

Aggressive Behavior and Suicidal Ideation of Adolescents with High and Low Level of Frustration Intolerance

Precious Lyn Cornejo-Babida¹

¹College of Arts and Sciences, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City

preciouslyn.cornejo-babida@unp.edu.ph

Abstract - With the "new normal," individuals tend to struggle in tolerating frustrations. Frustration intolerance is the difficulty to overcome stressful situations which may lead to negative behaviors like aggressiveness, depression, and suicidal ideation. This study focused on the adolescents' level of frustration intolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation and how they vary in terms of family structure and locus of control; and the relationship between frustration intolerance and aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. A quantitative method of analysis was employed. The sample were the 375 high school students of three state universities in Region I. Results show that the respondents have an average level of frustration intolerance, and aggressive behavior, but a low level of suicidal ideation. A significant difference was found between the levels of aggressive behavior of respondents from the three categories of family structure regardless of the level of frustration intolerance. With suicidal ideation, only the level of frustration intolerance, regardless of family structure, is statistically significant. Locus of control and the level of frustration intolerance are significant factors in suicidal ideation. A significant difference was found between the suicidal ideation of respondents with external locus of control and respondents with internal locus of control; and of respondents with external locus of control and bi-local locus of control. There are significant relationships between frustration intolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation.

Keywords: Frustration tolerance, aggressive behaviour, suicidal ideation, family structure, locus of control

1. Introduction

Challenges, stressors, and struggles are often part of one's daily life. Starting from personal problems, misunderstanding within the family, pressures from friends, many requirements at school to high expectations from work and a lot more make one's life more challenging and, for some, more stressful. Especially during this time of the pandemic, everyone has to adjust to the "new normal." Moreover, every person has his or her way of handling these stressors either positively or negatively. Some get frustrated easily and see life's demands and difficulties less calmly, while others have a low level of tension and are very calm even under stressful situations.

According to Bouman (2011), frustration tolerance is the ability to overcome obstacles and stressful situations. On the contrary, frustration intolerance focuses on the inability to handle and overcome frustrating experiences.

Further, Esposito (2017) added that frustration intolerance happens when a goal-oriented action is delayed. The resulting feeling is disappointment and unhappiness from unmet needs or unresolved conflicts. Frustration intolerance is what the psychologist Ellis called "I can't-stand-it-itis," which promotes unhealthy negative emotions such as anxiety, depression, and anger, as well as maladaptive behaviors including procrastination and avoidance, as cited by Guttenberg (2014). Ellis added, as cited by Fattah (2017), that frustration intolerance explains the belief that reality should be as one wants or expects it to be. Thus there is the refusal to accept the difference between what one wants and what happens in reality. People may demand that frustration must not exist and be unwilling to tolerate such frustration or the discomfort associated with it.

According to Firestone (2014), frustration intolerance may lead to negative emotions and

behaviors like aggressiveness, depression, and even suicide risk. As such aggressive behavior may cause verbal and physical abuse and may involve destroying properties (Gabbey, 2019)

Albert Ellis, as cited by Guttenberg, believed that a low level of frustration tolerance might lead to unhealthy negative emotions such as anger, anxiety, and depression. That is why, for worst cases, some individuals may also think to end their lives as Firestone (2014) stated that having a low tolerance to frustration may also elicit suicidal risks. Some may lead to having suicidal ideation or suicidal thinking, and as defined by Pedersen (2016), suicidal ideation is the contemplation of ending one's own life. These types of thoughts may arise in people who feel completely hopeless or believe they can no longer cope with their life's demands and difficulties. Suicidal ideation can vary from person to person and from fleeting thoughts to preoccupation to detailed planning.

According to Nordqvist (2018), as reviewed by Dr. Legg, T. J., a person who is experiencing or could experience suicidal thoughts may show feeling or appearing to feel trapped or hopeless; feeling intolerable emotional pain; having or appearing to have an abnormal preoccupation with violence, dying, or death; having mood swings, either happy or sad; talking about revenge, guilt, or shame; being agitated, or in a heightened state of anxiety; experiencing changes in personality, routine, or sleeping patterns; consuming drugs or more alcohol than usual, or starting drinking when they had not previously done so.

Lie and Liou (2012) found that as many as 17.8% of the Filipino students admitted to having considered suicide, while only 4.8% of Indonesian students admitted to doing so. More Filipino students (9.1%) make suicidal plans than Indonesian students (3.6%). However, they also found out that Indonesian students who have suicidal ideations make a suicide plan compared to Filipino students. Other findings of their study include: 53.5% of Indonesian who admitted to having suicide ideation do make a suicide plan and 40.6% of Filipino students who ever considered suicide make their suicide plan; students with suicide ideation are more likely to make a suicide plan; gender has a significant association about suicidal behavior, and female students are 1.9

times as likely as male students to have suicidal thought; third-year students were almost two times more likely than first-year students to have suicidal ideation, and bullied junior high school students are around 90% more likely to think of suicide.

Silva, dos Santos, Soares, and Pardono (2014) also studied the prevalence and factors associated with suicidal ideation among Brazilian adolescents. They found that 67.75% of adolescents who think about suicide can plan for it, and 63.28% who plan suicide are likely to commit it, which shows an alarming percentage. They were also able to verify that females are 50% more likely to plan suicide than males. Further, they also relate suicidal ideation to violent behavior and found out that "violent" adolescents are almost twice more likely to plan suicide. Adolescents who used illicit drugs showed higher chances of planning suicide, and those dissatisfied with their body shape are one and half times more likely to plan suicide than satisfied ones. They, therefore, concluded that there is a significant association between thought, planning, and attempting suicide, which led to concern about this behavior among adolescents, suggesting actions at school in this sense.

The study conducted by Estanda and Cruz (2016) found out that Davao Region ranked third among all regions in the country in terms of suicidal thoughts in 2013. Females have a higher level of suicidal thoughts than males. Estanda and Cruz (2016) also reported that the main reasons for thinking and committing suicide are family problems and quarrel with spouse or partner.

Bombo Radyo Vigan (2017, 2018) reported several cases of successfully committed suicide in the locality. Young people having aggressive behaviors, and some are committing suicide because of their high level of frustration intolerance and are not able to handle stress and problems in a healthy and positive way. Some of the reported causes include painful experiences, abuse, relationship, and family problems, and hanging is the most common method among suicide completers.

The Guidance Office of one university in the Ilocos Region recorded misbehaviors and aggressive behaviors of the Junior and Senior High

School students, and they have complained of having many requirements, personal and educational problems, which give them frustration. From 2015- 2018 the recorded aggressive behaviors include fistfights, hurting oneself, quarreling, threatening and writing bad words, slapping the classmate, and teasing. These behaviors occurred because of teasing, simple misunderstanding, miscommunication, the challenge of fist fight by a fellow student, feeling irritated, hiding one's bag and feeling harassed, negative messages in the social media, and problems with girlfriend/ boyfriend relationship. Some students voluntarily go for counseling because of the foreseen help given in the process. Some issues of the reported students were family problems, intimate relationship problems, and perceived information-overload in subjects. In addition to these, failure to comply with the requirements gets these students frustrated, which shows their high level of frustration intolerance.

With the cases of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation aforementioned, adolescents make attributions about their behavior wherein according to the theory of Locus of Control by Rotter (1954), as cited by Feist and Feist (2009), individuals with an internal locus of control take full responsibility for their actions and have the positivity to overcome their difficulties. In some cases, that individuals may have a typical level of locus of control and would neither exactly belong to an internal or external locus of control; they may have a bi-local locus of control or in between. They may sometimes blame destiny, but there are also instances that they strive for their betterment. As explained by Armitage (2015), individuals who have balanced external and internal loci of control are those with a bi-local locus of control.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine the level of frustration intolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation; and how aggressive behaviour and suicidal ideation vary in function of Family Structure and Locus of Control. It also determined how frustration intolerance relates to the level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The study used the quantitative method of research in gathering and analyzing the data that were collected. Questionnaires were the tool in gathering data. Moreover, correlational methods were used to see relationships and analyze the numerical data of the frustration tolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation of the respondents. Furthermore, cross-sectional design was utilized with the differences among the moderator variables.

2.2. Subjects of the Study

The respondents of the study were the 375 Junior and Senior High School Students enrolled in the Laboratory School of the University of Northern Philippines, Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University, and Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College during the 2nd semester of S.Y. 2017-2018. Random Sampling was utilized to identify the sample.

2.3. Data Gathering Tools

For Frustration Intolerance, the Frustration Discomfort Scale (Harrington, 2005a) on a 5-point Likert-type scale was employed with the following scoring: 1) absent, 2) mild, 3) moderate, 4) strong, 5) very strong. The full-scale mean inter-item reliability of this tool is 0.95. For Aggressive Behaviour, the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (AQ) with test-retest reliability of 0.78 was utilized. The scale used is as follows: 1- Extremely Uncharacteristic of Me, 2- Uncharacteristic, 3- Neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic, 4- Characteristic of Me, and 5- Extremely characteristic of Me. For Suicidal Ideation, the study used the Columbia- Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS) by Kelly Posner, Ph.D., Gregory K. Brown, Ph.D., Barbara Stanley, Ph.D., David A. Brent, M.D., Kseniya V. Yershova, Ph.D., Maria A. Oquendo, M.D., et al. (2009). The C-SSRS has three parts: 1) Suicidal Ideations, 2) Intensity of Suicidal Ideations, and 3) Suicidal Behaviour, but the present study's focus

is just the suicidal ideations so, with the permission of the authors, only part 1 and 2 were utilized. The C-SSRS has good convergent and divergent validity, and the internal consistency of the Intensity subscale is 0.937. Permission was also given to use a 5-point Likert scale to fit the needs of the present study. A checklist was prepared to identify the personal information, which includes the family structure. Lastly, for the locus of control, the I-E questionnaire by Julian Rotter with test-retest reliability of 0.61 was administered which includes the family structure. Lastly, for the locus of control, the I-E questionnaire by Julian Rotter with test-retest reliability of 0.61 was administered.

2.4. Ethical Considerations

Codes were used to maintain privacy and confidentiality, and the data collected will be disregarded when no longer necessary. Informed consent for parents and assent form was presented to and signed by the respondents, and their parents.

2.5. Data Analysis

Mean Analysis, Two-way Analysis of Variance, T-test, Pos Hoc Analysis, and Pearson Correlation Coefficient were employed to analyze the data gathered.

3. Results and Discussion

Using a five-point scale, the obtained means were utilized to determine the respondents' level of frustration tolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation. The respondents' Frustration Intolerance (FI), Aggressive Behaviour (AB), and Suicidal Ideation (SI) have been identified, and the data is presented in Table 1.

Generally, the respondents have average levels of Frustration Intolerance and Aggressive Behaviour while they scored Low in Suicidal Ideation. This means that the respondents have a typical level of intolerance to frustrations and aggressive behavior like most individuals their age are expected. On the other hand, a low score in suicidal ideation shows that the respondents may

Table 1. Obtained Means of the Respondents' Level of Frustration Intolerance, Aggressive Behaviour, and Suicidal Ideation

Variables	Mean	DR
Frustration Intolerance	2.99	Average
Aggressive Behaviour	2.97	Average
Suicidal Ideation	2.03	Low

Norm:

1.00- 1.80	Very Low
1.81- 2.60	Low
2.61- 3.40	Average
3.41- 4.20	High
4.21- 5.00	Very High

have only thought of suicide months back or never had thought of committing suicide.

These findings may imply that the respondents may have an intolerance to frustrating events but at a moderate level, which is typical for most individuals their age. This could be supported by the study of Gulzar, et al. (2012), which revealed that though students get frustrated, they have friends who are the most powerful helping hands that can assist them in chucking out their frustration. It can be observed that during adolescence, peers are the most influential. Additionally, according to Sincero (2012), social support involves an individual's family, friends, and peers who can support the person psychologically and emotionally, which leads to a better coping experience with stress and frustration. The low level of suicidal ideation for the respondents could be because, as the respondents belong to Filipino families with close family relations, respondents have a good support system, as mentioned by Sincero (2012).

Meanwhile, this study's focus is to know if there are significant differences in the levels of Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation between respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance and low level of frustration intolerance considering two moderator variables, namely family structure and locus of control. Of the 375 respondents, only 92 respondents identified with Low level of Frustration Intolerance and 90 respondents with a High Level of Frustration Intolerance for data analysis. The other 193 respondents obtained Average scores on

their frustration intolerance, which implies that they have a typical level of intolerance to frustration and may have the ability to cope like most individuals their age.

3.1. According to Family Structure

Family Structure has three categories: both parents are present, one parent is present, and both parents are absent.

Table 2 shows that for the three categories of family structure: both parents are absent, only one parent is present, and both parents are present, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation while those respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behaviour and suicidal ideation. Overall, regardless of the family structure, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behaviour and suicidal ideation. Respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behaviour suicidal ideation.

Moreover, for the three categories of family structure, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of suicidal ideation. In comparison, those respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of suicidal ideation.

Overall, regardless of the family structure, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of suicidal ideation. Respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of suicidal ideation. Though the mean scores fall under the low and very low levels, results show that respondents who have higher intolerance to frustration have a higher level of suicidal ideation as compared to respondents who have lower frustration intolerance whether they belong to families with both parents are present, only one parent is present or both parents are absent.

Table 3 presents a significant difference between the levels of aggressive behavior of respondents whose both parents are present, only one parent is present, and both parents are absent regardless of the level of frustration tolerance. A significant difference was also found between the level of aggressive behavior of respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance and a low level of frustration intolerance regardless of family structure. However, the combination of family structure and frustration intolerance was found as a not significant factor in the respondents' level of aggressive behavior. This implies that respondents with either a high or low level of frustration intolerance whose both parents are present do not significantly differ from respondents who have a high or low level of frustration intolerance whose

Table 2: Obtained means between respondents with High and Low Frustration Intolerance who belong to the three categories of Family Structure with their Level of Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation

family structure	FI	Mean (AB)	Std. Dev'n (AB)	Mean(SI)	Std. Dev'n (SI)	N
both par absent	Low FI	2.2869	.79227	1.8720	.75802	25
	High FI	3.2868	.67082	2.5632	1.12951	19
	Total	2.7187	.88865	2.1705	.98726	44
one par present	Low FI	2.5262	.71974	1.8435	.72163	23
	High FI	3.2976	.70596	1.9684	.69526	19
	Total	2.8752	.80484	1.9000	.70400	42
both par present	Low FI	2.7092	.51958	1.7182	.69959	44
	High FI	3.4503	.60186	2.2115	.88554	52
	Total	3.1106	.67411	1.9854	.83879	96
Total	Low FI	2.5487	.67065	1.7913	.71678	92
	High FI	3.3835	.63683	2.2344	.91849	90
	Total	2.9615	.77505	2.0104	.84999	182

Table 3. F-values and significance level differentiating Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation of Respondents with High and Low Level of Frustration Intolerance in the three categories of Family Structure

Source	Mean Square (AB)	F (AB)	Sig. (AB)	Mean Square (SI)	F (SI)	Sig. (SI)
familystructureMV2	1.369	3.272	.040	1.252	1.869	.157
FI	27.358	65.409	.000	7.433	11.090	.001
familystructureMV2 * FI	.259	.619	.540	.885	1.321	.270

only one parent is present and whose both parents are absent.

For suicidal ideation, only the level of frustration intolerance, regardless of family structure, is significant. This implies that the higher level of frustration intolerance, the higher their level of suicidal ideation. Family Structure regardless of Frustration Intolerance and the combination of family structure and frustration intolerance were both found not significant. Results are similar to the results presented earlier, having the level of frustration intolerance as significant, separating those with high frustration intolerance and low suicidal ideation from those with a low level of frustration intolerance. In this case, whether the respondents have both parents present, only one parent present, or both parents absent, as long they have high frustration intolerance, they have a higher level of suicidal ideation than those who have a low level of frustration intolerance.

Though the results show no significant differences in the suicidal ideation of respondents who belong to the three categories of family structure, Nielsen (1987) emphasized that among all the variables associated with suicide, adolescents' family factors are essential and crucial. According to her, most suicidal adolescents belong to families with drug and physical abuse, marital discord, high expectation, and these adolescents may often report feelings of being unloved or unwanted.

Further, Pos Hoc Analysis using the Tukey HSD method was employed to know where the significant difference in aggressive behavior lies between the three categories of family structure.

In terms of aggressive behavior, the significant difference lies between the mean scores of respondents whose both parents are present and

respondents whose both parents are absent. On the other side, respondents whose parents are present, and respondents whose only one parent is present did not significantly differ. The same is true with the respondents whose only one parent is present and respondents whose parents are absent.

It was shown that respondents whose both parents are present have a higher level of aggressive behavior compared to respondents with only one parent is present, and both parents are absent, though still falls under the average level. This is quite confusing because in a typical Filipino family with both parents are present, more time, more support both emotionally and physically are provided for the adolescents. This could imply that adolescents may tend to be disobedient towards their parents' ideas and attitudes. According to the Psychodynamic theory, adolescents have to go through individuation, wherein they develop resilience and become detached from their parents (Nielsen, 1987).

To sum this up, according to Jersild, Brook, and Brook (1978), though respondents with intact families with both parents present may not experience difficulties as respondents with only one parent is present or both parents are absent experience, it cannot be concluded, and it does not necessarily follow that adolescent with both parents are present have a better family environment which fosters a better psychosocial and emotional development. Also, an adolescent reared with only one parent present or both parents are absent may be raised better as compared to an adolescent whose both parents stay together in an environment of conflict and hostility. According to the findings of Navarez & Diaz (2017), despite the situation where mother, father, or both parents are not around during challenging times, with parents' absence, technology like cellular phones

and computers have become the default substitute for personal parenting. Navarez & Diaz (2017) explained that these children also aim for high grades because they want their parents to be happy, and it is only the reward they can give to their parents who sacrifice a lot. This just shows how important families are.

3.2. According to Locus of Control

The locus of control was categorized into internal, bi-local, and external.

For the locus of control, Table 4 shows that in all its categories, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance tends to have a lower level of aggressive behavior. In comparison, respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behavior, whether they have an internal, bi-local, or external locus of control. Overall, regardless of the locus of control, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behavior. In comparison, respondents with a higher level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behavior. This implies that whether the respondents believe that they can do things to improve and be better; or believe that they cannot do anything because it's their fate or

destiny, or just a typical adolescent who cannot determine between the two; they all have the same level of aggressive behavior. If the respondents have a higher level of frustration intolerance, regardless of locus of control, they have a higher level of aggressive behavior. If they have a lower level of frustration intolerance, they have a lower level of aggressive behavior.

With the level of suicidal ideation, it can be observed in Table 4 that in all the categories of locus of control, whether internal, bi-local, or external, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance, may have a lower level of suicidal ideation. On the contrary, respondents who scored high in frustration intolerance tend to have a higher level of suicidal ideation.

In general, regardless of locus of control, respondents with a higher level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of suicidal ideation. In comparison, those who have a lower level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of suicidal ideation.

As table 5 indicates that both loci of control alone and the combination of locus of control and the respondents' level of frustration intolerance were not found to be significant. However, the level of frustration intolerance alone, regardless of the respondents' locus of control, is significant.

Table 4. Obtained means between respondents with High and Low Frustration Intolerance and their Locus of Control with their Level of Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation

LOC	FI	Mean (AB)	Std. Deviation (AB)	Mean (SI)	Std. Deviation (SI)	N
internal loc	Low FI	2.5762	.66333	1.8053	.75550	38
	High FI	3.3816	.71275	2.0667	.80487	30
	Total	2.9315	.79068	1.9206	.78275	68
bi-local	Low FI	2.4957	.72343	1.6700	.58274	40
	High FI	3.3448	.55892	2.1459	.82986	37
	Total	2.9037	.77388	1.8987	.74683	77
external loc	Low FI	2.6256	.55567	2.1000	.89700	14
	High FI	3.4483	.67300	2.5957	1.11538	23
	Total	3.1370	.74289	2.4081	1.05367	37
Total	Low FI	2.5487	.67065	1.7913	.71678	92
	High FI	3.3835	.63683	2.2344	.91849	90
	Total	2.9615	.77505	2.0104	.84999	182

This implies that respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance tend to have a higher level of aggressive behavior. In comparison, those who have a lower level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behavior. This is supported by the findings of Wallace, Barry, Hill, and Green (2011), which found out in their study adolescents with an Internal Locus of Control was not associated with aggression. He did not worsen the possibility of aggression based on either self-esteem or narcissism.

Moreover, the combination of locus of control and the level of frustration intolerance was found as not significant factors in suicidal ideation. This means that respondents with either a high or low level of frustration intolerance who have an internal, bi-local, or external locus of control do not significantly differ with their level of suicidal ideation. On the other hand, it was found out that locus of control and the level of frustration intolerance are significant factors in suicidal ideation. That is why Pos Hoc Analysis was employed to identify where the significant difference lies in the three categories of locus of control. Results showed that a significant difference was found between the Suicidal Ideation of respondents with an external locus of control and respondents with an internal locus of control. The same is observed between the suicidal ideation of respondents with an external locus of control and a bi-local locus of control. On the contrary, there was no significant difference found between the suicidal ideation of respondents with an internal locus of control and bi-local locus of control.

Table 5. F-values and significance level differentiating Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation of Respondents with High and Low Level of Frustration Intolerance in the three categories of Locus of Control

Source	F (AB)	F (SI)
LOC	.398	3.903*
FI	62.187*	10.200*
LOC * FI	.020	.390

Significant at 0.05 level

Results imply that respondents with an external locus of control have a significantly higher level of suicidal ideation than respondents with an internal or bi-local locus of control. This may also mean that as respondents see reinforcements as external factors and as they believe that they cannot do anything with what is happening to them, the more they consider committing suicide if they encounter problems that for them which are very difficult to handle. But for those who have an internal locus of control would believe that whatever difficulties that they may experience, they have the choice and skill to overcome them, and the more they believe that thinking of suicide is not a good solution to problems.

The findings of the present study also support the findings of Evans et al. (2005). Their research revealed a relationship between an external locus of control and an increased risk for suicide, which means that higher levels of suicide risk were associated with a more external locus of control orientation.

On the other hand, results found that respondents with an internal locus of control have a significantly lower level of suicidal ideation. As discussed by April, Dharani, and Peters (2012) in their study, people with an internal locus of control believe that the outcomes of their actions are a result of their efforts (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976), abilities (Carrim et al., 2006), or permanent characteristics (Littunen & Storhammar, 2000). Hence, these individuals interpret reinforcements they receive from their surroundings as reliant upon their doings, and this belief entails that they are masters of their fates (Boone et al., 2005). Thus, thinking of committing suicide will be least considered as answers to encountered problems. This is supported by Aal et al. (2018) in their study where they discussed that internal health locus of control is more often related to a healthy lifestyle, sickness prevention, better physical and mental condition of a person while external health locus of control, on the other hand, allows for a prediction that a patient will be less involved in the prophylactics and take more health-related risks.

Also, according to the findings of Carrim, Basson & Coetzee (2006), respondents with an internal locus of control tend to be happier in their jobs, are absent less frequently, are less alienated

from the work-setting, and tend to be more involved in their careers compared to respondents with an external locus of control.

To sum it up, individuals may sometimes experience things beyond their control, which precipitate towards external locus of control. According to Nielsen (1987), there are times that it is just appropriate that adolescents may feel that external factors are in control of their outcomes. She added no ideal attitude towards how individuals see reinforcements either they continuously blame other people or continually blame themselves for a result. According to Armitage (2015), research suggests that the happiest people are those who are bi-local because they have balanced external and internal loci of control. They can clash off things that go wrong as out of their control, but feel responsible for things that go well. In the study of April, Dharani, and Peters (2012), they significantly concluded that the maximum level of happiness is achieved by individuals with a bi-local locus of control. This may imply that in respect of internal, external, and bi-local locus of control, the middle-road that allows for a maximum level of well-being represents a balanced locus of control expectancy of an individual. In contrast, internal and external expectancies both represent extremes and are representative of an imbalanced locus of control. This emphasizes the standard concept of the importance of balance in life and a perception that extremities should be avoided for optimal well-being.

3.3. Level of Frustration Intolerance in Relation with the Level of Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation

To show the relationship between Frustration Intolerance and Aggressive Behaviour, and Suicidal Ideation, the Pearson Correlation was computed as shown in the Table 6.

With the data presented in the table, it shows that there is a moderate positive significant relationship between Frustration Intolerance and Aggressive Behaviour ($r = .567$), and a low positive significant relationship between Frustration Tolerance and Suicidal Ideation $r = .258$. This confirms the hypothesis that the higher

Table 6. Correlation between Frustration Intolerance, Aggressive Behaviour and Suicidal Ideation

		Aggressive Behaviour	Suicidal Ideation
Frustration Intolerance	Pearson Correlation	.567**	.258**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	375	375

Legend: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

the level of frustration intolerance, the higher the level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation, showing a positive relationship.

The findings answering problem number 2 support the frustration-aggression theory of Freud and Dollard, stating that frustration and aggression go together and that aggression is the consequence of frustration. Freud, as cited by Kaur (2015), stresses that the occurrence of aggression always assumes the presence of frustration and vice-versa. It can be concluded that based on the frustration-aggression theory of Freud, the existence of frustration always leads to some forms of aggression. While according to the theory of Dollard, when the desired behavior is blocked, it will lead to aggressive behavior.

There are studies to prove that the amount of aggression depends upon the strength of frustration and amount of interference. However, according to Dugan (2004), frustration is not just the reason or cause of aggression. Still, there are other external stimuli, and that aggression is not the dominant natural response to frustration. Dugan (2004) explained that social learning theorists like Bandura allow for an impact of frustration in making it more likely that the person who has learned aggressive responses will use them. They see frustration as one possible initiator of aggressive behavior but insist that aggression is socially learned behavior rather than an automatic response to aggression or any other stimulus.

The level of frustration intolerance is also significantly correlated with the level of suicidal ideation. This supports the "I can't-stand-it-itis" of Ellis, which explains that having a low level of frustration tolerance may lead to unhealthy

negative emotions such as anxiety and depression and may lead to the thought of committing suicide. The higher the level of frustration intolerance, the more they are prone to committing suicide.

Findings also relate with the findings of study Estanda and Cruz (2016), that the main reasons for thinking and committing suicide are family problems and quarrel with spouse or partner.

In the present study, the level of Frustration Intolerance and the level of Suicidal Ideation have a low positive significant relationship. Since the respondents have an average level of frustration intolerance and have a low level of suicidal ideation, it is still comforting to know and observed that adolescents nowadays can still handle their frustrations appropriately. Despite the recorded suicide incidents among adolescents, it can even be concluded, based on the sample population used, that most adolescents still do not consider that much suicide as a solution to their problems.

Additionally, the findings of Shaheen, and Jahan (2017) also suggests that students perceiving higher levels of social support effectively manage their frustration and stressors, and they report a lower level of suicidal ideation. Such findings suggest that helping adolescents and their parents to develop more supportive social networks for effectively managing stress may help in eliminating or alleviating the negative stress outcome in the form of suicidal ideation.

To sum it up, the present study results found that as the respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance, the more they tend to have aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. This was supported by the frustration-aggression theory of Freud (1933) and Dollard (1939), as cited by Kaur (2015, stating that anger, aggression, depression, and the thought of giving up are typical responses to frustration. It may imply that individuals with a high level of frustration intolerance, the more they quickly get angry, which may lead to their use of aggression and even thinking of giving up or thinking of ending one's own life as ways of scape or as solutions to problems. It is still good that the level of aggressive behavior of the respondents is equivalent to an average level, which shows a typical level as expected with individuals their age

given the same situations. Also, the level of suicidal ideation is low, which shows that the respondents' suicidal ideation is not yet alarming. Moreover, according to Navarez and Diaz (2017), developing positive coping mechanisms when experiencing difficult problems and when facing frustrations like active coping, planning, and the use of instrumental support are helpful because they will learn to overcome challenges with the help of other people, to plan and more confident of their actions and to develop a strong social relationship which let the adolescents divert their aggressive behavior and suicidal thoughts.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

For family structure, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. In comparison, those respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. The overall, same results were found. Further, a significant difference was found between the levels of aggressive behavior of respondents whose both parents are present, only one parent is present, and both parents are absent regardless of the level of frustration intolerance. A significant difference was also found between the level of aggressive behavior of respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance and a low level of frustration intolerance regardless of family structure. However, the combination of family structure and frustration intolerance was found as a not significant factor in the respondents' level of aggressive behavior. In terms of aggressive behavior, the significant difference lies between the mean scores of respondents whose parents are present and respondents whose parents are absent. On the other hand, only the level of frustration tolerance, regardless of family structure, is significant with suicidal ideation.

For the locus of control, in all its categories, respondents with a low level of frustration, intolerance tend to have a lower level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. In comparison, respondents with a high level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation whether they have

an internal, bi-local, or external locus of control. Overall, regardless of the locus of control, respondents with a low level of frustration intolerance have a lower level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. In comparison, respondents with a higher level of frustration intolerance have a higher level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation. Locus of control alone was not significant; the same is true with the combination of locus of control and the respondents' level of frustration tolerance. However, the level of frustration intolerance alone, regardless of the respondents' locus of control, is significant. Locus of control and the level of frustration intolerance are significant factors in suicidal ideation. A significant difference was found between the Suicidal Ideation of respondents with an external locus of control and respondents with an internal locus of control. The same is observed between the suicidal ideation of respondents with an external locus of control and a bi-local locus of control. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the suicidal ideation of respondents with an internal locus of control and a bi-local locus of control.

Frustration intolerance has a bearing on aggressive behaviour. Frustration intolerance also has a bearing on suicidal ideation.

With the results of the study, guidance counselors and other mental health practitioners may design activities like counseling and seminar-workshops on self/ personality awareness, understanding family structure and locus of control as an aid in developing strategies to eliminate or lessen suicidal thoughts and aggressive behavior, mental health law awareness, overcoming stress and depression, etc. for the students to understand themselves more, know their strengths and weaknesses and be able to handle stressful and frustrating events appropriately and effectively.

With a proper referral system, psychologists and psychometricians may also be tapped to administer personality tests and other psychological tests to assess the level of aggressive behavior and suicidal ideation of the students to know better what particular intervention programs and activities to conduct.

Family members and parents are also encouraged to have an active role in their children's holistic development in partnership with the school and to be open in asking for professional help if necessary.

Classroom advisers may also continuously monitor their students, especially those with reported aggressive behavior and suicidal ideations, and work with the guidance counselor and parents. Teachers may incorporate in their subjects, such as personal development, understanding the self and other related topics, lessons or updates like mental health law, how to overcome depression, how to handle stress, etc.

Additionally, it is strongly recommended to conduct other studies on the psychological constructs studied in this research with various target populations and other relevant variables like emotional stability, resilience, and personality traits. It would be fascinating to know, for instance, how introvert and extrovert individuals differ in the level of their frustration tolerance, aggressive behavior, and suicidal ideation.

REFERENCES

- Aal, M.H.A., Mahmoud, S., & Saied, H. (2018). Relationship between Locus of Control and Suicide Attitude among Adolescents Commit Suicide Attempt. *IOSR Journal of Nursing and Health Science (IOSR-JNHS)*. E- ISSN: 2320–1959.p- ISSN: 2320–1940 Volume 7, Issue 2 Ver. 1 (March .2018), PP 86-99www.iosrjournals.org
- April K.A., Dharani, B., & Peters, K. (2012). Impact of Locus of Control Expectancy on Level of Well-Being. Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org/res on November 19, 2018.
- Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. (1976). Internal-external control as contributor to and outcome of work experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 156-165.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.2.156>.
- Armitage, J. (2015). Who's in Control? – How your Locus of Control Affects You. Retrieved from <https://organisationalproductivity.com/2015/04/15/locus-of-control/> on November 19, 2018
- Benjamin, A. Jr. (2016). Aggression. *Encyclopedia of Mental Health: Second Edition*. 33-39. 10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00198-1.

- BomboRadyoVigan (2017). Suicide note' ng dalagangnagpakamataysallicos Sur, 'nag-viral' sa social media. Retrieved from <http://www.bomboradyo.com/suicide-note-ng-dalagang-nagpakamatay-sa-ilocos-sur-nag-viral-sa-social-media/> on February 21, 2018
- BomboRadyoVigan (2018). Incidents of Suicide. Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/bomboradyovigan/> on July 13, 2018.
- Boone, C., van Olffen, W., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (2005). Team locus of control composition and leadership structure information and acquisition, and financial performance: A business study simulation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 889-909. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803929>.
- Bouman (2011). Encyclopedia of Clinical Neuroscience: Frustration Tolerance. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-0-387-79948-3_2139 on February 13, 2018
- Buss, A. H., and Perry, M. (2012). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459.
- Carrim, N. M. H., Basson, J., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control in a South African call centre environment. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 30(2), 66-81.
- Dugan, Máire A. (2004). "Aggression." Beyond Intractability. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Retrieved from <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/aggression>. On July 18, 2018.
- Esposito, L. (2017). Frazzled: High Anxiety and Low Frustration Tolerance. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/anxiety-zen/201711/frazzled-high-anxiety-and-low-frustration-tolerance>.
- Estanda, M.M., and Cruz, G. T. (2016). Suicide Attempts, Self- Esteem, Level of Happiness and Life Satisfaction Among Youth from Davao Region. Published by Commission on Population, Welfareville Compound, Mandaluyong City, © Commission on Population.
- Evans, W.P., P. E. Owens and S.C. Marsh. (2005.) Environmental Factors, Locus of Control, and Adolescent Suicide Risk. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 22(3-4), 301-319. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226745006_Environmental_Factors_Locus_of_Control_and_Adolescent_Suicide_Risk.
- Fattah, M. E. A. (2017). Frustration Intolerance and Its Relationship to Personality Traits among Sample of Najran University Students "Predictive Study." *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*. p-ISSN: 2163-1948 e-ISSN: 2163-1956. 2017; 7(2): 49-54. doi:10.5923/j.ijpbs.20170702.01.
- Feist, J. and Feist, G. (2009). *Theories of Personality: 7th Edition*. Published by McGraw-Hill, McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020. ©2009, 2006, 2002, 1998.
- Firestone, L. (2014). Suicide: What therapists need to know. In *Continuing education in psychology*. Retrieved August 29, 2017, from <http://gradpsych.apags.org/education/ce/suicide.pdf>
- Gabbey, A. E. (2019). Aggressive Behaviour. Retrieved from <https://www.healthline.com/health/aggressive-behavior> on December 12, 2020
- Gulzar, S., Yahya, F., Nauman, F., Mir, Z., and Mujahid, S. H. (2012). Frustration among University Students in Pakistan. Retrieved from <http://www.isca.in/IJSS/Archive/v1/i4 /2.ISCA-IRJSS-2012-058>. On July 18, 2018
- Guttenberg, B. (2014). Curing the "I can't stand-it-it-is." Retrieved from <http://albertellis.org/curing-cant-stand-it-is/> on February 13, 2018
- Kaur, B. (2015). Mode of Frustration. *Multidisciplinary E-Journal. An International Peer Reviewed, Refereed Journal*. ISSN: 2277-4262 SJIF: 4.081
- Kaur, M. (2014). Study Of Adolescence Problems In Relation To Frustration Of Mansa District. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)* ISSN(E): 2321-8878; ISSN(P): 2347-4564 Vol. 2, Issue 6, Jun 2014, 103-122 © Impact Journals
- Klonsky, D., and May, A. M. (2015). The Three-Step Theory (3ST): A New Theory of Suicide Rooted in the "Ideation-to-Action" Framework. Retrieved from <https://www2.psych.ubc.ca/~klonsky/publications /3ST.pdf> on February 22, 2018
- Kumari, A., and Gupta, S. (2015). A study of emotional intelligence and frustration tolerance among adolescents. *Advanced Research Journal Social Science* 6 (2):173-180.

- Lie, H. and Liou, J-C. (2012). Suicide Behaviour among Junior High School Students in the Philippines and Indonesia Associated with the Social Factors. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5cab/5a2ee90ff1ed480d1db5d5accb959f4cfa5b.pdf> on February 21, 2018
- Navarez, J. & Diaz, K.R. (2017). Coping mechanisms of Philippine students' left behind by OFW parents. *Slongan*, 3(1), 91–102.
- Nielsen, L. (1987). *Adolescent psychology: A contemporary view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Nordqvist, C. (2018). What are suicidal thoughts? Retrieved from <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/kc/suicidal-thoughts-ideation-193026> on February 14, 2018.
- Pearl, P. (2011). Mental Toughness - High Frustration Tolerance. Retrieved from http://www.selfgrowth.com/articles/mental_toughness_high_frustration_tolerance on February 13, 2018
- Pedersen, T. (2016). Suicidal Ideation. Retrieved from <https://psychcentral.com/encyclopedia/suicidal-ideation/> on February 13, 2018
- Silva, R. J. D. S., dos Santos, F. A. L., Soares, N. M. M. and Pardono, E. (2014). Suicidal Ideation and Associated Factors among Adolescents in North-eastern Brazil. Retrieved from <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/tswj/2014/450943/> on February 21, 2018.
- Sincero, S.M. (2012). Social Support and Stress. Explorable.com: <https://explorable.com/social-support-and-stress>.
- Wallace, Barry, Hill, and Green (2011). Locus of Control as a Contributing Factor in the Relation Between Self-Perception and Adolescent Aggression. Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/ab.21419