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ABSTRACT The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between locus of control with coping styles of problem-focused, excited-focused and avoidance among volleyball young men, Karaj City, Iran. The research method was correlation-descriptive that was implemented as monitoring. The population of this research was 200 volleyball young men that several teams of participating teams were chosen randomly that the statistical sample were 130 individuals with regard to Morgan’s Sample size table. Data were collected through locus of control questionnaire by Levenson (1989), and coping styles with stress of Endler and Parker (1990). Kolmogorov-Smirnov test revealed non-normality of data. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the locus of control and coping styles with stress. There was a significant and positive relationship between the locus of control and coping style of problem-focused among volleyball players, as well. Also, there is a significant and negative relationship between the locus of control with excited-focused avoidance coping style of volleyball players.

KEYWORDS Locus of Control, Coping Styles with Stress, Volleyball.

INTRODUCTION

Psychology is the scientific study of behavior of the organism, the scientific study of behavior in mental processes, and it is study of infrastructure of behavior that is studied on physiological and cognitive processes and it is a profession which is used to practically solve human problems. More than a hundred years of experience and research have been shown that mind and body are not separate categories; they act as integrated and intertwined ways that it is not easy to describe. So, it seems that the man is obliged to reconsider the use of words that they are able to refer to the complex relationship between mind and body. Now, the first step was done towards liberation from the chains of dualism, which a century psychology and two thousand years philosophy was enslaved, has been removed. It is a long way to go. Psychology is entering to new era with new insights to be watered. Specialists in physical education and sports science are mentioned to social factors such as cultural and cognitive point range for participating of people, especially athletes in sports activities. The locus of control, stress and coping with can be named as cognitive factors (Mollazadeh-esfanjani, 2012). Sports psychology is a science that deals with the study of individual behavior in physical activity and its aim is to explain, to describe, to predict and to change this behavior in the context of motor sport and position. Sports
psychology is study on athletes' personality and their real knowledge of the causes, which may be effected on better perform of sport skills at the service of teachers of physical education and sport as well. Therefore, development of athletes are depends on the psychological factors further of physical factors, and success achievement is necessity to allocate enough time on the physical and mental training. Sometimes, athletic is left the ring or impaired performance with a sentence of coach due to lack of knowledge about the characteristics and psychological of athletic trainers. Therefore, sports psychologists and researchers have to deal with this important issue that the teachers and coaches have to decide to use the scientific and psychological findings and strategies appropriate to the physical and mental training of athletes after deciding. Stress is in the lives of all human beings and is an inevitable fact of life. Since, the pressures of emotional and physical stress are annoying and undesirable, so people are motivated to do activities to reduce their stress. People reacts are very different to the stress that the reason for this difference is the type of cope. Cope is the cognitive and behavioral efforts and efforts to manage internal and external requirements that are stressful and they are beyond of the personal resources. The aim of it (cope) is destroying, removing, or minimizing stress tolerance. These efforts are acting as either business activities or are in the form of mental activity (Rasti, 2009).

Cope is not stable attribute, but it will be change through experience exchange processes. The way a person chooses to deal may be inappropriate strategy and his vulnerability to stress will increase (Lazarus, 1996). Coping skills of each person is the unique ways to dealing with his problems in life and it cause compatibility or incompatibility and it is depended on the style of his coping. These are divided to the three "problem-focused", "emotion-focused coping" and "anti-avoidance". Coping strategies "problem-focused" describes the ways which is calculated that actions that should be taken to reduce or eliminate the stress. Behavior of "problem- focused" are included to seek more information about it, changing the structure of the cognitive issue and is giving priority to steps to address the problem, on the contrary, coping strategies of "excitement" describes the ways that are based on individual self-centered and all efforts that is focused on reducing of his own discomfort.

Coping reactions of "emotional" are such as crying, nervous and upset, addressing censorious behaviors, preoccupation and fantasy. Finally, coping strategies of "avoidance" requires activity and cognitive changes that their aim was to avoid a stressors situation. Coping behaviors of "avoidance" may take as a form of bringing to engage of new activity or appear as turning to community and others (Endler and Parker, 1990). Researchers were deal to the issue of stress and coping strategies from different perspectives. The researchers have focused significant attention to the controlling factor or locus of control. One of the important aspects to study is investigation of the source control in character of people.

The locus of control is that how person believes that can have an effect on your life (Karimi, 2003). Locus of control can be internal or external (tendency to chance, tendency to the powerful device). Those have an internal locus of control who are believed that they are the original creators of their own lives, but those have external source they are believed to the primarily a product of chance, accident or a result of other people (Ganji, 2012).

Those who have an external locus of control are emotional, so rational lack of understanding of the events or behaviors causes associated with events. These people are resorted to acts such as withdrawal, apathy and anxiety in front of several threatening situations once they are faced to variety of unhealthy behaviors in life, whereas, those with internal locus of control tend to bold, they feel that they can affected on life (not passive and helpless) to the rewards and punishments. These people are shown high mental power and more tolerant against the stress distribution (Ganji, 2012). Sports success and performance are largely influenced by stressful exercise routine. Stress is inevitable in sports and stressful events are an integral part of stressful life in championship sports. The inability to effectively coping with sport stresses is harmful for athletic performance and personal satisfaction. Techniques to deal with stress and locus of control is protected the athlete against interfering thoughts and actions. The player cannot be distracted by external or internal events and it able him to do well technical and tactical skills.

This research will help coaches to better understand and react the problems of individual athletes and provide necessary programs and as much as possible and within the scope of their responsibility to guide athletes. Some of the research findings on the use of locus of control and coping style is different so, some researchers concluded that athletes with an locus of internal control use problem-focused coping and athletes with locus of external control use excited-focused and avoidance coping styles, while some researchers have achieved a different result, that athletes with locus of external control use problem-focused coping and athletes with locus of internal control use excited-focused and avoidance coping.
There are antithesis results of researchers in the use of the locus of control and coping with stress and inconsistency in the use of coping with stress among volleyballers and its relation to the locus of control in improving performance of volleyball. Thus, this study seeks to answer the question whether there is a significant relationship between the locus of control with problem-focused coping, excited-focused and avoidance coping among young men volleyball in Karaj city, Iran or not.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The research method was correlation-descriptive. The population was all the volleyball young men, 18 to 30 years old, in Karaj city, 2014 that several teams of participating teams were chosen randomly that the statistical sample were 130 individuals with regard to Morgan's Sample size table. Independent variables and the dependent variables were locus of control and coping styles with stress, respectively. To collect information and access to the participants, it was referred to the Department of Youth and Sports of Karaj city and with official letters about the permission of questionnaire distribution in Board of volleyball was received from the University. Then, by referring to the volleyball Board and offering letter to a Youth and Sports Department to provide the necessary cooperation, the names of the participants were received. Researcher after attending the training board at the time of preparation and volleyball matches gave the necessary explanation on how to complete the questionnaire.

Participants were given questionnaires and asked them to answer the questions accurately and honestly. In this case, the required information on participants was collected. Only two of them were unusable. So, 130 questionnaires were finally analyzed. The study was performed after describing in detail to participants the introductory remarks about the gauges and the purpose of the test, how to response to tests. It can be noted that regarding to ethical considerations, they were assured that the information will be used only in the research and be protected from any abuse after obtaining the consent of the people and giving the necessary knowledge. Following questionnaires were used to measure the variables.

**Locus of control Inventory (IPC) of Levenson:** This test is done by pencil and paper, which includes three scales C, P, I, and a total of 24 articles. Each scale has been set as Likert 6 point for and the range of answers to questions was from strongly disagree to strongly agree that -3, -2, -1 on the opposite side and 3 + 2 + 1 + on agree side. So, the score of zero was not entitled to each one. The total score for each of I, C, P variables was total scores for each subject in the minor scale in 8 articles which was summed with number 24. High scores in the sub scales were interpreted as the high expectations of control by desired root (Samaii, 2012). The validity of the C, P, I variables was achieved by comparing with inner-outer scale of Rutter and also comparing to other test. Levenson (1981) reported 0.76 correlation for the all variables of locus of control and achieved social trends of Marlowe-Crowne scale (r=0.78). The results of conducted research in Iran, including Naderi-nobandegani (2000), Torabi (2004), Khosravi and Aghajani (2005), Bapizadeh (2006), Shamsai (2006), Malekian (2007) and Samaii (2012) showed that the internal corelation of test and its correlation related to different variables was relatively in high level. Meanwhile, In Samaii research, the construct validity for the total scale of locus of control was 0.87. Levenson (1981) reported Kuder Richardson Coefficient of reliability as 0.71 for total variables of locus of control. The reliability of the method test-retest with one week interval was reported between 0.6-0.79. In Samaii research (2012), Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the total scale of control locus was 0.78 and for the main subscales of test (internal control, external control orientation to the powerful, external control orientation to chance) was achieved 0.72, 0.78 and 0.75, respectively. In Heydari research (2013), locus of control (IPC) test of Levenson was obtained with an average reliability of 88%.

**Test methods for coping with stress (Endler and Parker):** In this study, to investigate and collect information about the methods of coping with stress, Coping inventory for stressful situation (CISS) of Endler and Parker was used. This measuring tool with pencil and paper is the report that was prepared in 1990 by two mentioned psychologists. (CISS) test has been translated and validated in Iran for the first time by Akbarzadeh. This test consists of 49 articles, which has been set for each category for the Likert scale, from (never = 1 to much=5), the coping test (CISS) considers three main areas of coping that include problem-focused or active behavior with problem in order to manage and solve it that 16 articles measures problem-focused behavior and is shown with T letter.

Excite-focused coping or focus on responses of excite-focused problem that 16 article of the test measures coping behavior and is shown by the E letter. avoidance coping or evasion of the problem: that emerge as
the two from of turn to the community and other people or get out and engage in a new activity, that 16 articles of the test measures avoidance behavior is shown with A letter. According to the findings of the test providers i.e. Endler and Parker, as well as experts and psychologists arbitration, in particular, clinical psychologists, it is suggested that mentioned test has good reliability to assess coping with stress.

Also, investigating the performed researches in Iran, including researches of Akbarzadeh (1982-1992), Ghoreishi (1997), Bahrami (1997), Tabatabai (1998), Vaghi (2000), Fotovat-ahmadi (2001), Shokri et al. (2005) and Saeedi et al (2013) showed that the internal correlation of test and its correlation with in relation to the different variables, is rather in the upper limit that this quality is the use of the test validity. In research of Shokri et al., validity of the following statements test subscales was confirmed through calculating correlation of each of the following statements with the total terms of the subscale.

The observed correlation was as follows: problem-focused =0.85, excite-focused = 0.79 and avoidance = 0.76. Saeedi also investigated that the validity of construct for the total scale of coping with stress was 0.83. Reliability of coping with stress was calculated primarily by Endler and Parker (1990) on study on 313 individuals (161 female, 152 male). Alpha Cronbach’s coefficient for following three main scale test (problem-focused, excite-focused and avoidance) was reported more than 0.80 in various samples, such as teenagers, students and adults (Endler & Parker, 1990).

Alpha coefficient of two subscales of coping avoidance (social entertainment and management attention) in the mentioned sample was between 0.72-0.84. Also, the reliability coefficient of the subscales retest has been reported 0.73 within 6 weeks. In Iran, several researches have calculated the reliability of mentioned scale on various samples that acceptable results were obtained and in investigation by Saeedi (2013), Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was obtained 0.87 for the total scale of coping with stress. Pearson correlation was used to analyze the data. In all analyzes, the significance level was considered p<0.05 for all analyses.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of research variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem-focused coping style</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53.55</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excite-focused coping style</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance coping style</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal control</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed abnormal distribution of the data (p<0.05). To investigate the relationship between locus of control with problem-focused coping, excited-focused coping and avoidance coping style, Spearman correlation was used. The results are presented in Table 1. The results showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between locus of control and problem-focused coping style of volleyball men in Karaj city (P≤0.01 and r=0.271). And there was a significant and negative relationship between the locus of control and excited-focused coping style of volleyball men in Karaj (P≤0.01 and r=0.871). And there was a significant and negative relationship between the locus of control and avoidance coping style of volleyball men in Karaj city (P≤0.01 and r=0.334).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coping styles with stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem-focused coping style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.271&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between locus of control with coping styles of problem-focused, excited-focused and avoidance among volleyball young men, Karaj City, Iran. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the locus of control and coping styles with stress. There was a significant and positive relationship between the locus of control and coping style of problem-focused among volleyball players, as well. Also, there was a significant and negative relationship between the locus of control with excited–focused and avoidance coping style of volleyball players.

These findings are consistent with the results of Heydari (2013) and Rutkowska et al (2014). Consistent reasons are probably related to equal population and sport activities background. Findings of research studies were not inconsistent with the results of Khosravi and Aghajani (2005). The causes of discrepancies are likely related to differences in statistical population. These researchers performed the relationship of control locus and ways of coping with stress in the first year of high school female students in Tehran but the study of the relationship between locus of control with coping style with stress of volleyball men in Karaj city.

So, maybe the reason for the discrepancy reasons are factors such as: sex, sports history and sports success background and individual differences. In the general view, issue of control locus and its relation to methods of coping with stress among volleyball players of this aspect is critical that the locus of control among athletes and behavior coping with stress is capable to affect various forms of their professional lives. Because, systemic control locus is from individual’s beliefs that individual are dependent on and linked to the successes, failures and important events in their life. This behavior is affective on the morale and feels of athlete. Moreover, during the formal fields and even international sporting events affect on the social function of the ability of people to achieve happiness in work, friendship and eventually, affect their physical health. Athletes must deal with rationally methods in facing with their issues and career and competition with opponents.
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