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Abstract: College assignments will always be accepted by students as long as they are still carrying out education. Aside from being a compulsory requirement to fulfill grades, college assignments can also serve as a means for students to further improve their ability or master lecture material. However, sometimes the task will be a stressor for students because in one week students have to complete several college assignments at once, and also students face a fairly heavy task in its completion which makes it difficult for students to do it. These conditions will have the potential for stress on students, therefore the right coping strategies are needed to avoid stress. Some research on coping stress states that problem-focused coping is a form of good coping strategy in dealing with stressors so that a person does not continue to experience stress. Associated with one tendency that emerges a person in carrying out coping strategies, one psychological construct that relates to this tendency, the psychological construct is locus of control. In general, locus of control is divided into two dimensions, namely internal and external, but someone with an internal locus of control will tend to experience less anxiety. The explanation is a reference in this study. Applying quantitative research methods and using purposive sampling techniques, 100 students of the psychology faculty at Tama Jagakarsa University.
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1. Introduction

Law of the Republic of Indonesia number 12 of 2012 concerning higher education states that tertiary institutions are the place where teaching and learning activities take place in higher education. Students in higher education are called students (RI Law No.12, 2012), and professional teaching staff in higher education are called lecturers (RI Law No.14, 2005). The implementation of lectures in tertiary institutions is based on credit units and is carried out in the semester, namely the measurement of the duration of teaching and learning activities (RI Minister of Education Regulation No.49, 2014). At each semester the achievement index (IP) and cumulative achievement index (GPA) are issued by the higher education providers based on assessments made during lecture activities taking place in one semester (RI Minister of Education Regulation No.49, 2014). The achievement index (IP) issued by universities is based on several assessments, for example the university where the research was carried out has a standard in the assessment that is weighted in IP and cumulative IP. Divided into 4 assessments, namely: (a) 10% attendance, (b) independent duty 20%, (c) Semester Middle Examination 20%, (d) 50% Semester Final. Based on the proportion of these assessments, independent assignments that contribute 2.2 values that are equivalent to the midterm evaluation or UTs are enough to influence the student achievement index. Therefore, the work of an independent task should be done by each student with seriousness and earnest in order to get good grades.

Independent assignments are given directly by lecturers to students in accordance with the relevant lecture material. But sometimes the independent task requires students to focus on the process, and often students find obstacles in working on independent tasks given by the lecturer. The task with a high level of difficulty is not the only obstacle that students face, the task of different subjects is also another problem faced by students. Generally, Tama Jagakarsa University students get eight courses each semester. In addition to its main obligation to attend lectures, students have involvement in student organizations, both active and passive involvement. Organizations in the Psychology faculty that have several routine activities with 3 goals of quality improvement, both related to the relationship between students of psychology study programs, as well as to improve the quality of the psychology faculty itself.

In addition to activities in the campus environment, whether it is lecturing or organizing, there are also Tama Jagakarsa psychology faculty students who are workers, because the students want to improve the quality of themselves in order to be able to meet the demands of the workforce or because the students bear tuition fees without the help of the parties other. Busy work is often time consuming for students who work, and this has an impact on the disruption of the distribution of schedules between work and study. Busyness at work becomes a separate problem outside of the difficulties and number of lectures that must be done. The above conditions can trigger stress for students. Self stress is defined as any physical or psychological event that is perceived as potential in causing physical or emotional disturbances (Baron & Byrne 2005). But all situations that
have potential as stressors will not always make a person experience stress. Lazarus (in Davison, Neale, & Kring, 2012), discusses stress from the cognitive aspect and says that one way an individual accepts or assesses the environment determines the presence or absence of a stressor. A person will experience stress if the individual considers that the demands of the environment in which the individual is located are higher than his ability.

Examples of final exams will be addressed calmly for those who consider the test as a measure of the ability to learn within a certain period of time, but for some people who are not ready to deal with it will consider the final test as a stressor. So in other words the emergence or absence of stress is influenced by one's perception of a thing. Stress will arise if the individual considers it will be difficult for him, but stress will not arise if the individual considers it a challenge that will produce something that is proud if he is able to solve it. A person's difference in responding to a potential situation as a stressor is related to the concept of coping. Coping by Baron and Byrne (2005) is referred to as a response to stress as part of reducing or eliminating the threat or negative impact arising from stressful conditions, including actions, thoughts or feelings to be carried out in order to control themselves, and face the effects negative from these stressful conditions. Based on these 5 explanations, coping is interpreted as a person's attempt to change all forms of pressure that are felt to cause stress and also the negative emotions that accompany it. Compas, et al (in Baron and Byne, 2005) suggest that coping is a process, where there are two levels in it. The first level is emotional-focused coping or emotion-centered, which at this level individuals will do things that reduce or reduce the negative emotions that arise when dealing with stressors. Furthermore, when negative emotions can be controlled by individuals, they can continue in the second stage, namely problem-focused coping or coping, which focuses on the problem, which at this level individuals will solve the problems that become stressors. So it can be said that someone who experiences stress will take actions that aim to reduce negative emotions that arise due to stress (emotional-focused coping), after negative emotions begin to dim then the individual will solve the problem or find a solution to the problem (problem-focused coping).

2. Definition of Coping

Lazarus (in Carver & Scheier, 1989) argues that stress consists of three processes. The first response is the process of understanding threats to oneself, the second response is the process of bringing to mind a potentially threatening response, and coping is the third response as a process that plays a role in executing the two initial responses. Based on this explanation Coping can be interpreted as an attempt by a person to reduce what is considered and believed to be a potential threat.

Baron & Byrne (2005), defines coping as responses to stress in ways that will reduce threats and effects, including what a person does, feels, or thinks in order to master, deal with, or reduce the negative effects of situations full of pressure. While Davison, Neale, & Kring (2012), define the concept of coping as a person's effort to overcome problems or deal with emotions that emerge and are generally negative emotions. Coping can be focused on solving problems or to regulate the various negative emotions caused by the problem. Furthermore De Ridder (in Iversen, 2005), said that most of it the researcher seems to agree that coping can be classified into two main dimensions and each dimension has a different label, such as problem-focused coping with emotion-focused coping, approach coping with avoidance coping, or active with passive coping.

Larasati & Kilis (2014), mentions coping as a process by which individuals strive to manage a variety of pressures that are considered as stressful and emotionally accompanying. In addition, coping is also a form of anticipation in the face of the possibility of what will happen. Putri & Nurjadi (2015), explain coping as a constant change in the way of view and individual behavior as an attempt to regulate internal and / or external demands that are considered to exceed individual resources. Furthermore Distiana (2014) said that coping behavior would appear in someone as an effort to overcome difficulties and said to be successful when the individual managed to deal with the stressors he faced. Stress really needs to be suppressed by someone who experiences it in order to stay healthy, as expressed by Ursin & Eriksen (in Drageset, 2012), that stress response is considered an important physiological response and must be carried out as a challenge or threat to humans because individuals are unable to deal with problems or failing in a coping strategy that will cause illness and disease.

3. Definition of Problem-Focused Coping

Lazarus & Folkman (in Davison, Neale, & Kring, 2012), explain Problem-focused coping as a direct action to solve problems or find information relevant to the solution. So it can be said that individuals who are facing the threat of stressor will actively seek the cause of the threat or stressor then look for information that is appropriate to what action must be taken as a solution to the problem. Then, Larasati & Kilis (2014), argues that problem-focused coping itself is more often used for constructive threats that are considered to be resolved by individuals. So problem-focused coping can generally be done if threats, stressors, or problems experienced by a person are personal problems, or mild problems that involve themselves or only a few people and the level of the problem is still mild to moderate.

Furthermore Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub (1989) describe the subdimensions found in problem-focused coping, namely: active coping, planning, suppressing the suppression of competing activities, coping with restraint coping, and seek social support based on instrumental reasons (seeking social support for instrumental reasons). Carver Scheier, & Weintraub (1989), stated that several studies have shown that some dimensions are considered functional in overcoming threats (active coping and acceptance), and some are considered to be functional (denial & behavioral disengagement).

4. Definition of Locus of Control

Locus of control was first introduced by Julian Rotter in social learning theory. Rotter, 1966 (in Boshoff & Zyl, 2011)
states that social learning is a reinforcement of behavior that leads to an increase in certain behaviors that will lead to reinforcement in the future. Therefore, a person's response to an event arises based on his perception, whether it is a destiny, the influence of the environment and the power of others, or is due to his full control. Rotter (1966), mentions all things achieved by a person are influenced by the performance and skills possessed, but for some people assume that it is a gift obtained based on the strength that comes from outside. Someone in seeing the influence of various things they experience will react between seeing the incident because of the control and potential that they have or the results of outside influences. This means that someone who has the belief that the event he experienced is one form of luck, destiny, or even part of control over others and the environment, the person is included in the criteria of external control. Conversely, if it is part of the ownership, it is said to be in the criteria of internal control.

Stewart (2012), said that every event or event experienced by a person is a causal relationship that is influenced by several factors. Every human being has a view of every event experienced in his life. Someone, within him, has a psychological construct that acts as a belief or view of the extent to which he is able to control the events or events he experiences, this psychological construct is called locus of control. Then Daum&Wiebe (2003), mentions locus of control as a psychological construct related to attribution that discusses the extent to which a person considers everything that happens to be in their control and beyond their control. The type of locus of control that a person has will show one person's view of all things that they experience are part of their own control or based on outside influences. Rogelberg (2006), defining locus of control is a personality variable that reflects a person's general beliefs with control of ownership by yourself or control from outside himself.

Levenson (1973), argues that there are differences in behavior and mindset between individuals who have the belief that all events are a series of destinies, with individuals who have the belief that all events are a potential of human control. This is the reason the locus of control dimension is divided into three, internal, chance, and powerful others. The development of the locus of control dimension developed by Rotter was also believed to be able to increase the use of locus of control. Spector (in Karimi, 2011), states that belief in a person generally considers that failure and success is control over the actions and behavior of the individual (internal), or is the control of others and also fate, luck or fate (external), is a definition locus of control. The description above can be said that everyone has a different view of the events they experienced, both failure and success, is the result of self-control, others, destiny or fate. This condition is called locus of control.

5. Definition of Internal Locus of Control
Rotter (1966), said, "If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior, his own behavior is relatively permanent characteristics, we have this conviction in internal control. The internal locus of control here is defined as a person's belief in all events that occur depending on the behavior or as a whole part of the permanent character they have. Or in other words the individual believes in his ability to be able to control or create certain conditions or situations. Internal locus of control, by Stewart (2012), is defined as a belief that a person has for behavior and actions that do will produce a particular event or event, and the individual has complete control. Spector (in Karimi, 2011), states that there is a general belief that the success or failure that is experienced is the influence of the individual's control or ability carried out by action or behavior. Levenson (1973), mentions that the internal locus of control leads to the extent to which a person believes that he has control over his own life. This condition means that the individual is convinced of the ability possessed to be the main factor for what will happen. The explanation above leads to the conclusion that someone in his life will experience failure and success. Individuals with an internal locus of control will believe that success achieved or failure experienced due to awareness of their abilities. While individuals with external locus of control will assume that failure or success is derived from fate, grace, fate, help and power of others.

6. Factors Affecting Locus of Control
As previously explained that locus of control is a psychological condition that is owned by each individual. The psychological condition of each individual has several factors that influence a person's tendency to be in an internal or external locus of control. The first factor that affects locus of control is age. Heckhausen & Schulz; Milgram; Ryckman & Malki (in Schulz & Schulz 2013), it is concluded that a person will tend to tend to have an internal orientation when the individual grows up. So it can be said that age influences in one's orientation tends to be on internal or external locus of control.

The second factor is gender. Parsons & Schneider (in Haider & Naeem 2013), use Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale to measure the locus of control of students from both gender. Significant differences in categories based on sex found that women were more inclined to external locus of control. Hasan & Khalid (2014), said that women are indicated to have a low internal locus of control orientation, because they are considered to be influenced by the sensitive nature inherent in women and the dominant role of others significantly.

The third factor that influences one's locus of control is cultural factors. Spector et al (2003) conducted a study of differences between eastern and western nations related to beliefs in the workplace with investigations on three variables (secondary control, socioinstructural control, and work locus of control). The research was conducted in three countries, namely USA (United States of America), Hong Kong, and PRC (People's Republic of China) and used WLCS (Work Locus of Control Scale), SCS (Secondary Control Scale), and SICS (The Socio Instrumental Control Scale) (Spector et al, 2003). The results show that USA people have more internal control than Hong Kong and PRC (Spector et al, 2003). The difference between the above results between western (USA) and eastern (Hong Kong & PRC) nations which have different cultural contexts also
leads to locus of control which influences aspects of cross-
culture, namely inter-cultural differences in the above
Western culture represented by the USA with eastern culture
represented by Hon Khong and PRC.

7. The Relationship between locus of internal control and problem focused
coping

The task of college is the responsibility of every student that
must be done well. The level of difficulty of different tasks
each subject has the potential to become a stressor for
students, if the response that appears is not right then
students will experience anxiety and continue to stress. Stressors will trigger a person to respond to the
stressor so as not to cause anxiety that continues in stressful
conditions. This response is known as a coping strategy. There are two responses to coping strategies, namely
problem-focused coping that is focused on handling
problems or stressors, and emotional-focused coping
handling is done only to reduce negative emotions arising
from stressors alone without handling or solving the
problems they face.

Every individual has different views in responding to all the
events he experiences. The concept is known as locus of
control, namely a person's perception of all the events they
experience is seen based on the influence of behavior
(ability) themselves (internal) or others (external) (Stewart,
2012). Previous studies have suggested that someone with an
internal locus of control tends to experience low anxiety
Bemardi (in Goyzman, 2010). Then problem-focused coping
is the right coping strategy to solve problems or deal with
stressors so that anxiety arises because the stressors are
permanently lost because the problems faced have been
resolved. So it can be concluded that internal locus of
control and problem-focused coping play a positive role so
that a person is protected from the high level of anxiety that
appears to be stressed by the individual.

8. Population and Sampling Method

The research method used in this study is a correlational
research method. The correlational method is in accordance
with the aim of the study that wants to examine the
relationship between internal locus of control and problem-
focused coping. According to Azwar (2011) correlational
research is research that aims to see how far the variance in a
variable is related to variations in one or more other
variables based on correlation coefficients. Correlational
research method was chosen because in this study wanted to
see whether or not there is a relationship between internal
locus of control and problem focused coping. The
population used in this study were all students of the Faculty
of Psychology at Tama Jagakarsa University in South
Jakarta who were active in lectures totaling 130 students.
This amount is known from information from the
Psychology Faculty Tama Jagakarsa University Study Program. The sample is part of the number and
characteristics possessed by the population if, the
population is large, and researchers are not likely to learn everything in the
population such as limited funds, energy, and time, the
researcher can use samples taken from that population
(Sugiyono, 2010). The sampling technique in this study uses
purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is a
sample determination technique with certain considerations
(Sugiyono, 2010). Based on the determination of the number
of samples from Isaac and Michael (in Sugiyono, 2009) for a
total population of 130 people, it only takes 95 people with an
error rate of 5%. So that the samples taken in this study
were 100 people who have been adjusted to the criteria set in
this study.

9. Data Collection Method

Data collection methods used in this study by distributing
questionnaires containing psychological measuring
instruments adapted from standard measuring instruments.
The measuring instrument in question is MLCS
(Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale) developed by
Hanna Levenson (1973) to measure internal locus of control
variables, and COPE Briefs made by Charles S. Carver &
Michael F. Scheier (1989) to measure problems focused
coping. 1. Internal Locus of Control Measurement Tool
The internal locus of control scale used in this study uses a
standard measuring instrument that is specifically used to
measure a person's locus of control. The measuring
instrument is the Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale
(MLCS) developed by Hanna Levenson (1973). The scale of
this internal locus of control uses a Likert scale which is five
alternative choices of answers to items in the form of
statements with very suitable, appropriate, inappropriate,
and very inappropriate answer criteria. All of these
statements are favorable with the answer score weight
between 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jawaban</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidak Setuju</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangat Tidak Setuju</td>
<td>STS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the problem-focused coping scale in this study uses a
standard psychological measurement tool to measure coping
strategies, called the COPE Brief. Brief COPE has two
dimensions that can determine the tendency of a person's
coping strategy in general. These dimensions are problem-
focused coping and emotional-focused coping.

10. Analysis of Research Results Data

After obtaining valid items, the researchers look for
reliability of measuring instruments. Based on the results of
the analysis of measuring devices using SPSS 23.0 for
Windows, the reliability coefficient was obtained for the
internal locus of control scale of 0.854 and problem-focused
coping of 0.928. Based on the rules of Guilford and Fucher
(in Kuncoro, 2004), the two alpha coefficients of the
measuring instrument show that the coefficient is
reliable. Normality test is done to find out the data that has
been obtained is data that is normally distributed or not. This
can be done by comparing Asymp.sig with a significance
level of 0.05, if the Asymp.sig value is > 0.05 then the data is
normal, if the Asymp.sig value is <0.05 then the data is not
normal. Data analysis performed resulted in Asymp.sig value 0.001 for internal locus of control and 0.005 for problem-focused coping. Based on these results, the data obtained is not normally distributed.

The results of the correlation of the two variables based on the data obtained in this study showed a significant relationship between internal locus of control and problem-focused coping, with the acquisition of \( r = 0.728, p = 0.000 \). The acquisition of 0.728 correlation coefficient shows that there is a positive relationship between internal locus of control and problem-focused coping of 72.8%. This shows the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, so that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) which states that “there is a relationship between internal locus of control and problem-focused coping when facing college assignments at Tama Jagakarsa University students” is accepted.

The results of the tests conducted by the researcher get results that show the difference between men and women. Internal locus of control variables get mean male value of 20.59, and female mean value is 25.78 with a significance value of \( p = 0.000 \). These results can mean that men have lower internal locus of control than women. Whereas for problem focused coping variables, the mean male value is 50.22 and the female mean value is 64.52 with a significance value of \( p = 0.000 \). These results can mean that men have lower problem-focused coping variables than women.

11. Conclusion

The relationship with the positive direction between internal locus of control and problem-focused coping in this study means that students with internal locus of control have a tendency to do tasks well, so that students have a greater chance to understand and master the lecture material. This attitude is what makes students achieve satisfactory academic achievement, because students with problem-focused coping will do their jobs well so that they have many opportunities to master and understand all the lecture material. Saadu& Next (2013), in his study stated that students who apply problem-focused coping have 47.47% of academic achievements that are better than students who apply emotion-focused coping. Then Sarason and Sarason (in Saadu& Next, 2013), stated that students who apply problem-focused coping tend to have confidence in their studies and have control over stressful conditions, they are more persistent and firmly built with students who do not apply problem-focused coping.

Based on the results of data collection and analysis conducted, it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between internal locus of control and problem-focused coping in the face of coursework in Tama Jagakarsa University students. This means that the more oriented the internal locus of control, the higher the tendency of problem-focused coping responses. Conversely, if someone’s orientation is an external locus of control, the tendency of problem-focused coping responses is lower.
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