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Abstract: This study investigated the sources of stress of 61 Pre-service Language Teachers in Western Mindanao State University using the Undergraduate Sources of Stress (USOS) Questionnaire developed by Blackmore and Jones (2005). A descriptive-quantitative design was utilized to determine these sources of stress and to identify whether there is a significant difference in the sources of stress across genders. The results and findings of the study showed that academic-related concerns are the main sources of stress for the majority of pre-service language teachers. Also, it appeared that male and female respondents do not significantly differ in their sources of stress. These findings contributed new insights with regards to the scarcity of studies conducted which aimed to determine the sources of stress among undergraduate students, specifically, among Preservice Language Teachers in the Philippines.
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Introduction

Studies have shown that there are underlying demands attached to the process of a person transitioning to college (Byrley, 2016). This makes sense that college students are not exempted from obtaining new challenges as they strive for successful adjustments. However, when left unmanaged, the numerous challenges present among university students are most likely to place an aggravated stress upon them (Carpenter & Hasin, 1999; Broman, 2002 as cited in Hamaideh, 2009). Thus, the stress they might encounter may originate from diverse sources such as academic workload, financial hardship, time restrictions, and interpersonal challenges with teachers, peers, and significant others (Albor, et al., 2020).

It is scientifically recognized that stress is an unavoidable, natural, and a common aftermath of one’s existence (Pitt et al. 2017). Hence, it is imperative that learners must attend and act upon their experienced stresses as it is believed that students under stress are plausible to develop unhealthy habits (Byrley, 2016). (Aksoy and Kutluca, 2005 as cited in Aydin, 2016) also emphasized that stress is a condition that affects the communication process, performances, and actions of people. This illustrates that the weight of a person’s stress may greatly impact not just their functionality, but also their ability to appropriately react toward various situations. (DeDeyn, 2008 as cited in Bayrakdaroglu, & Hekim, 2020) also mentioned that one must be scrupulously cautious because physical signs of stress linked with pessimistic outlook in life, leads to even more detrimental thinking, further explaining that stress has significant effects upon the individuality of a person.

Some early researchers of stress including (Lazarus & Folkman, 1996; Selye, 1950 as cited in Olpin, 1996) have identified stress as a negative emotion that develops when a person feels unable to comply with the expectations imposed on them by their environment. It is also claimed that stress carries noxious effects and people regardless of age, gender, and status tend to react differently upon different stress sources (Niemi & Vainiomäki, 2006; Rosal et al., 1997 as cited in Tuncay, et. al, 2020). In other terms, stress can relate to a wide spectrum of physiological changes brought on by physical or psychological factors, or a combination of both.
On another note, sources of stress, as identified by (Feng, 1992; Volpe, 2000 as cited in Ahmad et al., 2015), is anything that tests the adaptability of a person or stimulates either the body or thinking of an individual. Whereas, environmental, psychological, biological, and social aspects are just some of the variables that contribute to stress (Kai-Wen, 2015). In this sense, to avoid worse consequences of stress, one must begin identifying its sources (Pruthi, 2021).

Moreover, although various researchers have already been scrutinizing stress among university students for decades (Hamaideh, 2009), there are still numerous stress-related issues and discoveries in the present. As a result, stress is almost becoming a part of the students’ daily lives (Tuncay, Müdürüoğlu, & Bulut, 2020). In support to this, an investigation made by Bulo & Sanchez (2014) claimed that the foremost sources of stress among college learners are mainly interpersonal stressors that include situations where students work among strangers and when students are in conflict with their parents or guardians. Similarly, (Pitt, Oprescu, Tapia, & Gray, 2013) revealed that the principal sources of stress among university students are lack of social assistance, life in college, and assessments. Along with it, studies among learners in healthcare professions such as in nursing, pharmacy, psychology, and physiotherapy also emphasized that educational issues are their main sources of stress (Alghamdi et al., 2019; Benau, & Votta, 2014; Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006; Tyrrell, 1992).

It is without doubt that there are already various studies conducted that aim to ascertain students’ sources of stress. However, these analyses were focused mainly towards the general population of college students (Byrley, 2016; Kai-Wen, 2015; Bulo & Sanchez, 2014; Pitt, Oprescu, Tapia, & Gray, 2013) and medical students (Alghamdi et al., 2019; Benau, & Votta, 2014; Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006; Tyrrell, 1992). Hence, there is only limited understanding when it comes to the sources of stress of students in other specializations (Kizilaslan, 2014).

With that, it is imperative to study this notion among a particular population, specifically towards Pre-Service Language Teachers as they are also subjected to face diverse stressors as an outcome of having a different process compared to other university students (Kizilaslan, 2014). Therefore, to extend the scope of this concept, the primary intent of this study is to determine the sources of stress of Pre-Service Language Teachers.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the top sources of stress of the Pre-Service Language Teachers?
2. What are the least sources of stress of the Pre-Service Language Teachers?
3. Is there a significant difference in the sources of stress across gender?

**Review of Related Literature**

**Stress**

It is quite evident that during these present times, there are still various controversies and cases with regards to stress that brings forth serious influence towards the carnal and psychological state of a person. Despite the fact that numbers of experts have already been investigating the concept of stress for ages, it is unfortunate that stress has still managed to pervade (Bulut, Müdürüoğlu, & Tuncay, 2020) and with its prevalence, stress is now widely perceived to be an approximate portion of human life (Aydın & Kaya, 2016).

The word stress denotes a wide variety of definitions (Acosta-Gomez et al., 2018; Ahmad et al., 2015; Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014; Dhumale, Gore, Kadam, & Waghachavare, 2013; Gray, Oprescu, Pitt, & Tapia, 2017; Lazarus, & Folkman, 1984) and views (Byrley, 2016; Kwaah & Essilfie, 2017; Pritchard, & Wilson, 2005). It is for that reason that authors agreed upon the idea that stress cannot have an absolute meaning (Hatunoglu, 2020). However, early researchers such as Lazarus and Folkman (1984) claimed that stress is any mental or physical phenomenon present in an individual as a result of their contact towards the ever-changing environment. This
definition is further supported by Ahmad et al., (2015) which mentioned that stress is a complicated phenomenon where one is trapped in a tension-inducing situation. This suggests that stress is an internal conflict that sprouted from a potential dissatisfactory condition.

Dhumale, Gore, Kadam, and Waghachavare (2013) characterized stress as anything that threatens the inmost stability of a person while Gray, Oprescu, Pitt, and Tapia (2017) viewed stress as any challenge developed in the physique, psychological state, or emotional dispositions of an individual. It is a distinct experience that an individual encounters when they are not able to comply with the impositions placed upon them. With that, it is only typical when a person encounters stress as it is considered to be a conventional consequence of human existence that is almost impossible to elude Gray, Oprescu, Pitt, and Tapia (2017). Similarly, Acosta-Gomez et al. (2018) characterized stress as an ill-dispose circumstance that greatly impacts the health and life aspects of people. Therefore, people, regardless of their demographic profile, are subjected to stress.

Stress is not something that humans can just easily avoid. Inescapable as it is, adverse experiences of stress might lead to serious illnesses and potential damaging repercussions that may threaten one’s well-being (Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014; Bulut, Müdürüoğlu, & Tuncay, 2020). Considering this matter, one must have the idea on how to both cope and deal with it (Acosta-Gomez et al., 2018) because individuals are most likely to experience the unpleasant emotion of stress when they have reached the point of struggling or being incapable to keep pace and meet the expectations of the surroundings they are indulged in (Essilfie, & Kwaah, 2017; Pritchard, & Wilson, 2005).

Byrley (2016) emphasized the cons of poorly-managed stress in the context of university students and mentioned that learners tend to undergo physical changes when they are stressed out. For instance, when students neglect the risky consequences of stress, their sleeping pattern might be negatively affected and could potentially result in unfavorable educational outcomes. Hence, the totality of stress is multifaceted. This supposed that stress is a serious condition that affects people differently (İhtiyaroğlu & Ateş, 2018) and the reasons behind it encompasses socio-cultural, environmental, and psychological variables (Brand, & Schoonheim-Klein, 2009 as cited in Bedewy & Gabriel, 2015).

Furthermore, the concept of stress has also been substantially investigated across different countries and among different types of learners. Countries where the subject is widely conducted involved - China (Hashim, & Zhiliang, 2003); Taiwan (Kai-Wen, 2015); Egypt (Bedewy, & Gabriel, 2015); Dublin (Tyrrell, 1992); the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam (Benau, & Votta, 2014); South Africa (Bowen, 2016); Nepal (Giri, Giri, Kamait, Marla, & Singh, 2014); Ireland (Tully, 2004); Turkey (İhtiyaroğlu & Ateş, 2018); and Vietnam (Hoi, Luong, Son, Thien, & Vu, 2019). Different types of respondents involved in this study also include – Students (Bedewy, & Gabriel, 2015; Benau, & Votta, 2014; Bulut et al., 2020; Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014; Gray et al., 2017; Jang, & Lee, 2015; Kai-Wen, 2015; Tyrrell, 1992), Teachers (Aydınl, & Kaya, 2016; Bowen, 2016), School Counselors (Gutierrez, & Mullen, 2016), and Athletes and Non-Athletes (Pritchard, & Wilson, 2005). However, although studies have been made among different types of people across various places, its scope is still limited especially in Philippine setting. Therefore, this research seeks to investigate the sources of stress among Pre-Service Language Teachers in the Philippines.

Sources of Stress

Inquiries with respect to stress is not something that is latest in the field of studies. Hence, to be able for an individual to deal, control, and effectively cope with it, it is imperative that a person experiencing stress must identify the main sources of their stress or their stressors (White, D. M., 2016). Thus, in recognizing personal stressors, one should put in mind that human beings vary in terms of stress sources and tolerance towards stress. Depending on the person experiencing it, one cannot truly fathom the heaviness of stress (Byrley, 2016). As reported, sources of stress or stressors has gained varied definitions and differed contributing factors according to different

Thawabieh and Qaisy (2012) claimed that any variables that produce all sorts of mental and physical strain are referred to as stressors or sources of stress. Stressors could also be perceived as any unpleasant occurrences in one’s life that may involve abrupt catastrophes, chronic presence of stress, and habitual or regular inconveniences and difficulties (Thawabieh, & Qaisy, 2012). A number of authors have also pointed out the different general classifications of stressors with respect to the context of their studies. Bayrakdaroglu and Hekim (2020) claimed that life happenings are the major sources of stress that includes a change in hormone and other bodily chemical and mental pressure. Meanwhile, Kai-Wen (2015) specified that external conditions, mental conditions, biological factors, and social aspects can all be considered as stressors.

In light of this, stressors among university students are also well investigated and presented in multiple studies (Ananda et al., 2009; Byrley, 2016; Tyrrell, 1992; Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014; Tuncay et al., 2020) and it is believed that college students distinctively seemed to have common patterns with regards to experiencing obstacles associated to stress (Gittins, 2007 as cited in Bulo, & Sanchez). As learners began journeying the new stage of their life in becoming college students – whose decisions greatly affect their future, their main stressors may revolve around the concepts of gender identity, managing time, educational pressures, solitude, financial capabilities, relationships with people and major decision making (Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014). However, Bulut et al. (2020) specified that more than 50% of the university students have struggles with academic stress. Hence, the author looked into the specific stressors that students may have in classroom settings, such as delivering a speech and cognitive arithmetic in front of an audience, as well as assessment tension. Many authors concur that “assessments,” “fear of defeat,” “case load,” and “accomplishing course requirements” are the most distressing elements in students’ education and academic environments (Tuncay et al., 2020).

Ananda et al. (2009) expressed that medical students’ stressors may also include academic demands, status with school faculty or personnel, other interpersonal relationships, and poor well-being habits. The results indicated that for medical students, academic stressors (35-70%) that includes “academic achievements, examinations; course material; and competition among students” are their cardinal sources of stress (Ananda et al., 2009). This claim is further supported by the studies conducted among students in healthcare professions where results have showed that Nursing Students (Alghamdi et al., 2019); Psychology Students (Tyrrell, 1992); Pharmacy Students (Benau, & Votta, 2014); and Physiotherapy Students (Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006) have identified academic-related concerns as their primary stressors.

With that, as Acosta-Gomez et al. (2018) stated that no one is spared when it comes to experiencing stress, it could be deduced that any student can either be under the classified group of stressors mentioned (Weightman, 1999 as cited in Thawabieh & Qaisy, 2012). Hence, the opportunity of being able to identify and deal with one’s stressors should not be taken lightly as it is certain that determining what causes stress in one’s life is the primary move in achieving functional and efficient stress management, stress reduction, and in other cases, stress avoidance (Health line, 2020).

Although the notion of student stressors has been studied for years, there is still an obvious limitation when it comes to its scope. If not among the general population of university students (Bulo, & Sanchez, 2014; Dhumale et al., 2013; Kai-Wen, 2015; Pitt et al., 2017; Thawabieh, & Qaisy, 2012; Tuncay et al., 2020) the study of stress is dominantly conducted among medical students of different fields (Alghamdi et al., 2019; Benau, & Votta, 2014; Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006; Tyrrell, 1992). Therefore, to provide further insights with regards to this topic, the current investigation aimed to extend the scope toward Pre-Service Language Teachers.
Methodology

Research Design

The study implemented descriptive-quantitative design utilizing survey research tool. Quantitative research strives to quantify and statistically treat data (Creswell, 2003 as cited in Williams, 2007) such as in the case of this study, which attempts to quantify the variable sources of stress of pre-service language teachers. Moreover, it is descriptive for the reason that this study sought to describe and interpret the variables through descriptive statistics such as mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) (Leedy, & Ormrod, 2001 as cited in Williams, 2007).

Additionally, a survey questionnaire was used for data gathering as it is commonly employed to measure latent variables similar in the status of this research (McLeod, 2018). For the relevancy and adequacy of data to be collected from the respondents, a research tool was adopted. The data collection was also conducted ‘one-shot’ and in a relatively short period of time – suggesting that this study is cross-sectional (Shanahan, 2010; Salkind, 2010 as cited in Reyes et al., 2020).

Respondents of the Study

The sample size of this study consisted of 61 Pre-service English Language Teachers from Western Mindanao State University. In terms of gender, the majority of the respondents were female (63.3%). Among the female respondents, (36.84%) were first year students, (5.26%) were second year, (52.63%) were third year, and (5.26%) were fourth year.

Research Instrument

To assess the sources of stress of the respondents, a research tool named The Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire (USOS) was adopted. It was developed and trialed by the authors (Blackmore, & Jones. 2005) based on the accumulated research literature on sources of stress among undergraduates. The instrument consisted of 17 items that were equally distributed among its subscales: Financial Issues, Personal Issues, and Academic Issues. It has been shown that the instrument is measured to have “moderate to good reliability” with internal consistency of α = 0.82 for “academic demands”, 0.79 for “personal issues”, and 0.67 for “financial concerns”. Moreover, the instrument was answerable with 5-Point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (Not at All) to 4 (A Great Deal).

Pilot Testing and Reliability of the Instrument

The research questionnaire was pretested among 30 pre-service English language teachers in order to evaluate its reliability. It was reported that 30 is an adequate number of respondents for a researcher to conduct pilot run (Hill, 1998 as cited in Tappin, 2014).

Table 1.0 Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the subscales of the Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire (Blackmore, & Jones. 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>N (Number of Items)</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Issue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.0 indicates the internal consistency of the subscales in the questionnaire adopted from (Blackmore, & Jones. 2005). In comparison, both the present study and the previous study conducted by (Donnellan et al., 2010) have moderate to good reliability scores, which has the internal consistency of .67 for the Financial Issues, .81 for the personal issues, and .77 for the Academic Issues.

Data Collection Procedure

Due to remote learning, the survey was technically constructed and disseminated via Google Forms. Information about the survey, consent form, and instruction were provided before the respondents were led to the questionnaire. On average, the survey was completed within about
10 minutes. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test was employed to analyze the data, which resulted in an overall reliability score of .86 which signifies as good.

**Coding Procedures**

To make it possible to compute and analyze the data collected, the following processes were observed: For the demographic profile of the respondents, which includes gender, the responses were coded as follows: 1 for male and 2 for female. For the year level of the respondents, responses were coded as: 1 for first year, 2 for second year, 3 for third year, and 4 for fourth year. Additionally, for the determination of the Sources of Stress of the respondents, the answers on the Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire were coded as follows: 0 for Not at all, 1 for A little, 2 for Somewhat, 3 for Quite a bit, and 4 for A great deal.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive Statistics were employed to characterize the demographic information. Unless otherwise stated, values identified in the results are mean and standard deviation. Responses in the Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire were tabulated as 0=Not at all, 1=A little, 2=Somewhat, 3= Quite a bit, and 4= A great deal. The interpretation of the mean was provided as shown in Table 2.0.

**Table 2.0. Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire Calculated Mean Interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.21-4.00</td>
<td>Very High Response Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.41-3.20</td>
<td>High Response Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.61-2.40</td>
<td>Moderate Response Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81-1.60</td>
<td>Low Response Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00-0.80</td>
<td>Very Low Response Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results and Discussion**

**Sources of Stress of the Respondents**

Drawn from the descriptive analysis, Table 3.0 shows the responses of respondents in each item of the research instrument – Undergraduate Sources of Stress Questionnaire (USOS), mean (M), standard deviation (SD) and interpretation (Interp.) – 0.0 to 0.80 (Very Low Response Rate [VLRR]), 0.81 to 1.60 (Low Response Rate [LRR]), 1.61 to 2.40 (Moderate Response Rate [MRR]), 2.41 to 3.20 (High Response Rate [HRR]), and 3.21 to 4.0 (Very High Response Rate [VHRR]).

**Table 3.0. Respondents’ Sources of Stress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Interp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>QAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal Finances</td>
<td>4 6.6</td>
<td>9 14.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>9 14.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>13 21.3</td>
<td>5 8.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cost of books/equipment</td>
<td>8 13.1</td>
<td>11 18.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University Fees</td>
<td>25 41.0</td>
<td>12 19.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Relationships with family members</td>
<td>15 24.6</td>
<td>13 21.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Relationship with partner</td>
<td>43 70.5</td>
<td>9 14.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>11 18.0</td>
<td>14 23.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>11 18.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>9 14.8</td>
<td>5 8.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the analysis found in Table 3.0, it could be noted that the preservice language teachers were found to have “Moderate Response Rate” in the overall sources of stress (Mean – 2.39). This suggests that the sources of stress of the respondents derived from the three subscales provided, specifically – Financial Subscale, Personal Subscale, and Academic Subscale. However, the moderate response rate in this study does not compare favorably with the study conducted (Donnellan, Feeney, Hussey, & Walsh, 2010) which reported to have attained “High Response Rate”. Hence, the inconsistency found on the present result and with that of Donnellan et al. (2010) can be due to the fact that the present study was done from that current mode of learning which is online.

Furthermore, among the stressors provided in the instrument, it can be noted that items 13 (M-3.23, SD-0.97) interpreted as VHRR, 15 (M-3.15, SD- 1.09) interpreted as HRR, and 17 (M-3.10, SD- 0.97) interpreted as HRR, are the most rated items. These items relate to academic issues. This suggests that academic concerns are the top sources of stress of the Pre-Service Language Teachers. To specify, “Intellectual demands of the course” (e.g. Pedagogical Knowledge as per the Teaching Profession), “Time demands of the course” (e.g. studying, making reports), and “The amount of materials to be learnt in the course” (e.g. lectures, textbooks), are the respondents’ top three stressors. This is in consonance with the study conducted by (Alghamdi et al., 2019; Al-Tarawneh and Kahtoon, 2014; Benau, &Votta, 2014; Bulut, Münduroğlu, &Tuncay, 2020; Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006; Tyrrell, 1992) which claimed that academic-related issues are the top sources of stress for the majority of the university students including medical students of different fields. Perhaps, the reason for this is that undergraduates, regardless of their course-taken, are subjected to experience academic stress to an extent and in one way or another.

On another note, items 7 (M-0.57, SD-1.07) interpreted as VLRR, 5 (M-1.31, SD-1.38) interpreted as LRR, and 6 (M-1.90, SD-1.50) interpreted as MRR, are the least rated items in the questionnaire. These items relate to financial and personal issues. This means that financial difficulties and personal affairs are the least sources of stress for the majority of the preservice language teachers. Particularly, “Relationship with Partner” (e.g. romantic partner), “University Fees” (e.g. tuition), and “Relationship with Family Members” (e.g. Mother-daughter, Parents- Children) are the respondents’ three least sources of stress. Moreover, the present result disputes the claim of that (Bulo& Sanchez, 2014) which states that primary sources of stress among college learners are personal/interpersonal stressors. It is supposed that because of remote learning or online education, the students are confined in their place of residence, hence, no school fees are collected, and that the situation facilitates improved communication process which then restricts any possible misunderstanding among family members.
Gender difference on the Sources of Stress

To determine if there is difference in the sources of stress across gender, the data was analyzed with the use of parametric statistics known as T-test for independent samples. Table 4.0 presents the findings.

Table 4.0. T-test results on the difference in sources of stress when grouped according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Stress</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.0, it could be inferred that the male and female respondents do not significantly differ in their sources of stress. With the males (M=2.53, SD=0.49) having high response rate in the overall sources of stress as compared to females (M=2.35, SD=0.75), it can be deduced that gender does not influence sources of stress. Although the previous investigation did not provide any analysis pertaining to gender difference with regards to sources of stress, the present result reflects other investigations which claimed that there is no overall significant difference in the sources of stress among male and female undergraduate students (Black, Bagalkote, Campbell, Creed, Guthrie, Shaw, 1998; Black, Creed, Guthrie, Hamilton, Shaw, Tomenson, 1995; Firth, 1986; Banks, Clegg, Jackson, Kemp, Stafford, & Wall, 1980 as cited in Donnellan, Feeney, Hussey, & Walsh, 2010).

Conclusion and Implications

Results on the Sources of Stress among Preservice English Language Teachers indicate that Academic Stressors are their major sources of stress. This resonates with other investigations which led to the notion of academic stressors’ long history in the lives of the undergraduates (Alghamdi et al., 2019; Al-Tarawneh and Kahtoon, 2014; Benau, &Votta, 2014; Bulut, Müüroğlu, &Tuncay, 2020; Gupta, Jones, Mandy, & Tucker, 2006; Tyrrell, 1992). Thus, the findings are found important as it is believed to be a part of the primary steps in addressing student stress, hence, providing an avoidance for long-term and serious consequences (Agha, Al Farhan, Althubaiti, Bamuhair, Ibrahim, Rahman, 2015).

Moreover, since there is no significant difference in the sources of stress among male and female Pre-service Language Teachers, and in consideration of the former finding, it is strongly suggested that matters such as these must be resolved hastily through curriculum-modification plans and design interventions that will prioritize the supply of academic support.
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