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ABSTRACT

Practicum is a highly stressful situation whereby trainee teachers are subjected to a high quality standard, deals with numerous students' behaviour, adapt with the school climate and so forth. In this stress coping factors comprising of self-efficacy, subjective well-being and emotional intelligence are associated with practicum stress experienced by 137 trainee teachers in the Sabah Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). Resiliency Scale for Young Adults (RSYA), Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale, the Emotional Intelligence Traits, Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) and Rating Pre-Service Teacher Events for Stress Scale were adapted and used in this study. Collected data were analysed using the PLS-SEM approach. The result showed self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, subjective well-being and stress are moderate but resiliency has moderately low level. Self-efficacy and subjective well-being are significant predictors of resilience and stress, however, emotional intelligence is not. It is hoped that this study will provide more understanding about stress and stress coping abilities so that appropriate orientation, content, and practice during practicum can be planned and implemented in an effort to prepare high quality educators.

Keywords: practicum, stress, stress coping factors, resiliency, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, subjective wellbeing, PLS-SEM.
Ngui, G.K., & Lay, Y.F.

INTRODUCTION

The practicum is an important aspect of teachers’ education (Farrell, 2008;). The practicum becomes the best avenue for them to examine and evaluate their knowledge and skills in actual teaching environment and aligning it to their personal educational philosophy and theories (Kabilan & Raja Izzaham, 2008; Kennedy, 1996; Goh & Matthews, 2011). The positive experience during practicum is related to the reinforcement of their intention to continue with the teaching profession but on the contrary, it may lead to turnover among the trainee teachers. Ong et al. (2004) stated that practicum promotes confidence and this in turn supports learning.

Although practicum seems to provide numerous benefits to the trainee teachers, it may also lead to stress (Caires et al., 2010). There are many studies in the past (Borg, 1990; Wendt & Bain, 1989; Capel, 1997; Morton et al., 1997; Malek & Ajmal, 2010) indicating the phenomenon of practicum stress. When stress is perceived highly, this could result in the teachers to quit the teaching course. Practicum becomes so stressful because there are many factors, internal and external causing teachers to be psychologically challenged. These factors include balancing demands from students, mentoring teachers, school administrators, supervisors and adapting to the new work environment (Klassen & Durksen, 2014).

LITERATURE REVIEW

It became imperative that teacher trainees develop coping ability to deal with the stressful situation during practicum. According to the numerous theoretical models to explain stress such as the Person-Environment Fit Theory (French & Kaplan, 1972; French et al., 1982; French & Kahn, 1962), the Lazarus Transactional Process Model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), the Spielberger State-Trait Process Model (Spielberger et al., 2002), the Karasek Demand-Control Model (Karasek & Theorell, 1990) and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Model (NIOSH, 2002), stress can be overcome by good coping strategies. According to Soave (2014), coping strategies may include resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and subjective well-being.

A resilient person is able to cope with practicum stress and continue to enjoy a positive and healthy life (Bonanno, 2012). Resilience is an important personal attribute for trainee teachers as it provides protection from stress and ensure that trainee teachers continue with their training program. According to Castro et al. (2010), teachers who are resilient showed greater coping ability.

Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s perception and belief about something. In the context of teaching and learning, trainer teachers’ self-efficacy refers to their perception and belief about the teaching practicum. Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986) provides the theoretical framework to support
one’ behavior to be more effacious than others. According to Wood and Bandura (1989), individual who believes about his ability to become more motivated, to have cognitive resources and actions is more likely to be effacious, thus having more ability to perform a particular task for a period of time in order to attain a desired outcome. Teachers who have high efficacy will have confidence in his or her competency and show greater commitment towards their job, accepting innovation, give more efforts to teach and experience lower risk to burnout as well as being more satisfied with their work (Hoy & Spero, 2005; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001).

Emotional intelligence has also been reported to help cope with stress. Weisenger (2000) explained emotional intelligence as the ability to sense, understand and apply forces behind emotions in daily practice. Emotion is used to deal with problems as individuals identify emotional meaning and comprehend them before attempting to solve problem (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). By employing emotion, a person can shape his or her behaviour and thinking processes to deal with stressful situation. Since trainee teachers faced stressful situation during practicum, emotional intelligence knowledge and practice can help them to overcome these challenges (Tan, Abd Aziz & Mahani, 2010).

Subjective well-being refers to happiness or satisfaction with life (Diener, 1984). Being happy is an armour against stress as it provides the individual with the ability to adapt to the changes in his or her life (Windle et al., 2010). Subjective well-being can strengthen resilience towards stress. Therefore, it is also regarded as a coping ability to manage the impacts of practicum stress.

Research Objectives

The research objectives are:
i. To determine the level of resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, subjective wellbeing and stress among the trainee teachers;
ii. To determine the relationships between resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and subjective wellbeing with teachers’ stress during practicum.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The methodology uses PLS-SEM to examine the inter-relationships of numerous factors affecting trainee teachers’ stress level during practicum training. These variables are inter-related and gives effect to the dependent variable or endogenous variable in the PLS-SEM context, namely: stress during practicum training.
Population and Sampling Procedures

The research population involves trainee teachers undergoing teaching course in four teacher education institutes in Sabah. The sampling method is purposive based on the name list of trainee teachers undergoing practicum training. For this study, the sample size is 137, adequate to represent all trainee teachers in the teacher education institutes in Sabah. The determination of the sample is based on Cohen’s principle of sample size adequacy (Ringle, Sarstedt, & Straub, 2012).

Research Instruments

The main research instrument is questionnaire. Practicum stress is measured using Cohen’s (1988) Perceived Stress Scale which comprises of 10 items, popularly known as PSS-10. The Scale showed good reliability with Cronbach Alpha between 0.78 to 0.91 and reliability coefficient for test-retest between 0.55 and 0.85 (Cohen, Kamarck & Mermelstein, 1983). The 25-item Resiliency Scale is used to assess trainee teachers’ resilience (Wagnild & Young, 1990, 1993). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s (2001) Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale consisting of 12 items is used to measure the trainee teachers’ self-efficacy. Beside that, the Emotional Intelligence Traits Questionnaire is used to determine the trainee teachers’ emotional intelligence (Biggart, Corr, O’Brien & Cooper, 2010; Cooper & Petrides, 2010) whereas the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is used to measure current satisfaction with life among the trainee teachers. This scale was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin (1985).

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was carried out after getting written approval from the State Education Department to ensure ethical procedures in research implementation are adhered to. The questionnaires were distributed and collected after three weeks, then checked to ensure that all have been filled in completely.

Data Analyses Procedures

Data analyses use statistical software like IBM SPSS 21.0 and PLS-SEM 3.0. Descriptive statistical analysis determines the demographic profiles of the respondents. It is also used to determine the levels of variables using mean. Covariance analyses using PLS-SEM determine the relationship between variables.
RESULTS

Demographic Profiles of the Respondents

The respondents comprised of 137 trainee teachers with 68.6% females and 31.4% males. Majority of the respondents (96.4%) are between 25 and 30 years old and only 3.7% are above 30 years old. The trainee teachers major in Mathematics (51.8%), TESL (15.4%) and other subjects (32.8%).

Descriptive Result of the Research Variables

Table 1 below shows the level of self-efficacy, subjective well-being, emotional intelligence, resilience and stress. The result showed moderate levels of self-efficacy, subjective well-being, emotional intelligence, and stress whereas resiliency is moderately low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
<th>Mean ± Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>5.822 ± 1.078</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>4.856 ± 0.848</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>4.876 ± 0.556</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>25 – 175</td>
<td>123.891 ± 18.807</td>
<td>Moderate Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>2.109 ± 0.574</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of PLS-SEM to Construct the Structural Model

Table 2 presents a summary of the values for reflective model measurement. Although all variable showed good internal consistency, only self-efficacy and subjective wellbeing have satisfactory indicator reliability. There are weak and moderate outer loadings in Resilience, emotional intelligence and stress indicators. The value of AVE for all latent variables showed acceptable values except for emotional intelligence with AVE < 0.05. Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) test showed that all values are less than 0.85, indicating acceptable discriminant validity. Overall, the assessment of the reflective measurement models showed satisfactory result for self-efficacy and subjective wellbeing with minor adjustment of indicators for resilience, emotional intelligence and stress.
### Table 2: Assessment of the Reflective Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Internal Consistency (CR)</th>
<th>Indicator Reliability (Outer Loadings)</th>
<th>Convergent Validity (AVE)</th>
<th>Discriminant Validity (HTMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>An item (DT11, OL = 0.376) is deleted, 7 items retained (OL = &lt;0.708)</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>25 items revised ((OL = &lt;0.708).</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>All 12 items have outer loading &gt; 0.708</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Wellbeing</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>All 5 items have outer loading &gt; 0.708</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>9 items have outer loading &gt;0.708. Only one item has OL &lt; 0.708) (S8, OL= 0.675) which was retained</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reflective measure model is assessed based on the convergent validity which is given by its average variance extracted (AVE). Additionally, significance and relevance of the outer weights and the collinearity among the indicators are also referred to. It is shown that the convergent validity indicated satisfactory values of both composite reliability and AVE for resilience, self-efficacy, subjective well-being and stress whereas for emotional intelligence, the composite reliability is not supported with an acceptable AVE (< 0.5).

The significance and relevance of the outer weights was determined through bootstrapping analysis. Table 3 presents the bootstrapping analysis result. Emotional intelligence is shown as an insignificant predictor of resilience and stress. Resilience is also not a significant predictor of stress. However, self-efficacy is a significant predictor of emotional intelligence, resilience, stress and subjective wellbeing. Furthermore, subjective wellbeing is a significant predictor of emotional intelligence, resilience and stress.
The structural model is also assessed to determine the inter-relationship between the constructs. Collinearity among the indicators were assessed based on the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values which must be below five (VIF < 5). In Table 4 below, it is indicated that all values of VIF are below 5, thus concluding that there is no multi-collinearity among the indicators.

The predictive capabilities of the structural model is determined based on the R square ($R^2$) and the effect size ($f^2$). In Figure 2, the $R^2$ values are indicated. It shows that self efficacy explains 20.4% of variance in subjective wellbeing and 43.5% of variance in emotional intelligence. Also, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and subjective wellbeing contribute 61.7% to the variance in resilience. However, the combination of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, subjective wellbeing and resilience only contributed 10.8% to the variance in stress. Based on the path coefficient, self-efficacy is moderately related to emotional intelligence ($\beta = 0.405$), resilience ($\beta = 0.474$) and subjective wellbeing ($\beta = 0.451$).
Figure 1: PLS Algorithm Indicating the $R^2$ values

Table 5 shows the effect size, $f^2$ which indicates the relative effect of each variable. Emotional intelligence has a greater effect on resilience compared to stress. Likewise, self-efficacy also has a greater impact on resilience than subjective wellbeing and emotional intelligence but least of all on stress. Subjective wellbeing has a greater impact on emotional intelligence than in resilience and stress. Overall, self-efficacy and subjective wellbeing give greater effect on resilience and stress compared to emotional intelligence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Subjective Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

This study shows that resilience is moderately low while self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, subjective wellbeing and stress are all moderate. The trainee teachers’ resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and subjective wellbeing may have been the combination of past personal experience before going into the teaching education course. Therefore, there is a mixture of trainee teachers with most of them having moderate levels.
This research is based on theoretical concepts that identifies a high possibility of inter-relationships between resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and emotional wellbeing and effect on stress. PLS-SEM as a statistical tool measured and determined the relevance of the structural model. The result showed that emotional intelligence is not a good predictor of stress as it yielded unfavourable outer loadings although AVE was good. However, self-efficacy and subjective wellbeing are better predictors of resilience and stress.

Overall, the result showed that self-efficacy is a strong exogenous latent variables to predict emotional intelligence, subjective wellbeing, resilience and stress. Subjective wellbeing can predict emotional intelligence, resilience and stress. In this study, emotional intelligence does not contribute significantly to resilience and stress. Further to that, the low resiliency among the trainee teachers do not have any significant impact on their stress.

**CONCLUSION**

Overall, the result in this study highlighted the relationships among the variables: between self efficacy and resilience, subjective wellbeing and stress. It has also shown that both self efficacy as well as subjective well-being are significant contributor to resilience and stress. However, emotional intelligence is an insignificant predictor of resilience and stress. Furthermore, the assessment in the reflective measurement model and the formative measurement model suggest that emotional intelligence does not have a good fit in the structural model. The path coefficient indicated that the inter-relationships between the latent variables do exist but the beta coefficients do not show strong relationship among these constructs. One of the limitations of this study could be contributed by the small sample size and therefore require more data collection to validate this initial finding. However, it has been shown through this study that both self-efficacy and subjective well-being play significant roles to explain resilience and stress. Therefore, it provides merits to include promotion of self-efficacy and subjective wellbeing in the teacher education curriculum as this can help to improve their resiliency and consequently manage stress effectively. Further to that, other theoretical supports of about other variables’ contribution to stress such as school climate, workloads, etc should be explored.
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