involved, success leads to increase self esteem, while failure brings embarrassment remorse and feelings of personal inadequacy and inferiority Zahn, Kelly (1995).

Muthayya (1960) conducted a study on adolescents to study the level of aspiration and its relation to modes of reaction to frustration Prakash (1984) conducted a study of the factors affecting level of aspiration.

The above discussion based on review of literature suggests that an individual may largely differ and suffer because of the hearing loss and because of the disability they show, maladjustment within their peer group and also with the society. They need special care and training to cope up with this problem. They should have real goal in their life as it will help them to adjust properly in the society. These individuals are exceptional, though they have the same characteristics as that of the normal individuals. The only difference is that they lack the hearing or speech power. Due to their differences they have variations among them also. Hence they have certain limitations in their life. If they aspire without considering their limitations they can become the victims of frustration and maladjustment. Many a times the society compares them without considering their limitations and it results into higher frustrations and has negative effects. Hence, there is a need to know them and help them to have better adjustments so that they can be directed into right direction for their all-round development and also for the betterment of society and nation.

The present study hypothesizes that: There will be no significant difference between HI and NHI on frustration tolerance test.

#### METHOD

**Sample :** In the following study the sample comprises of 60 young adults, (30-30) both (male /female), HI and NHI.

Age- 15 to 30 years

I.Q- 5 to 75 percentile i.e. Average and

Socio-economic status : Middle class –Upper Middle class. All samples were from Vadodara city.

**Tools :** Following tests were used in the study and each has been described below:

**Standard Progressive matrices (SPM):** The standard progressive matrices developed by [John C. Raven](#) (1936) is used. The scale has a test-re-test reliability varying, with age, from 0.83 to 0.93. it correlates 0.80 with the Terman Terrill scale , and has been found to have a “c” saturation of 0.82.

**Socio-Economic Status Scale (SES):** The Socio-economic status scale (urban) by B. Kuppuswamy (1962) the scale is used for collecting information on the socio-economic variables regarding an individual or his father. There are two forms of the inventory. Form A and Form B.

The inventory is self explanatory and requires students in schools and colleges to fill up the particulars regarding their various items relating to education, occupation and income may be completed. The social classes are divided into following groups: Upper, Upper Middle, Lower Middle, Upper Lower, Lower.

Several methods were used to test the validity of the scale: Matching against outside criterion, Distribution Pattern, Comparison of dichotomous groups.

**Frustration Tolerance test (FRTO):** The test was developed by Dr.S.N.Rai, in 1988, Meerut. Two sets of data are obtained from this experiment. Time (in minutes and seconds) devoted by the subjects on two insolvable puzzles, i.e. puzzle number I and III. Number of attempts made for solving two insolvable puzzles, i.e., puzzle number I and III. Time and number of attempts are summed and mean time and mean number of attempts are calculated for each subject to know the frustration tolerance.

**Interview schedule:** To validate the information a questionnaire was prepared wherein following information were collected to understand the psychosocial aspects: Preliminary Information, Family Information, Personal information. The data was subjected to analysis using descriptive and Non-parametric statistics using "Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 13.0).

**Procedure:** Firstly, the screening tools i.e. Standard Progressive Matrices, Socio-economic status scale was administered on HI individuals and scores were obtained. Then the NHI individuals were matched with the HI on these screening tools. An interview schedule was also administered to get the demographic details.

After the screening test, the Frustration tolerance test and Level of aspiration test were administered on the HI and NHI individuals.

## RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

The t test results obtained on frustration tolerance test for mean score time, shows that the mean scores of time of HI (463.33) and NHI (441.88) on two insolvable puzzles .i.e. I& III; indicating that the mean scores of time are not significant.

By analyzing the mean scores of time in both the groups we see that the HI =7.33 minutes & NHI = 7.35 minute i.e. towards 10, suggesting maximum time taken to solve the puzzles and can be interpreted having high frustration tolerance in both the groups.

The t test results obtained on frustration tolerance test for mean scores of errors of time of Hearing impaired (15.05) and Non Hearing impaired (17.45) on two insolvable puzzles .i.e. I& III indicating that the mean scores of error are not significant.

By analyzing the mean scores of error in both the groups we see that the hearing impaired=15 errors & Non hearing impaired = 17.45 i.e. difference of 2 which is not a wide difference. We see that the no. of attempts can be made on the test puzzles are 31 and the tendency of the scores fall nearly around half of the attempts made. Therefore no significant difference observed in both the groups.

The t-test results of the mean scores of time (0.570) mean scores of errors (0.210) indicates that there is no significant difference between the time taken and the no. of attempts made by Hearing Impaired and Non-Hearing Impaired on the puzzles I & III.

As observed by the investigator there may be some of the following reasons that have affected the nature of scores, are as follows:

-In both the groups the subjects had no prior exposure to such kind of task. So, they were motivated to perform on it.

-As the task was drawing base task the subjects in both the groups enjoyed doing the task and also found it interesting.

-As second task being the completion task it seemed to lower the frustration level in both the groups.

Thus, from the above test findings null hypothesis formulated that there will be no significant difference between HI and NHI on frustration tolerance test is confirmed.

By reflecting the information obtained from Interview taken from both the groups and analyzing we see that some of the subjects do have low aspiration as it can be seen from the nature of responses given on expected Income. In HI group their preference for expected income ranges between 5000-15000 whereas none showed the preference for 20000 and above as they find less scope and expects to earn less. While in NHI it's not the case.

### CONCLUSION

Thus, test findings of the present study indicate that there is no significant difference between HI and NHI, on frustration tolerance test, as discussed they tend to continue to perform and were motivated to complete the task, rather than giving up, same as the NHI individuals did and hence the null hypothesis is confirmed.

The HI individuals have the main problem in their communication skill. They can communicate with only those people who know the sign language and that is known only by few people, hence their area for communication is confined. A normal person feels handicapped in communicating with them.

The HI lack the communication skill, this make them less interactive. Their limitations hinder them to comprehend the things around them. The atmosphere which they get is not very motivating as compared with NHI. Also the higher education facility, job opportunities available, seems to be limited and therefore they are lost and need constant support and motivation. The changes should be made in the education system and a more encouraging and supportive environment should be provided by the teachers and parents so that HI individuals could also aspire to their fullest. Also, Life skills education to them can help them better adjust to life and society.

### FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

By getting better information of frustration tolerance level it may be helpful in following ways:

- To understand the emotional aspects.
- To plan better interventions.
- To help at planning level so that Hearing impaired gets more vocational opportunity.
- It helps understand their psychological aspects more deeply and it will help to mental health professional to plan and give relevant interventions.
- It will help any further studies that would be conducted on the samples that have some working experience.
- Other tools of frustration tolerance level may be able to bring further robust results.

---

**REFERENCES**

---

- A.Adler. (1935). The Fundamental views of Individual Psychology. *International Journal of Individual Psychology* , 5-8.
- Brackney B, K. S. (1995). Psychopathology and academic performance: The role of motivation and learning strategies. *J.Couns. Psychol.* 42(4): , 456-465.
- Ciaccio J (2000). A teacher's chance for immortality. *Educ. Digest*, 65(6): 44-48.
- Costa PT, M. R. (1993). Bullish on personality psychology. *The Psychologist* , 302-303.
- Dai LJ (2009). Fresh Students Endurance on Frustration and Solution. *J. Harbin Univ.*, 30(3): 142-144.
- Gerra G, Caccavari R, Reali N, Bonvicini P, Marcato A, Fertoni G, Delsignore R, Passeri M, Brambilla F (1993). Noradrenergic and hormonal responses to physical exercise in adolescents. Relationship to anxiety and tolerance to frustration, *Neuropsychobiol.* 27(2):65-71.
- Kitzrow MA (2003). The mental health needs of today's college students: Challenges and recommendations, *NASPA J.*, 41 (1): 165-179.
- Levine, E. (1960). *Psychology of Deafness*. New York : New York : Columbia University Press , 1960.
- Liu S, Zhang N (2007). Relationship among Frustration Tolerance in Undergraduates the parental Rearing Behavior and Social Support Correlates, *China J. Health Psychol.* (9): 144-147.
- Martimportugués-Goyenechea C, G.-J. L. (2005). Simultaneous multiple stressors in the environment: physiological stress reactions, performance, and stress evaluation. *Psychol. Rep.* 97(3) , 867-874.
- Motowidlo SJ, P. J. (1986). Occupational Stress: Its Causes and Consequences for Job Performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 71(4): , 618-629.
- Muthayya, B. (1960). Adolescents A study of Level of Aspiration and Its relation to Modes of Reaction to Frustration among Adolescents. A study of Level of Aspiration and Its relation to Modes of Reaction to Frustration among. *Third Survey of Research in Education.* , 381.
- Kochkin, S., Luxford, W., Northern, J., Mason, P., & Tharpe, A. M. (2007). MarkeTrak VII: Are 1 million dependents with hearing loss in America being left behind?, *Hearing Review*, 14, 10, 10-36.  
<http://www.betterhearing.org/pdfs>.
- Prakash, V. (1984). A study of the factors affecting Level of Aspiration";. *Fourth Survey of Research in Education*, , Vol II pp. 414-415.
- Polat, F. (2003). Factors Affecting Psychosocial Adjustment of Deaf Students. *Jnl. of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* Volume 8, Issue 3, Pp. 325-339.
- Ripley GD (1972). Student health service at a college of further education, *J. R. Coll. Gen. Pract.*, 22(116): 169-171.



Spacapan S, C. S. (1983). Effects and aftereffects of stressor expectations. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 45(6): , 1243-1254.

Sun YS (2008). Frustration Tolerance of University Students and Countermeasures for Its Enhancement, *J. Southwest Agricultural University (Social Sciences Edition)*. 6(4): 200-203.

TAO Xinhua, Z. Y. (2007 ). The Interaction among Deaf Students' Mental Health, Achievement Motivation and Behavioral Mode . *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 39,6, 1074 - 1083.

Yan Q (2009). On Methods of Mental-Health Education of University Students, Theory and Practice of Education. (9):15-17.

Zhang H, L. G. (2006). A Short Discussion About The Influence That Physical Training Have On Psychological Health. *J. Jining Teachers'College*. 27(3): , 39-40.

[Zahn SB](#), [Kelly LJ](#) (1996). Changing attitudes about the employability of the deaf and hard of hearing. *American annals of the deaf.*, 140, 5, 381-385.