

The Relationship among Optimism, Hope and Coping Styles of Student Teachers

Naing Naing Maw¹ & May Ye Yint Naing²

Abstract

The primary purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship among optimism, hope and coping styles of student teachers. Quantitative approach was used in this research. A total of 600 student teachers from Yangon University of Education and Sagaing University of Education participated in this study. Life Orientation Test (LOT), Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS) and Cope Scale were used as the research instruments. As a result of research, student teachers in this study are optimistic and high hope. There was no significant difference in gender, university, age group and education level of optimism and hope. There was significant difference in pathway thinking in gender and age groups. Student teachers used positive reinterpretation and planning coping styles the most. Student teachers used substance use and behavioral disengagement coping styles the least. Moreover, there were significant gender differences in mental disengagement, venting of emotion, religious coping, humor, restraint and substance use subscales coping styles. There were significant university differences in positive reinterpretation, substance use and planning coping styles. There were significant age difference in venting of emotion and emotional social support coping styles. There were significant differences in behavioral disengagement and planning coping styles among five levels of education. Hope was positively predicted by optimism. Finally, hope was positively predicted by positive reinterpretation, active coping and religious coping styles.

Keywords: Optimism, Hope, Coping Styles

Introduction

Education plays an important role in a nation. Education should cultivate the inner potentialities, capacities and qualities of a child so that the child will develop to his fullest potentialities. It is also essential to

¹ Dr., Professor/ Head, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

² Senior Assistant Teacher, Basic Education High School, Yit Kan Gyi, Kawa Township, Bago Region

produce physically and mentally strong individuals. Like education, positive psychology focuses the strengths of the people such as creativity, flow experiences, subjective well-being, happiness, hope, and optimism and so on. Optimism has been found to be important for healthy psychological functioning. Optimism also brings positive change to one's mind, so that he can overcome his own problems successfully. When a person stays optimistic, he remains energetic to deal with complicated situations in a successful manner. Being optimistic, one can view things from all angles, rather than seeing from one perspective.

Hope differs from optimism due to its direct focus on personal agency and producing alternative paths when dealing with stress though they resemble to each other in explaining generalized expectations about future (Snyder et al., 2001). Hope predicts various significant outcomes ranging from physical and psychological health to performance in academia and sports (Snyder et al., 2002). Hopeful children often draw upon their own memories of positive experiences to keep them buoyant during difficult times. In this way, they tell themselves their own uplifting stories, or they create their own positive personal narratives (Snyder et al., 2002).

Many people face with stressful life events in their daily lives. So, coping with stress is an important role in people's lives to become mentally and physically strong person. In relation to coping, the strategies employed have been shown to have an impact upon individual well-being. Therefore, in the present study, the relationship among optimism, hope and coping strategies of student-teachers can be found. Based on the research, people can find out how much our student teachers' thinking has been filled with hope, optimism and how they cope with stress.

Purpose of the Study

The main objective of the study is to investigate the relationship among optimism, hope and coping styles of student teachers. The specific objectives of this study are

1. to find out whether student teachers are optimistic or not
2. to explore the differences in optimism of student teachers by gender, university, age group and education level
3. to investigate how much hope student teachers have

4. to explore the differences in hope of student teachers by gender, university, age group and education level
5. to investigate the different coping styles which student teachers use
6. to explore the differences in coping styles of student teachers by gender, university, age group and education level

Scope and Procedure

In this study, four questionnaires such as Life Orientation Test (LOT), Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS), Cope Scale and demographic variables such as age, gender, academic year and university were examined by the self-reported survey questionnaire. With the help of 50 student teachers from Yangon University of Education, pilot study was compiled. After pilot study, a sample of 600 student teachers from Yangon University of Education and Sagaing University of Education were examined.

Definitions of Key Terms

Optimism is defined as a generalized expectancy for positive rather than negative outcomes (Scheier & Carver, 1985).

Hope refers to the general cognitive-motivational variable including one's belief in which one utilizes pathway thinking and agency thinking (Snyder, 1994).

Coping refers to a variety of cognitive and behavioral strategies individuals use to manage their stress (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004).

Coping Styles refers to the degree of general style in coping how one usually manages stressful life events (Carver et al., 1989).

Review of Related Literature

Optimism points a powerful beam of light into the darker corners of person's lives, revealing possibilities that are hiding in the shadows. Optimism is regarded as a generalized expectation that influences any and all psychological processes in which learning is involved (Tolman, 1932). The positive-minded person interprets events from the angle of hope, finding benefits and creative solutions the pessimist overlooks (Price Pritchett, 2007). Psychologists have discovered that optimism and pessimism are not two poles on a single scale. They're two quite separate dimensions. And the best results seem to come when our mental activity that's pessimistic is reshaped (Price Pritchett, 2007).

Dispositional optimism is the global expectation that good things will be plentiful in the future and bad things, scarce (Scheier & Carver, 1992). Results show that dispositional optimism is linked to desirable outcomes and in particular to active and effective coping (Scheier, Weintraub, & Carver, 1986). Children rank particularly high on optimism, but it drops off significantly once they enter puberty (Price Pritchett, 2007). Females in general are more optimistic than males. But they're also more pessimistic. Studies show that, on average, females have a greater emotional range than males.

Hope reflects person's perception of goal attainment, though selected goals should have at least some degree of important for person (Stotland, 1969). The construct of hope is understood as a combination of (1) the thoughts that an individual has about the ability to develop pathways leading to their goals and (2) a sense of personal agency about reaching those goals (Snyder et al., 2000). These two components, agency and pathways, are thought to interact with each other in leading the individual to pursue goals that are thought to be specific, important, and of a relative probability of being achieved. Research has also confirmed that school age students who have highly hopeful have better social interaction, self-esteem, optimism and academic achievement (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997). By helping adolescents to select several goals, they can turn to their other important goals when they face a profound blockage in one goal.

Coping is the process of managing demands (external or internal) that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person (R. S. Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Coping style is a general propensity to deal with stressful events in a particular way. Coping is divided into two components: problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping. In problem-focused coping, person focuses his or her attention to what can be done to alter the situation with the aim of reducing or eliminating stress evoking situation. In emotion-focused coping, person does not try to change the situation rather try to lessen emotional distress by using strategies like avoidance, minimization, distancing etc. In other words, people use problem-focused coping strategies in controllable situations, while they adopt emotion-focused strategies in uncontrollable situations (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Method and Procedure

Participants

By using random sampling technique, the sample of 600 student teachers was randomly selected from Yangon University of Education (YUOE) and Sagaing University of Education (SUOE). The 600 student teachers were chosen from first year to fifth year at both universities. Specifically, 60 students from each year participated as sample of the study.

Instrumentation

Three instruments in this study are Life Orientation Test (LOT) (developed by Scheier & Carver, 1985), Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS) (developed by Snyder et al., 1991) and Cope Scale (developed by Scheier, Carver & Weintraub, 1989). LOT, DHS and Cope Scale were used in this study to examine students' optimism, hope and coping styles respectively. These three instruments were modified into Myanmar version. After developing the instruments, expert review was conducted for face validity and content validity in the first week of November, 2017. Then, during the second week of December, 2017, a pilot testing was conducted.

Data Collecting Procedure

Prior to the actual data collection, pilot study was done in the first week of December in 2017 with a sample of 50 first student teachers from Yangon University of Education. For real data collection, the student teachers were administered at the second week of January in 2018. With the permission of administrative personal of universities, three questionnaires were administered to the student teachers from Yangon University of Education and Sagaing University of Education. The process of collecting data took almost two months.

Data Analysis and Findings

By applying the three instruments of LOT, DHS and Cope Scale, differences in optimism, hope and coping styles of student teachers were examined among two selected universities. In addition, differences by gender, university, age group, compulsory subject, level of education were investigated. With the aim of investigating the relationship among optimism, hope and coping styles of student teachers, correlations among variables were discussed.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Optimism of Student Teachers

| Variable | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD |
|----------|-----|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| Optimism | 600 | 10 | 31 | 19.77 | 3.545 |

According to the results shown in table 1, the mean score for optimism of students was 19.77 and its maximum score was 31. This finding can be assumed that student teachers in this study were optimistic. It may be due to the fact that almost all of them have definite future to become teachers and they don't need to worry about job after graduation. So they are optimistic about their future.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Hope of Student Teachers

| Subscale of Hope | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD |
|------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| Agency | 600 | 8 | 16 | 13.11 | 1.541 |
| Pathway | 600 | 7 | 16 | 12.87 | 1.605 |
| Total Hope | 600 | 16 | 32 | 25.98 | 2.713 |

According to the results shown in table 2, the mean score for hope was 25.98 and its maximum score was 32. So, student teachers in this study had high hope. This may be due to the fact that student from two universities got high marks in matriculation examination and almost all of them had definite goal to become teachers and they are now in the way towards that goal. So they are high in hope.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Coping Styles of Student Teachers

| Subscale of Coping Styles | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD |
|-----------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| Positive Reinterpretation | 600 | 4 | 16 | 12.93 | 1.818 |
| Mental Disengagement | 600 | 4 | 16 | 10.80 | 2.185 |
| Venting of Emotion | 600 | 4 | 16 | 11.39 | 2.420 |
| Instrumental Social Support | 600 | 4 | 16 | 11.72 | 2.276 |
| Active Coping | 600 | 6 | 16 | 11.84 | 1.839 |

| Subscale of Coping Styles | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD |
|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Denial | 600 | 4 | 16 | 8.90 | 2.428 |
| Religious Coping | 600 | 4 | 16 | 11.13 | 3.103 |
| Humor | 600 | 4 | 16 | 9.60 | 2.968 |
| Behavioral Disengagement | 600 | 4 | 15 | 6.78 | 2.373 |
| Restraint | 600 | 4 | 16 | 11.09 | 2.014 |
| Emotional Social Support | 600 | 4 | 16 | 10.86 | 2.542 |
| Substance Use | 600 | 4 | 16 | 4.85 | 2.127 |
| Acceptance | 600 | 6 | 16 | 11.84 | 1.954 |
| Suppression of Competing Activities | 600 | 4 | 16 | 10.96 | 2.252 |
| Planning | 600 | 5 | 16 | 12.21 | 2.063 |
| Total Coping Styles | 600 | 106 | 215 | 156.90 | 17.326 |

According to the results of table 3, the mean score for positive reinterpretation and planning among subscales of coping styles was the highest. But the mean score of substance use subscale was the lowest. It may be due to the fact that students in this study were prospective teachers and they are under the guidelines of parents and teachers systematically and so they use substance use coping styles the least.

Table 4. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Optimism by Gender

| Variable | Gender | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------|--------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Optimism | Male | 300 | 19.73 | 3.544 | -0.265 | 0.791 |
| | Female | 300 | 19.81 | 3.553 | | |

According to the results of table 4, the result revealed that there was no significant gender difference in optimism. It can reasonably be said that optimism of student teachers did not depend on gender. This finding was consistent with the previous finding of Hasnain, Wazid, and Hasan (2014).

Table 5. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Hope by Gender

| Subscale of Hope | Gender | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Agency | Male | 300 | 13.08 | 1.583 | -0.371 | 0.711 |
| | Female | 300 | 13.13 | 1.501 | | |
| Pathway | Male | 300 | 13.01 | 1.658 | 2.041* | 0.042 |
| | Female | 300 | 12.74 | 1.541 | | |
| Total Hope | Male | 300 | 26.09 | 2.800 | 0.993 | 0.321 |
| | Female | 300 | 25.87 | 2.623 | | |

According to table 5, the result of *t* test showed that there was significant difference in pathway at 0.05 level by gender. This finding could be interpreted that pathway thinking of selected male student teachers was higher than that of selected female student teachers. However, there was no significant gender difference in agency subscale and hope. This finding was consistent with the previous findings of Hasnain, Wazid, and Hasan (2014). They found that there was no gender difference in hope.

Table 6. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Coping Styles by Gender

| Subscale of Coping Styles | Gender | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|-----------|--------------|
| Mental disengagement | Male | 300 | 10.48 | 2.122 | -3.604*** | 0.000 |
| | Female | 300 | 11.12 | 2.203 | | |
| Venting of emotion | Male | 300 | 11.18 | 2.360 | -2.132* | 0.033 |
| | Female | 300 | 11.60 | 2.466 | | |
| Religious coping | Male | 300 | 10.76 | 3.188 | -2.912** | 0.004 |
| | Female | 300 | 11.50 | 2.976 | | |
| Humor | Male | 300 | 9.84 | 2.904 | 1.985* | 0.048 |
| | Female | 300 | 9.36 | 3.017 | | |

| Subscale of Coping Styles | Gender | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Restraint | Male | 300 | 11.31 | 2.008 | 2.690** | 0.007 |
| | Female | 300 | 10.87 | 1.998 | | |
| Substance use | Male | 300 | 5.38 | 2.714 | 6.298*** | 0.000 |
| | Female | 300 | 4.32 | 1.065 | | |

Note * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

According to table 6, the result revealed that there were significant gender differences in mental disengagement, venting of emotion, religious coping, humor, restraint and substance use subscales. Among them, the mean scores of humor, restraint and substance use were higher in male students than female students. The finding of significant gender difference in humor and substance use coping styles was consistent with the finding of Ali Doruk (2015). However, the mean scores of female students were significantly higher in mental disengagement, venting of emotion and religious coping than male students. The finding of significant gender differences in venting of emotion and religious coping was consistent with the finding of Anthony Sullivan (2002). There were no significant differences in other factors of coping styles by gender.

Table 7. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Optimism by University

| Variable | University | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------|------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Optimism | YUOE | 300 | 19.83 | 3.499 | 0.403 | 0.687 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 19.71 | 3.596 | | |

From above table 7, there was no significant difference between two universities in optimism.

Table 8. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Hope by University

| Subscale of Hope | University | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------|------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Agency | YUOE | 300 | 13.13 | 1.490 | 0.371 | 0.711 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 13.08 | 1.593 | | |
| Pathway | YUOE | 300 | 12.88 | 1.546 | 0.051 | 0.959 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 12.87 | 1.664 | | |
| Total Hope | YUOE | 300 | 26.01 | 2.580 | 0.241 | 0.810 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 25.95 | 2.845 | | |

From above table 8, there was no significant difference between two universities in both hope and two subscales.

According to table 9, there were significant differences in positive reinterpretation, substance use and planning of coping styles. The mean scores of selected student teachers from YUOE were higher in positive reinterpretation and planning than selected student teachers from SUOE. It may be due to the facts that students from YUOE get greater experiences, supporting environments and many activities to deal with stress and so they use positive reinterpretation and planning coping styles more than students from SUOE. However, the mean score of student teachers from SUOE was higher in substance use than student teachers from YUOE. But the mean value of substance use coping styles is so low that students from YUOE and SUOE rarely use substance use.

Table 9. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Coping Styles by University

| Subscale of Coping Styles | University | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Positive reinterpretation | YUOE | 300 | 13.13 | 1.774 | 2.801** | 0.005 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 12.72 | 1.840 | | |
| | SUOE | 300 | 10.80 | 2.454 | | |
| Substance use | YUOE | 300 | 4.66 | 1.893 | -2.195* | 0.029 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 5.04 | 2.325 | | |

| Subscale of Coping Styles | University | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| | SUOE | 300 | 11.01 | 2.168 | | |
| Planning | YUOE | 300 | 12.48 | 1.880 | 3.313** | 0.001 |
| | SUOE | 300 | 11.93 | 2.199 | | |

Note * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Table 10. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Optimism by Age Group

| Variable | Age Group | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------|--------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Optimism | Below 19 | 280 | 19.64 | 3.597 | -0.832 | 0.406 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 19.88 | 3.501 | | |

From above Table 10, there was no significant difference between two age groups in optimism.

Table 11. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Hope by Age Group

| Subscale of Hope | Age Group | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------|--------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Agency | Below 19 | 280 | 13.07 | 1.594 | -0.523 | 0.601 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 13.14 | 1.496 | | |
| Pathway | Below 19 | 280 | 12.74 | 1.664 | -1.970* | 0.049 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 12.99 | 1.544 | | |
| Total Hope | Below 19 | 280 | 25.81 | 2.827 | -1.461 | 0.145 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 26.13 | 2.605 | | |

Note * $p < 0.05$

On the basis of table 11, there was no significant difference between two age groups in agency thinking and hope. But there was significant difference in pathway thinking. It may be due to the fact that older persons are good in finding the routes towards goals because they have more knowledge and experiences than younger ones.

Table 12. Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Students' Coping Styles by Age Group

| Subscale of Coping Styles | Age Group | N | Mean | SD | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|--------------|
| Venting of emotion | Below 19 | 280 | 11.10 | 2.414 | -2.827** | 0.005 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 11.65 | 2.399 | | |
| Emotional Social Support | Below 19 | 280 | 10.53 | 2.660 | -3.009** | 0.003 |
| | 19 and above | 320 | 11.15 | 2.402 | | |

Note ** $p < 0.01$

According to the result of table 12, there were significant difference in venting of emotion and emotional social support. The mean scores for 19 and above age group of student teachers were higher than that for below 19 age group student teachers.

Table 13. ANOVA Results of Optimism by Education Level

| Variable | Educational Level | N | Mean | SD | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------|-------------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Optimism | 1.1 | 120 | 19.91 | 3.983 | 0.760 | 0.551 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 19.31 | 3.130 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 20.04 | 3.530 | | |
| | 4.1 | 120 | 19.88 | 3.487 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 19.73 | 3.560 | | |
| | Total | 600 | 19.77 | 3.545 | | |

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (First Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester)

According to the results of table 13, there was no significant difference in optimism among five levels of education.

From the above table 14, there was no significant difference in hope and two subscales among five levels of education.

According to the results of table 15, there was significant difference in behavioral disengagement and planning among five levels of education.

Table 14. ANOVA Results of Hope by Education Level

| Subscale of Hope | Education Level | N | Mean | SD | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------|-----------------|-----|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Agency | 1.1 | 120 | 13.18 | 1.586 | 0.755 | 0.555 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 12.95 | 1.603 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 13.19 | 1.434 | | |
| | 4.1 | 120 | 13.00 | 1.655 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 13.22 | 1.421 | | |
| Pathway | 1.1 | 120 | 12.78 | 1.676 | 0.914 | 0.455 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 12.70 | 1.554 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 12.89 | 1.704 | | |
| | 4.1 | 120 | 12.93 | 1.599 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 13.07 | 1.482 | | |
| Total Hope | 1.1 | 120 | 25.96 | 2.818 | 0.876 | 0.478 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 25.65 | 2.724 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 26.08 | 2.696 | | |
| | 4.1 | 120 | 25.93 | 2.841 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 26.28 | 2.477 | | |

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (First Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester)

Table 15. ANOVA Results of Coping Styles by Education Level

| Sub-scale of Coping | Education Level | N | Mean | SD | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----|------|------|----------|--------------|
| Behavioral Disengagement | 1.1 | 120 | 6.63 | 2.39 | 3.187* | 0.013 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 7.29 | 2.42 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 6.43 | 2.28 | | |

| Sub-scale of Coping | Education Level | N | Mean | SD | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----|-------|------|----------|--------------|
| | 4.1 | 120 | 6.48 | 2.26 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 7.08 | 2.42 | | |
| Planning | 1.1 | 120 | 11.82 | 2.16 | 2.684* | 0.031 |
| | 2.1 | 120 | 12.16 | 2.29 | | |
| | 3.1 | 120 | 12.68 | 1.92 | | |
| | 4.1 | 120 | 12.23 | 1.92 | | |
| | 5.1 | 120 | 12.16 | 1.92 | | |

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (First Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester)

Table 16. Results of Post-Hoc Analysis for Coping Styles by Education Level

| Subscale of Coping Styles | (I) Education Level | (J) Education Level | Mean Difference (I-J) | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Behavioral Disengagement | 2.1 | 3.1 | 0.867* | 0.036 |
| Planning | 1.1 | 3.1 | -0.856* | 0.011 |

Note: * $p < 0.05$

Regarding the behavioral disengagement, the mean score of students from second year was significantly higher than students from third year (first semester). And then, concerning planning, the mean score of students from third year (first semester) was significantly higher than first year students.

Table 17. Relationship Between Optimism, Subscales of Hope and Subscales of Coping Styles

| Variable | Optimism | Agency | Pathway |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Optimism | 1 | 0.301 ^{**} | 0.257 ^{**} |
| Positive Reinterpretation | 0.271 ^{**} | 0.496 ^{**} | 0.472 ^{**} |
| Mental Disengagement | -0.020 | 0.095 [*] | 0.015 |
| Venting Emotion | 0.037 | 0.196 ^{**} | 0.195 ^{**} |
| Instrumental Social Support | 0.094 [*] | 0.220 ^{**} | 0.169 ^{**} |
| Active Coping | 0.148 ^{**} | 0.399 ^{**} | 0.417 ^{**} |
| Denial | -0.084 [*] | 0.007 | 0.086 [*] |
| Religious Coping | 0.002 | 0.194 ^{**} | 0.136 ^{**} |
| Humor | 0.056 | 0.190 ^{**} | 0.206 ^{**} |
| Behavioral Disengagement | -0.277 ^{**} | -0.212 ^{**} | -0.130 ^{**} |
| Restraint | 0.089 [*] | 0.249 ^{**} | 0.257 ^{**} |
| Emotional Social Support | 0.089 [*] | 0.196 ^{**} | 0.124 ^{**} |
| Substance Use | -0.202 ^{**} | -0.059 | 0.009 |
| Acceptance | 0.089 [*] | 0.236 ^{**} | 0.227 ^{**} |
| Suppression of Competing Activities | 0.051 | 0.229 ^{**} | 0.225 ^{**} |
| Planning | 0.244 ^{**} | 0.428 ^{**} | 0.415 ^{**} |

Note: ^{*}p<0.05, ^{**}p<0.01

Table 17 showed that optimism was significantly and positively correlated with subscales of hope, agency and pathway. This finding was consistent with the previous finding of Sueda Ozcan Ceran (2013) that optimism was positively and significantly correlated with agency and pathway subscales of hope. In addition, there was significant positive correlation between optimism and positive reinterpretation, instrumental social support, active coping, restraint, emotional social support, acceptance and planning coping styles. However, there was significant negative

correlation between optimism and denial, behavioral disengagement and substance use coping styles.

There was significant positive correlation between agency thinking and pathway thinking of hope and positive reinterpretation, venting of emotion, instrumental social support, active coping, religious coping, humor, restraint, emotional social support, acceptance, suppression of competing activities and planning. However, there was significant negative correlation between agency thinking and pathway thinking of hope and behavioral disengagement coping styles.

Table 18. Regression Analysis for Prediction of Hope of Student Teachers

| Variable | B | β | t | R | R ² | Adj R ² | F |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------|----------------|--------------------|--------|
| Hope (H) | 10.94 6 | | 11.298*** | 0.651 | 0.424 | 0.408 | 26.829 |
| Optimism (OP) | 0.130 | 0.169 | 4.947*** | | | | |
| Positive Reinterpretation (PR) | 0.467 | 0.313 | 7.057*** | | | | |
| Mental Disengagement (MD) | -0.043 | -0.035 | -0.943 | | | | |
| Venting of Emotion (VE) | 0.091 | 0.082 | 1.850 | | | | |
| Instrumental Social Support (ISS) | 0.024 | 0.020 | 0.480 | | | | |
| Active Coping (AC) | 0.223 | 0.151 | 3.479** | | | | |
| Denial | -0.015 | -0.013 | -0.353 | | | | |
| Religious Coping (RC) | 0.100 | 0.114 | 3.352** | | | | |
| Humor (HM) | 0.050 | 0.055 | 1.500 | | | | |
| Behavioral Disengagement (BD) | -0.086 | -0.075 | -1.949 | | | | |
| Restraint (R) | 0.061 | 0.045 | 1.251 | | | | |
| Emotional Social Support (ESS) | -0.051 | -0.048 | -0.974 | | | | |

| Variable | B | β | <i>t</i> | R | R ² | Adj R ² | F |
|---|--------|---------|----------|---|----------------|--------------------|---|
| Substance Use (SU) | 0.038 | 0.030 | 0.856 | | | | |
| Acceptance (A) | -0.009 | -0.007 | -0.185 | | | | |
| Suppression of Competing Activities (SCA) | 0.049 | 0.040 | 1.088 | | | | |
| Planning | 0.110 | 0.083 | 1.836 | | | | |

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The result showed that hope was positively predicted by optimism. Moreover, hope was positively predicted by positive reinterpretation, active coping and religious of coping styles. So, optimism, positive reinterpretation, active coping and religious coping were predictors of hope in positive direction ($\beta = 0.169$, $\beta = 0.313$, $\beta = 0.151$ and $\beta = 0.114$ respectively). So, it could be concluded that the higher the optimism and the more the students used positive reinterpretation, active coping and religious coping, the higher the hope. The adjusted R^2 value is 0.408. This indicated that approximately 41% of the variance in hope could be explained from optimism, and subscales of coping styles. The model equation to predict the hope from optimism and subscales of coping styles was as follows.

$$H = 10.946 + 0.130OP + 0.467PR + 0.223AC + 0.100RC$$

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

According to the findings, student teachers in this study had optimistic thinking and high hope. In addition, student teachers had high agency thinking, pathways thinking. This may be due to the fact that student from two universities got high marks in matriculation examination and almost all of them had definite goal to become teachers and they are now in the way towards that goal. So they are high in hope. Moreover, student teachers use positive reinterpretation and planning coping styles the most. They used both problem-focused coping styles such as planning and emotion-focused coping styles such as positive reinterpretation. However, the student teachers used substance use and behavioral disengagement coping styles the least.

Regarding the gender, there was no significant gender difference in optimism and so optimism of student teachers did not depend on gender. In addition, there was no significant gender difference in agency thinking. But,

there was significant gender difference in pathway thinking. Concerning the coping styles, there were significant gender differences in mental disengagement, venting of emotion, religious coping, humor, restraint and substance use coping styles. There were no significant differences in other factors of coping styles by gender.

From the view point of universities, there was no significant difference between two universities in optimism and hope. However, there were significant differences in positive reinterpretation, substance use and planning of coping styles. Investigating across the different age groups, there was no significant difference between two age groups in optimism and hope. However, there were significant difference in venting of emotion and emotional social support of coping styles. Looking across the education level, there was no significant difference in optimism among five levels of education and hope. However, there were significant differences in behavioral disengagement and planning among five levels of education.

The result of correlation analysis showed that optimism was significantly and positively correlated with subscales of hope; agency and pathway. Moreover, there was significant positive correlation between optimism and positive reinterpretation, instrumental social support, active coping, restraint, emotional social support, acceptance and planning of coping styles. However, there was significant negative correlation between optimism and denial, behavioral disengagement and substance use of coping styles.

Again, there was significant positive correlation between agency thinking and pathway thinking of hope and positive reinterpretation, venting of emotion, instrumental social support, active coping, religious coping, humor, restraint, emotional social support, acceptance, suppression of competing activities and planning. However, there was significant negative correlation between agency thinking and pathway thinking of hope and behavioral disengagement coping styles. Finally, multiple regression analysis showed that optimism, positive reinterpretation, active coping and religious coping were predictors of hope in positive direction.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express profound and sincere thanks to Rector Dr. Aye Aye Myint (Yangon University of Education). I would like to offer respectful gratitude to Pro-Rector Dr. Pyone Pyone Aung (Yangon University of Education) and Pro-Rector Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Yangon University of Education) for their administrative supports and their official

help in this study. I would like to express my special thanks to Dr. Khin Thuza Saw for her valuable suggestions and expert judgments as an external examiner.

References

- Ali Dourk et al., (2015). Intolerance of Uncertainty and Coping Mechanisms in Nonclinical Young Subjects. Retrieved January 30 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/journals>
- Anthony Sullivan. (2002). Gender differences in coping strategies of parents of children with Down syndrome. *The Down Syndrome Educational Trust*. Retrieved from January 12, 2018 from <http://www.down-syndrome-net/library/periodicals/dsrp/08/02>
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, K. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(2), 267-283.
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2004). Coping Pitfalls and promise. *Annual Review of psychology*, 55, 745-774.
- Hasnain, N., Wazid, S.W., & Hasan, Z. (2014). Optimism, hope and happiness as correlates of psychological well-being among young adult assumes males and females. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19 (2), 44-51.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- Price Pritchett. (2007). *Hard Optimism*. McGraw- Hill, Two Penn Plaza, New York, NY 10121-2298.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4, 219-247.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16, 201-228.
- Scheier, M. F., Weintraub, J. K., & Carver, C. S. (1986). Coping with stress: Divergent strategies of optimists and pessimists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1257-1264.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get here from there*. New York: The Free Press.
- Snyder, C. R., Feldman, B. D., Shorey, H. S., & Rand, K. L. (2002). Hopeful choices: A school counselor's guide to hope theory. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(5), 298-307.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J.R., Holleran, S.A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 570-585.
- Snyder, C. R., Hoza, B., Pelham, W. E., Rapoff, M., Ware, L., Danovsky, M., Highverger, L., Ribinstein, H., & Stahl, K. J. (1997). The development and validation

- of the children's hope scale. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 22(3), 399-421.
- Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. (2000). Optimism and hope constructs: Variants on a positive expectancy theme. In E. C. Chaung (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice* (pp. 101-126). Washington, D.C.; American Psychological Association.
- Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. (2001). Optimism and hope constructs: Variants on a positive expectancy theme. In E. C. Chaung (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice* (pp. 101-125). Washington, D.C.; American Psychological Association.
- Stotland, E. (1969). *The psychology of hope*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sueda Ozcan Ceran. (2013). *The Role of Hope and Coping Styles in Optimism*.
- Tolman, E. C. (1932). Purposive behavior in animals and men. New York: Century.