



WORK STRESS ADAPTATION: ROLES OF GENDER, SOCIAL SUPPORT AND PERSONALITY

Olukayode Ayooluwa AFOLABI*

&

Oluwatoyin Beatrice DAHUNSI

*Department of Pure & Applied Psychology
Adekunle Ajasin University
Akungba-Akoko, Nigeria*

*Tel.: 08034676352 E-Mail: afolabi95@yahoo.co.uk

ABSTRACT

Workers in Nigeria are faced with many stress factors such as work-related, domestic, after job, age or retirement problem to cope with or managed. In view of this, the present study examined the effects of gender, social support and personality (Type A and Type B) on work stress adaptation. Using random and accidental sampling techniques, a total of 210 civil servants (78 males and 132 females) from 10 Government Ministries in Akure, Ondo State were sampled. Participants completed measures of Type A behavior scale, Perceived social support scale and Job stress scale. One hypothesis was formulated and tested using 2x2x2 ANOVA analysis. The results revealed that gender ($F(1,202) = 9.938, p < 0.05$), social support ($F(1,202)=20.263, p<0.01$) and personality ($F(1,202) = 12.630, p < 0.01$) had significant effects on work stress adaptation. However, there were no significant interaction effects of gender, social support and personality on work stress adaptation. The findings suggested that males, type A persons and civil servants with high social support were found to exhibit a higher level of work stress adaptation. The implications of the findings were discussed and appropriate recommendations were made.

Key Words: *Type A/B personality, social support, work stress adaptation, civil servants/workers, personality.*

INTRODUCTION

Work stress is widely experienced and so pervasive that it's been found to affect people from all industries, ranks and socio-economic status levels. About one-third of workers report high levels of stress NISOH (1999). Evidence shows that stress is the major cause of turnover in organizations (e.g. Afolabi and Imhonde, 2002; Wainwright and Calnan, 2002). With continued stress at the workplace, workers will develop psychological and physiological dysfunctions and decreased motivation. Also, because so much of our lives are spent at work, work stress can create stress in other areas of life as well. Work stress can be defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker (Afolabi and Imhonde, 2002; Quick and Quick, 1984). Work stress adaptation refers to individual ability to cope with work stressors, usually by either changing oneself physically and mentally to be better suited for that particular work stressors. A civil servant who will adapt to work stress must continually be prepared for changes to avoid stress and survive in the competitive world. The employee must develop positive attitudes toward stressful situations in life and give up negative attitudes such as fear, anger and revengeful attitudes, which actually germinate stress. Such employee must find and protect whatever time he or she gets to refresh and also spend quality time with his or her family. Adapting to demands of stress also means hanging your personality, improving the line of communication, efficiency and also learns from other's experience (Afolabi and Aigbodion, 2006; Arnold, Cooper and Robertson, 1995).

This study shows interest on the influence of personality (Type A and Type B) and social support on work stress adaptation. Personality is made up of the characteristics patterns of thoughts, feelings and behaviors that make a person unique. A simple division of personality type is Type A and Type B, which is based broadly on anxiety and stress levels. Type A personality behavior was first described as a potential risk factor for heart diseases by cardiologists Friedman and Rosenman (1974). After an eight and a half year long study of



healthy men between the ages of 35 and 59, Friedman and Rosenman estimated that Type A behaviour doubles the risk of coronary heart disease in otherwise healthy individuals. Type A personality is characterized by excessive drive and competitiveness, a sense of urgency and impatience, and underlying hostility (Rosenman, 1978; Friedman & Rosenman, 1974). This behavior pattern shows that persons who possess the type A personality are slightly prone to stress than persons who do not have the behavior pattern, termed Type Bs (Schaeubroeck, Ganster, & Kemmerer, 1994; Booth-Kewley & Friedman, 1987).

Type B categories reveal a greater capacity to cope with potentially stressful situations, consequently reducing their risk of becoming ill. It is not the amount of work undertaken or aspects of the work situation itself that affect type As, but rather the way they think and feel about the work they do. Type B personality tends to be steady, enjoy achievements but not becoming stressed when they are not achieved. Type Bs tends to live at a lower stress level. When faced with competition, they do not mind losing and either enjoy the game or back down.

Social support is the perception that one is cared for, has assistance available from other people, and that one is part of a supportive social network. These supportive resources can be emotional (e.g. nurturance), tangible (e.g. financial assistance), informational (e.g. advice), or companionship (e.g. sense of belonging). Social support can be measured as the perception that one has assistance, or the degree to which a person is integrated in a social network. Support can come from many sources, such as family, friends, pets, organizations, coworkers, and so on (Umeh, 2002). It also refers to helpful social interactions available on the job with supervisor or co-workers (Way & MacNeil, 2006) and it is characterized by affective support (like love, liking and respect), and direct help (e.g. aid in work, giving information or money (Frese, 1999). The support provided by both supervisor and co-workers may take different forms in the work place, including emotional support, appraisal support, instrumental support and informational support (Beehr, Jex, Stacy and Murray , 2000).

Gender and work stress adaptation

Gender is another factor that is important in determining susceptibility to workplace stress. Several factors appear to magnify the effect of workplace stress on women. The total workload of women who are employed full-time is higher than that of their male counterparts, particularly where they have family responsibilities. Another reason is lower levels of control on their jobs, since the great majority of women skills tend to occupy less senior jobs than men. The proliferation of women in high-stress occupations and the prejudice and discrimination suffered by many women who are in more senior positions, such as managerial jobs, both as a result of organizational and corporate policy and from their colleagues at work are other factors that predispose them to stress (Afolabi and Imhonde, 2002).

In line with this, Ptacek, Smith and Dodge (1994), in an attempt to control for the effects of event type on sex differences in coping, men and women responded to an identical achievement-related stressor under controlled laboratory conditions. Although men and women were similar in their cognitive appraisal of the situation, they nonetheless reported differences in preparatory coping. Women reported seeking social support and using emotion-focused coping to a greater extent than men, whereas men reported using relatively more problem-focused coping than women. The masculinity and femininity of respondents failed to moderate the relation between sex and coping. These results are inconsistent with a purely situational explanation of sex differences in coping but are consistent with the notion that men and women are socialized to cope with stress in different ways.

Largely due to these kinds of factors, women are significantly more likely to report burnout, stress-related illnesses, or a desire to leave their jobs (International Labour Organization, 2001). Also important to note is that there may be differences in the coping mechanisms men and women use to deal with stress. It has been found in general that



women tend to use more social-emotional strategies to cope with stress whereas men are more likely to use behavioural/mental disengagement (Afolabi and Aigbodion, 2006). Men tend to cope by way of problem-focused strategies while women characteristically use more emotion-focused strategies to manage their stress.

Korabik, McDonald, & Rosin, (1993) cited an evidence that suggest that women may have been socialized in a way that predisposes them to ineffective coping. For example, women get sick as a way of coping with stress more often than men do. However, Wichert (2002) deduced that when it comes to how men and women react to stress over the long-term, it has been found that men tend to show physical deterioration as a response to stressful situations, whereas women generally exhibit physiological symptoms.

Social support and work stress adaptation

Social support is another factor that can buffer the effect of workplace stress that an individual experiences. There is a substantial body of evidence suggesting that lack of social support may lead to ill health, and in fact has been shown to exert a negative effect on people's health and well-being in a range of stressful situations (Umeh, 2012).

It has been suggested that social support brings health benefits irrespective of the degree of stress encountered by the individuals, and also acts as a "buffer" against the negative effects of stress by fulfilling specific needs – through practical help, advice and information or emotional comfort. According to Uchino, Cacioppo, Kiecolt-Glaser (1996), many studies have indicated that anyone who has high social support tends to have less chance of getting depression and anxiety disorders. The familial support is a psychological enhancement to help the individual reduce their stress.

Dorman & Zapf (1999) also explained in their study that many adults normally deal with a lot of stress at work. The high demands and low social contact/support within the workforce tend to cause the development of depressive symptoms among workers over a period of time. A high level of social support from a supervisor may help prevent depression from developing. This is a guarantee, especially if the high demands continue to overwhelm the workers. Additionally, social support reduces the importance of the perception that a situation is stressful and (in some way) tranquilizes the neuro-endocrine system so that people are less reactive to perceived stress. It also facilitates healthy behaviours, such as exercising or getting rest.

When it comes to appraising potential stressors, the availability of emotional, informational, and instrumental support may substantially affect an individual's perception of threat. Emotional support may increase individuals' confidence in their ability to deal with the challenges that confront them. Informational support may yield new strategies for resolving particular problems, or reduce the perceived magnitude of the challenge by placing it in the context of difficulties encountered by others.

Type A & Type B Personality and work stress adaptation

With respect to individual personality differences, one can view workplace stress as a function of the relationship between work characteristics and attributes of, and resources available to the individual worker. Studies have shown that individuals displaying Type A characteristics have a significantly increased risk of experiencing the deleterious effects of stress, specifically with respects to cardiovascular disease. It is argued that individuals exhibiting Type A behaviours are more likely to enter into demanding jobs, more likely to over-react to them, and for this reason would be more vulnerable to stress and coronary heart disease in particular (Wainwright & Calnan, 2002).

Cowley, Hager and Rogers (1995), cited another distinction that may be related to the Type A personality which involves types of people known as "hot reactors". These are individuals who, when facing the challenges of daily life, suffer extreme surges in blood



pressure. Other individuals, who do not exhibit this reaction to stressors, have been found to be less at risk for the deteriorating effect of workplace stress.

In contrast, according to Wellness group (2013) the "Type B" personality is a much more relaxed, less time-conscious and driven person. Type B personalities are able to view things more adaptively. They are better able to put things into perspective, and think through how they are going to deal with situations. Consequently they tend to be less stress-prone. Type B personalities are not as likely to suffer from stress as much as other personality types unless there is a specific cause, such as bankruptcy or divorce. They are the complete opposite of the Type A personality. They are more relaxed about things, less driven and generally content with their lot, and are less likely to try to achieve unnecessary aims and objectives. Type B personalities have enough confidence in their fellow human beings to be able to delegate. They are calm and rational and not likely to damage their health long term due to a stressful lifestyle.

Based on these, the research sets to examine the influence of Type A & Type B personality and social support on work stress adaptation among civil servants. It also seeks to examine the influence of gender on work stress adaptation among civil servants. The study will be of great use to workers, organizations and even the society such that it will educate workers on the need to avoid or prevent stressful situations in order for them to be productive and also to have a good well-being. It will also help the Organizations to make policies that will benefit workers health, which will in turn, bring about healthy organization and also good social relationships. Based on these, the following hypothesis was tested:

1. There would be main and interaction effects of gender, social support and personality (Type A & B) on work stress adaptation.

METHODS

Research Design

A 2x2x2 factorial design was adopted in this study. This is because there are three independent variables (personality, social support and gender) and each has 2 levels. Moreover, variables of this study were not manipulated. The dependent variable is work stress adaptation.

Study Setting and Participants

Civil servants in government offices in Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria constitute the population of this study. Random and accidental sampling techniques were adopted to select participants from Government Ministries of Education, Information, Environment, Lands and Housing, Justice, Transport, Works, Youths and Sports, Culture and Tourism including Women Affairs and Social Development. The participants were 210, out of which 78 (37.1%) were males and 132 (62.9%) were females. Also, 124 (59.0%) of the participants were married, 71(33.8%) were single, 11(5.2%) were divorced, and 4(1.9%) were widows. Their qualification also varied: 5 (2.4%) had below School Certificate, 36 (17.1%) had SSCE, 64 (30.5%) had NCE/OND, 86 (41.0%) had first degree, 17 (8.1%) had Postgraduate degree qualifications and only 2 (1.0%) of the participants did not include their qualifications. Their job status revealed that 46 (21.9%) were of junior cadre/level, 66 (31.4%) were of intermediate level, 94(46.2%) were of senior level and only 1 (0.5%) of the participants, did not respond. In addition their length of service ranged from 7 to 35years with a mean of 9.28 years and SD of 7.81years.

Instrument

Data were gathered through the use of validated questionnaires which comprises of four sections (A-D). Section A tapped socio-demographic information. These include age, gender, marital status, and educational qualification, length of service and job status. Type A



and Type B behavior was measured using a 28-item scale developed by Omoluabi (1997). The scale measures the personality trait called Type A behaviour. Sample item include: "I become upset if I think something is taking too long". Agbu (1999) obtained construct validity coefficients of .79, .80, .76, .20 for speed & impatience, job pressure, hard driving & PSC. In this study, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.79 was obtained for the overall scale. Scores above the mean score indicate Type A behavior pattern while scores below the mean indicate Type B behaviour pattern. The scale is scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 1= never true to 4= always true.

Section C contained perceived social support scale. It is a 12-item multidimensional scale by Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet and Farley (1988). The scale measured the perceived social support from family to coworkers and to friends. The scale is scored on a 7 point scale ranging from 1= very strongly disagree to 7= very strongly agree. Sample item include: "There is a special person who is around when I am in need". For the present study, a reliability of .90 was established and all the items were found reliable for this study. High score indicate high level of social support while low score indicate low level of social support. Section D contained job stress scale by Theorell (1988). It was a 17-item scale originally developed by Karasek (1979). It was used to measure stress adaptation which include job demand and job control. The scale was rated on a 4-point scale from 1=often to 4=never/almost never for job demand and job control items. Sample items include: "Does your work demands too much effort"?, "Does your work often involve conflicting demands?", etc. Theorell (1988) reported Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.79 and 0.87 respectively. In this study a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.69 was obtained for the overall scale.

Procedure

Due to a cordial relationship the researchers have with some individuals who happened to be among the participants in this study, they serve as link to other participants in the various organizations. The participants were selected randomly and the questionnaires were administered to them. Copies of the questionnaire were also administered to individuals who show readiness and interest in participating in this research. They were encouraged to read and respond to the items carefully and were made to know that there is no right or wrong answer.

Using random and accidental sampling technique, two hundred and twenty-five (225) questionnaires were administered but only two hundred and ten (210) copies of them were returned and found useful for analysis. This yielded a response rate of 93.3%.

Data Analysis

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis was conducted to determine the extent and direction of relationship among the variables in this study. 2x2x2 ANOVA (factorial analysis) was conducted to determine the main and interaction effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

**RESULTS**

The following are the results from the data analysis. The first analysis involved inter-correlations of all the variables of the study. The result is presented in table 1 below.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix Showing the Mean, SD and Inter-variable relationships among variables of the study

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Age	1								
2. Gender	.009	1							
3. Marital Status		-.17*	1						
4. Educational Qualification	.19**	-.08	-.16	1					
5. Length of Service	.72**	.02	-.12	.09	1				
6. Job Status	.50**	-.05	-.20**	.21**	.37**	1			
7. Personality	-.25**	.34**	.03	.13	-.28**	.511**	1		
8. Social Support	-.01	-.10	.03	.02	-.003	.002	.40**	1	
9. Work Stress Adaptation	.12	.31**	-.07	-.11	.10	.113	.33**	.47**	1
Mean	27.45				9.28		62.17	53.55	46.33
SD	4.71				7.81		11.16	16.94	7.34

Note * $p < 0.05$

** $p < 0.01$

N=210

Table 1 shows that gender had significant relationship with work stress adaptation $r(208) = .31$; $p < 0.01$. This implied that males have higher stress adaptation than females. Also it shows that personality had a significant positive relationship with work stress adaptation ($r(208) = .33$; $p < 0.01$). This implies that individuals with Type A personality tend to show higher level of adaptation to work stress than Type B personality. Social support had a significant positive relationship with



Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Gender, Social Support and Personality on Work Stress Adaptation

Gender	Social Support	Personality	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	Low	Type B Behaviour	43.95	7.352	19
		Type A Behaviour	43.09	6.992	11
		Total	43.63	7.112	30
	High	Type B Behaviour	44.83	4.764	12
		Type A Behaviour	50.33	5.493	36
		Total	48.96	5.794	48
	Total	Type B Behaviour	44.29	6.399	31
		Type A Behaviour	48.64	6.572	47
		Total	46.91	6.808	78
Female	Low	Type B Behaviour	40.56	5.240	41
		Type A Behaviour	45.65	6.062	17
		Total	42.05	5.919	58
	High	Type B Behaviour	45.82	6.500	22
		Type A Behaviour	50.44	7.469	52
		Total	49.07	7.460	74
	Total	Type B Behaviour	42.40	6.197	63
		Type A Behaviour	49.26	7.404	69
		Total	42.98	7.647	132
Total	Low	Type B Behaviour	41.63	6.134	60
		Type A Behaviour	44.64	6.442	28
		Total	42.59	6.355	88
	High	Type B Behaviour	45.47	5.889	34
		Type A Behaviour	50.40	6.696	88
		Total	49.02	6.828	122
	Total	Type B Behaviour	43.02	6.294	94
		Type A Behaviour	49.01	7.056	116
		Total	46.33	7.343	210



work stress adaptation $r(208) = .47; p < .01$. This implies that civil servants with high level of social support also experienced high level of high level of work stress adaptation.

Table 2 shows that individuals with Type A personality ($M = 49.01, S.D = 7.06$) score higher than those with Type B personality ($M = 43.02, S.D = 6.29$) on work stress adaptation. It was also noted that individuals with Type A personality and high social support scored higher ($M = 50.40; S.D = 6.70$) in their measure on work stress adaptation compared to those with type B personality and low social support ($M = 41.63; S.D = 6.13$). Also, individuals with high social support had higher work stress adaptation (Mean = 49.02, S.D. = 6.828) than those with low social support (Mean = 42.59, S.D. = 6.355). The same way, the table showed that male respondents also have higher work stress adaptation (Mean = 46.91, S.D. = 6.808) than females (Mean = 42.98, S.D. = 7.647).

Table 3: Summary of 2x2x2 ANOVA showing the main and interaction effects of gender, social support and personality on work stress adaptation.

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Gender	402.732	1	402.732	9.938	< .05
Social Support	821.121	1	821.121	20.263	< .01
Personality	511.811	1	511.811	12.630	< .01
Gender * Social Support	9.196	1	9.196	.227	> .05
Gender * Personality	63.771	1	63.771	1.574	> .05
Social Support * Personality	86.312	1	86.312	2.130	> .05
Gender * Social Support * Personality	115.491	1	115.491	2.850	> .05
Error	8185.603	202	40.523	-----	-----
Total	11270	209	-----		

The result in table 3 indicates that gender had significant effect on work stress adaptation [$F(1, 202) = 9.938, p < 0.05$]. This implies (from Table 2) that male workers have a higher level of work stress adaptation than female workers. Social support also had a significant effect on work stress adaptation [$F(1, 202) = 20.263, p < 0.01$] indicating that the social support given to a worker would determine their level of stress adaptation at work. In addition, personality had a significant effect on work stress adaptation [$F(1, 202) = 12.630, p < 0.01$]. Therefore, the personality of an employee (either type A or type B) would determine their level of stress adaptation at work. In this case, type A respondents have a higher work stress adaptation than the type B individuals (Table 2). The result also reveals that the interaction effects of gender and social support [$F(1, 202) = 0.227, p > 0.05$], including that of gender and personality [$F(1, 202) = 1.574, p > 0.05$] on work stress adaptation were not significant. Lastly, the interaction between the three variables (gender, social support and personality) on work stress adaptation was also not significant [$F(1, 202) = 2.850, p > 0.05$]. Therefore hypothesis 1 which predicted that there would be main and interaction effects of gender, social support and personality was partially confirmed.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the main and interaction effects of gender, social support and personality (Type A and Type B) work stress adaptation among civil servants in Akure, Ondo State. The result showed that gender had a significant effect on work stress adaptation. The result of this study is in line with the findings of Korabikk, McDonald, & Rosin, (1993) which found that women as a result of socialization are predisposed to ineffective coping. For example, women get sick as a way of coping with stress more often than men do. This result is also in support of Wichert (2002) which reported that men tend to show physical deterioration as a response to stressful situations, whereas women generally exhibit physiological symptoms. In another study by Matud (2004), he found that women scored significantly higher than the men on the emotional and avoidance coping styles and lower on rational and detachment coping. The men were found to have more emotional inhibition than



the women. And the women scored significantly higher than the men on somatic symptoms and psychological distress. Although the effect sizes are low, the results of this study suggest that women suffer more stress than men and their coping style is more emotion-focused than that of men. In the same vein, Ptacek, et. al. (1994) found that women reported seeking social support and using emotion-focused coping to a greater extent than men, whereas men reported using relatively more problem-focused coping than women. The masculinity and femininity of respondents failed to moderate the relation between sex and coping. These results are inconsistent with a purely situational explanation of sex differences in coping but are consistent with the notion that men and women are socialized to cope with stress in different ways.

It was also found that social support had a significant effect on work stress adaptation. This result supported the findings of Wainwright and Calnan (2002) & Wichert (2002) who found that social support is a factor that can buffer the effect of work place stress that an individual experiences. There is a substantial body of evidence suggesting that lack of social support may, lead to ill health, and in fact has been shown to exert a negative effect on people's health and well-being in a range of stressful situations. The result also supported the Person-Environment fit model of French, Caplan & Harrison (1982) which reported that social support is one of the protective mechanisms by which individuals can protect themselves from the stress that accompanies a match between the person and the environment. For example, employees who have impossible deadlines might seek informational and emotional support from co-workers. By reducing their experience of stress in this way, employees might be able to focus better and come closer to meeting their deadline strains than if they were overwhelmed and suffering from strains. The results also supported the findings of Payne (1980) that by providing feedback that connotes caring, understanding or affirmation, supporters may decrease the distress workers suffer when faced with difficult situation.

However the result of this finding did not support the findings of Dorman & Zapf (1999). Their study shows that the best combination for workers would be low stressors and low social contact. This study which took place in Germany shows that there is no much correlation of social support and stressors among the co-workers. Furthermore, there was no interaction effect of personality (Type A & Type B) and social support on work stress adaptation. The result however supported the findings of Friedmann & Booth-Kewley (1987) who posited that there are aggressive adults living in our society and that more social support would soothe the individuals with Type A personality, leading to better health, thus reducing the risk of developing coronary heart diseases (Maddi, Bartone, & Puccett, 1987).

In addition, personality had a significant effect on work stress adaptation. The result of this study supported the findings of Friedman & Rosenman (1974). According to their findings, there is a relationship between personality and tolerance towards stress, in particular with reference to the ways people cope with stress, which led to the existence of two personality types (Type A & B). The result also supported the cognitive social learning theory of Price (1982). According to this theory, Type A individuals are achievement oriented, that is, they base their sense of self-esteem and self-worth on the number and quality of their achievements (i.e. they possess an externalized sense of self-worth). Accordingly, Type A individuals do what they deem necessary to obtain justice for themselves. They believe that all resources are scarce and thus there is fear of insufficient supplies. This belief contributes to their constantly striving and competing to obtain the limited resources available. Also they try to achieve their goals by means necessary, including aggressive acts.

Conclusion

This study has apparently showed that there is a significant connection between gender, social support and personality and work stress adaptation. However, the findings revealed that Type A civil servants adapt more to work stress than Type B civil servants. It



has also validated the importance of social support on adaptation to work stress such that civil servants who scored high on social support reported high adaptation to work stress. Moreover, the findings showed that gender, social support and personality have no significant interaction effect on work stress adaptation implying that irrespective of civil servants' gender, specific personality type and the extent of social support they received, their adaptation to work stress does not differ. However, the result showed that male civil servants have higher work stress adaptation than female civil servants.

Implication of the findings

The findings in this study have implication for management of physical and physiological health and well-being of workers as well as social relationship in workplace. To increase the level of adaptation to work stress workers should ensure that they understand their personality and their relationship with co-workers should be strengthened as this will greatly enhance their job performance. Organizations should also look into individual differences and coping skills that are important in predicting which certain job conditions will result in stress. In doing this, preventive strategies that focus on workers and ways to help them adapt to demanding job conditions would be necessary.

Limitations of the Study

Some limitations have been noted in this study. This research was restricted to only 210 participants which may not be enough for generalization. Likewise data was collected using self-reported questionnaires which are prone to response invalidity. That is, participants' responses may not be sincere or genuine. More so, participants were only drawn from few government organizations in Akure. Furthermore, this study majorly considers two variables (personality and social support) as factors that influence work stress adaptation. The influence of other variables such as organizational climate, locus of control, self-esteem as well as workplace policy should be considered in future researches.

Recommendation

Emotion can be geared up when conflicting issues like viewing stressors in exaggerated terms, taking difficult stand, making issue a disaster, pleasing everyone, reacting to things viewed as absolutely critical and urgent etc. In such situations, emotion and stress can be perfectly controlled by adopting moderate views, always taking the simplest stand possible, always please everyone, putting some situation in perspective and tempering excess emotion, not allowing exaggerations. Furthermore, workers can adapt or reduce and even completely remove stress factors by creating a conducive stress-free working environment around themselves as much as it lies within their power, while physical working infrastructure and professional training plays a major role in this area. Every worker should stay healthy by taking good sleeping hours in a day; eating good and adequate diet, consulting medical professionals in case of any stress symptoms; constituting positive attitude towards change; managing time properly; and setting a realistic goal.



References

- Afolabi, O.A. & Aigbodion, A.I. (2006). *Industrial and personnel psychology: A modern approach*. Benin: Ever-blessed.
- Afolabi, O.A. & Imhonde, H.O. (2002). Situational factors in work behavior and incidence of stress. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 126-137.
- Agbu, J.O. (1999). Assessment and management of Type A behavior among postgraduate students. *Unpublished M.Sc. Project*. University of Lagos, Nigeria.
- Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L. & Robertson, I.T. (1995). *Work Psychology: Understanding human behavior in the work place*. UK: Pitman Publishing
- Beehr, T.A. Jex, S.M., Stacy, B.A. & Murray, M.A. (2000). Work Stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21, 405.
- Booth-Kewley, S. & Friedman, H.S. (1987). Psychological predictors of heart disease: A quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 343-362.
- Dorman, C. & Zapf, D. (1999). Social support, stressors at work and depressive symptoms: Testing for main moderating effects with structural equations in a three-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 874-884.
- French, J.R.P., Caplan, R.D. & Harison, R.V. (1982). *Mechanisms of job stress and strain*. New York: John Wiley.
- Fresse, M. (1999). Social support as a moderator of relationship between work stressors and psychological dysfunction: a longitudinal study with objective measures. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(3), 179-192
- Friedman, M. & Rosenman, R.H. (1974). *Type A Behaviour and your Heart*. New York : Knopf.
- International Labour Organization.(2001). What is workplace stress? Retrieved July, 22, 2005 from <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/safe/work/stress/whatis.htm#gender>.
- Karasek, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.
- Korabik, K., McDonald, L.M. & Rosin, H.M. (1993). Stress, coping, and social support among women managers. In B.C.Long & S.E.Kahn (Eds.) *Women, work, coping: A multidisciplinary approach to workplace stress*. (pp. 133-153). McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Matud, M.P. (2004). Gender differences in stress and coping styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(7), 1401-1415.
- Maddi, S.R., Bartone, P. T. & Puccetti, M.C. (1987). Stressful events are indeed a factor in physical illness: Reply. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 833-843.
- NISOH (1999). Stress at work: U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NISOH). Publication Number 99-101.
- Omoluabi, P.F. (1997). The development of TABS: A unified scale assessing Type A behavior pattern. *Unpublished manuscript*, Department of Psychology, University of Lagos.
- Payne, R. (1980). "Organizational stress and support" In C.L. Cooper and R. Payne (eds). *Current concerns in occupational stress*. New York: John Wiley.
- Price, V.A. (1982). Type A behavior pattern: A model for research and practice. New York: Academic Press.
- Ptacek, J.T., Smith, R.E. & Dodge, K.L. (1994). Gender differences in coping with stress: When stressor and appraisals do not differ. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(4), 421-430.
- Quick, J.C. & Quick, J.D. (1984). *Organisational stress and preventive management*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Rosenman, R.H. (1978). The interview method of assessment of the coronary-prone behavior pattern . In T.M. Dembroski, S.M. Weiss, J.L. Shields, S.G.Haynes, & M.Feinlib (Eds), *Coronary-prone behavior* (pp.55.69). New York: Springer-Verlag
- Schaubroeck, J., Ganster, D. C. & Kemmerer, B.E. (1994). Job complexity, Type A behavior, and cardiovascular disorder: A prospective study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 426-439.
- Theorell, T. (1988). The demands-control-support model for studying health in relation to the work environment: an interactive model. In K. Orth-Gomer & N. Schnelderman (Eds), *Behavioural medicine approaches to cardiovascular diseases*. pp.69-85. Toronto, Canada: Multi Health System.
- Uchino, B.N., Cacioppo, J.T. & Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K. (1996). The relationship between social support and physiological processes: A review with emphasis on underlying mechanisms and implications for health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119,488-531
- Umeh, C.U. (2012). Social support in social relationships: An empirical investigation. *An unpublished M.Sc. project*. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Wainwright, D., & Calnan, M. (2002). *Work Stress: The making of a modern epidemic*. Bucking: Open University Press.
- Way, M., & MacNeil, M. (2006). Organizational characteristics and their effects on health. *Nursing Economics*, 24 (2), 67-77.
- Wellness Group (2013). How do personality types impact people's responses to stress? Retrieved online on August 27, 2013 from <http://health.howstuffworks.com/wellness/stress-management/personality-types-impact-on-response-to-stress.htm>



- Wichert, I. (2002). Job insecurity and work intensification: The effects on health and well-being. In B.Burchell, D.Lazdipo, & F. Wikenson (Eds.) *Job insecurity and work intensification* (pp. 92-111). NY: Rutledge.
- Williams, V.R. (2003). Sources of workplace stress perspectives, June 2003. Retrieved July 13, 2013 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karoshi>.
- Zimet, G.D., N.W., Zimet, S.G & Farley, G.K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 30-41.