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Relationship between Type B personality trait and stress management among secondary school principals in Kenya

The study investigated the Relationship between Type B Personality Trait and Stress Management among Secondary School Principals in Kenya. Kelly's personal construct theory supported by Carl Rogers Person Centred theory informed the study. The study adopted a Convergent Parallel research design within the Mixed Method approach. From a population of 295 principals, the study sample size was 169 principals obtained using stratified random sampling. Quantitative data was collected using Personality Questionnaire and Stress Management Questionnaire while an interview schedule was used to collect qualitative data from twenty (20) principals. Validity of the research instrument was ensured through expert judgement by the University lecturers. The reliability of the research instruments was determined by the use of Cronbach's Alpha and a co-efficient (r= 0.814) was obtained. The quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) windows version 22 as well as Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient while qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis. The study established a positive relationship between Type B personality trait and stress management (r=.620). Qualitative results revealed that most principals used multi-tasking to manage and accomplish their tasks thus reducing their stress. It is envisaged that this study would provide valuable information to the secondary school principals on how to overcome stressful situations within their schools. The study recommends that the Ministry of Education should induct newly appointed principals on how to enhance their intrapersonal traits; this would help them understand how to manage stressful situations in their schools.
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INTRODUCTION

Stress is a normal and an essential part of life that goes hand in hand with working towards any goal or challenge. A World Bank Report (2009) on secondary school leadership revealed that the education system world over have been ineffective and has failed to address the issue of secondary school principals stress and burnout. This has negated efforts to create a stronger human resource base which is invaluable for development in all spheres in the school. A study by Gramwari and Jamal (2013) noted that the inexperienced secondary school principals suffer more frequent stress than experienced assistant teachers. Secondary school principals in Norwegian public secondary schools exhibited more stress that emanates from their daily routine or tasks in their job description. Stress management could determine how individual secondary school principals deal with stressful experiences. Stress management could depend on intrapersonal variables within an individual secondary school principal (Menon and Natesan, 2012). On the other hand, Berkel (2009) study in Canterbury, found out that students who exhibit Type B
personalities speak less quickly, less loudly and less explosive than students with Type A personality trait. Students with Type B personality trait are described as less explosive, less active, less hardworking and are not achievers. A student personality can either be introverted or extroverted. Most university students with Type A personality trait behaviour patterns are more susceptible to stress than students with Type B personality trait behaviour tendencies.

Adams (2009) found no significant correlation, on the extent to which Type B personality type is related to a preferred leadership approach. Similarly, Jackson (2008) found out that both of these principals scored high in the influential and conscientiousness sub-scales and low in the dominance subscale. Similarly, Montgomery and Rupp, (2005) in Ottawa Canada showed that the strongest association of teacher stressors exist with negatively-oriented emotional responses and confirmed their central role in teachers’ responses to stressful situations alongside active coping mechanisms, personality mediators, and burnout. In another study, Gramstad, and Jamal (2013) in Norway showed extraversion had the highest mean value among participants, while reality weakness had the lowest. Neuroticism and reality weakness were related to high levels of perceived job stress. Extroversion, on the other hand, protracted against symptoms of depression. On the other hand, Asubhray et al. (2012) study concluded that a significant relationship between Type B personality trait and burnout existed. Similarly, Kilinc et al. (2014) in Turkey indicated that productive-social humour style was positively significantly correlated with such dimension of teacher leadership as institutional improvement and professional improvement.

On the other hand, Shirmard et al. (2013) in Iraq indicated that there is a significant relationship between the Type B personality and contingency leadership style. Yet in another study, Antoniou et al. (2013) in Greece showed that rational coping behaviours and one's personality are a resource which help teachers to overcome work related stressors and burnout and achieve their valued outcomes with the students, while avoidance coping predicted a secondary level of stress and burnout. Similarly, Chiorri et al. (2015) study in Turkey indicated that all Type B personality trait except extraversion significantly interacted at least with one workload source.

On the other hand, Birdie (2015) in India revealed that majority of suicide attempters Type B personalities were inclined towards internal locus of control but insignificant with optimism. Meanwhile Katyal et al. (2011) in India revealed highly significant difference between job stresses of employees working in Non-Nationalised bank employees with regard to Neuroticism. In another study, Sheikhbardsiri et al. (2015) in Iran showed that EMS personnel's PSTD was significantly correlated with Type B personality trait of conscientiousness and neurotism and openness. In another study, Salami (2011) in Pakistan revealed that B personality and social support interacted with job stress to predict personal accomplishment. Similarly, Cleare (2013) in Bahamas suggested that while significant positive relationship existed, Type B personality was not substantial predictor of job satisfaction.

Another study by Kumari (2008) in Haryana study differentiated the two groups, the high burnout groups scored significantly high in psychotism, neurotism, and lie scale. The low burnout group scored low on psychotism, neurotism, lie scale, Type B personality behaviour and all the three dimension of burnout via emotional exhaustion, depersonalization on extraversion and occupational stress. In another study, Popoola and Ilugbo (2010) in Nigeria showed that there was significant relationship between stress and each Type B personality traits of extraversion, locus of control, self-concept and achievement motivation. Similarly, Ibukun, Oyewole, and Abe (2011) study in Nigeria showed that Teaching Service Commission could place secondary emphasis on the use of experience and teachers Type B personality in appointment of principals. On the other hand, Motah et al. (2007) in Mauritius study found that Type B personality influence preparation and presentation on their final year project. In another study, Kennedy et al. (2014) reported some variability in the Type B personality characteristics and level of nursing stress and burnout. Mmaduakonam and Ifeoma (2015) in Anambra State, Nigeria revealed that teachers with high achievement drive exhibited a significantly higher level of stress than those with low achievement drive; teachers with high competitive tendency exhibited a significantly higher level of stress than those with low competitive tendency.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was based on Convergent Parallel research design within a mixed method approach. Convergent Parallel research design was used for collecting, analyzing and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data obtained from secondary school principals. The target population of the study were secondary school principals in public secondary schools in Homa Bay County. There are six categories of public secondary schools in Homa Bay County namely, national two (2), County Boys’ secondary schools sixty four (64), County Girls’ secondary school fifty one (51), Mixed secondary schools one hundred and ten (110), Boys’ Day secondary school thirty seven (37) and Girls’ Day secondary school thirty one (31). Simple random sampling was then used to select the other one hundred and sixty seven (167) principals in the other categories of secondary schools to take part in the study. The study used self-efficacy questionnaires and an interview schedule to collect quantitative and qualitative data respectively.

The data collected from the secondary school principals with Type B personality trait could be combined within a context of a single study and the themes encapsulated within an overall design that guides the entire study (Creswell, 2013). The approach allowed the study to validate and corroborate the findings on Type B personality.
trait of secondary school principals from both qualitative and quantitative analysis and compare with the information in the reviewed literature. The approach is also justifiable when the study intends to continuously look at the research hypotheses on secondary school principals with Type B personality trait and stress management. It is also justifiable when the study intends to use one method to inform another on how secondary school principals with Type B personality trait and stress management. Mixed method is also justifiable when the study wants to continuously look at the research hypotheses on the secondary school principals stress management from different angles and clarify the unexpected findings. It is also useful when the study intends to develop a theory on secondary school principals’ intrapersonal characteristics and stress management strategies and then test it. Quantitative data from questionnaires were collected first and analysed separately. Then the interviews data were collected and analysed qualitatively, the two results were then compared, related, interpreted and the discrepancies explained within the results (Creswell, 2013).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To establish the index of the Principal’s Type B personality behaviour, feeling and actions, the means of the individual ranking on the items were calculated. The percentages of the responses on the measuring scale was also computed and summarized in Table 1.

The findings of the study, as indicated in Table 1, show that a significant majority of the secondary school principals were happy with their job as principals. This was indicated by nearly two thirds, 108 (63.9%), of the principals who participated in the study, confirmed that they were very much satisfied with their jobs as principals. Only about a fifth, 35 (20.7%), of them said they were not satisfied with their job as principals, the remaining 26 (15.4%) were undecided on the matter. This is in agreement with Delongis and Holtzman (2005) study in New Braunsfel which indicated that principalship is competitive and potential candidates are to prove through interview results that they are competent enough and experienced to manage those schools. Similarly Adams (2009) stipulated that On the contrary, slightly less than half, 84 (49.7%), of the respondents alluded that they were always not competitive in looking for responsibilities. This is in contrast with Jackson (2008) study in United States of America which found out that principals scored higher in their influence and conscientious sub-scale and low in dominance sub-scale. This means that the Principals with Type B personality are not domineering but consult in

Table 1. Type B personality trait and stress management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t mind leaving things temporarily unfinished</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.9%)</td>
<td>(21.3%)</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(23.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always not competitive in looking for responsibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
<td>(18.3%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good listener and always let others finish talking</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27.2%)</td>
<td>(53.3%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>(1.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never in a hurry even if pressured with time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(28.4%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(36.7%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to wait calmly in a queue</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.9%)</td>
<td>(43.2%)</td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally take one thing at a time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.4%)</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>(27.9%)</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
<td>(1.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always slow and deliberate in his/her speech</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.7%)</td>
<td>(26.6%)</td>
<td>(22.5%)</td>
<td>(34.9%)</td>
<td>(11.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always concerned with satisfying his/herself or others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.3%)</td>
<td>(12.4%)</td>
<td>(8.9%)</td>
<td>(49.1%)</td>
<td>(24.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always slow but sure at doing Things</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>(30.25)</td>
<td>(30.2%)</td>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally expresses his/her feelings Openly</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.9%)</td>
<td>(54.4%)</td>
<td>(13.1%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take limited responsibility in school matters as a Principal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.5%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>(39.6%)</td>
<td>(34.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never judge things in terms of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>(32.5%)</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
<td>(34.9%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2016)
order to come up with popular decisions. This makes management of the school an all-inclusive and insubordination is not possible. Just slightly under a third, 55 (32.5%), of the respondents confirmed that they were competitive to look for responsibilities.

On the same note, it was discovered from the findings of the study that nearly three quarters, 126 (74.5%), of the respondents disagreed that they take limited responsibility in school matters as a Principal; they insisted that they bear all responsibilities as pertains to school matters in their institutions. This is in agreement with Montemogery and Rupp (2005) study in Canada which found in their studies that the stronger association of teacher stressors exist with negatively oriented emotional responses and confirmed their central role in teacher responses to stressful situations alongside active coping mechanisms, personality mediators and burnout. Quite a negligible proportion 23 (13.6%) of the respondents accepted that they do not bear full responsibilities and that their tasks were limited. On the other hand Ortega et al. (2007) study in Europe which found out that negative coping strategies of escape and denial as well as complaints and criticism were related to neuroticism, while conscientiousness was positively related to developing a plan of action. Similarly Asubhraj et al. (2012) study in India showed a strong relationship between Type B personality traits and occupational stress management. In contrast Whitehead (2011) revealed that 82% of Type B personality principals reported moderate stress, and that work overload was also characteristics of principal personality.

It emerged from the findings of the study that most principals would wish to accomplish the things they start to do. This fact was corroborated by more than half, 92 (54.5%), of the respondents who totally disagreed with the assertion that most principals don’t mind leaving things temporarily unfinished, this is in contrast with Berkel (2009) study in Canterbury which found high social support to be associated with lower level of personalization subscale and personnel accomplishment sub-scale. The Principals though refuted that they wish to complete what they start, but it is not bad if it stalled for reasonable causes. This means that Type B personality are not under any undue pressure to accomplish what they start but leave its completion to take a natural course. These help them to relieve a lot of pressure on themselves hence reducing their stress levels. This type of Principals can live longer for they live a life which is stress free. Only 15 (8.9%) strongly agreed and 36 (21.3%) agreed that they do not mind leaving things temporarily unfinished. This enable Type B personality have better stress management strategies compared to principals with Type A personality trait.

In contrast, Kilinc et al. (2014) study in Turkey which noted that Type B personality trait principals possessed either near average or above average emotional intelligence. As regards pressure of time, the findings of the study established that majority of the Principals in Homa Bay County put a lot of effort to meet deadlines. This was indicated by the fact that most, 86 (50.9%), of them refuted the study’s assertion that they are never in a hurry even if pressured with time, only 62 (36.7%) of them agreed to the statements. On the same note, it also emerged from the results of this study that a significant number of principals in Homa Bay County were keen to fix their own deadlines. The finding showed that Type B personality trait are always not in a hurry to beat deadlines and are not bothered which means they manage their own stress by not setting deadlines for their actions. 106 (63.3%) of the respondents confirmed that they never set their own deadlines, only 36 (21.3%) of them agreed that they never set deadlines but allow administrative issues to take their own course. However, 26 (15.4%) of the respondents did not divulge their position on the matter.

This finding resonates Kennedy et al. (2014) study in Cameroon which found out that Type B personality traits set their own deadlines, are never in a hurry and do not mind leaving projects unfinished in case conditions are not favourable. Type B personalities therefore are good stress managers for they are never bothered with deadlines but move with projects at their own pace.

On the nature of personality of the Principals, it was discovered that quite a reasonable number of them were composed and relaxed, as insinuated by about three quarters, 127 (75.2%), of the Principals who participated in the study. This is in contrast with Katyal et al. (2011) study in India which suggested that the strongest association of teachers stressors exist with negatively oriented emotional responses and confirmed their central role in teachers response to stressful situations alongside active coping mechanism, personality mediators and burnouts. This implied that they are always calm and unhurried about appointments; only 27 (16%) of the Principals who participated in the study said they were in a hurry and always worried about appointments. This finding contrasts Ibukun et al. (2011) study in Nigeria which found out that Type B personality traits are calm, are never in a hurry and do not mind being late for an appointment. More than a half 71 (42.1%), of the Principal participants revealed that they were always slow but sure at doing things.

Majority, 136 (80.5%), of the respondents held that they were good listeners and always let others finish talking in a conversation before they speak. In contrast, 78 (46.1%), of respondents rejected the claim that they are always slow and deliberate in their speech; only 78 (46.1%) of them accepted that they were always unhurried and slow in their speech. This is in agreement with Chirorri et al. (2015) study in Turkey noted in their study that Type B personality types have positive stress management skills. This is in agreement with Montogomery and Rupp (2005) study which found out that type B personality are patient and can wait in a queue and not in a hurry for appointments. Type B trait attitude make them not feel stressed even if they are late for appointment or while waiting to be served in a bank.
Although 39 (23.1%) of the secondary school principals who took part in the study said they would not mind waiting in a queue to be served, the majority 105 (62.1%) of them confirmed that they were able to wait calmly in a queue without complaints. This confirms the finding of Salami (2010) in Pakistan which noted that Type B personality is calm, patient and never in a hurry. They therefore would wait patiently in a queue to be served either in a bank or cafeteria. This resonates Gramwari and Jamal (2013) study in Norway which indicated that types B personality trait are calm, not hurried and can be patient. On the same note it was established that more than half 91 (53.8%), of the respondents routinely take one thing at a time to avoid being mixed up or forced to hurry over things, only 75 (44.5%) while 47 (18.4%) of them believed they could do more than one task at a time. This is in agreement with Shirmard et al. (2013) study in Iran which indicated that Type B personalities have stronger stress management strategies for they do not experience pressure in any situation however difficult. This makes this calibre of principals to have better stress management strategies than the type. It therefore confirms the study findings that 38% of stress management among principals is explained by Type B trait alone.

The findings of the study show that the secondary school principals believe that they do well as regards their relationship with their colleagues. Nearly 126 (74.5%) of the respondents held the perception that they were easy going persons and cope well with staff members. Merely 30 (17.8%) of them believed that they were coping well with their staff members. 124 (73.4%) of the respondents disagreed with the claim that most principals are always concerned with satisfying themselves before others. In similar argument, majority, 70 (41.4%), of the respondents denied the opinion that most principals normally have a large number of interests outside their workplace and other than their professional duty. However, 71 (42%) of them accepted that they do have some interest elsewhere besides their responsibility as principals and 28 (16.6%) were undecided on the matter. This confirms Sunbull (2011) findings that type trait personality have handful of activities. They tend to do more than one thing at a time as they always multi task. Similarly, Shimard, Mirmair and Khorshidi (2013) revealed that Type B personality principals concentrate in their work and are high achievers and do not always wanted to change profession.

It emerged from the findings of the study that nearly three quarters of the respondents strongly agree 32 (18.9%), agreed 92 (54.4%) of the respondents agreed that they normally express their feelings openly. This confirms Popoola and Ilughbo (2010) study in Nigeria which noted that stress is caused by interference of employment of the organizational responsibilities with family organizational roles and lack of involvement in decision making. Only 25 (3.6%) of them indicated that they never express their feelings openly. This is in agreement with Motah and Pointe (2008) study in Mauritius which found out that multiple intelligence and their personality influences preparation and presentation on their final year of project. Similarly Mmaduakanam and Ifeoma (2015) study in Nigeria which indicated that leaders with higher achievement drive exhibit a significantly higher level of stress than those with low competitive tendency, teachers with secondary levels of anxiety exhibit a significantly higher levels of stress than those with low levels of anxiety. On the other hand Whitehead (2011) study in New Zealand found out that most Principals reported moderate or high stress and that work overload was also characteristic of Principals personality. However, 22 (13.1%) of respondents were undecided.

It was also established from the findings of the study that the respondents were divided on whether they need to use numbers to make judgment or not. This was revealed by the proportions which supported and which did not support; whereas 59 (36.9%) of respondents were in agreement, the other 71 (42%) of the respondents disagreed that they judge things in terms of numbers. However, nearly a quarter, (23.1%) 39, of the principals who participated in the study remained non-committal on the use of numbers to make judgments. This is in agreement Mmaduakanam and Ifeoma (2015) study which noted that teachers with high achievement drive exhibited a significantly higher level of stress than those with low achievement drive. The study further found out that teachers with secondary competitive tendency exhibited a significantly higher level of stress than those with low competitive tendency.

Although 39 (23.1%) of the Principals who took part in the study said they would mind waiting in a queue to be served, the majority, 105 (62.1%), of them confirmed that they were able to wait calmly in a queue without complaints. On the same note it was established that more than half, 91 (53.8%), of the respondents routinely take one thing at a time to avoid being mixed up or forced to hurry over things. Only less than 75 (44.5%), of them believed they could do more than one task at a time. This is in agreement with Delongis and Hutzman (2005) in Kenya confirmed that Type B personality normally are never in a hurry, they take one thing at a time and not worried about deadlines. On the other hand they are more organized in their undertakings. These personality characteristics can easily manage stress and are good administrators for they are not under any undue pressure to deliver. This finding is in agreement with Ilbukan et al. (2011) study in Nigeria which from statistical analysis conducted (correlation and regression) strongly support the existence of personal, psychological and contextual determining factors in the Type B personality trait. This therefore implies that there is strong relationship between Type B personality traits and stress management.

To address this, the hypothesis “there is no statistically significant relationship between Type B personality trait and stress management among secondary school principals in Kenya” was tested. To establish relationship between type B personality traits of the principals and their
Stress Management, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was carried out on the items of Type B personality traits vis-a-vis the items on Stress Management. Correlation test was conducted at p < 0.5 (95% confident level).

The findings indicated that there was a positive correlation between Type B personality trait and stress management. As indicated in Table 2, there was a strong positive (n=169, r = .620) highly significant (p < .000) correlation between stress management and Type B personality trait, with high level of stress management associated with Type B personality traits among the secondary school principals in Homa Bay County. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. This means that Type B personality trait has a significantly positive relationship with stress management.

On computing of a coefficient of determination, it was established that the two variables share a significant proportion of their variance, $R^2 = 0.3844$. This implied that there was a sizeable overlap between the two variables. This translates to 38% per cent of the variance in respondents’ scores on stress management of the secondary school principals being explained by Type B personality trait alone. This was quite a reputable amount of variance explained by only one independent variable. This therefore implies that there is a strong influence of Type B personality traits on stress management. This finding is in agreement with Cleare (2013) study in Bahamas which noted that personality Type B is significantly related to stress management. This also confirms Salami (2011) study in Pakistan found out that job stress, Type B personality dimensions and social support are separately predicted dimensions of burnout amongst education lecturers.

In contrast Popoola and Ilugbo (2015) study in Nigeria which concluded that personality traits were not substantial predictors of stress levels. This finding on principals with Type B personality trait was in agreement with Kelley (1991) theory which asserts that all events that happen to us are open to multiple interpretations which he referred to as constructive alternativism. Qualitative data was obtained from principals with Type B personality trait and how they manage their occupational stress. One of the principals reported that:

“…hurry hurry has no blessings. You have to take your time and do things in a meticulous way. I am always not in a hurry so as to do things in the right way…” (Principal, 16)

Principal 16’s response indicates somebody who is composed, organised and plans ahead and avoids last minutes rush to beat deadlines. Such principals are less stressed because whatever they want to do is well planned and in case of shortcomings, it can be rectified before things move out of control. This finding is in agreement with Jackson (2008) study in USA which indicated that, principals scored secondary in the influential conscientiousness sub-scales and low in the dominance sub-scales. Similarly excerpts from Principal 9 who reiterated. Similarly Ghamwari and Jamal (2013) in Lebanon noted that Type A personality trait had no moderating effect on the relationship between leadership style and career stress. On the other hand Katyal et al. (2011) in Iran confirm that there was a positive relationship between Type A personality and leadership style.

“...I try to do one thing at opportune time and not in a hurry and end up doing things haphazardly…” (Principal, 9)

Principal 9 also indicated that she is not in a hurry to do things but strive to do one thing at a time and in an organised way. This is in agreement with Whitehead (2011) study in New Zealand which found out that secondary school principal reported moderate or secondary stress and that work overload was also characteristic of principal's personality. This is in agreement with Mmaduakonam and Ifoema (2015) study in Nigeria which found out that those teachers with high achievement drive exhibited significantly higher levels of stress than those with low achievement drive. In contrast Kennedy et al. (2014) study in Cameroon found some variability in personality characteristics and level of stress and burn out amongst nurses.

Another principal on his part reiterated that:

“...it is not good to move, walk and eat and do things quickly, most of the time one has to do things at their own pace within a reasonable time frame” (Principal, 3)
the same time, this is typical of those principals’ that exhibits Type B personality trait. Principals who exhibit Type B personality are calm composed and do one thing at a time. This in agreement with Berkel (2009) study in Kenya which revealed a significant positive correlation between Type B personality trait and stress management. On the other hand, Almund, Duckworth, Heckman and Kautz (2011) study in Kenya indicated that Type A personality trait were positively correlated to one life cycle while Type A personality trait were more malleable over life cycle compared to cognition. Similarly, principal 14 reiterated that “Personally I do not do things in a hurry. Student here are hard to push. This being a mixed school and most of them are day scholars. During the rainy season, they come to school late and want to leave early because of swollen streams after the rains. I normally take my time to do thing hence am not in a hurry." (Principal 14)

Principals 14, seem not to be worried with time, they do not want to do things quickly but do one thing at a time as they organize themselves. This finding is in agreement with Sunbull (2011) study in Turkey which found a significant relationship between Type B personality traits and burnout associated with most of them tending to adopt multi-adaptive coping strategies in stressful situations. Similarly Jackson (2008) in the United States of America stipulates that Principals scored secondary in influential and conscientiousness subscales and low in the dominance subscale. This means that Type B personality would not multitask and hence would take one thing at a time and after finishing they move to another task. This makes Type B personality to adopt a strategic stress management mechanism thus reducing their level of stress. This is expressed thus: “There is no way I can do or take more than one thing at a time. I normally do one thing at a time before venturing into other areas. This enables me to concentrate and thoroughly undertake a task” (Principal, 7)

According to principal 7 she takes her time to do things in an organized manner. She looks more organised as she purposes to undertake only one thing at a time. This is in agreement with Katyal et al. (2011) study in India which revealed a highly significant difference between job stressors of employees work and occupational stress. This is expressed thus: “It is normal that not all candidates can pass examination. Passing an exam is not in itself success in life. I have seen people who have excelled in exams and have good jobs but lead very miserable lives. While there are people who never performed well in schools and are doing so well in life. Not all students can pass exams” (Principal 2)

According to principal 2 there is not much he can do to change ones status but to allow nature take its own course. This principal has external locus of control and can only rely on significant others in order to achieve his objective. Principal 2 needs to be counselled to understand that students’ success lies in the organizational ability of the principal and that the principal is the school and the school is the principal. This finding resonates Birdie (2015) which revealed that the principal is the image of the school. “I am normally very relaxed and do not hurry in doing things. I normally take my time and do not do one thing at a time. Human beings should not act as robots but take your time to do things meticulously to avoid mistakes and resort to I wish I knew” (principal 9)

From the excerpt it is evident that Principal 9 did not venture into many activities at the same time but tackle one task meticulously then move on to another. This reduces her level of stress as she plans ahead what she wants to do. This finding concurs with Shirmard et al. (2013) in Iraq whose study indicated significant relationship between personality Type B trait and principals’ leadership style. This means that principals who exhibit Type B personality traits had better stress management strategies.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concluded that principals that exhibited Type B personality trait are better stress managers. This was because the study found out that principals who exhibit Type B personality trait were more composed, do one thing at a time and were even very patient when waiting in a queue. It’s recommended that, Secondary school principals with Type B personality trait to adopt appropriate therapy technique to assist in stress management. This would enable the secondary school principals with Type B personality trait develop skills to manage their stresses well. This is because was because the study found out that Type B personality trait principals were more composed.
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