Dilla Journal of Education
https://www.du.edu.et/duj

PGDT Trainees' Coping Styles, Locus of Control and Sex as Predictor of Psychological Wellbeing: Evidence from Dilla University Institute of Education and Behavioral Sciences PGDT Trainees

Shemsu Rediy Befileta

Lecturer at Dilla University and PhD fellow in Applied Developmental Psychology, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa University

Received: 25 December 2021 Accepted: 19 February 2022 Published: 15 April 2022

ARTICLE INFO.

Key words/phrases: Coping strategies, Locus of control, Psychological well-being, University students

Abstract

Educational settings are one of the areas of academic study where studying school teachers' psychological constructs is especially important. The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between locus of control, coping styles, and sex with psychological well-being among PGDT (Post Graduate Diploma in Teaching) trainees at Dilla University. What do the locus of control, coping style, and psychological wellbeing profiles of the participants look like? Do locus of control orientation, sex, and coping styles have a significant relationship with psychological wellbeing dimensions? Do locus of control, sex, and coping styles have significant joint or unique predictive validity for psychological wellbeing? The study employed a correlational research design. The population of the current study includes all regular and summer program PGDT trainees in the Institute of Education and Behavioral Science at Dilla University. 209 trainees were chosen as the sample using the proportionate stratified random selection approach. The Ryff Psychological Wellbeing, Locus of Control Scale, and Coping Style Scale were utilized to collect data. The data was examined in descriptive ways, such as mean and standard deviation, as well as inferential statistics, such as Pearson correlation, independent sample t-test, and hierarchical multiple regression, using the SPSS-23 statistical program. The findings demonstrate that locus of control has a negative significant link with psychological well-being in all six domains, including self-acceptance, positive interpersonal relationships, autonomy, environmental mastery, life purpose, and personal progress (P .05). Furthermore, the problem-focused coping style and its six aspects have a considerable positive link with psychological well-being (P .01). On the other hand, avoidant coping styles have a negative relationship with psychological wellbeing and its dimensions (P .01). Nonetheless, the emotion-focused coping style had no significant link with psychological well-being and its four dimensions (P > .05) except for autonomy and environmental mastery (P .05). Coping techniques and locus of control orientation can contribute to psychological well-being among university students, according to the findings. Problem-oriented coping styles, in particular, are positive predictors of psychological well-being, whereas avoidant coping styles, as well as external orientation in the locus of control, are negative predictors. The findings have consequences for the psychological makeup of trainees as well as future teaching careers.

Email: shemsanthe1st@gmail.com
DOI:10.20372/dje.v01i01.05

1 Introduction

This manuscript is organized into five sections: background of the problem, method, results, discussion, and conclusion and recommendations. The first section aims to set the theoretical and contextual background for the problem by summarizing and reviewing the relevant literature, both globals as well as local, relating to the psychological wellbeing of the students. This section also states the problems (together with the key research questions and purpose) that motivated this research, describes the significance of the study, and provides conceptual definitions of important variables in the study.

The second section (method) describes the study design and setting, summarizes the sampling and sample characteristics of the study, the procedures used to collect data, and the data analysis method. The result section deals with the findings obtained from the instruments and their statistical analysis. The result part has been summarized under the following subheadings: result of descriptive statistics, t-test analysis, results of correlation, results of multiple regression analysis, and results of stepwise regression analysis.

The discussion part of this manuscript attempts to see whether the research questions raised are answered satisfactorily or not. The discussion section attempts to relate the results of the analysis with the research questions forwarded at the beginning and the existing body of theoretical and research literature. In the last section of the manuscript, the researcher presents conclusions drawn from the study findings above and suggestions forwarded by the researcher.

1.1 Background of the Problem

Psychological well-being has undergone extensive empirical review and theoretical evaluation (Wissing & Van Eeden, 2002). There is currently no single consensual conceptual understanding of psychological well-being. Recent years have seen a widening interest in research on aspects of wellbeing (Huppert, 2009; Ryff & Singer, 1998). Huppert (2009) defined "psychological wellbeing" as "about how life is going well. It is a combination of feeling good and functioning effectively. "This demonstrates that a psychologically healthy person will be happy, capable of doing things, coping with difficult situations, experiencing life satisfaction, and having a good support system. Psychological well-being refers to positive mental health (Edwards, 2005) and is a multidimensional construct (Ryff, 1989) which develops through a combination of emotional regulation, personality characteristics, identity, and life experience (Helson & Srivastava, 2001). It is an ability to live rich, meaning-full, and vital lives (Ryff, 1989), a life full of vitality and meaning (Insel & Roth, 2006, cited in Kibret, 2015), an optimal functioning and development of one's true and highest potential (Insel & Roth, 2006, cited in Kibret, 2015), and an experience that is mainly structured by the individuals' choices of life or lifestyle factors (Babao & Moscoso, 2008). Thus, individuals who display strength in these areas will be in a good state of psychological wellbeing. Psychological wellbeing can increase with age, education, extraversion, and consciousness and decrease with neuroticism (Keyes *et al*., 2002).

Despite extensive evaluation and assessments, experts have indicated that psychological well-being is a diverse multidimensional concept, with exact components still unknown (Keyes *et al*., 2002; Ryff, 1989b; Wissing & Van Eeden, 2002). Ryff has extensively researched the objective understanding of psychological well-being. Ryff's (1989) research has brought about a shift in focus from a subjective to an objective conception of psychological wellbeing. Ryff's (1989) research has resulted in a new objective psychological well-being measurement being developed (Ryff, 1989b; Ryff & Keyes, 1995), with the following components: autonomy, personal growth, environmental mastery, purpose in life, positive relations with others, and self-acceptance. Subsequently, the current study is well represented and approached by the eudemonic well-being perspective, which posits that the maximum development of individual potential (i.e., psychological well-being) is determined by the abovementioned six indicators of positive psychological well-being. The Ryff model is widely recognized as one of the most influential models in the field of psychological well-being. Ryff (1989) takes psychological well-being as an attempt to realize the potential abilities of an individual, or in

other words, the progress of the potential and real talents of every person. Ryff (1989) identifies six components for psychological well-being, which include: One-autonomy: the feeling of independence and impression in life events, as well as an active role in behaviours. Two-Environmental mastery means a sense of mastery over the environment, controlling the outer activities and taking advantage of surrounding opportunities. Three-Personal growth: the feeling of having continuing growth and achieving novel experiences as a creator with potential talents. Four: Positive relations with others: having a sense of satisfaction and intimacy in one's relations with others and comprehending the importance of these dependencies. Five-Purpose in life: having a goal in life and believing that there is meaning in the past and present life. Six-self acceptance: means having a positive attitude towards oneself and accepting the diverse aspects of oneself, like bad and good traits, and having positive feelings about the past life. Ryff and Singer (1998).

Several research documents show that psychological wellbeing is associated with various personality as well as behavioural factors. Many researchers have emphasized the importance of locus of control and coping mechanisms in predicting an individual's psychological well-being. Based on the findings of such studies, it has been argued that psychological wellbeing is partly influenced by personality as well as behavioural factors. Among the important personality and behavioural variables that may influence students' psychological wellbeing are locus of control (Uma & Manikandan, 2017), Mobarakeh *et al*., 2015; Nwankwo *et al*., 2017) and coping mechanisms (Rosario *et al*., 2011; Carnicer & Calderón, 2013; Ziba & Nahid, 2013). Moreover, demographic factors like gender as an important factor are expected to be related to and affect the psychological wellbeing of individuals. Regarding gender issues, previous studies reported various study findings. For example, Mills *et al*. (1992) conducted a study on "The Effects of Gender, Family Satisfaction, and Economic Strain on Psychological Well-Being" in which only married respondents were considered and found that husbands had higher psychological wellbeing than wives (see Nwankwo *et al*., 2017).

Higher institution learning is among the educational contexts in which people experience high levels of stress. Higher education students' loci of control, level of psychological well-being, and coping style all have a significant impact on their academic achievement. One of the basic and influential parts of every society is the educational system of that society, and schoolteacher (PGDT) trainers are among the most important pillars of this educational system. Therefore, carrying out surveys about this population in society is crucial and could resolve many problems. It is obvious that having a series of traits in school teacher (PGDT) trainers of a society like balanced development, having a better locus of control orientation, having adaptive and productive coping strategies or styles, and high psychological wellbeing could have considerable effects on personality aspects, personal and social development, emerging competent behaviours, nurturing more talented people, and decreasing the personality and behavioural abnormalities of the people of that society. So, conducting investigations about psychological wellbeing, coping styles, and locus of control orientation in school teacher (PGDT) trainers not only helps to develop and increase the quality of trainers' lives but also leads to more growth and progress in the whole educational system society.

Now, with respect to what has been stated, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between locus of control, coping styles, and psychological wellbeing of school teacher (PGDT) trainees at Dilla University. Based on the purpose of the study, attempts were made to answer the following questions: First things first: what do the locus of control, coping style, and psychological wellbeing profiles of the participants look like? Second, do locus of control orientation, sex, and coping styles have significant relationships with psychological wellbeing dimensions? Third: Do locus of control, sex, and coping styles have significant joint or unique predictive validity for psychological wellbeing?

1.2 Review of Related Literatures

In psychological research, Psychological wellbeing is one of the variables of greatest impact due to its effect on people's health and well-being. Ryan

and Deci (2001) took a dualistic approach to well-being: hedonic, which focuses on happiness and well-being in terms of attaining pleasure and avoiding pain; and eudemonic, which conceptualizes fulfillment and well-being in terms of how fully functional a person is. Ryff (1989) presented a model of eudemonic well-being, and Ryff and Keyes (1995) later described well-being as realizing one's true potential by striving for perfection. Ryff's model takes a multidimensional approach to measuring psychological well-being. Likewise, other authors have analyzed its structure (Abbott *et al*. 2006; Kafka and Kozma 2002; Mele´ndez *et al*. 2009;) and found six dimensions: autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, purpose in life, environmental mastery, and positive relations with others.

This research approach is well represented by the eudaimonic well-being perspective, which posits that the maximum development of individual potential (i.e., psychological well-being) is determined by six indicators of positive psychological functioning: self- acceptance (SA), environmental mastery (EM), positive relations with others, autonomy, purpose in life (PL), and personal growth (PG; Ryff, 1989). Psychological well-being consists of six dimensions, including autonomy (independence and self-determination), environmental mastery (the ability to manage one's life), personal growth (being open to new experiences), purpose in life (believing that one's life is meaningful), self-acceptance (a positive attitude towards oneself and one's past life) and positive relations with others (high quality relationships) (Ryff, 1989).

An extensive body of research suggests that several variables that are closely linked to these six dimensions of psychological well-being favor the adoption of adaptive coping strategies in the academic context. Some of these variables reviewed by Freire, Ferradás, Valle , Núñez and Vallejo (2016) are self-esteem (Cabanach *et al*., 2014), perceived control (Doron *et al*., 2009), quality of social support (Fernández-González *et al*., 2015), self-determination (Ryan and Deci, 2000), PL (Freire *et al*., 2015), and pursuit of self-realization (Miquelon and Vallerand, 2008).

Academic stress has a great impact on various aspects of life of higher education students. Coping strategies and stress response is more important than stress itself. Whatever better ways to deal with stress is applied, stress will be less damaging (Akouchian, Rouhafza, Hasanzadeh & Mohammad, 2009). Different styles of coping with stress are defined such as problem- focused style (PFCS) and emotional-focused style (EFCS) (Wonderlich-Tierney, & Vander, 2010). PFCS includes problem solving to get rid of stress like managing the problem that causing stress and EFCS, including the use of emotional responses during stressful situations such as mental rumination or blaming others (Kelly, Tyrka, Price, Carpenter, 2008). PFCS is more effective in solving the problem than EFCS. Coping refers to cognitive, emotional, and/or behavioral efforts to address (master, reduce, or tolerate) a troubled person-environment relationship (Folkman and Lazarus, 1985). Accordingly, coping strategies play a crucial role in people's health (Kraag *et al*., 2006), with relevant implications for subjective well-being (e.g., Parsons *et al*., 1996; Sheldon and Lyubomirsky, 2006; Viñas *et al*., 2015) and psychological well- being (e.g., Loukzadeh and Bafrooi, 2013; Portocarrero and Bernardes, 2013; Bryden *et al*., 2015; Mayordomo *et al*., 2015).

Folkman (1984) postulated that problem-focused coping strategies are more likely to be used to maintain psychological well-being in situations where the environmental challenge can be altered. In contrast, emotion-focused coping strategies are more likely to be implemented when the problem is inalterable. It should be noted that some researchers indicate coping is also tied to subjective well-being. Assuming that coping strategies are important for people's well-being, prolific research has focused on studying whether some coping mechanisms are more adaptive than others. Although the contextual nature of coping suggests that one strategy can be adaptive in one context but not in others (Endler *et al*., 1994), approach coping is generally considered more adaptive than avoidant coping (e.g., Gustems-Carnicer and Caldeet alrón, 2013; Syed and Seiffge-Krenke, 2015).

Coping with the stress of life can influence on mental health and well-being. Psychological well-being focuses on the positive and negative emotions and

increase pleasure and decreases negative moods (Ryff, 1989). It depends on several factors such as individual (self-esteem, optimism), demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, and marital status), economic status (physical health, social interaction) (Binder & Coad, 2010). Several researches evidenced the link between different coping styles or strategies with psychological well-being. For example, in their study Loukzadeh.,and Bafrooi (2013) showed emotion focused coping styles9EFCS) was more commonly used than problem focused coping style(PFCS). This study indicates a significant negative relationship between EFCS and purpose in life. EFCS and personal growth are negatively related. More over there is a significant positive relationship between PFCS and purpose in life.

More recently, authors have indicated that problem-focused coping styles and strategies are linked to high well-being, while emotion-focused coping is associated with low well-being (Williams and McGillicuddy-De Lisi 2000), in men and women alike. Fierro and Jime´nez (2002) cited in Freire, Ferradás, Valle, Núñez and Vallejo (2016), in a study of young college students, reported that modes of coping were linked to well-being, which was negatively correlated with passive or emotion-focused modes of coping. Along those lines, a study by Gonza´lez *et al*. (2002) showed well-being to have a positive, significant correlation with problem-focused coping, as well as seeking social support. Meanwhile, a negative correlation was observed between wellbeing and emotion-focused coping strategies

Locus of control refers to the tendency to perceive outcomes in life as a result of one's own actions and thus being within one's own control (i.e., internal locus of control), as opposed to being determined by external factors, such as chance or powerful others (i.e., external locus of control) (Rotter, 1966; Keenan and McBain, 1979 cited in Reknes , Visockaite, Liefooghe, Lovakov & Einarsen, 2019)). People with high internal locus of control typically try to master their environment, while those with high external locus of control often feel helpless because they perceive that outcomes in life are outside their own control (Keenan and McBain, 1979). The role of locus of control in individuals' positive psychological characteristics have been studied separately (Pannells & Claxton, 2008).

In their review Alexandra, Kurt, and Nandani (2012) indicated that Internal locus of control has been linked with academic success (Gifford, Briceño-Perriott & Mianzo, 2006), higher self-motivation and social maturity (Nelson &Mathias, 1995), lower incidences of stress and depression (Garber & Seligman, 1980), and longer life span (Chipperfield, 1993). Psychological and physical wellbeing has also been shown to be moderated by perceived control (Brandstadter & Renner, 1990). Kulshrestha and Sen (2006) have noted significant negative correlation between locus of control and subjective well-being, which is to say that individuals with an external locus of control are significantly less happy than their internal counterparts. It is noted that internals actively manipulate their environments, thus acting to take control of events and to change dissatisfactory conditions (Kulshresta & Sen, 2006). In contrast, externals feel powerless to control their successes or failures (Nielsen, 1987) and, thus, are unable to remove themselves from dissatisfactory situations (Kulshresta & Sen, 2006).

The current study focused on university students (particularly PGDT Trainees), a group that has not been examined by previous research. Therefore, the primary objective of this study is to identify profiles of psychological well-being according to their functioning in the six different dimensions that comprise psychological well-being. The second objective is to determine whether the identified profiles of psychological well-being predicted by in terms of coping strategies(problem focused, emotion focused and avoidance coping) that the students adopt to deal with academic demands and their Locus of control (internal verses external orientation) belief as well as gender. It is expected that students with high functioning on psychological well-being indices use adaptive coping strategies and an internal locus of control to a greater extent than students with a profile of poor in different dimensions of psychological well-being.

2 Methods

2.1 Participants

This study aimed to explore the extent to which locus of control, coping styles, and gender predict school teacher (PGDT) trainees' psychological wellbeing. Hence, to carry out the study, the descriptive and correlational research designs were employed. The study population was drawn from Postgraduate Diploma in Teaching (PGDT) regular and summer program trainees who were enrolled in the 2018/19 academic year at Dilla University Institute of Education and Behavioral Science. In the study population, all the fields that are Amharic, English, Afaan Oroomo, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, History, Physical Education, Civics, and ICT were used. To reach the study goals among the population with a size of approximately 692 people (603 male and 89 female), according to Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination model table, 242 people were selected as the sample. Then, the target population was categorized by strata (i.e., stratified by field of study/department). 242 was selected with the consideration of a proportional stratified random sampling approach in terms of department and gender. The questionnaires were distributed by lottery method and finally collected from 209 PGDT trainers who properly filled them out.

2.2 Instruments

In this study, three different instruments (Ryff psychological wellbeing, adapted adolescent coping styles scale, and adult Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control scale) were used as questionnaires.

Psychological wellbeing scale

This scale is used to assess those students' psychological well-being characteristics. In Ryff (1989), the 42-item psychological wellbeing scale was used. In this study, psychological well-being is a multidimensional construct that encompasses psychological and psychosocial well-being. This psychological wellbeing construct is operationalized in terms of six dimensions: self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, and purpose in life. For this study, the scale has 42 items and six dimensions (67) that contain six subscales reflecting self-acceptance (7 items), autonomy (7 items), environmental mastery (7 items), personal growth (7 items), positive relations with others (7 items), and the purpose of life (7 items). The scale has 22 direct and 20 reverse items for scoring, and the range of the total score of each person on this scale in all six dimensions could fluctuate. Hence, the scale items are to be rated on a six-point scale that ranges from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree (e.g., In general, I feel in charge of the situation in which I live.

Locus of control scale

The participants' locus of control orientation was measured using an adapted adult Nowicki-Strickland internal-external locus of control scale (1973) version of the ANS-IE (Nowicki and Duke, 1973scale) indicating external and internal locus of control. This scale was developed based on the theoretical framework work proposed by Rotter. The ANS-IE was chosen because it has been used in personality measurement. The original scale consisted of 40 items, and the respondents were asked to choose "Yes" or "No" options to the given statements. It is scored in external directions (Nowicki and Duke, 1993). The instrument has a range of scores from zero to forty. As interpreted by the score, the higher the score (i.e., above the median point) in the locus of control of the orientation scale, the more external it means.

Coping scale

The study adopted the coping scale locally used by Shemsu (2010). The scale was developed on the basis of the general short form of self-reported The adolescent coping scale (ACS) was used as an instrument in this study. As described by Shemsu (2010), the original scale contains 19 items (18 structured and one open-ended item) which were developed by Frydenberg and Lewis (1993). The adolescent coping scale was chosen because the wording of the items in the original scale was not ambiguous and it retained the narrow band of coping distinctions. Moreover, the scale was developed for adolescents but is also used to assess young adults' coping behaviours (Frydenberg and Lewis 1998). The questionnaire items were de-

signed to measure on a 4-point likert scale, ranging from "does not apply to me" to "applies to me always". The adopted scale has 31 items (13 items for the problem-focused coping subscale, 9 items for avoidance coping, and 9 items for emotion-focused coping subscale), which was developed by taking 18 items from the Adolescent Coping Scale (ACS).

2.3 Method of data analysis

After all the required data was collected and checked in the questionnaires, the data analysis was conducted. To analyze and interpret the data, the SPSS program version 23.0 was used. To analyze the coded data, descriptive statistics, an independent sample t-test, Pearson product moment correlation, multiple regression, and stepwise multiple regression analysis were used. All statistical analyses were performed at an alpha level of 0.05.

3 Results

To know the role of locus of control, coping styles, and gender in predicting the psychological wellbeing of students, descriptive statistics, independent sample T-test, Pearson correlation coefficient, and regression analysis were calculated. The results are presented in the following tables.

3.1 The status of Locus of control orientations, Coping styles and Psychological wellbeing of the respondents

In order to see the profiles of locus of control orientations, coping styles, and psychological wellbeing of the respondents, the following descriptive statistics, that is, mean and standard deviation, were used.

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Participant Profile of Locus of control, Coping styles and Psychological wellbeing (N=209)

Variables		Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Locus of control (IV)	LOC	8	38	20.20	4.882
Coping style (IV)					
Subscales	Problem Focused coping	17	52	37.80	6.936
	Avoidance Coping	10	35	19.64	5.177
	Emotion Focused Coping	11	34	23.71	4.632
	Total	40.00	115.00	81.1531	12.58722
Psychological wellbeing (DV)					
Subscales	Autonomy	13	41	26.63	4.757
	Environmental mastery	15	40	27.00	4.602
	Personal growth	17	42	28.24	5.153
	Positive relationship with other	11	41	27.39	4.905
	Purpose in life	16	89	29.13	6.652
	Self acceptance	18	40	28.13	4.696
	Total	124.00	217.00	166.517	21.92910

The above table 1 shows the descriptive statistical analysis of the variable. As it was illustrated in the above table 1, the respondents' locus of control beliefs were externally oriented (M = 20.20, SD = 4.882) rather than internally oriented. It is noted that the total score on the LOC scale between 8 and 19 is considered an internal LOC, whereas the score between 20 and 38 is considered an external LOC. As it is mentioned in the methodology section, the higher the score (i.e., above the median point) in the locus of control of orientation scale, the more external it means. With regard to the coping styles, problem-focused coping (M = 37.80, SD = 6.936) was the major coping style which was mostly used by the participants. Followed by emotion-focused and avoidance coping were (M = 23.71, SD = 4.632)

and (M = 19.64, SD = 5.177) respectively. Concerning psychological wellbeing, purpose in life (M = 29.13, SD = 6.652), Personal Growth (M = 28.24, SD = 5.153), Self-Acceptance (M = 28.13, SD = 4.696), Positive Relationship With Others (M = 27.39, SD = 4.905), Environmental Mastery (M = 27.00, SD = 4.602), and Autonomy (M = 26.63, SD = 4.757) respectively. Note that in all the sub-domains of psychological wellbeing, the observed mean (i.e., mean of each subscale) ratings are higher than the expected mean (i.e., 21), and hence the mean ratings for the total psychological wellbeing scale (166.52) are higher than the expected mean (126.52).

Table 2: T-Test Results for gender differences on LOC, Coping style, and Psychological wellbeing (N=209)

Sub-scales	Sex					
	Female (N=61)		Male (N=148)			
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	T	Sig. (two tailed)
Psychological wellbeing total (DV)	164.245	19.342	167.452	22.907	-.961	.338

As can be seen from table 2 below, an independent-samples t-test was conducted and there was no significant difference between males (M = 167.45, SD = 22.91) and females (M = 164.25, SD = 19.34) in their total psychological wellbeing scores. df (207) =-.961, p =.338 (two-tailed).

3.2 Relationship between the Variables Under the Study

In an attempt to explore the relationship between the independent variables (sex, locus of control, coping styles) and dependent variables (psychological wellbeing and its sub dimensions) in the study, a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient test was computed.

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. As can be seen from table 3, locus of control was negatively and significantly related to all sub dimensions of psychological wellbeing (p 0.05). Concerning coping styles with psychological wellbeing totals and sub dimensions, table 3 is displayed as follows. Problem-focused coping style was positively and significantly related to all the sub dimensions of psychological wellbeing and its total scale (p 0.01). More importantly, a problem-focused coping style was positively and significantly related to total psychological wellbeing (r =.421, p 0.01). In contrast, the avoidance coping style was negatively and significantly related to all sub dimensions of psychological wellbeing and its total scale (p 0.01). In addition, the emotion-focused coping style was negatively and significantly related to only autonomy (r =.156, p 0.05) and environmental mastery (r =.143, p 0.05). However, coping style as a total scale was significantly and positively related to only the autonomy sub dimension of psychological wellbeing (r =.155, p 0.05).

Table 3 below shows that locus of control was negatively and significantly related to psychological wellbeing total with (t (207) =-3.679, p 0.01). Sex, on the other hand, was not significantly related to total psychological well-being (t(207) =.887, p > 0.05).According to this table, the locus of control was a significant negative predictor of psychological well-being.The regression model summary reveals that locus of control contributed 6.6% of the explained variance in psychological wellbeing. This regression finding implies that since the participants identified with an external locus of control, the external locus of control impacts poor psychological wellbeing among respondents.

3.3 Predicting Psychological wellbeing from Coping styles (PFCS, EFCS &AVCS)

Other independent variables examined to predict the psychological wellbeing of the respondents were coping styles. In order to know the contribution of coping styles in predicting psychological wellbeing, multiple regression was also done.

Table 3: Results of Pearson correlation test for examining the relationship between the study variables under the study

Variables	Sex	LOC	PFCS	AVCS	EFCS	A	EM	PG	PRS	PIL	SA	PWB Total
Sex**	1.00											
Locus of control	-.028	1.00										
Problem Focused Coping	-.039	-.176*	1.00									
Avoidance Coping	-.018	.233**	.049	1.00								
Emotion Focused Coping	.000	-.028	.599**	.419**	1.00							
Autonomy	.001	-.164*	.350**	-.142*	.156*	1.00						
Environmental mastery	.039	-.171*	.411**	-.280**	.143*	.413**	1.00					
Personal growth	.114	-.166*	.289**	-.315**	-.101	.381**	.387**	1.00				
Positive relationship with other	.137*	-.185**	.311**	-.269**	.069	.360**	.485**	.467**	1.00			
Purpose in life	.021	-.163*	.230**	-.315**	-.064	.319**	.282**	.428**	.408**	1.00		
Self acceptance	-.025	-.224**	.243**	-.311**	.008	.363**	.476**	.495**	.513**	.398**	1.00	
Psychological wellbeing total	.067	-.249**	.421**	-.386**	.038	.648**	.687**	.739**	.747**	.709**	.745**	1.00

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note: Control point PFCS stands for Problem Focused Coping, AVCS stands for Avoidance Coping, and EFCS stands for Emotion Focused Coping. A: Independence, EM stands for environmental mastery.PG: Personal development, PRS: Positive interpersonal relationships PIL: Life's Purpose, Self-acceptance and PWB total: Psychological wellbeing total

Table 4: Results of multiple regression analysis for Predicting Psychological wellbeing from three Coping styles (N=209)

Variables	Un standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
Problem Focused Coping	1.604	.231	.507	6.933	.000
Avoidance Coping	-1.538	.273	-.363	-5.626	.000
Emotion Focused Coping	-.540	.381	-.114	-1.416	.158

**p< .01

From table 4, it can be seen that problem-focused coping and avoidance coping were the significant predictors of psychological wellbeing. According to the table, problem-focused coping style was significantly and positively predicted psychological wellbeing (t = 6.933, p 0.01), whereas avoidance coping style was significantly and negatively predicted psychological wellbeing (t =-5.626, p 0.01).However, emotional-focused coping style was not significantly predicted by psychological wellbeing (t =-1.416.887, p > 0.05). The regression model summary reveals that 35% of the total variation in the dependent variable (psychological wellbeing) can be explained by the combined problem-focused coping and avoidance coping styles. The findings imply that problem-focused coping styles had a positive effect, whereas avoidance coping styles had a poor effect on respondents' psychological wellbeing. With respect to Standardized Coefficients Beta, find which beta value is the largest (ignoring any negative signs out front). In this case, the largest beta coefficient is b =.51, which is for problem-focused coping. This means that this variable makes the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable (psychological wellbeing) when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for.

A stepwise regression method has been employed to evaluate the relative contributions of each predictor variable in predicting the criterion variable and to identify the strongest predictor.

Table 5: Result of stepwise regression analysis for predicting Psychological wellbeing from coping styles (PFCS and AVCS)

Model	Variables	Un standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients					
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	R2	Δ R2	F
1	Problem focused Coping	1.332	.199	.421	6.684	.000	.178	.178	44.672
2	Avoidance Coping	-1.727	.239	-.408	-7.212	.000	.343	.166	52.011

**P<0.01

As it can be seen from the stepwise regression analysis table above, the predictor variables considered in this analysis are problem-focused coping style and avoidance coping style. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity. Problem-focused coping style (PFCS) was entered at Step 1, explaining 17.8% of the variance in psychological wellbeing. Following the addition of the PFCS and AVCS subscales at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 34.3%, F (4, 421) = 53.846, p.001.The second predictor variable, AVSC, explained an additional 16.6% of the variance in psychological wellbeing after controlling for PVCS, R squared change =.343, F change (2, 421) = 52.001, p .001. In the final model, only the two coping styles were statistically significant, with the problem-focused coping scale recording a higher beta value (β =.421, p .001) than the avoidance coping scale (β = –.408, p .001). As a result, among the respondents, a problem-focused coping style is a relatively stronger predictor of psychological well-being.

4 Discussion

As observed in the result section, the study found that the participants' locus of control orientation tendency was externally oriented rather than internally oriented (M = 20.20, SD = 4.882). The score above the median point is considered externally oriented; the finding confirmed by the mean score is above the median point (20). It is understandable that since the majority of the respondents are externally oriented in their locus of control, the PGDT trainers and students believe whatever happens to them is caused by forces outside of their control-whether by chance, fate, or by other people who are more powerful than they are, they also more likely to construct events as resulting from luck, chance, fate, or powers beyond their personal control.

With regard to the coping styles profile, it was found that problem-focused coping (M = 37.80, SD =) was the major coping style which was practiced by the participants. It implies that the majority of the respondent styles of coping are directed at altering the discomfort-arousing situations and comprise strategies such as seeking social support, focusing on solving the problem, physical recreation, seeking relaxation diversion, improving relationships, working hard and focusing on the problem. Considering the psychological wellbeing profile of the participants, the study found that in all the sub-dimensions of psychological wellbeing, the observed mean ratings are higher than the expected mean (i.e., 21), and hence the mean ratings for the total scale (166.52) is higher than the expected mean (126). This could explain why most sub dimensions of respondents' psychological well-being are said to be at a high level.

The current study's correlation analysis shows a significant negative relationship between the locus of control and all psychological wellbeing sub dimensions as well as its total scale (r = -.249, p.01).Furthermore, the multiple regression analysis also confirms that the locus of control variable (that is, external LOC) significantly predicts psychological wellbeing. As the finding indicated, the locus of control variable does contribute to the prediction of psychological wellbeing significantly

and negatively (t (207) =-3.679, p 0.01). Since the participants' locus of control is externally oriented, it is understandable from the result that there is an inverse relationship between locus of control and psychological wellbeing. Individuals who score in the external direction on the locus of control orientation scale tend to experience poor psychological wellbeing. This study finding tends to be in agreement with past studies which have found that locus of control is associated with psychological wellbeing as well as study findings that demonstrate a negative correlation between psychological wellbeing and external locus of control (Uma & Manikandan, 2017; Mobarakeh *et al*., 2015).

Moreover, this study also attempts to find the relationship between three coping styles and psychological wellbeing and its sub dimensions. The result of the correlation analysis shows that there is a significant correlation between problem-focused coping style positively and avoidance coping style negatively with all psychological wellbeing dimensions. However, the emotion-focused coping style does not significantly correlate with most psychological wellbeing subscales except autonomy and environmental mastery, which are positively correlated. Similar results in support of this finding have been reported by other authors who relate problem-solving coping strategies with a high level of psychological wellbeing (Parsons, Frydenberg, & Poole, 1996).

The multiple regression analysis also confirms that the relative contribution of the three coping styles (PFCS, AVCS, and EFCS) as independent variables found that problem-focused coping style (PFCS) and avoidance coping style (AVCS) regressed to the overall psychological wellbeing. Problem-focused coping styles positively predicted psychological wellbeing, while avoidance coping styles negatively predicted psychological wellbeing total. Specifically, it implies that proactive, problem-solving coping in PGDT trainers and students had a beneficial effect on their psychological wellbeing and positive functioning. It means that the problem-focused coping style was the strongest predictor, rather than the avoidance coping style, in explaining the variance in psychological wellbeing. The finding implies that problem-focused coping strategies in college students had a beneficial effect on components of psychological wellbeing. In contrast, avoidance coping strategies are associated with a greater negative effect on components of psychological wellbeing.

In support of these findings, Farzana, Shahina, and Shah (2016) found that coping style influences the psychological well-being of the individual. In particular, positive coping styles like optimism give better psychological well-being. Further evidence from Murray-Harvey *et al*. (2002), a study on student teachers, found that avoidance coping strategies are associated with negative psychological well-being. Specifically, cognitive avoidance strategies such as avoiding thinking about the stressor, seeking distraction, and acceptance–resignation are associated with greater psychological distress or poor psychological wellbeing.

5 Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the study findings, it is concluded that locus of control, especially externally oriented LOC, has a negative effect on PGDT trainees' overall psychological well-being. Similarly, the avoidance coping style has a negative effect on students' overall psychological well-being. In contrast, a problem-focused coping style has a beneficial effect on having better psychological wellbeing among university students. .

Suggestions for Further Researches

With regards to the numerous limitations of this study, the following suggestions are put forward by the researcher for further research: embarking on a similar study with more participants from various institutions/universities and conducting related studies using variables such as age, locality, economic status, self-concept, and a slew of others as variables that may impact university students' psychological well-being.

Acknowledgments

During the research, many people have generously helped us, and to list them all here would cover too many pages. But for the countless acts of kindness and support, we are profoundly grateful.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval

Consent was sought form the research participants. Confidentiality was maintained in reporting information.

References

Abbott, R. A., Ploubidis, G. B., Huppert, F. A., Kuh, D., Wadsworth, M. E. J., & Croudace, T. J. (2006).Psychometric evaluation and predictive validity of Ryff's psychological well-being items in a UK birth cohort sample of women. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 4, 76. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-4-76.

Akouchian SH, Rouhafza HR, Hasanzadeh A, Mohammad Sharifi H.(2009). Relation between social support and coping with stress in nurses in psychiatric ward. *Journal of Guilan university of medical sciences*.18(69):41–46. [Google Scholar]

Babao, A.J. & Moscoso, L.S. (2008) Lifestyle and Health Status of Faculty of the college of Human Ecologyand Food Sciences and the College of Education. *Journal of the American Association* 16, 25-34.

Binder M & Coad A. (2010). An examination of the dynamics of well-being and life events using vector auto regressions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 76(2):352–71. [Google Scholar]

Brandtstadter, J. & Baltes-Gotz, B. (1990). Personal control over development and quality of life perspective in adulthood. In B. Baltes & M.M. Baltes (Eds.), *Successful aging: Perspectives from behavioral sciences*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 197-224. Carnicer, J.G. & Calderón C.(2013). Coping strategies and psychological well-being among teacher education students: Coping and wellbeing in students. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(4), pp.1127-1140.

Farazan, P., Shahina, M., & Shah, M. K. (2016). Optimism as Predictor of Psychological Well-being among Adolescents. *The international Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3 (4), 12- 21.

Freire C, Ferradás MM, Valle A, Núñez JC and Vallejo G (2016). Profiles of Psychological Well-being and Coping Strategies among University Students. *Front. Psychol*. 7:1554. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01554

Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1993). *The Adolescent Coping Scale*. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Helson, S. & Srivastava, S. (2001) three paths of adult development: conservers, seekers, and achievers.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 995, 1010.

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 1, 137-164

Kafka, G. J., & Kozma, A. (2002). The construct validity of Ryff's scales of psychological well-being and their relationship to measures of subjective well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 57, 171–190. doi:10.1023/A:1014451725204.

Kelly MM, Tyrka AR, Price LH, Carpenter LL (2008). Sex differences in the use of coping strategies: predictors of anxiety and depressive symptoms. *Depress Anxiety*; 25(10):839–46. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Keyes, C.L.M., Schmotkin, D. & Ryff, C.D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: the empirical encounter of two traditions. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87, 1007 – 1022.

Kibret TB (2016) Health-Related Behaviors, Health Consciousness and Psychological Wellbeing among Teaching Faculty in Jimma University, Ethiopia. *Clinical Exp. Psychology* 2: 113. doi: 10.4172/2471-2701.1000113

Krejcie, R.V.& Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining Sample size for research activities*. Educational and Psychological measurement.

Kulshresta, U. & Sen, C. (2006). Subjective well-being in relation to emotional intelligence and locus of control among executives, *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32, pp. 93-98.

Loukzadeh, Z., and Bafrooi, N.M. (2013). Association of coping style and psychological well-being in hospital nurses. *Journal of Caring Sci.* 2, 313–319.doi: 10.5681/jcs.2013.037

Mele´ndez, J. C., Toma´s, J. M., Oliver, A., & Navarro, E. (2009). Psychological and physical dimensions explaining life satisfaction among elderly: A structural model examination. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 48, 291–295. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2008.02.008

Mobarakeh V. Mohammad R. , Rumaya, J., Siti, N. Y., Ma, R. R. (2015). Locus of control and psychological well-being among Iranian adolescent migrants in Kuala-Lumpur, Malaysia. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*,10(3), 310- 313. http://www.iasir.net

Murray-Harvey, R., Slee, P., Lawson, M., Silins, H., Banfield, G., & Russell, A. (2002). Under stress: the concerns and coping strategies of teacher education students. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 23 (1), 19-35 Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. (1973). A Locus of Control Scale for Collage as well as non-Collage adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, in Press.

Nwankwo B.C. Okechi B.C. and Kalu O.E. (2017). Role of Locus of Control and Gender on Psychological Well-being among Youth Athletes. *Journal of Psychological and Sociological studies*, 1(1).

Parsons, A., Frydenberg, E., & Poole, C. (1996). Overachievement and coping strategies in adolescents males. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66, 109-114

Reknes I, Visockaite G, Liefooghe A, Lovakov A and Einarsen, SV (2019). Locus of Control Moderates the Relationship Between Exposure to Bullying Behaviors and Psychological Strain. Front. Psychol. 10:1323.doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01323

Ryff C D. (1989). Happiness is Everything or Is It? Exploration on the Meaning of Psychological Wellbeing. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57: 1069-1081. http:// doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff, C. & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9,1-28.

Shemsu R.(2010). Locus of Control, Sex and Personality characteristics as Predictors of Coping Styles Among Young adults; the case of Dilla University. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University

Uma, K and Manikandan, K.(2017). Role of Self-esteem, Locus of control and Coping in predicting the Psychological well being of Adolescents. *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences*; 5(2),654-661

Williams, K., & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. (2000). Coping strategies in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 537–549. doi:10.1016/S0193-3973(99)00025-8.

Wissing, M.P. & Van Eeden, C. (2002). Empirical clarification of the nature of psychological well-being. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32, 32 – 44.

Wonderlich-Tierney AL, Vander Wal JS(2010). The effects of social support and coping on the relationship between social anxiety and eating disorders. *Eat Behavior* ; 11(2):85 91. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Ziba Loukzadeh and Nahid Mazloom Bafrooi (2013). Association of coping style and psychological well-being in hospital nurses. https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01554