



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Psychology

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING, SELF-EFFICACY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL AMONG YOUNG ADULTS

KEY WORDS: Subjective Well-being, Self-efficacy, Locus of control, Young adults, Covid-19 pandemic.

Kajal Dass

Student MSc Counselling Psychology., Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru, 560077

Dr. Kiran Babu NC

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru,560077.

ABSTRACT

The current study sought to investigate young adults in the age range of 18 to 24 years' subjective well-being, locus of control, and self-efficacy following the Corona virus pandemic. The purpose of this study was to comprehend the relationship between subjective well-being, self-efficacy, and locus of control as well as any gender differences among young adults concerning the three variables and any variations in the three variables based on the socioeconomic status of the young adults. The findings showed that Subjective well-being and Self Efficacy had a significant positive relationship and a negative correlation with Locus of control. Subjective well-being and self-efficacy among young people did not differ based on gender. Subjective well-being and locus of control did not differ according to socioeconomic status, but self-efficacy levels did according to the socioeconomic status of the young people.

INTRODUCTION

Young adults are categorized as being between the ages of 18 and 24. This period of development in one's life brings about major shifts and is indeed crucial to build a strong base for the later ages in life. This age is the transition from adolescence and is a crucial developmental stage during which young adults are confronted with a variety of adjustments (such as fertility, residential instability, cohabitation, academic changes, and employment opportunities) and a variety of roles, such as student and employee almost always for the first time. While Young adults face numerous challenges, it is extremely crucial that one takes a positive outlook on life, and enjoys this stage of life as it is marked by a lot of new learning and experiences. It is extremely important that individuals at this age overcome and learn from the various challenges and have an optimistic way of looking at life.

Subjective Wellbeing

It is the Individual's appraisal of their life. The subjective well-being of an individual is dependent on their perception of life circumstances, hence even if two individuals are faced with the same situation their subjective well-being levels can contrast significantly as it is based on personal evaluation and individual differences are crucial in identifying the levels of subjective wellbeing. It is assessed in light of the person's emotional responses to the situation by concluding their assessment of the occurrences in their own life. The concept was introduced by Professor Ed Diener in his influential 1984 article Subjective Well-Being and defined it as the concept in which positive emotions prevail and unpleasant emotions are less frequently experienced when one has subjective well-being. It is assessed in light of the person's emotional responses to the situation by concluding their assessment of the occurrences in their own life (Diener, 1984).

Locus Of Control

LOC measures how much weight people give to consequences as a result of their internal factors like hard work, talent, and competency or External factors like luck, and fate which are not under one's power. The degree of control a person feels they have over a circumstance or event is known as locus of control. (Gan et al., 2007). According to (Rotter, 1966), people having an internal locus of control are more aware of opportunities that may help them achieve their goals, take steps to build their network capability, put forth more effort to succeed, and are more likely to learn new skills, ask questions, and remember pertinent information. People who have an internal locus of control think that their acts have consequences because of their efforts, competence, or inherent qualities (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976);(Carrim et al.,

2006; Littunen & Storhammar, 2000); According to them, positive outcomes are the result of hard work and individual talents (Carrim et al., 2006).

Self Efficacy

It the conviction that one can complete a task effectively. (Bandura, 1997). Rapid change, fierce competition, worry, and dissatisfaction in today's world cause a lot of stress for young people. This never-ending stress can pose a threat to their self-efficacy has been determined to be one of the most crucial and single most crucial—factors influencing success in nearly every area of life, including Leadership (Anderson et al., 2008), Musical performance (Craske & Craig, 1984), Sports (Wurtele, 1986). Self-efficacy is also related to academic performance, people with strong self-efficacy also have good academic accomplishments. (Pavani & Agrawal, 2015)

METHOD

Research Design- Quantitative research design was used.

Hypotheses

- H₀₁ - There is no significant relationship between Subjective Wellbeing and General Self Efficacy in Young adults.
- H₀₂- There is no significant relationship between Subjective wellbeing and Locus of Control in Young Adults.
- H₀₃- There is no significant relationship between Self-efficacy and Locus of control in Young Adults.
- H₀₄- There is no difference in Subjective well-being based on gender.
- H₀₅- There is no difference in Self-efficacy based on gender.
- H₀₆- There is no difference in Locus of control based on gender.
- H₀₇- There is no significant difference between socio-economic levels and Subjective well-being.
- H₀₈- There is no significant difference between socioeconomic levels and Self Efficacy in Young Adults.
- H₀₉- There is no significant difference between socioeconomic levels and Locus of Control in Young Adults.

Sample

The sample comprised three hundred sixty-four young adults (18-24 years) with 171 males and 192 females. A total of Seventy-seven people belonged to the lower socio-economic class, Eighty-four people in the sample belonged to the lower middle socioeconomic class, One hundred and five people from the sample belonged to the middle socio-economic class, Sixty Five people belonged to the upper middle class and finally, Thirty-three people belonged to the Upper socio-economic class in the sample.

Sample Distribution- Inclusion and Exclusion criteria

Inclusion Criteria

- Individuals who fell under the age range of 18-24 years.
- Individuals currently residing in Bangalore.
- Individuals who have not been diagnosed with any Mental Health problems

Exclusion Criteria

- Individuals who leave the responses incomplete.
- Individuals who did not agree with the ethics of the research.
- Multiple responses from the same individuals were not considered.

Instruments

Three measures were used in this study,

1. Subjective Wellbeing Inventory- Sell and Nagpal created this 40-item questionnaire in 1992, which assesses 11 aspects of SWB. Except for 14, 27, and 29 items, each statement has three possible responses: very good, pretty good, and not good. For positive statements, these answers are scored 3, 2, and 1; for negative statements, the scoring is the opposite. Better Subjective Well Being is indicated by a higher score, and vice versa.

2. Rotter's Locus of Control Scale- The purpose of Rotter's (1966) 29-item scale, which comprises 6 items that are fillers and only 23 items that are scored, is to assess the degree to which a person believes that his behaviour is predominantly influenced by his environment or direction (internal control). A high Score (7 or greater) Signifies External LOC Low Score (6 or below) Implies Internal LOC.

3. General Self efficacy scale- A 10-item psychometric instrument is used to assess individuals' positive self-perceptions of their capacity to meet a range of demanding life requirements.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table No. 1 Correlations between Subjective well-being, Self-efficacy and Locus of control of young adults.

Variables	N	1	2
1. Subjective Wellbeing	364	—	
2. Self efficacy	r	0.39**	—
	p	0.01	
3. Locus Of Control	r	-0.31**	-0.16**
	P	0.01	0.01

Note. **p < 0.01

Table 1 denotes the correlation between Subjective well-being, General Self Efficacy and Locus of Control among Young adults. The analysis showed that there was a positive relationship between Subjective Well-being and Self Efficacy and the result was statistically significant on 0.01 levels (r=0.39, p=0.01). Hence the null hypothesis was rejected "H01 - There is no significant relationship between Subjective Well-being and Self Efficacy in Young adults". The results were in line with the previous research, study done by (Pramudita, Qorthobi, Rachmawatie, 2019; Santos et al., 2014) showed a positive correlation between subjective well-being and self-efficacy which indicates that an individual's confidence in their ability to complete tasks is more satisfied in life. This suggests that young adults who have higher subjective wellbeing or are satisfied with their lives have better higher self efficacy levels which helps them overcome difficulties and helps them to adjust after going through all types of difficult life experiences, both to daily problems and to new situations.

The results also showed that Subjective well-being was negatively correlated with Locus of control the result was statistically significant at 0.01 levels (r= -0.31, p=0.01), and the null hypothesis was rejected "H02 - There is no significant relationship between Subjective well-being and Locus of

Control in Young Adults". The results can be supported by the previous studies done (Karatas & Tagay, 2012; Stocks et al., 2012) also indicated a negative relationship between Subjective well-being and Locus of control. This result suggests that young adults who have higher levels of subjective wellbeing have lesser score on locus of control which means that they tend to attribute outcomes in their life on their own inner capabilities rather than attributing the outcomes as a consequence of an external factor which is out of their control.

Self-efficacy was also negatively correlated with Locus of control and the result is statistically significant on 0.01 level, (r=-0.16, p=0.01) hence the null hypothesis "H03 There is no significant relationship between Self-efficacy and Locus of control in Young Adults" is rejected. The results obtained are contradictory to the studies conducted by (Akca et al., 2018; Landine & Stewart, 1998) which stated that there is a positive relationship between Self efficacy and Locus of control. The results are also contradictory to previous research, study done by (Smith, 1989), which stated that there is no significant relationship between Self efficacy and Locus of Control. Hence situational factors, motivational factors could be responsible for such a result and further research on this could lead to better clarity in understanding the relationship between the two variables.

TABLE No. 2- Difference in Subjective Wellbeing based on gender.

Variable	Male (171)		Female (192)		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Subjective Wellbeing	50.68	9.53	49.41	10.39	1.20	0.22

The analysis shows that the p-value= 0.22 was more than 0.05, and the null hypothesis was accepted "H04 - There is no difference in Subjective well-being based on gender". Which suggested that there is no significant difference in subjective well-being based on gender, t=1.20. The results obtained can be supported by previous research. Studies done (Eryilmaz, 2010; Joshi, 2010) also indicate that subjective well-being is not determined by gender. The results suggest that overall satisfaction or subjective wellbeing of an individual is not dependent whether the individual is a male/female.

TABLE No 3- Difference in Self efficacy based on gender.

Variable	Male (171)		Female (192)		t	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Self Efficacy	27.76	6.11	28.58	5.146	-1.36	0.17

The analysis of the above table indicated the gender difference on Self efficacy among young adults. The analysis shows that the p-value= 0.17 was more than 0.05, and the null hypothesis was accepted "H05- There is no difference in Self efficacy based on gender". This means that there was no significant difference in Self Efficacy based on gender, t=-1.36. The result obtained can be supported by previous research by Roothman et al., (2003), Kumar & Lal, (2006) which also showed that there is no gender difference in Self Efficacy. The results indicate that the ability to overcome challenges the capacity to adjust after going through all types of difficult life experiences, both to daily problems and to new situations does not depend on the basis of gender as the results indicate the difference obtained between both the genders was not significant.

TABLE No 4- Difference in Locus of Control based on gender.

Variable	Male (171)		Female(192)		t	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Locus of Control	11.03	2.49	11.66	3.20	-2.09	0.03

The analysis shows that the p-value= 0.03 was less than 0.05, and the null hypothesis was rejected "H06- There is no

difference in Locus of Control based on gender". This means that there is a significant difference in the locus of control based on gender, $t = -2.09$. The results are in line with the previous research by (Waghmare, 2016), which states that there is a significant difference in Locus of control based on gender. The Mean values obtained indicate that Females ($M = 11.66$) have a higher score on Locus of Control which means

they have an external locus of control than Males ($M = 11.03$), supporting results were indicated in research done by (Zaidi & Mohsin, 2013) show that Males have a more internal locus of control than females. A lot of factors like lifestyle, Patriarchy, Gender stereotypes could be the reason for such results because of which females tend to focus on their externals rather than their internals.

TABLE NO 5- Difference in Subjective Wellbeing based on Socio-Economic levels.

Socio economic status (SES)	Low SES (N=77)		Lower Middle SES (N= 84)		Middle SES (N=105)		Upper Middle SES (N=65)		Upper SES (N=33)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Subjective Wellbeing	47.97	10.71	49.99	9.55	50.20	9.13	51.74	10.41	50.65	10.93	1.33	0.25

In table 5 One-Way ANOVA shows the difference in Subjective well-being based on socioeconomic levels. As the p-value is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted "H07- There is no significant difference between socioeconomic levels and Subjective well-being". This means that there is no significant difference in Subjective well-being based on socioeconomic levels.

Therefore, an analysis of variance shows that the difference in socioeconomic levels on Subjective well-being was not significant. ($F_{4,359} = 1.33, p = 0.25$). Various factors like Growth mindset (Zhao et al., 2021), Education, family relationships (Navarro et al., 2017) during young adulthood could be responsible for higher subjective well-being rather than only socio-economic levels.

Table NO- 6 Difference in Self Efficacy based on Socio-Economic levels

Socio economic status (SES)	Low SES (N=77)		Lower Middle SES (N= 84)		Middle SES (N=105)		Upper Middle SES (N=65)		Upper SES (N=33)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Self Efficacy	26.61	6.42	27.83	4.97	28.41	5.43	29.24	4.96	30.15	6.24	3.30	0.01

In table 6 One Way ANOVA shows the difference in General Self Efficacy based on socioeconomic levels. As the p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected "H08- There is no significant difference between socioeconomic levels and General Self Efficacy." This means that there is a significant difference in General Self Efficacy based on socioeconomic levels.

Therefore an analysis of variance shows that difference in socioeconomic levels on Subjective well-being was significant. ($F_{4,359} = 3.30, p = 0.01$). The results are in line with the previous study, by (Han et al., 2014) which showed a significant difference in self-efficacy based on socioeconomic status, higher income predicted higher Self-efficacy.

Table NO- 7 Difference in Locus of Control based on Socio-Economic levels

Socio economic status (SES)	Low SES (N=77)		Lower Middle SES (N= 84)		Middle SES (N=105)		Upper Middle SES (N=65)		Upper SES (N=33)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Locus of Control	11.57	2.89	11.30	2.61	11.65	3.00	10.81	3.15	11.12	2.78	1.01	0.40

In table 7 one way ANOVA shows the difference in Locus of control based on socioeconomic levels. As the p-value is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted "H09- There is no significant difference between socioeconomic levels and Locus of Control" Which means that there was no significant difference in the locus of control based on socioeconomic levels. Therefore an analysis of variance shows that the difference in socioeconomic levels on the Locus of control was not significant. ($F_{4,359} = 1.01, p = 0.40$). The results are contradicting previous studies conducted by (Serin et al., 2010; Shifrer, 2019) which states that income levels impact the locus of control among individuals. Income levels of the individuals might have an impact on the locus of control of the individuals but the results of the current study contradicted previous findings therefore more research to identify more prominent factors that impact locus of control which could lead to reducing the impact of income levels and people attributing outcomes/reinforcements to their own attributes could be further studied.

males; therefore females tend to have an external locus. The study also analyzed the difference in the level of subjective well-being, locus of control and self-efficacy according to the different socio-economic levels which showed that there was no difference among Young adult's subjective well-being according to the socio-economic levels. Upon analysis, it was found that the difference between general self-efficacy and the different socio-economic levels was significant and indicated that young adults who belonged to a higher socioeconomic status had higher levels of self efficacy as well. The difference between Locus of control and Socioeconomic status revealed that there was no difference in the levels of locus of control based on the socioeconomic status among young adults.

CONCLUSION

It was found that there is a significant positive relationship between Subjective well-being and Self-efficacy which revealed that the Young adults whose subjective well-being was high also had higher self-efficacy levels. Subjective well-being was negatively correlated with Locus of control. Self-efficacy was also negatively correlated with Locus of control, the results of gender differences showed that there was no gender difference in Subjective well-being and self-efficacy among young adults, which shows that the overall satisfaction levels and belief that they can achieve their goals among young adults had no gender difference.

Implications

1. The present study findings show that SWB was positively correlated with Self-efficacy. Schools, Policymakers could use this finding to increase self-efficacy among students and young adults and provide training to strengthen Self-efficacy levels so that their overall satisfaction with life could be increased.
2. The study also showed that there was a difference in the levels of Self-efficacy based on socioeconomic levels. Policymakers and social workers could use this finding and work to provide the underserved sections of the population with better resources. Educational institutions could also provide special scholarships to people who lack financial resources so that they can also seek quality education. Training and sessions to increase self-efficacy could be conducted in underserved communities so that people in the communities feel empowered and socioeconomic levels do not impact self-efficacy which is indeed a very important factor in overcoming situations and succeeding in life.

A gender difference was found in the Locus of Control and the results indicate that females had more locus of control than

Delimitations

The following factors narrowed the scope of the present study.

1. The study collected data only from Bangalore. The sample could have been collected from other locations as well.
2. The researcher could have collected more data and made the sample gender inclusive, with the representation of the LGBTQIA+ community as well.
3. The researcher could have interpreted the results obtained on the Subjective well-being scale dimension-wise and correlated the dimensions with Locus of control and Self efficacy for richer analysis.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

REFERENCES

1. Akca, F., Ulutas, E., & Yabanci, C. (2018). Investigation of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Locus of Control and Intercultural Sensitivities from the Perspective of Individual Differences. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(3), 219–232.
2. Anderson, D. W., Krajewski, H. T., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (2008). A leadership self-efficacy taxonomy and its relation to effective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 595–608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.003>
3. Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. (1976). Internal-external control as contributor to and outcome of work experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.2.156>
4. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control (pp. ix, 604). W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
5. Carrim, N., 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. <https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC59597>
6. Craske, M. G., & Craig, K. D. (1984). Musical performance anxiety: The three-systems model and self-efficacy theory. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 22(3), 267–280. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(84\)90007-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(84)90007-X)
7. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
8. Eryilmaz, A. (2010). Turkish Adolescents' Subjective Well-Being with Respect to Age, Gender and SES of Parents. *International Journal of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences*, 4(7), 1573–1576.
9. Gan, Y., Shang, J., & Zhang, Y. (2007). Coping flexibility and locus of control as predictors of burnout among Chinese college students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 1087–1098. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2007.35.8.1087>
10. Han, J., Chu, X., Song, H., & Li, Y. (2014). Social Capital, Socioeconomic Status and Self-efficacy. *Applied Economics and Finance*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.11114/aef.v2i1.607>
11. Joshi, U. (2010). Subjective Well-Being by Gender. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 1(1), 20–26. <https://doi.org/10.22610/jeb.v1i1.211>
12. Karatas, Z., & Tagay, O. (2012). Self Esteem, Locus of Control and Multidimensional Perfectionism as the Predictors of Subjective Well Being. *International Education Studies*, 5(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n6p131>
13. Landine, J., & Stewart, J. (1998). Relationship between Metacognition, Motivation, Locus of Control, Self-Efficacy, and Academic Achievement. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 32(3), 200–212.
14. Lüttunen, H., & Storhammar, E. (2000). The indicators of locus of control in the small business context. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 08(04), 343–360. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218495800000188>
15. Navarro, D., Montserrat, C., Malo, S., González, M., Casas, F., & Crous, G. (2017). Subjective well-being: What do adolescents say? *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(1), 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12215>
16. Pavani, S., & Agrawal, G. (2015). A Study of Self-Efficacy and Academic Achievement among College Students. *International Journal*, 1(1), 5.
17. Pramudita, Qorthobi, Rachmawatie, R., Arie, Reny. (2019). [PDF] Relationship between Self-Efficacy and the Subjective Well-Being at Belitang 1 Public High School Students | Semantic Scholar. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Relationship-between-Self-Efficacy-and-the-at-1-Pramudita-Qorthobi/b91e9e28ead8fb7be90b0b355bf001fbd87c793f>
18. Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092976>
19. Santos, M. C. J., Jr, C. S. M., & Jr, F. O. (2014). ESTABLISHING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, 3(1), 1–12.
20. Serin, N. B., Serin, O., & ahin, F. S. (2010). Factors affecting the locus of control of the university students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 449–452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.041>
21. Shifrer, D. (2019). The Contributions of Parental, Academic, School, and Peer Factors to Differences by Socioeconomic Status in Adolescents' Locus of Control. *Society and Mental Health*, 9(1), 74–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869318754321>
22. Smith, R. E. (1989). Effects of coping skills training on generalized self-efficacy and locus of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 228–233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.228>
23. Stocks, A., April, K., & Lynton, N. (2012). Locus of control and subjective well-being—A cross-cultural study. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 10, 17–25.
24. Waghmare, R. (2016). Effect of Gender and Location on Locus of Control among College Students (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 3521244). <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3521244>

25. Wurtele, S. K. (1986). Self-efficacy and athletic performance: A review. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4, 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.290>
26. Zaidi, I. H., & Mohsin, M. N. (2013). Locus of control in graduation students. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 6(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.695>
27. Zhao, S., Du, H., Li, Q., Wu, Q., & Chi, P. (2021). Growth mindset of socioeconomic status boosts subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 168, 110301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110301>