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ABSTRACT

Stress can be destructive if not well managed. In addition to its effect on the health of the individual, it also has a direct bearing on the individual’s performance at work and productivity. The study was therefore aimed at finding the sources of stress and management strategies among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana. A descriptive research design was used for this study. The population for this study was 500 pastors serving in the Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. A total of 217 ministers of the gospel were sampled for the study. Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (t-test and ANOVA) were used to analyze the data. The study found that the most predominant source of stress among ministers of the gospel was “Inadequate financial support from the congregation”. The study also revealed that the leading way ministers of the gospel managed stress was “delegating duties to others”. It was recommended that the general working conditions of ministers of the gospel should be improved by church governing councils. More seminars, conferences, workshops and symposia should be organized by church governing councils, to expose ministers of the gospel to the sources of their stress and also to sharpen their skills for stress management.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Stress, with its exacting influence on modern man in all spheres of life, is no respecter of persons. According to Melgosa (2013), very few people escape from stress. It is part of our daily routine. Time and work pressure, relationship problems, noise, pollution, finances and insecurity are some of the sources of stress.

Stress is the emotional and physical strain caused by people’s response to pressure from the outside world. Common stress reactions include tension, irritability, inability to concentrate, frustration and a variety of physical symptoms that include headache and a fast heartbeat. According to Ho (2009), the types of stress are eustress, distress, and hyper stress, while the signs of stress include sickness or absence, accident or incident, disciplinary action or compliance, seeking help from fellow employees or counselling, low attitude and esteem for the job, frustration, irritability, and anger.

Stress has been defined severally. Stress is derived from the Latin word “stringere”, which was used in the 17th century to describe hardships or afflictions and up to the present, its meaning remains as “forces, pressure, strain or strong effort” (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997).

Lazarus and Folkman (1984 p 26) viewed stress from a psychological perspective and asserted that the stress process is, “a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as
taking or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being”. Keil (2004) built on this definition, asserting that “stress involves a set of circumstances with which the individual is attempting to cope”.

Selye (1956) explained that stress is not inherently deleterious. Each individual’s cognitive appraisal, their perceptions and interpretations, give meaning to events and determine whether events are viewed as threatening or not. Personality traits also influence the stress equation because what may be overtaxing to one person may be exhilarating to another. Nevertheless, stress has been regarded as an occupational hazard since the mid-1950s. In fact, occupational stress has been cited as a significant health problem.

Stress, according to D’Arcy (2007) is the body’s way of rising to a challenge and preparing to meet tough situations with focus, strength, stamina and heightened alertness. Ofoegbu and Nwandiani (2006) see it as a process in which environmental events or forces threaten the well-being of individuals in the society. Adeyemo and Ogunyemi (2005) see it as an unavoidable characteristic of life and work. Thus, in relationship to occupation, it is the physical, mental and emotional tear and wear brought about by incongruence between the requirements of the job and capabilities, resources and needs of the employee to cope with job demands (Akinboye & Adeyemo, 2002).

Freudenberger (1974) coined the term “burnout” to describe workers’ reactions to the chronic stress common in occupations involving numerous direct interactions with people. Burnout is typically conceptualized as a syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Work life, however, is not independent from family life: These domains may even be in conflict. Stress may result
from the combined responsibilities of work, marriage, and children. The effects of both work and non-work stress among nurses have been studied infrequently. And yet, non-work stress may be particularly salient to nursing, a predominantly female profession. Women continue to juggle multiple roles, including those roles related to the home and family, for which the women may have sole or major responsibility.

Nevertheless, work stress and burnout remain significant concerns in nursing, affecting both individuals and organisations. For the individual nurse, regardless of whether stress is perceived positively or negatively, the neuroendocrine response yields physiologic reactions that may ultimately contribute to illness. In the health care organisation, work stress may contribute to absenteeism and turnover, both of which detract from the quality of care (Menzies, 1960).

Annan (2003) noted that teaching physical education in second cycle schools in Ghana is characterized by insecurity of position. He stated further that from the Ghanaian situation, right from the school level to the club levels, 95% of schools and clubs emphasize on winning once they participate in any sports competition. The Physical Education teachers are evaluated based on their performance on the basis of win record. A losing season will therefore place the teacher or the coach’s job in jeopardy; this makes the individual’s work very stressful.

In 1991, the Fuller Institute of Church Growth conducted a survey of 1000 pastors which showed that 50% of respondents had considered leaving the pastoral vocation during the previous three months and 70% had a low self-image than when they began their profession (Beebe, 2007).
A number of recent studies has shown that, as a result of these and other factors related to pastoral stress, the average length of service in congregational ministry has dramatically decreased over the last two decades. Beebe (2007) asserted that members of the clergy are more likely to suffer from stress related illnesses such as obesity, arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure and depression than most other Americans. These are the first published results of the continuing survey of 1,726 ministers, which began in 2007. Beebe recognized that the use of anti-depressants has risen among clergy and life expectancy has fallen. The advent of a persistent modern way of communication is made possible by cell phones and social media; this has added significant new dimensions to stress: many pastors are expected to be chief executive officers of their congregations as well as their spiritual guide, to be on cell phone without interruption, and to participate in all activities. Vacations are generally not taken or are too short or interrupted to produce real relaxation. Again, other researchers have identified what they call “compassion fatigue” among chaplains, clergy and ministers in general.

**Statement of the Problem**

Stress can be destructive if not well managed. In addition to its effect on the health of the individual, it also has a direct bearing on the individual’s performance at work and productivity. On the basis of this, it is important that every occurrence of stress be properly managed to ensure that such negative effects are minimized if not eliminated. This can be best achieved by adopting coping mechanisms.

Stress is experienced by most workers. However, majority of workers are not aware of the dangers of unmanaged stress since they are not given education on
effective management of stress. These individuals are therefore left to deal with the difficult situation in their own way and eventually pay with their health and peace of mind in working life. Also, such individuals do not recognize the fact that when it becomes impossible to change one’s environment, personal change becomes a necessary tool in an attempt to deal with stress. While a certain level of stress is needed by each of us to deal with in our everyday lives, it can also lead to serious illness, poor performance at work and eventually low productivity if not managed properly. Awareness of stress and its effective management is paramount for work performance and increasing productivity in Ghana’s economic development. The expectation people put on their ministers and what ministers themselves put on themselves are debilitating.

According to Mills and Koval (1964), every minister of the gospel experiences enormous stress of ministry, they feel alone and struggle with emotional pain, family problems, and failures. Smith (1973) states that several factors suggest that ministers of the gospel are more vulnerable to stress than other workers because of their unique position in their organisations. Smith, however identified role conflict, and role ambiguity as the main source of ministers’ stress. Much of the role conflict ministers face stems from the fact that they are caught at the interface between the larger organisation and the local congregation. A local congregation of ten holds values and initiates programmes that sometimes conflict with larger denominations programme. Members of the Pastor’s congregation hold many individual expectations as to his or her roles. Within the congregation are children, young people, young couples, middle-aged, and senior citizens. There are both rich and poor, active people who want to change everything within the shortest possible time and the inactive ones who are dragging things. All expect something different from
the minister, and in times of crises feel they have been betrayed. Kahn (1964) also noted that ministers work is associated with much stress. He continued to indicate that several factors suggest that ministers may be more vulnerable to work related stress than other members of the work force and that the stress they experience may be more severe.

Ministers fill a multiplicity of roles that require many diverse skills. These wide varieties of the roles often give rein to many conflicting expectations. The minister labors from four in the morning until ten in the night in every type of work. He has a burning desire to work with the teenagers and spends all his time with the older folks. He is all the time praying and giving counseling to members through phone calls. Spends all his time evangelizing the unchurched, and is never out of the office. This description also addresses the issue of role overload. For example, the minister’s role might include those of preacher, educator, evangelist, scholar and theologian administrator, Counsellor, promoter and financier (Kahn, 1964).

Role strain appears to be at the very heart of clergy stress (Smith, 1973). Three aspect of role strain are worthy of attention: role conflict which occurs when two or more expectations clash. The second is role ambiguity which results when the worker is uncertain as to which position he is expected to fill, and lastly, role overload, which results when the level of stimulation or demand exceeds the workers’ capacity to process or comply with those demands. For example, when one’s work infringes upon one’s leisure hours etc. These three role strains account for a significant amount of clergy stress. In addition to the wide range of roles and skills required of ministers of the
gospel, the minister is continually under the observation of his role senders. Not only must they carry out many of their roles in public; they often live in a situation in which their personal lives are subject to observation. Their home life may not be regarded with any degree of privacy, their days off are not respected unless they leave town, they cannot ignore the numerous phone calls that follow after them (Smith, 1973). It is important to note that, on the individual level role strain, role ambiguity, and role overload have serious emotional and psychological consequences. Kahn (1964), argues that tension and anxiety predictably accompany role strain and ambiguity that a person experiences. The consequence of the tensions and anxiety experience as a result of role strain is psychosomatic diseases. Excessive emotional stress can result in confusion, a loss of self-esteem as well as physical illness. Furthermore, people experiencing strong conflict tend to communicate less with others than they do when they are relatively free of conflict. These circumstances reduce pastoral effectiveness.

The role strain and role ambiguity correlated negatively with job participation and job satisfaction. As role strain increased the employee’s participation in and satisfaction with his or her job decreased. It has also been determined that when levels of role strain and ambiguity are high employee’s confidences in the organisation drops and their suspiciousness towards administration increases. Job-related stress in the form of role strain brings undesirable consequences upon organisation and employees alike. It tends to create a climate of suspicious toward administration and organisation lead to job dissatisfaction, and cause workers to leave organisation.
In Ghana, Laryea (2016) conducted a study on “vocational life conflict and coping strategies of the Anglican clergy in Accra” and found out that so much goes on among the clergy, including resolving in some cases life treating issues and stress related events. Laryea further reported that clergies have to resolve issues related to financial constraints and the other hazards. Clergy also face a number of other work-related stressors including high demands on their time, lack of privacy, pressures from frequent relocation and criticism from church members. These stressors, in turn, have been linked to feelings of stress and burnout (Carroll 2006; Frame & Shehan 1994; Gleason 1977). The effects of these stressors on mental health of clergies may vary by the personal resources and personality characteristics that clergy possess, with a God-involved problem-solving capacity, extroversion, and social support predicting better outcomes (Carroll 2006; Dewe 1987; Rodgerson and Piedmont 1998). On the basis of the above, the study investigated sources of stress among ministers in Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches in the Cape Coast metropolis and the management strategies adopted by these ministers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to identify sources of stress common to ministers and the management strategies they used for coping effectively with stress. The specific objectives that were raised for the study were:

1. To identify the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis.
2. To identify the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis.
3. To find out the significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

4. To find out the significant difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

5. To find out the significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

6. To find out the significant difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

7. To find out the significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry.

8. To find out the significant difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry.

9. To find out the significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of years in ministry.

10. To find out the significant difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of years in ministry.

11. To find out the significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

12. To find out the significant difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis?
2. What are the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

**Hypotheses**

The conduct of the study was guided by the following hypotheses that were generated.

1. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

   $H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

2. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

   $H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the bases of age.

3. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

   $H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

4. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

   $H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.
5. $H_0$: There is no statistically difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry? (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).

$H_1$: There is a statistically difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry? (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).

6. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry.

$H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry.

7. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

$H_1$: There is a statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

8. $H_0$: There no statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

$H_1$: There a statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

9. $H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.
H1: There is a statistically significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

10. H0: There is no statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

H1: There is a statistically significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

Significance of the Study

It was hoped that the findings of the study would add to the literature on stress from the results of examining the sources and coping strategies of stress in this study. The study might serve as an eye opener to pastors to enable them identify stress symptoms in their personal lives and consciously act appropriately. Also, the study would enable Christian Counsellors and church elders to help design stress relief packages for pastors serving in their churches. Finally, it would help reduce the adverse effects of poorly managed stress on the families and congregations of ministers of the gospel.

Delimitation

This study was confined to Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic Ministers in the Cape Coast metropolis. It focused on the sources and coping strategies of stress among ministers of the gospel. It also examines how ministers age, gender, type of ministry, years in ministry and their ministerial engagement contribute to ministers stress and their management strategy.
Limitations

A questionnaire was used in gathering data for the study. The limitation here was that the respondents only responded to the items on the questionnaire which might not totally reflect their true feelings on the subject.

Definition of Terms

Charismatics: They are a new movement within the Pentecostal group who lays more emphasis on the prosperity and the material wellbeing of the believer.

Management Strategy: Way and manner at which a person is able to cope or adjust to stressful conditions in his/her life.

Ministers of the Gospel: Refers to trained religious leaders whose work is to oversee the work of God in a church or congregation setting. The term may also mean a clergyman, priest, servant of God and pastors in modern terms.

Orthodox: The orthodox Christians are the missionary led churches who were the first group of protestant churches in Ghana.

Pentecostals: They are a renewal movement within Protestant Christianity that places special emphasis on a direct personal experience of God through the baptism with the Holy Spirit as evidenced by speaking in tongues.

Sources of Stress: The point at which stress springs into being, or the point from which one’s stress is coming from.

Stress: Any stimulus or an emotional experience that raises ones excitement or tension/anxiety level beyond ones usual capability is termed as stress.

Stressors: The origination or root of worry, tension or anxiety that may come from either physical, psychological or environment of a person.
Organisation of the Study

The thesis consists of five chapters. The first chapter introduces the field of study with the meanings of stress and its effect on humans/ministers of the gospel. The statement of the problem and the purpose of the study follow the background study. Two research questions and ten hypotheses seek to identify sources of stress among ministers of the gospel and how they manage stress in their lives as they do gospel ministry in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The chapter ends with the significance of the study, delimitation, limitation of the study and definition of terms.

The second chapter of the study contains a review of related literature relevant to the study. The chapter has three main sections; theoretical framework, conceptual issues, and empirical review of literature. Chapter three focuses on the research methodology used for the study. It examines the research design, population, sample and sampling techniques, research instrument, pilot testing, the data collection procedure and the data analysis.

Chapter four focuses on the presentation and discussion of findings of the study. Chapter five presents a summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations for policy and practice as well as suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of related literature on the sources of stress and its management strategies. The review is in three sections: theoretical review, conceptual framework and empirical review. The theoretical aspect of the review deals with theories related to stress. The second section is on conceptual framework which considered a diagrammatic representation of the study under review and concepts on stress. The third section captures empirical studies on issues of stress.

Theoretical Review

The theories underlying the study is theories of Occupational Stress. Under the theories of occupational stress, models which include Psychological model of occupational stress, Sociological model of occupational stress and Person – Environmental fit model of occupational stress are reviewed. Other life events theories of stress relevant to the study include Hardiness theory, Saranson’s Cognitive Interference theory and Eysenck’s Processing Efficiency theory.

Theories of Occupational Stress

Occupational stress is currently one of the most costly occupational health issues. According to Cartwright and Cooper (1997), the most widely accepted definition of occupational stress includes emotional exhaustion, (which can result in diminished interest in work, fatigue and detachment) depersonalization (which can result in diminished contact with co-workers
and the public, withdrawal of psychological investment, self-absorption, and negative attitude toward others) **and dissatisfaction** which can also result in feelings of failure, fatalism, diminished competence, and incapacity to respond to further environmental demands. There are several theories/models that have been proposed to explain the genesis and development of occupational stress.

**Psychological Model of Occupational Stress**

The history of psychological models of occupational stress has been one of finding victims to blame and then to intervene in linear way to alter the performance of the latest scapegoat. Proponents of these models have variously blamed the job, the equipment the worker and blamed the management (Cooper, 1995). As a result, the theories have spawned a large amount of research searching for the putative factors responsible for occupational stress. Personality and organisational factors have been identified as the major culprits (Kenny, 1995).

Personality has always been considered a major mediator of stress reactivity. That is, although certain events are regarded as normatively stressful, sensitivity to stressors varies between individuals. That is, individuals with different personalities will respond similarly to physical threats, but different responses to ego threats are related to personality differences (Eysenck, 1985). Most theories of occupational functioning agree that personality makes a significant contribution to performance and well-being, while acknowledging that the relationship between personality and environmental factors is dynamic and complex. For example, work adjustment theory (Rounds, Davies & Lofquist, 1987) is founded on the notion that stable cognitive, behavioural and emotional dispositions underpin work adjustment,
but that situational influences impact upon these stable dispositions for adaptation and change in both positive and negative ways. Similarly, Heady and Wearing (1992), found that enduring personality characteristics such as neuroticism and extraversion, determine peoples’ daily work experiences, use of coping strategies, the levels of psychological distress and well-being. Extraversion has been positively correlated with subjective well-being (Costa & McRae, 1980), while introversion and neuroticism are associated with increased stress.

Hobfoll (2001), reacting to what he perceives to be the current over-emphasis on environmental factors, has argued a re-consideration of the role of personality in the etiology of occupational stress. He states that we can no longer pretend that there is an objective way to define stress at the level of environmental condition without reference to the character of the person. Hobfoll (1993), concluded that “personality can cushion as well as aggravate the impact of occupational stress”. The relationship between role stress and role distress has been found to be moderated by a range of personality characteristics including intolerance of ambiguity, dependency, strong affiliation needs, low risk propensity and high-self-focused attention (Seigall & Cumming, 1995). On the positive side, humour and optimism can significantly moderate the relationship between daily hassles, self-esteem maintenance, emotional exhaustion and physical illness (Fry, 1995).

Despite the enthusiasm for the view that personality characteristics are fundamental to an understanding of occupational stress, it is not certain that workplace difficulties would improve without simultaneously attending to extrinsic organisational factors that may be operating. Moreover, personality
traits may be fixed to some extent, but their place in the system as antecedents or consequences will depend on the nature of the interaction between individual and environmental systems, and to any changes that may occur within that system.

**Sociological Model of Occupational Stress**

The most radical departure from the medical model has been the approach of industrial sociologists who have brought the social organisation of work as the primary determinant of occupational injury, illnesses, and stress into sharp focus (Berger, 1993; James, 1989). Industrial sociologists argue that power structures, the institutionalized conflicts of interest between safety and productivity, the social division of labour, the labour process, industrial relation and politics are the root causes of occupational illness and stress (McIntyre, 1998). Further, sociologists argue that for every occupational illness or stress, there are physiological and ergonomic components whose effects are mediated by the social environment, specifically, the organisation of work and the sociology of medical knowledge surrounding the illness (Figlio, 1982). What has been the case for occupational stress is that while gaining recognition that such conditions are public issues, solutions continue to be sought in the individual (Levi, 1990). The major contribution of sociological approaches to occupational stress and illness is that occupational health and safety has increasingly become an industrial relation issue between capital and labour. In other words, the focus has shifted from a fatalistic acceptance to legislated requirement that employers provide a safe workplace for all employees.
Person-Environmental Fit Model of Occupational Stress

Another theoretical model which has been in existence for a considerable amount of time, and which to a large extent has underpinned other approaches to stress and well-being is the Person – Environment Fit (P – E Fit) perspective. This account of the stress process stems from the early works of Lewin (1951) and Murray (1938). Lewin observed that an individual’s personal characteristics interacted with their work environment to determine strain, and consequently behaviour and health. This concept was developed into the Person-Environment Fit model, which suggests that the match between a person and the work environment is key in influencing their health (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). For health conditions, it is necessary that employees’ attitudes, skills, abilities and resources match the demands of their job, and that work environments should meet workers’ needs, knowledge and skills potential. Lack of fit in either of these domains can cause problems, and the greater the gap or misfit between the person and their environment, the greater the strain as demands exceed abilities, and needs exceed supply (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). These strains can be linked to health-related issues, lower productivity, and other work problems (French, Caplan & Harrison, 1982). Defence mechanisms such as denial, reappraisal of needs, and coping also operate in the model to try and reduce subjective misfit.

In the occupational stress and well-being literature, the fit concept has been characterized as having two components:

a. The degree of match, congruence, between the demands people confront at work and their abilities to meet those demands, referred to as demand-ability fit and
b. The match, congruence or correspondence between the person’s needs and the resources available to him/her. The latter is referred to as needs-supplies fit.

Most research on the relationship between P-E fit and stress has focused on the second of these types of fit, as it is assumed that lack of fit (that is misfit) between needs and resources will have a pronounced impact on stress levels and overall well-being. However, demands-ability fit can also be important in terms of a person’s well-being. For example, if a person’s workload is high and they do not have the time or energy to perform what is expected from them, it can induce a high level of psychological strain. A simplified depiction of the basic theory relating to P-E fit is presented in Fig. 1.01. The theory hinges on the amount of a “stimulus” (for instance, workload, work complexity, level of authority, and social interaction with work colleagues) that an individual prefers to have and the actual level of the various stimuli (referred to in this figure as “received”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low Strain</td>
<td>High Strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>High Strain</td>
<td>Low Strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1- Levels of Psychological Strain Predicted by P–E Fit Theory by Sonnentag and Frese (2003)

There are two conditions in which the level of fit is high: when the preferred levels and the received levels are both high: when the preferred levels and the received levels are both low. Consider for instance, the level of
social contact people have with their work colleagues. An individual may wish to have an extensive amount of contact with colleagues and may actually experience this amount (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). This situation is one where there is a strong match between what people want and what they receive; that is a strong fit and they should (at least theoretically) experience low strain (and high psychosocial well-being). Alternatively, the individual may not actually want very much contact at all with work colleagues, and does not have substantial interpersonal contact. Again, this situation reflects a high degree of fit, and one might expect the levels of strain to be low. This situation however, is not as clear-cut as the high-high condition, because here social interaction may not be important for individuals and other factors may have more impact on their stress and well-being levels.

Conversely, P–E Fit model postulate that high strain will occur when there is a mismatch between the person’s needs and what they receive or confront at work. The condition which should create the highest level of strain will be one where the person strongly desires a particular feature (such as interpersonal contact), but does not receive it (the high-low box in Fig. 1.0) under these circumstances, strain will be at its highest level, on the other hand, when people do not have a strong preference for an attribute (in this case, interpersonal contact), but they do receive it, there is some ambiguity over whether his situation will be stressful for them. Strictly speaking, they should experience strain, as there is a mismatch between their preference and what they are supplied with. However, this is likely to depend on numerous other factors, including whether the attribute interferes with other activities or things the individuals would prefer to be engaged in. For example, having frequent
contact with work colleagues may distract the person from core job activities, leading to frustration and a sense of lack of achievement in which case high strain might be anticipated. In contrast, even though they may not desire it, interpersonal contact may serve as a welcome distraction from a challenging task; hence, they may not feel stressed by it. Although the P–E fit model predicts that misfit will increase levels of strain, in practice the amount of strain experienced in the high-low condition in Fig.1. may be substantially greater than that felt in the low-high situation.

In summary, the basic notion underlying P–E Fit Theory is that there needs to be a match between what people want and what they receive, as well as a match between their abilities (knowledge, skills) and the demands placed upon them. Lack of match creates strain and ultimately, reduces their senses of psychosocial well-being. However, demands-ability and needs-supply match are considerably more relevant to people when the stimuli are important to them. (Edwards 1995; Edwards, 2000) has referred to this as dimension importance, and is related to Maslow’s need-hierarchy principle.

The concept of P–E Fit has received widespread recognition in the occupational health and well-being literature, and numerous investigations have been designed around this concept. There is no doubt that this model occupies an important position in conceptualizations of both work stress and work-related well-being and that the theory has several practical applications. The model has also generated critical lessons for organisations in relation to stress management interventions and occupational health and well-being promotions.
Life Events Theory

Researchers have long been interested in understanding how individuals and their environment affect each other, primarily so as to describe and explain age-related behaviour and individual differences. Holmes and Rahe’s (1967) life events theory states that events that occur in the lives of people can lead to an increase in stress, which if left unresolved, could develop into a serious health risk, and adversely affect other dependents and organisations. A life event is indicative of a significant change in the on-going life patterns of the individual. According to Settersten and Mayer (1997), a life event is a significant occurrence involving a relatively abrupt change that may produce serious and long lasting effects.

According to Holmes and Rahe (1967), life events can occur in a variety of domains such as family, health and work. Furthermore, life events may be age-graded (school, marriage and retirement), history graded (war and depression), or non-normative (illness and divorce). Life event stresses thus essentially follow the environmental tradition, and are concerned with situational encounters and the meaning a person may attach to such events. Stressful life events are causally implicated in a variety of undesirable effects on human performance and health (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1997).

Selye (1974), believes that all life events require adaptation, but all life events are not necessarily unpleasant. He went ahead to say that life events can either be pleasant in nature where the stress is called ‘eustress’ or unpleasant in nature where the stress is called ‘dystress’. Auto (1995), also has it that there may also be some life events which simply act to help maintain the internal steady state or to keep the individual interested in undertaking
appropriate activities and such stress may be called ‘neustress’. In the early 1960s, Rahe and Holmes began developing a life events schedule based upon the findings of Meyer’s “life charts” taken over 5,000 patients at the University of Washington. Each item selected by Holmes and Rahe for their “schedule of recent experience” was included because it was found to have occurred in a large number of patients preceding the onset of their illness. Holmes and Rahe (1967), later developed the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS) by assigning weights to life events of different judged severity from the “schedule of recent experience”. These weights were called “life change units” (LCU). The social Readjustment Rating Scale has also been used extensively in studies of onset of psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia, depression and suicide attempts.

Holmes and Rahe (1967), further explained that the SRRS has an enormous impact on research on the relations between life events and illness. It also brings forward and strengthens the notion that the effects of stressors operate largely through the creation of excessive adaptive demands. This makes users of SRRS to be more concerned with the magnitude of life change than with whether the change was positive (e.g., promotion) or negative (e.g., job loss). The life events theory suggests that stress can emanate from the various activities that people get involved in on a daily basis. The work of ministers is event-driven and can be so demanding and tasking that if not properly managed can result in severe stress on the individual. This can also have a damaging effect on their families and the congregation as whole.
Hardiness Theory

Hardiness which is alternatively referred to as psychological hardiness is a personality style first introduced by Suzanne C. Kobasa in 1979. According to Kobasa’s (1979) theory, some people are more resistant to stress and better able to cope with it than others. This is partly due to the fact that some people have a number of personality traits that protect them from the effects of stress. Psychologists call this the stress-hardy personality. The stress hardy personality traits are commitment, control, and challenge.

Commitment: Commitment means having a purpose to life and involvement in family, work, community, society, friends, religious faith, ourselves, etc., giving us a meaning to our lives. When the individual has this commitment to something or someone that is important to him or her, this gives his or her life a purpose. When committed to something, the individual tends to be motivated to put in more effort. This can help the individual to find goodness and meaning to his or her life (Phares, 1976).

Control: Phares’s (1976) study showed that how much control we perceive we have over any stressor will influence how difficult the stressor will be for us to cope with. Researchers have found there are basically two types of control, which are internal and external and these can either exacerbate or reduce a stressful situation. Internal Locus of Control people are aware that they cannot influence all the external events that go on in their lives, but they do have a deep sense that they have a choice in how they react to that stressor and believe that although they cannot totally influence it, they do have some influence over the event.
External Locus of Control individuals believe they have little or no control over what happens to them and that what happens is due to fate or destiny which they will not be able to influence it. For example, people who suffer a chronic back problem may believe it is their destiny and fate in life to suffer the pain. They may believe there is nothing they can do to influence their condition and the subsequent pain, so therefore they do not take any action, nor use any strategies that could enable them to reduce their pain.

**Challenge:** According to Kobasa (1979), challenges about how an individual perceives the events that occur in his or her life, seeing the difficulties as a challenge rather than as a threat and accepting is that the only thing in life that is constant is change. If the individual views change as a total threat or see every difficulty, he or she encounters as threatening to him or her then this is going to trigger a stronger fight/flight response than if the event is seen as a challenge. Stress hardy people do not spend time ruminating over why things have to change. They are not frightened by things but they accept it as being a natural part of life, not a threat but an opportunity to learn and grow.

Stress hardy people obviously have a natural advantage over people who do not have these personality traits. However, Phares (1976), suggested that people who do not naturally have the stress hardy personality traits can actually learn them, with time and practice, and so increase their own levels of stress hardiness. According to Kobasa (1979), having a stress hardy personality does not mean that a person never ever suffers stress. It means that their ability to deal with it, without it causing a problem, is greater. It is about learning to control how an individual reacts to the challenges he or she faces in a more flexible, confident and less destructive way.
Frankyl (1987), also said that the one thing that cannot be taken away from a person is their choice of how they deal with the difficult situations which they find themselves in. Hence everyone has some degree of control over how stressors affect them. In life it is impossible to remove all the pressure and stress that people will encounter, but that doesn't mean people are impotent in the face of it. This theory indicates that some individuals have inherent stress management strategies based on their personalities. Therefore stress management strategies may vary from person to person in accordance with their personality types or differences.

**Saranson's Cognitive Interference Theory**

Saranson, Pierce and Saranson (1996) define cognitive interference as intrusive thoughts which are unwanted or disturbing. According to Saranson’s cognitive interference theory, interference diminishes attention to task, lowers the individual’s ability to function effectively, subsequently interfering with one’s performance. When an individual experiences stress it may be recognized as a call for action and this can lead to task relevant or task irrelevant cognitive activities (Saranson et al., 1996). They believe that task relevant cognitive activities will occur in a situation where the individual perceives the stressor as a challenge and is able to direct one’s attention to a task by setting aside unproductive worries. This subsequently has a positive influence on performance. Task irrelevant cognitive activities or “self-preoccupying worry, insecurity and self-doubt” (Saranson et al., 1996, p. 142) associated with high anxiety occur when the call for action is imposed by situational demands (either perceived or real), such as exams or evaluation of performance by a supervisor. For anxious individuals, the precipitating event
or situation may magnify “personal preoccupations such as fear of negative consequences and give rise to uncertainty about outcomes, hyper-vigilance and concern over potential dangers” (Saranson, 1986, p. 20). When the person is preoccupied with intrusive thoughts he or she does not pay enough attention to the task at hand, contributing to poor performance (Saranson et al., 1996), subsequently influencing personal development (Saranson, 1986). Saranson adds that the content of one’s preoccupations is not only due to one’s perception of a situation but also by personality characteristics and one’s social background. This theory projects interferences and intrusive thoughts as sources of stress.

The theory points out that, intrusive thoughts that result in stress may be identified as a call for action. As a way of managing this stress the individual, for that matter the minister of the gospel, may resort to relevant or irrelevant mental activities. Relevant mental activities such as setting aside unproductive worries occur when the stressor is perceived as a challenge, this impacts positively on performance. On the other hand, irrelevant mental activities occasioned by situational demands adversely affect performance. The job of the pastor is characterised by a lot of cognitive interferences that demands proactive management efforts.

**Eysenck’s Processing Efficiency Theory**

According to Eysenck’s processing efficiency theory, anxiety decreases the effectiveness of information processing. Performance of many cognitive tasks requires a working memory for active processing and transient storage of task relevant information (MacLeod, 1996). In high anxiety states, working memory is not reduced, but its functioning is affected as it is
employed to sustain certain types of task irrelevant processing operations, therefore leaving less capacity for the task at hand (Eysenck, 1985; MacLeod, 1996). Eysenck (1979, p. 364) notes that the “task-irrelevant information involved in worry and cognitive self-concern competes with task-relevant information for space in the processing system”. Therefore highly anxious people find themselves in a divided attention situation or what Eysenck calls “dual task”.

The processing capacity of individuals with high anxiety is further decreased by the effort put into compensating for the adverse effects of anxiety or the investment of processing resources (Eysenck, 1985). It therefore affects performance quality. Eysenck (1996) believes however, that worry about task performance possesses a motivational function and it “leads to the allocation of additional processing resources to the task” (p. 98). In this situation, if there is sufficient expenditure of effort, it may not affect the performance efficiency negatively (Eysenck, 1979). The notion of task irrelevant processing operations employed during a high anxiety state is in line with Saranson’s theory of cognitive interference which postulates that intrusive thoughts disrupt the performance in anxious individuals. Ministerial engagement falls under this theory of processing efficiency and requires a working memory for active processing.

**Conceptual Issues**

**Concept of Stress**

Cox (1978) stated that, although everybody talks about stress, it is often not clear what stress is really about. Many people consider stress to be something that happens to them, an event such as an injury or a job loss.
Others think that stress is what happens to our body, mind, and behaviour in response to an event (E.g. heart pounding, anxiety, or nail biting). While stress does involve events and our response to them, these are not the most important factors. People’s thoughts about the situations in which they find themselves is the critical factor. Cox (1978) further stated that, when something happens to us as individuals, we automatically evaluate the situation mentally. The individual decides if it is threatening to him or her, how he or she needs to deal with the situation, and what skills he or she can use. If the individual decides that the demands of the situation outweigh the skills he or she has, then the situation is labelled as “stressful” and he or she reacts with the classic “stress response.” However, if the individual decides that his or her coping skills outweigh the demands of the situation, then he or she do not see it as “stressful.” Cox (1978)

Several definitions of stress have been offered over the years. Stress is derived from the Latin word “stringere”. It was used in the 17th century to describe “hardships or affliction”, and up to now its meaning was denoted as “force, pressure, strain or strong effort” (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997). According to Fisher (1986), the term stress is an umbrella term for an increasingly wide variety of conditions, responses and experiences.

Randall and Altmair (1994) stated that one of the first scientific attempts to explain stress was made by Hans Selye in 1956. Hans Selye was the first to describe human stress. His early works were on the responds and adaptation of the body against any demand.

Selye (1956) believed that the response to stress was “non-specific” which means that the person’s response to stress follows a universal pattern
whatever the external and internal demand of the body is. Selye called this phenomenon as the General Adaptation Syndrome (GAS, Fig. 1).

Figure 2- General Adaptation Syndrome (GAS) (Selye, 1956)

In the first stage, alarm (A), the body prepares itself for quick response such as increasing blood pressure. If the stressor continuous (Selye just thought an environment stressor), then the second stage, resistance (B) occurs. In this stage the body needs an organ or system to deal with stressor to return equilibrium. Therefore, the most important stage in GAS theory is the resistance stage. If people cannot balance their life, the exhaustion (C) stage occurs. Luthans (1987, p. 130) describes the third stage as “the automatic shutoff valve of death”, because in this stage exhaustion, collapse and even death may occur. Many conflicting definitions of stress appeared in literature, with passionate debates and arguments defending and opposing different definitions (Manktelow, 2006). A complication that arises from the confusion surrounding the definition of stress is that all individuals instinctively feel that they know what stress really is, having experienced it at one stage or another (Steptoe, Owen, Kunz-Ebrecht, & Mohamed-Ali, 2002). One therefore expects that it should be easier to formulate a clear definition of stress.

As stress is multi-faceted, a single definition will not suffice. Stress is considered a cluster of related experiences, pathways, responses and outcomes
caused by a range of different events or circumstances that affect respective individuals differently (Manktelow, 2006). One seminal researcher in the field of stress realized in the late fifties that all operational definitions of stress differed according to the occupational perspective of the person formulating the definition (Seyle, 1956). To a lawyer or linguist, words have an exact, distinct and fixed meaning, while in other fields; definitions continue to develop as research and knowledge in this field expand.

Back in time, though, the word ‘stress’ was borrowed from the field of physics. Humans were thought to resemble certain characteristics of objects such as metals that resisted moderate forces from outside, but lost their pliability at a point of greater pressure (Hobfoll & Vaux, 1993). The first modern researcher to apply the concept to humans was Walter Cannon in 1932. He was primarily concerned with the influence of less complex factors such as the effect of cold, lack of oxygen and other environmental stressors on organisms. Later he concluded that an individual could withstand an initial low level of stressors, but indicated that long term or severe stressors lead to a breakdown of biological systems when the capacity to tolerate pressure is exceeded by the intensity of duration of the stressor (Hobfoll & Vaux, 1993).

Seyle (1956) supported the notion of Cannon, who emphasized stress as a response to factors impacting on the individual. Seyle expressed the opinion that stress itself is not always destructive, as it depends on the manner in which it is perceived. The stress experienced from an exciting, creative and successful task is considered positive, while that of dullness, failure or degradation is deemed negative. He also believed that the biochemical effects of stress would always be experienced, whether the situation was perceived as
positive or negative. Since Selye’s initial findings, a great deal of research has been published in which perspectives and ideas changed, some subtle, others more drastic (Manktelow, 2006). Selye’s initial findings on stress, with regard to positive or negative situations, were rejected, as stress was mostly viewed as a negative phenomenon, with associated harmful biochemical and long-term effects. These effects have seldom been reported in correlation to positive situations (Manktelow, 2006). One of the more commonly adopted definitions of stress is the definition formulated by Cox and Mckay (1978). They define stress as part of a complex and dynamic system of transactions between the individual and his/her environment. This description of stress is diverse as it intentionally draws from both response-based and stimulus-based definitions (Cox, 1978). By incorporating these two approaches emphasis is placed on the ecological and transactional nature of the stress phenomenon.

Lazarus and Folkman (1984, p.13) viewing stress from a psychological perspective, assert that the stress process is ‘a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being’. Keil (2004) builds on this definition, asserting that, ‘stress involves a set of circumstances with which the individual is attempting to cope’. Atkinson (1993) describes stress as being a state that occurs when people come across events that they perceive as endangering their physical or psychological well-being.

Furnham (2005) asserts that stress in modern society is studied from varied perspectives and that its study focuses not only on the term stress as being a state of tension which encompasses physical, mental, psychological or
social demands, but also refers to the cause of stress, which is referred to as stressor. Le Blanc, Hox, Schaufel and Taris (2000) identified and categorized job-related stressors into four main sections namely: job content, working conditions, employment conditions and social relations at work. The first which is job content incorporates work over or under load, complex work, monotonous work and work with too much responsibility. Stressors related to job content are dangerous work and conflicting or ambiguous demands. The second category of stressors which is working conditions is the physical demands of work. The dangerous situations and lack of protective devices as the work place were deemed stressor to the category of work stressor. Toxic substances, poor conditions, work posture and lack of hygiene also were potential contributors to stress in the workplace. Thirdly, employment conditions such as shift work, low pay, poor career prospects job insecurity and flexible labour contract. Finally, social relations at work accounted for the fourth category of job related stressors and were sub divided into poor leadership, low social support, low participation in decision-making and discrimination.

The complexity of the subject of stress is exemplified in the multitude and multifaceted approaches to its exploration and vast development of models. Some models view occupational stress from a personal perspective and others view stress from an organisational or environmental perspective. Despite difficulty in defining stress, there is a general consensus that stress involves three meanings (Le Blanc et al. 2000).

1. Stress as a stimulus, which explores the sources of stress

2. Stress as a response, which explores the reactions to stress
3. Stress as the intervening process between both stimulus and response.

In relation to the working environment three models dominated research on stress. The first model is the social-environment model (Michigan Model), which provides a simplistic view of stress in the workplace with emphasis on categorising and describing causes/sources of stress (Furnham, 2005). The second model, person–environment model (P-E model), describes stress as the lack of association between the environment demands at work and the personal characteristics of the worker (Koslowsky, 1998). This model has been improved to the ‘Karasek job-strain model’ with emphasis placed both on the psychological and physical effect of stress in the workplace, in particular with the correlation between stress and cardiovascular disease (Karasek, Baker, Marxer, Ahlbom & Theorell, 1981).

The Karasek job-strain model was further developed into the Demand-Control-Support model (D-C-S Model), (Karasek & Theorell, 1990) which adopted a three dimensional approach to stress to include the importance of support in the working environment. High workload, low perceived control and low support were considered to contribute to stress.

The third model by Siegrist (1996) adopted a more sociological approach to stress in the development of an effort–reward imbalance model (ERI), where stress emerged from the effect of low reward resulting from perceived high effort. One likely response that fits with his model is the feeling of being undervalued in the workplace, though personality traits and work-home interface are not taken into account. While all of the above models have considerable merit, they suit different circumstances. Generalising the above models to the ministers of the gospel is not always afforded as stress in
this vocation is considered to be ‘an internal cue in the physical, social, or psychological environment that threatens the equilibrium of an individual’ (Karasek et al, 1981, p. 12). The equilibrium of the individual is not confined to physical well-being, which is emphasized in the Karasek job-strain model.

Stress can be further categorized into two, which is, eustress and distress. Eustress (good stress) is a type of stress that can enhance wellbeing when faced with challenge and responsibility (Gibbons, Lawrence, Leclaire, Powell, & Smart 2007). On the other hand distress, which is the type of stress that causes more concern, receives and deserves most attention and is synonymous with bad stress (Malone, 2004). The Yerkes–Dodson Law suggests that stress, which is contained within certain limits, can actually have a beneficial effect on the person’s wellbeing and that extension to beyond or below these stress or excitement levels can cause harm to the individual when exposure is chronic (Cooper & Robertson, 1990).

Hansen (1986) states that physiological signals of stress include high blood pressure, shaky nerves, intolerance to patients, backaches, anxiety, failure in sexual performance among others. He continued that the behavioural signals include feeling of weakness and faintness, not listening to others, doing things hurriedly, losing personal possessions, and feelings of being dominated by time. Occupational stress exists in all professions (Cooper, 1998) with concern regarding the overwhelming presence of stress in the workplace in the twentieth century (Arnold, Cooper, & Robertson, 1998). Farrington (1997) outlines how stress is depressing, demoralizing and de-motivating for pastors. Stress affects the well-being of the clergy with a
positive correlation between stress and mood disturbance (Healy & McKay, 2000).

McVicar (2003) declares that stress involves a person’s perception of the demands being made on them and to their perception of their ability to meet those demands. Arnold et al (1998) describe occupational stress as any force that pushes a psychological or physical factor beyond its range of ability, producing strain. According to Folkman et al., (1986) cognitive theory of stress and coping has two functions. These are, (a; dealing with the problem causing stress (problem-focused coping), and b; regulating emotion (emotion-focused coping). Emotion-focused coping or cognitive coping strategy changes only the interpretation of a threat because it involves thinking rather than acting (Lazarus, 2000). Problem-focused coping involves action which addresses the perceived problem or “doing something to alter the source of stress” (Carver, Sheier & Weintraub, 1989, p. 267) and therefore it helps one manage the situation which causes the distress. An individual can simultaneously deal with stressors using both types of coping, that is, dealing with the stressors directly (action) and regulating one’s feelings (emotion). However, problem-focused coping is used more often when the person thinks that something constructive can be done about the situation (Carver et al., 1989). Emotion-focused coping on the other hand is used more often when an individual feels “that the stressor is something that must be endured” (Carver et al., 1989, p. 267).
Figure 3- Model for sources of stress and its management strategies among ministers of the gospel

**Sources of Stress**

When we define the term sources we can understand how important it really is in our overall stress management. The word means “the point at which something springs into being or the point of its origin. In other words, what the causes are and where the stress, anxiety, worry and the tension one is experiencing are coming from (The American Heritag Dictionary of the English Language, 2009).
Physical stressors impinge upon the five senses and pertain to the domain of the tangible and concrete. These are stress triggers that we can see, hear, touch, smell or taste. A car coming straight at us on the sidewalk is a real, tangible and imminent physical threat, which must and does trigger an immediate stress reaction. We respond to this physical threat by stepping out of the way, instinctively and without giving it much thought. Included in the physical stressors is pain, which is the body’s reaction to a noxious agent that attacks its structure. Thus, illness, which frequently produces pain, is considered primarily as a physical stressor, rather than psychological. However, and it’s a big caveat, it would be a mistake to consider illness a purely physical stressor, as illness (especially if accompanied by pain) has a way of affecting the mind by producing negative thinking, negative self-appraisal, hopelessness, mental fatigue and other effects on the person’s spirit, attitude and worldview (Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

Psychological stressors are the most complex and perhaps the most frequent type of stressors we encounter in our daily lives. To understand psychological stressors, it is important to remember that they can fall into two distinct categories: real or perceived. Real psychological stressors are produced by the perception of an emotional danger or threat, in other words by a concern over something that is based on reality and does or may objectively occur. An example of this may be an impending relationship breakup. Perceived psychological stressors are produced by the same mechanism, and are a concern over events or situations that are often based on reality but may be exaggerated or may in fact never occur. An example of the latter may be a
worry or concern over an unnamed threat that may keep us from being able to take an elevator, or ride in an aircraft (Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

To summarize, the four principal sources of stress may be grouped as follows:

1. **Environmental**
   
   This type of stress relates to the environment and surroundings that causes stress. These include physical stressors that impinge upon the five senses, such as weather, traffic, noise, pollution, and disturbing images. (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

2. **Social**
   
   Includes psychological stressors triggered when demands are made on our time, attention and skills, such as in job interviews, public speaking, work presentations, interpersonal conflict, competing priorities, financial problems, and loss of relationships and loved ones (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

3. **Physiological**
   
   This relates to one’s physiology, body reaction and responses to stressful situations. It is often discussed as physical stress and in relation to the physical stress symptoms you exhibit includes physical stressors that are produced at various stages in our life, such as during growth spurts in adolescence, menopause, and lack of exercise poor nutrition insufficient sleep, illness, injuries, and aging. Included in this category
is also the physical stress produced by psychological stressors, which produce muscle tension, headaches, stomach upsets, anxiety attacks, and bouts of depression (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

4. **Cognitive-emotional**

The principal source of this type of stress is our own thoughts. Our brain interprets changes in our environment and body and conducts an automatic “threat assessment” to decide whether a danger is present and thus mobilize the body’s defences. The good functioning, or poor functioning of our threat assessment mechanism determines whether we become alarmed appropriately or inappropriately, and whether to remain stressed or relax (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Zuccolo, 2013; Global Organisation for Stress, 2016).

**Different Types of Stress**

Stress management can be complicated and confusing because there are different types of stress namely; acute stress, episodic acute stress, and chronic stress. Each with its own characteristics, symptoms, duration and treatment approaches.

**Acute Stress**

Acute stress is the most common form of stress. It comes from demands and pressures of the recent past and anticipated demands and pressures of the near future. Acute stress is thrilling and exciting in small doses, but too much is exhausting. By the same token, overdoing on short-term stress can lead to psychological distress, tension headaches, upset stomach, and other symptoms.
Fortunately, acute stress symptoms are recognized by most people. It’s a laundry list of what has gone awry in their lives: the auto accident that crumpled the car fender, the loss of an important contract, a deadline they’re rushing to meet, their child’s occasional problems at school, and so on. Because it is short term, acute stress doesn’t have enough time to do the extensive damage associated with long-term stress. The most common symptoms are: Emotional distress - some combination of anger or irritability, anxiety and depression, the three stress emotions (Legg, 2016).

1. Muscular problems including tension headache, back pain, jaw pain and the muscular tensions that lead to pulled muscles and tendon and ligament problems.
2. Stomach, gut and bowel problems such as heartburn, acid stomach, flatulence, diarrhoea, constipation and irritable bowel syndrome.
3. Transient over arousal leads to elevation in blood pressure, rapid heartbeat, sweaty palms, heart palpitations, dizziness, migraine headaches, cold hands or feet, shortness of breath and chest pain.

It should be noted that acute stress can crop up in anyone’s life, and it is highly treatable and manageable.

**Episodic Acute Stress**

There are those, however, who suffer acute stress frequently, whose lives are so disordered that they are studies in chaos and crisis. They are always in a rush, but always late. If something can go wrong, it does. They take on too much, have too many irons in the fire, and cannot organize the slew of self-inflicted demands and pressures clamoring for their attention. They seem perpetually in the clutches of acute stress.
Legg (2016) stated that episodic stress is common for people with acute stress reactions to be over aroused, short-tempered, irritable, anxious and tense. Often, they describe themselves as having “a lot of nervous energy.” Always in a hurry, they tend to be abrupt, and sometimes their irritability comes across as hostility. Interpersonal relationships deteriorate rapidly when others respond with real hostility. The work becomes a very stressful place for them.

The cardiac prone, “Type A” personality described by cardiologists, Friedman and Rosenman, (1959) is similar to an extreme case of episodic acute stress. Type A’s have an “excessive competitive drive, aggressiveness, impatience, and a harrying sense of time urgency.” In addition, there is a “free-floating, but well-rationalized form of hostility, and almost always a deep-seated insecurity.” Such personality characteristics would seem to create frequent episodes of acute stress for the Type A’s individual. Friedman and Rosenman (1959) found Type A’s to be much more likely to develop coronary heart disease than Type B’s, who show an opposite pattern of behavior. Another form of episodic acute stress comes from ceaseless worry. “Worrywarts” see disaster around every corner and pessimistically forecast catastrophe in every situation. The world is a dangerous, un rewarding, punitive place where something awful is always about to happen. These “awfulizers” also tend to be over aroused and tense, but are more anxious and depressed than angry and hostile.

The symptoms of episodic acute stress are the symptoms of extended over arousal: persistent tension headaches, migraines, hypertension, chest pain and heart disease. Treating episodic acute stress requires intervention on a
number of levels, generally requiring professional help, which may take many months. Often, lifestyle and personality issues are so ingrained and habitual with these individuals that they see nothing wrong with the way they conduct their lives. They blame their woes on other people and external events. Frequently, they see their lifestyle, their patterns of interacting with others, and their ways of perceiving the world as part and parcel of who and what they are.

Sufferers can be fiercely resistant to change. Only the promise of relief from pain and discomfort of their symptoms can keep them in treatment and on track in their recovery programme.

**Chronic Stress**

While acute stress can be thrilling and exciting, chronic stress is not. This is the grinding stress that wears people away day after day, year after year. Chronic stress destroys bodies, minds and lives. It wreaks havoc through long-term attrition. It’s the stress of poverty, of dysfunctional families, of being trapped in an unhappy marriage or in a despised job or career (Leg, 2016). Chronic stress comes when a person never sees a way out of a miserable situation. It’s the stress of unrelenting demands and pressures for seemingly interminable periods of time. With no hope, the individual gives up searching for solutions.

Some chronic stresses stem from traumatic, early childhood experiences that become internalized and remain forever painful and present. Some experiences profoundly affect personality. A view of the world, or a belief system, is created that causes unending stress for the individual. When personality or deep-seated convictions and beliefs must be reformulated,
recovery requires active self-examination, often with professional help. The worst aspect of chronic stress is that people get used to it. They forget it’s there. People are immediately aware of acute stress because it is new; they ignore chronic stress because it is old, familiar, and sometimes, almost comfortable.

Chronic stress kills through suicide, violence, heart attack, stroke, and, perhaps, even cancer. People wear down to a final, fatal breakdown. Because physical and mental resources are depleted through long-term attrition, the symptoms of chronic stress are difficult to treat and may require extended medical as well as behavioral treatment and stress management.

Developmental Stages of Stress

According to Jung (2013), stress progresses by the three stages. These are alarm, resistance and exhaustion stages. The stages are depicted pictorially in their order of severity in figure 4.

Figure 4- Three Stages of Stress

**Alarm stage:** Alarm reaction appears in the beginning of stress. It is the stage in which the hormone of internal secretion and the chemical element of the human body respond properly by surprising of the mind and body with outer stimulus, inner conflict or anxiety. The physical symptoms of this stage are
headache, slight fever, and fatigued condition, losing of appetite, feeling of helplessness, muscular pain and arthritis. The psychological symptoms are vague anxiety, irritation, the decline of resisting power of the mind and body, the decrease of concentration power, and insomnia. If stress is continued in the alarm stage without being dealt with, it develops to the stage of resistance (Jung, 2013).

**Resistance stage:** The secretion of adrenal cortical stimulus hormones and steroid hormones from the pituitary gland try to relieve the response of stress. At this time, the resisting power against the stress increases and the symptoms of the beginning stage of stress disappear. In the resisting period, it does not catch cold or get sick easily because of the active immunity system by secreting internal secretion. If the stress is accumulated chronically, the ingredient content of adrenaline and Nor-epinephrine in blood increases and brings to the heart acceleration, anxiety, nervousness and tension; or it leads to psychological chronic anxiety or neurosis. If the stress is continued in spite of resistance like this, it develops finally to the stage of exhaustion (Jung, 2013).

**Exhaustion stage:** This is called “the escape stage” or “the period of falling illness”. The physical resisting power against the stress decreases because the secretion of hormones from the pituitary gland and adrenal gland is not sufficient and the symptoms of early alarm reaction stage reappear in the stage. If resistance is not recovered, it brings disease or even death in severe cases. If it develops to the stage of exhaustion, it may bring disease in the body organs like the stomach, heart or skin or it may bring disease like schizophrenia (Jung, 1993).
Empirical Review

The empirical review focused on the findings of other researchers on the topic. To assist in getting more accurate picture of stress among ministers of the gospel, the researcher undertook an empirical review of related literature also. The study found it appropriate to review literature on the following areas:

1. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel
3. Stress and personality type
4. Relevance of counselling in stress management
5. Age difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel
6. Gender difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel
7. Gender difference in the management of stress among ministers of the gospel.
8. Ministerial engagement differences in stress among ministers of the gospel

Sources of Stress among ministers of the gospel

Different professions categories stress as suited in their field of study. In the Christian literatures stressors come to Christian leaders (Pastors and Preachers) in four categories (Croucher, 1994).

Bio-ecological sources: related to poor diet, this is where the individual takes in too much caffeine, refined white sugar, processed flour, salt among others. Lack of exercise and/or poor exercise habits also contribute to stress related illness. They also include noise and air pollution. A survey by the Evangelical
Lutheran Church in America (and cited by the New York Times) reported 69% of its ministers as being overweight, 64% as having high blood pressure, and 13% as taking prescription antidepressants. Similarly, a 2005 survey of Presbyterian clergy had reported that occupational stress and burnout played a factor in 4 times as many ministers leaving the profession during the first five years of ministry. (Beebe, 2007).

**Vocational sources**: this include career uncertainty, role ambiguity (a lack of clearly defined and mutually-agreed ministry functions), role conflict (between church expectations and personal or family needs), role overload (too many real or imagined expectations), lack of opportunities to upgrade and be yourself, sense of loneliness, time management frustrations and many more. Since 1964 Kahn has recognized ambiguity and role conflict as stressful characteristics of the working role. Ambiguity can be defined as the lack of clarity concerning the employee’s targets and duties, while role conflict as the conflict among professional roles.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) state that, role pressure occurs when an individual’s expectation or demands conflicts with expectations and demands of the organisation. Stress resulting from role ambiguity is experienced when the individual loses a sense of certainty and predictability in the work role. The pastor experiences role ambiguity when he becomes uncertain about how to do certain things, especially how to achieve the goals set, through laid down procedures, even though he has been preaching for some years. When the pastor is not able to meet the spiritual needs of the congregation as expected the pastor experiences frustration because of failure
and loses. If this phenomenon persists for a long time, the pastor may lose focus due to stress and can abandon his calling.

To Bass (1990), stress in individuals or groups occurs when their situation become very complex, ambiguous and unclear, as well as highly demanding regarding competence or when structural means to deal with the demands are not present. This conflict is supported by Kahn’s (1964) findings that too much work produces the greatest stress. Taken together, these findings might indicate a need to recognize the content of pastors’ work and give higher priority to the stressors that easily come to the pastors in order to reduce them if not eliminated them totally.

**Psychological sources:** This involves the power of one’s own mind in how the individual rationalizes and make meaning of daily hassles and worries. It is about how the brain, the psyche or the mind thinks about the stressful conditions the individual faces. This is however in relation to the great life-change stressors - from the most stressful (such as the loss of a spouse), through divorce, death of a close family member, personal injury or illness.

Clergy are abandoning the ministry at an alarming rate. The ‘world scene’ appears to give conclusive backing to this assertion. Australia records over 10,000 pastors living the pastoral ministry each year (Beasley-Murray, 1995). A survey of these men and women disclosed that only 2,500 (25 per cent) of them left, ‘without hurt, conflict, loss of health etc. (Croucher, 1994). In the United States the situation is little better. David McKenna writes, ‘... the ministerial profession looks like a desert over which a cowboy has ridden and moved on, leaving the debris of burned-out pastors on the trail’ (McKenna 1980, p 89).
The British scene, although better than Australia and the United States, is still a picture of a Church haemorrhaging men and women from the pastoral ministry. A former principal of Spurgeon’s College London writes that out of 406 students who were trained for the Baptist ministry in the period 1955-1985, over 100 (25 per cent) have left the ministry altogether (Beasley-Murray, 1995). There are a variety of reasons which may be put forward to explain this exodus. For some clergy it is the discovery that they have neither the gifts nor the temperament to cope with the demands of traditional ministry. For others it is either the lack of security (for denominations without a clergy freehold), loneliness, financial difficulties, family or marital problems, personality conflicts with superiors or members of the congregation, or perhaps an overwhelming sense of disillusionment. Sadly, for some members of the clergy their resignation is uninvited and involuntary. They are asked to resign perhaps because of sheer incompetence or some inappropriate sexual activity.

Several studies suggest that ministers experience high levels of stress that could be detrimental to both their physical and mental health. Mills and Koval (1971) noted that, of 4,908 ministers in 27 Protestant denominations, 75 percent reported one or more periods of major stress in their areas. In two-thirds of this group, the stress arose from the pastoral work associated with the local church. Other studies have suggested that a large number of ministers are responding to these high levels of stress by leaving the ministry. MacDonald (2003) reported that, one-third of ministers surveyed in a Gallup Poll seriously considered leaving the ministry. Several South African studies also support
this conclusion that clergy are experiencing high levels of stress, which could lead to serious burnout.

Management Strategies of Stress

Management is defined as “the person’s cognitive and behavioural efforts to cope (reduce, minimize, master, or tolerate) the internal and external demands of the person-environment transaction that is appraised as taxing or exceeding the person’s resources” (Folkman, Lazarus, Gruen, & DeLongis, 1986, p. 572). According to Folkman and Lazarus’ cognitive theory of stress and coping, coping has two functions: a) dealing with the sources of the stress (problem-focused coping), and b) regulating emotion (emotion-focused coping) (Folkman et al., 1986). Emotion-focused coping, or cognitive coping strategy, changes only the interpretation of a threat because it involves thinking rather than acting (Lazarus, 1976). Problem-focused coping involves action which addresses the perceived problem or “doing something to alter the source of stress” (Carver, Sheier & Weintraub, 1989, p. 267) and therefore it helps one manage the situation which causes the distress. An individual can simultaneously deal with stressors using both types of coping: dealing with the stressors directly (action) and regulating one’s feelings (emotion). However problem-focused coping is used more often when the person thinks that something constructive can be done about the situation (Carver et al., 1989). Emotion-focused coping on the other hand is used more often when an individual feels “that the stressor is something that must be endured” (Carver et al., 1989, p. 267).

Based on the research done by Folkman and Lazarus, the researchers Carver, Sheier and Weintraub (1989) have devised a detailed coping inventory
and added a few additional dimensions of coping. Problem-focused coping involves actions such as: taking action to remove stressor; planning how to confront stressor; suppressing competing activities (putting other projects aside in order to deal with the stressor); restraint coping (waiting until an appropriate opportunity to act presents itself); seeking social support for instrumental reasons (seeking advice, assistance or information) (Carver et al., 1989). Emotion-focused coping involves: seeking social support for emotional reasons (getting moral support, understanding, or sympathy); positive reinterpretation and growth; acceptance; turning to religion; focusing on and venting of emotions; denial; behavioural disengagement (reducing effort to deal with stressor, or giving up on goal); mental disengagement (i.e. daydreaming, escaping through sleep, immersion in computer, TV); alcohol and drug disengagement (Carver et al., 1989). Coping methods, whether emotion-focused or problem-focused can be judged by an individual as effective or ineffective.

Effective coping with stress requires first an appraisal of the event, then a mobilization of the “personal and social coping resources” and eventually the use of actual coping strategies (Shipton, 2002, p. 244). Ineffective coping methods may lead to prolonged stress, feeling of powerlessness and eventual burnout and attrition. Stress management starts with identifying the source of stress in your life. It is not as easy as it sounds because your true source of stress is not always obvious, and it is all too easy to overlook your own stress-inducing thoughts, feelings and behaviours. Definitely, you may know that you are constantly worried about work
deadlines, but maybe it is your procrastination, rather than the actual job demands that leads to deadline stress (Smith & Segal, 2012).

Although stress is an inevitable feature of work and personal life, it still can be managed. Whetten and Cameron (1998) see that eliminating or minimizing stressors at the beginning is important and it is the best way to manage stress. It may be called proactive stress management. The second important thing is to increase individuals’ capacity to remove stress by increasing their resiliency. Although stress management is an organisational philosophy, individual resiliencies are also important to cope with stress. Most authors agree that there are two types of coping strategies: individual and organisational (managerial).

**Organisational Management Strategies**

Some organisations have low stress, whereas other organisations have high stress, which affect their employees adversely. Some precaution can be taken by organisations to eliminate or to reduce stress. Managers may redesign the job when they see high level of stress. Goal setting of organisation increases motivation among employees. Role negotiation must be supplied against role conflict. Role negotiation can be sustained by giving the definition of a specific role within the organisational context. The person then identifies the expectations for that role.

Social support system can be applied within the organisation. Club activities and family meetings are few kinds of supporting systems. Managers are responsible for controlling the physical environment. They may reduce noise, institute better control of temperature, and provide physical facilities to improve employee health and to reduce stress.
and culture is also important for producing or eliminating stress. Centralized or formalized organisations may exert much more stress than participative organisations. Therefore, employees are eager to have the ability to take part in decision-making process. Upward communication has to be provided by top management.

There is no one unique way of coping strategies. Since stress reactions is determined by personality of the individuals, by the perception of the threat, by the type and magnitude stressors, and by the level of training and experience of personnel, as Mangelsdorff (1995) states that commanders and leaders have to decide on the form of their intervention.

**Individual Management Strategies**

Individual prevention focuses on how the person can manage stress before it becomes a problem. They can use three important resiliencies to minimize stress (Whetten & Cameron, 1998). These are:

**Physiological Resiliency:** There are two main strategy related to physiological resiliency: exercise and proper diet. Exercise improves a person’s response to stressful activities. It is much more important for clergy (pastors, preachers etc.) because of the serious concentrations and skills needed to search through the scriptures as well as how to handle the flock in the ministry. Diet has no direct effect on stress. However, it can play an indirect role on stress management. High sugar can stimulate stress response and high cholesterol in foods can adversely affect blood chemicals. Eliminating alcohol, smoking, and drug abuse may help individuals for their health and work.
**Psychological Resiliency:** Balancing lifestyle can improve psychological resiliencies. Balancing lifestyle includes social, physical, cultural, work activities and so on. Time management (Organizing and prioritizing are a few time management skills) is the most efficient method to balance these activities. Time management skills can help employees make the most effective, efficient use of time (Turkel & Leblebici, 2001).

Using relaxation techniques such as meditation and praying may increase psychological resiliency. The relaxation response does not require any support. Prepared to changing environment and conditions, resiliency of people mentally increases. Positive thinking to the situations may also reduce stress conditions.

**Social Resiliency:** Kowalski (2000) focused more on social resiliency especially for seeking input from others. He believes that a trusted person may see new ways to deal with the situations, because he believes that no one can deal with all life’s stresses alone. Unions and social support must be established to decrease stress level. The unions do many things that relieve job stress. In developed countries the rate of unionization is great (Cooper & Michael, 1985).

Scholars have offered many possible solutions to the negative effects of occupational stress (Michie, & Williams, 2003), mostly focusing on identifying and alleviating its sources in the workplace, or arguing for the buffering effects of social support (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998; Yildirim, 2008). Few studies, however, have assessed whether support groups can effectively reduce occupation-related mental distress, and fewer still have examined their effects among clergy. Support groups can be of several types,
though most are similar in that they bring together persons facing a common set of challenges, and rely on interaction among these persons to yield solutions. For this reason they are often referred to as peer support groups (Peterson et al. 2008), a term used interchangeably with “support group” and “peer group”. Determining the effects of peer groups is important, for denominations are increasingly turning to peer groups as a means of combating pastoral challenges. Discussing difficult experiences with another person gives a chance to feel better. The process of confessing appears to counter the detrimental effects of stress. This process also called “networking” (Luthans, 1987).

Drawing on a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data, these studies indicate that peer group participation is associated with higher pastoral effectiveness, and a variety of other positive outcomes. Studies have found that participants in peer groups reported higher motivation and energy in their ministry, as well as greater creativity, increased intimacy with God, and positive impacts on family and close friends (Miller & Holly, 2011). Another study noted that of the 23% of Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) clergy who participated in a support group, almost all found the experience helpful to some degree (Miles, Proeschold & Bell, 2012). Extant studies also have found connections between peer group participation and congregations, noting that clergy in peer groups serve in congregations that are growing, and that promote a culture of involvement. Positive group effects seem most likely for groups that are ethnically and denominationally diverse, that are led by a trained facilitator, and that promote confidentiality and accountability (Dolan, 2010).
Optimism also improve social resiliency. Optimism and pessimism are two different thinking styles. Optimist people avoid distress by understanding the bad events and think positively. One being relaxed and making jokes also affect person’s well-being. Many people find that watching a favourite movie or listening to music can relieve stress. Carrell, Elbert, and Hatfield (2000) explain that humour and laughter may reduce susceptibility to physical illness and disease. It is thought that if people have a good sense of humour and laugh regularly, they may be releasing hormones that will help to maintain their health.

In psychology, coping is constantly changing cognitive and behavioural efforts to manage specific external and or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person. Coping is thus expending conscious effort to solve personal and interpersonal problems, and seeking to master, minimize or tolerate stress as well as conflict. Psychological coping mechanisms are commonly termed coping strategies or coping skills. Hundreds of coping strategies have been identified. Classification of these strategies into a broader architecture has not yet been agreed upon (Folkman & Lazarus, 1990). Pastors should choose the right leadership styles to help them cope with stress. They should not use one leadership style throughout their work but change their style to suit the situation in which the problem is found.

According to Lazarus (1966), motivation and coaching are the nuts and bolts of a leader’s job. The human factor is the most vital and critical of all organisational resources. The human factor, through the leadership, mobilizes and utilizes all other factors for the production of concrete outputs. The non-
human materials considered to be mere potentials until turned to consumable goods and services. Consequently, for optimum performance, the workforce needs to be regularly motivated and encouraged through incentives, which can be economic, material and psychological in nature. Motivation is anything done or efforts made to encourage the behaviour of employees towards better performance in the course of accomplishing the goals of the organisation. Motivation is the incentives, inducements and rewards that are given to workers at regular basis so as to boost their morale for enhanced productivity.

In managing our stress it is important to recognize where our locus of control is and with time, stress management training and practice we can move from an external locus of control to a more internal locus of control and in so doing improve our coping abilities. Managers/ Leadership must also understand the main elements of stress; the sources of stress; how it occurs; how to reduce or prevent it by using managerial tactics. They must also observe the symptoms of employees to identify stress occurrence. To increase performance, managers must also learn how to create healthy stress for employees. It may seem that there is nothing you can do about stress. The bill will not stop coming, there will never be more hours in a day and your career and family responsibilities will always be demanding. But you have more control than you might think. In fact, the simple realization that you are in control of your life is the foundation of stress management. Managing stress is all about taking charge of your thoughts, emotions, schedule, and the way you deal with problems.

Ogilvie (1984 p 11) emphasizes the fact that “stress can be managed”. He further argues that “God has endowed man with an inner ability to handle
the external pressures of life and a stress management mechanism that gives them an immense capacity to cope with the pressures and problems of life”. Therefore, no individual needs to be a helpless victim of stress producing situations, or circumstances.

Further, Ogilvie (1984) asserts that the secret to the effective use of God’s given stress management system – cerebral function, limbic system, interaction and automatic adoption, is somehow mysteriously linked to our relationship to God; for without His spirit to infuse the tissues of man’s brains with wisdom, knowledge and truth; man’s own strength and coping ability are limited.

Sehnet (1985) gives five ways to manage stress. First, is the change of work and social environment, understanding our emotions and learning un-stress solutions? Next, is taking care of our bodies and providing on our spiritual needs. He warns that too many people ignore the flashing lights that the body gives such as headache, irritability and indigestion which could easily land one into a hospital bed.

Shlemon (1984 p. 12) asserts that, because we live in a world that is not yet perfect we suffer on account of the imperfection of those around us. No human being has ever been able to love us totally, this being the cause of the feelings of rejection, loneliness and hurts that sometimes are so subtle that we fail to acknowledge. These feelings are still capable of blocking emotional and spiritual growth. Unhealed hurts can sometimes lead to destructive behaviours. Although individuals are often unaware of the reason for constant tension in their lives, but they gradually develop habits to deal with it. (Hendrickson, 2002) asserts that stress is manageable therefore every stressed
person should do the needful to get out of negative stress. Nyambura (2008) notes that just as there are many sources of stress, so there are many possibilities of its management. First, one needs to be aware of their stressors. One should determine what events distress them and how they respond to them. Then, one should recognize what to change or eliminate completely. This could possibly reduce the intensity of the stressors or shorten exposure to them. At the same time, one needs to try and reduce the intensity of their emotional reactions to stress by tempering excess emotions and putting the situation in perspective but not dwelling on the negative aspects.

Other suggestions include relaxation techniques to reduce muscle tension, heart rate and blood pressure. Stress could also be managed by exercises done three or four times a week, eating well-balanced and nutritious meals but avoiding nicotine, excessive caffeine and stimulants. Enough sleep and consistency in sleep schedule can also be useful. Finally, one should pursue realistic and meaningful goals, developing mutually supportive relationships and being moderate in reaction to stressors.

Kumar (2008) suggests the following as possible ways to fight stress: eating foods that reduce stress, for example, herbal trees like chamomile and peppermint; taking a good night’s sleep and unwind with muscle relaxation techniques. Others include, visualization and meditation techniques, which involve simple act of concentrating the mind on a single word or object; chiropractic techniques, which include, application of manual pressure to muscles, bones and joints, particularly the spine; and, Yoga exercise.

Further, Kumar (2008) suggests that positive thinking; acupressure; aromatherapy - which is the use of essential oils that gives various plants
scents to relax the body and mind; homeopathy - a system of medicines that uses highly diluted substances to boost the body’s natural ability to cure itself and Taichi Chuan - a combination of exercise, Chinese medicine and oriental philosophy can also assist in the reduction of stress. In addition, Wong (2008) lists other stress remedies such as taking control of any situation with self-confidence and assertiveness, refusal to be dictated by fears, and boost on energy levels and increase of enthusiasm for life and relationships. One should also end the torture of feeling lonely and isolated, rebuilding self-esteem and regaining clarity and direction to a brighter future. Having good habits, easy exercises and participation in ones favourite sports or game can also reduce stress. In a review of women and stress, Monda (2008) asserts that people are biologically ‘unreal’ to react differently to stress. So, everyone is their own best weapon in defending themselves against stress and its related consequences. One should listen and not ignore the signals their body sends. Once these signals are detected, the victim should realize the need to seek for remedies. Also, Monda (2008) asserts that in certain instances, talking about a stressful situation to a friend might assist instead of trying to sort out the problem alone as it might be a fruitless task because in isolation one can easily lose perspective. Stressed individuals should indulge themselves into regular leisure activities. Likewise, the body has to be provided with sufficient nutrients because our bodies do not have a source of self-perpetuating fuel. However, one should avoid drinks such as coffee and tea that has a strong effect on moods and disrupts the body’s smooth functioning.

Monda (2008) again advises that one could take a good quality supplement with the diet to help support the body and reduce the harmful
impact of poor nutrition as one adjusts to eating properly. Body exercises are encouraged because they help in increasing the brain's oxygen supply, relieves muscle tension, increases one's energy levels and helps one to grow her confidence. Finally, Monda (2008) recommends that stress victims take plenty of rest as it is through rest that the body could regain its lost energy. Another remedy is laughter which is a powerful antidote to stress. Therefore, one should purpose to have a good laugh. Seeing the lighter side of things helps in putting suffering in perspective and could fill one with hope and take one's mind off pain. Likewise, watching a funny movie or reading a comic strip or telling a joke would be helpful. Also, setting aside time each day to write down one's thoughts, hopes, fears and dreams could help ease the mind and keep one focused. This does not mean shrinking one's responsibilities but that one takes a conscious effort to separate what is important from what is not at the time. Lastly, one should learn to delegate and to say no to responsibilities and requests that could be avoided.

**Stress and Personality**

People deal with stressful situations every day, but how a person deals with stress has a lot to do with personality type. Some people overreact, some don't know what to do and some are calm. Psychologists believe this has to do with the personality a person is born with. Many factors influence how people appraise a situation or event. Some of them are backgrounds, values, customs, experiences, religious, attitudes, and ideologies. The important thing is the personality. Personality is a dominant element to interpret the internal and external demands as a stress or not. We all have certain features to our personality that make us unique as people; however, there are many aspects of
our personality that are similar to other people. These similar personality factors are called Personality Traits.

**Type ‘A’ and Type ‘B’ Personality**

This describes two common, contrasting personality types - the high-strung Type ‘A’ and the easy-going Type ‘B’ as patterns of behaviour that could either raise or lower, respectively, one’s chances of developing coronary heart disease. It was originally published in the 1950s. Though it has been widely controversial in the scientific and medical communities since its publication, the theory has nonetheless persisted, both in the form of pop psychology and in the general lexicon, as a way to describe one’s personality. Such descriptions are still often equated with coronary heart disease or other health issues, and not always as a direct result of the theory.

Type A personality behaviour was first described as a potential risk factor for heart disease in the 1950s by cardiologists Meyer Friedman and Ray Rosenman. After an eight and a half yearlong 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. The individuals enrolled in this study were followed well beyond the original time frame of the study. Subsequent analysis indicated that although Type A personality is associated with the incidence of coronary heart diseases; it does not seem to be a risk factor for mortality. This research had a significant effect on the development of the health psychology field, in which psychologists look at how an individual’s mental state affects his or her physical health. Research has indicated that certain personality traits can make us more vulnerable to stress. People with such traits are known as Type
A personalities. Type A’s tend to be more competitive, more impatient, have time urgency when compared to the more relaxed and laid back Type B personalities. It’s important to realise that we are all a mixture of type A and B personality traits but if we are excessively type A, this can make us more vulnerable to stress. Further, type ‘A’ people can be identified with the following traits, must get things finished, excessively competitive, never late for appointments, cannot listen to conversations, interrupt and finish other’s sentences, always in a hurry, do not like to wait, want everything to be perfect, trying to do more than one thing at a time and very busy at full speed. Further, people with these personality traits hold feelings in, not satisfied with work or life. They usually engage in few social activities and interests, if in employment, will often take work home.

The Type B individuals as a contrast to those with Type A personalities. People with Type B personality by definition generally live at a lower stress level and typically work steadily, enjoying achievement but not becoming stressed when they are not achieved. When faced with competition, they do not mind losing and either enjoy the game or back down. They may be creative and enjoy exploring ideas and concepts. They are often reflective, thinking about the outer and inner worlds. They do not mind leaving things unfinished for a while, calm and unhurried about appointments, can listen and let the other person finish speaking, can express feelings, wait calmly and take one thing at a time, do not mind things not quite perfect, quite satisfied with work/life, engage in many social activities/interests, if in employment, will limit working to work hours. Critics of this theory point to the limitations of the original study comprise the inclusion of only middle-aged men and the
lack of information regarding the diets of those subjects. While the latter could serve as a confounding variable, the former calls into question whether the findings can be generalized to the remaining male population or to the female population as a whole.

It should be noted, however, that Friedman and Rosenman (1959) conducted a randomized controlled trial on 862 male and female post myocardial infarction patients, ruling out (by probabilistic equivalence) diet and other confounds. Subjects in the control group received group cardiac counselling, and subjects in the treatment group received cardiac counselling plus Type-A counselling. The recurrence rate was 28% in the control group and 13% in the treatment group, a strong and statistically significant finding. Some scholars argue that Type A behaviour is not a good predictor of coronary heart disease. According to research by Redford Williams of Duke University, the hostility component of Type A personality is the only significant risk factor. Thus, it is a high level of expressed anger and hostility, not the other elements of Type A behaviour, that constitute the problem.

Allen (1993) states that personality makes people “more prone” or “more resistant” to stress. There are some personal characteristics mentioned below that affect the stress perception state: Self-esteem is an individual’s general feeling of worth. Individuals with high self-esteem have positive feelings about themselves. Individuals with low self-esteem view themselves negatively. People with high self-esteem perform better and are more satisfied with their jobs than those with low self-esteem. “An individual’s generalized belief about internal control (self-control) versus external control (control by the situation or by others)” is called locus of control (Nelson & Quick, 1990,
p. 74). Internals have been found to have higher job satisfaction, higher motivation, having more efforts lead to performance, and less anxiety than externals. Externals are more prone to get stress in organisations. Self-efficacy is an individual’s beliefs and expectancies about his or her ability to accomplish a specific task effectively. Individuals with high self-efficacy believe that they have ability to get things done.

According to Eadie (1975) the personality type most commonly found in the ministry is best described as the helping personality. These types are principally motivated by altruistic ideals and wish to be helpful and concerned. The concept of the helping personality was developed by Eadie (1975) out of a survey of (Church of Scotland) parish ministers.

**Relevance of Counselling in Stress Management**

When the stress of life leads to drug abuse chronic physical ailments or pain, an absence of pleasure or relaxation in life, or when it affects one’s well-being negatively in any way, it may be helpful to meet with a mental health professional or medical doctor to receive treatment for the manifested symptoms of stress and work through the issues causing it. When stress occurs as a result of another condition or an event such as a loss, a divorce, or a life-altering medical diagnosis, therapy can help address these concerns and their other effects on a person’s life. When workplace issues lead to stress, for example, ways to deal with those issues can be explored with the help of a therapist. When stress develops as a result of a family or relationship issue, couples or family therapy may help resolve the issue, leading to a reduction in the levels of stress experienced. People who cope successfully with stress tend to adopt the following strategies (Ackummey, 2003).
Cognitive behavioural Therapy: Cognitive behavioural Therapy is often an effective form of therapy for stress, as the technique can help change negative thought patterns that develop as a result of stress, helping the person in treatment find new ways of thinking about stressful events that may not have such a negative effect. Cognitive therapy makes the assumption that in order to understand client’s feelings or emotional problems it is necessary to concentrate on their cognitive reactions to their problems. The counselor ought to examine the client thought and feelings about him/herself, about others, the external world and the future. Ackummey (2003). Akinade (2005) defined cognitive therapy as an approach and set of procedures that attempts to change feelings and behavior by modifying faulty thinking and believing. Cognitive therapy emphasizes the importance of thinking in human behavior and holds that thinking causes people to feel and act the way they do (Austad, 2009).

Stimulate control technique: When stress of life leads to excessive drinking, smoking the counselor helps the counselee to identify those things, events, or thought that makes him behave in that excessive manner and finds way of eliminating them. Those identified things, situations are the stimulus and the strategies adopted to eliminate them are the controls.

Relaxation Technique: Relaxation helps us deal with tense muscles that cause aches, pain and fatigue. One way to relax is to lie down or sit comfortably. Breathe deeply while you tense and then relax groups of muscles. Reading a book, gardening, visiting, talking with friends, listening to music, going for a walk, playing a game, etc. can be relaxing.
Another relaxation technique is “progressive relaxation” developed by Dr. Edmund Jacobson in the 1930s. The Jacobson technique involves activities tensing and then relaxing different muscle groups in order to increase awareness of both tension and relaxation with this training, stress can be recognized early and counteracted with a relaxed state.

**Controlled breathing:** Rapid breathing is part of the stress reaction and becomes a vicious cycle. “Over-breathing” causes the body automatically to activate regulatory mechanisms that can cause stress-like symptoms, including light − headedness, dizziness. Ackummey emphasized that, to deal with stress-related sequence of symptoms, individuals can be thought to pace their respiratory rate.

**Cognitive restructuring:** Cognitive restructuring is another technique that can be employed to combat stress. Cognitive restructuring assumes that stress commonly results from negative patterns of thinking. To help a client to think more realistically and positively about stressors can help reduce and finally eliminate stress completely. Croucher (1982) like Ackummey emphasized that, clients who want to reduce stress must improve their self-attitudes, learn a healthy assertiveness. For example clients must learn to say “No” without apology. Clients combating stress must help to know what their gifting’s are, what their limit are, and must be bold to face their fears, above all they must avoid state of helplessness. Counselor must help clients to develop the attitude of growth.

**Social support:** Ackummey and Croucher suggested that counselors can encourage their clients to join small support prayer groups. Ministry peers will better understand your needs; a cross − denominational group will
enhance trust and provide other spiritual directions Ackummey emphasis “over faith and trust in God becomes our hope and prayer and scripture reading can become a basis for coping” (Ackummey, 2003 p.132). We need to understand that religion must not become a way by which one can passively wait on for instant solution.

Ackummey (2003) examined Christian client’s expectations regarding prayer in counseling and found that 82% of clients desired available prayer in counseling. They preferred that counselors introduce the subject of prayer in counseling. Tan (2007) illustrated how prayer and scripture reading can be explicitly be used in Christian cognitive – behavioral therapy (CBT).

He stressed that intercessory prayer and scripture have the strongest effects on the cognitive symptoms of depression. Once again counselors must be careful not to abuse their use as therapist.

**Exercise:** Exercise provides a way of discharge tension, resulting in heightened feeling at well-being (Ackummey, 2003). Crouchers also pointed out that three to four times a week by walk, swim, play tennis, prepare and regularly breathe deeply will prevent acute stress. Exercise and sleep help reduces adrenal arousal.

**Time management:** Managing time is refusing to take too much and learning to say “No” or wait are valuable ways of reducing stress Morelli (2005) says that effective diverse time periods. Research has shown that persons function on various time cycles, some of these cycles occur within a day, others daily and some seasonally.
Age Difference in the Sources of Stress Among Ministers of the Gospel

According to Woolston (2015), at any age, stress is a part of life. Young and old alike have to face difficult situations and overcome obstacles. While young adults struggle to establish a career, achieve financial security, or juggle work and family demands, older people may face failing health or dwindling finances or simply the challenges of retaining their independence. Unfortunately, the body's natural defenses against stress gradually break down with age. But you don't have to give in to stress just because you're no longer young. Aldwin, Sutton, Chiara and Spiro (1996) conducted a study and state that controversies exist concerning the influence of age on the stress and management process, partly due to differences in methods across studies. They examined age differences in stress and coping, using both semi structured interview questions and a management checklist in middle-aged, young-old, and old-old men. Despite extensive probing, nearly a quarter of the old-old reported having had no problems and they expended less management effort even when they did have problems. The types of problems reported varied systematically with age. Middle-aged men were more likely to appraise their problems both as challenges and as annoyances than the older men. Different age patterns emerged from the management of stress interviews verses the checklists, but controlling for type of problem significantly attenuated age differences. However, there were no age differences in perceived stressfulness of the problem and management of stress efficacy. One interpretation of these results is that the nature of stress changes with age, from episodic to chronic, which in turn affects stress level of individual and management processes.
Gender Difference in the Sources of Stress Among Ministers of the Gospel

In empirical research, many scholars have examined the role of gender in individuals’ experiences of stress, social support, optimism, and psychological health. Many stress and psychological health studies have found that female ministers of the gospel tend to have higher levels of stress and psychological health symptoms than male ministers of the gospel. For example, Asberg (2008) indicated that women had higher levels of stress than men in their sample of surveys collected from 1983, 2006, and 2009. Asberg further found that in their sample of undergraduate males had lower levels of stress, anxiety, and depression than undergraduate females ($N = 239$). Asberg and colleagues suggested that stress and negative emotions may be more readily acceptable for females than for males. In addition, scholars have suggested that the gender socialization process of encouraging males to be more independent and responsible and females to be more dependent on others could influence how males and females respond to stressful events (Dedovic, 2009). Lavoie and Douglas (2012) conducted a metric and scalar invariance across gender in both community and psychiatric samples. They explained that prior literature has found females to have higher mean scores than males, but that in their study the stress measure operated in an equivalent manner across males and females. Thus, they mentioned that gender differences on mean scores are not explained by measurement bias but more due to “true gender differences arising from alternate social, biological, or psychological influences” (p. 56) and demonstrate the role gender plays in individuals’ experiences of stress. Allen and Stoltenberg (1995) also found in their study of college students that women had significantly higher mean scores of kin and
non kin supports as well as satisfaction with supports than men \((N = 182)\). Barbee (1993) described that gender roles ascribed to female ministers of the gospel, such as providing nurturance and expressing emotions openly, may allow them to seek and obtain social support more than male ministers of the gospel who are encouraged to be autonomous and in control of emotions. Chang, Sanna and Yang (2003) also only reported the sample size of males and females in their study and did not conceptualize or empirically test how individuals’ gender may play out in the experience of optimism, pessimism, positive and negative affect, and psychological adjustment. Only a few studies have tested levels of optimism across gender and there have been mixed results. Chang, Sanna, and Yang (2003) also noted in their study that, the only study that looked at 45 optimism across gender for college students, found no significant differences between male and female college students on optimism \((N = 163)\). In a sample of rural adolescents \((N = 193)\), Puskar (2010) discovered that males had significantly higher mean scores than females. Past literature has shown the need for future research to incorporate a holistic and detailed understanding of the stress and management process among female ministers of the gospel and male ministers of the gospel on a conceptual and empirical level.

Bittman and Wajcman (2000), Zani and Pietrantoni (2001) into stress suggests some differences in the way that males and females experience and deal with occupational stress. Further mentioned that until fairly recently research into occupational stress focussed mainly upon men. Research focussing on the stress experience of women in the workplace is now commencing. Lim and Teo (1996) found that female occupational stress was
related to either overt or subtle discrimination at an organisational or personal level. In addition, they suggested that female ministers of the gospel were more likely to name stress arising from the work-home interface. The stress arising from the juggling of home and work life emerges as problematic for women in many studies (Davidson and Cooper, 1983 cited in Fielden & Cooper, 2001). Further to this, Posig and Kickul’s (2004) findings show that although the work-family balance is an issue for both male and females, women are at a far higher risk of role overload than men. Frankenhaesur (1989 cited in Irvine, 1997) undertook a gender comparison study using both biomedical and social indices. He discovered that in contrast to male workers, the stress levels of women workers increased substantially at the end of the day.

**Gender Difference in the Management of Stress Among Ministers of the Gospel**

Just as there are gender differences in the experiencing of stress, there is research suggesting the existence of gender differences relating to dealing with stress. Research conducted by Watson and Sinha (1998) suggests that ‘gender may be a possible moderating variable in the relationship between stress and coping behaviour.’ The results of the study point to males tending toward isolation and suppression as coping mechanisms and females toward altruism. In commenting on these results Watson and Sinha (1998) say that the differences may reflect cultural expectations that males will withdraw and that females will act in a helpful and nurturing way. Although Watson and Sinha point to culture as a mediating influence on the behaviour of males and females in the face of stress, the earlier mentioned research by (Taylor, 2000).
Contradictory results regarding gender differences about coping strategies have been reported Matud (2004). Matud again reported women scoring significantly higher than men on emotional and avoidant coping, while also suffering from more stress. Different coping strategies, such as destructive coping and constructive coping, have been discussed in studies involving police personnel (He, 2002; Patterson, 2003). Hughes’ (1989) study of Australian Clergy identified the support gained from meeting with other clergy as significant for a majority of the informants (68%). The same study identified that the area for further training that clergy are most likely to name as important is the area of ‘people skills.’ This included counselling, psychology, pastoral care, marriage counselling and youth work. Australian NCLS research of 1996 suggested that the most common method for clergy dealing with stress was speaking to someone (Kaldor & Bullpitt, 2001). The two most significant categories for such conversation were spouse and ministerial colleagues. In Pryor’s (1986) Victorian study amongst UCA clergy, 57% of informants named their spouse as the most significant source of support. The research concluded that meaningful interaction is an antidote to loneliness and that interactive clergy who are intentional about connecting with colleagues and others have greater levels of enjoyment and job satisfaction.

Ministerial Engagement Differences in Stress Among Ministers of the Gospel

In England, Miles and Bell (2012) reported in their study that despite the fact that both full time and part time ministers of the gospel were all exposed to stress, difference existed in their experience of stress. Their study
which was conducted in the rural congregations in the United States of America revealed that full time ministers of the gospel experienced much stress than part time ministers of the gospel. The study used recent data from United Methodist Church clergy in North Carolina to test extant depictions of ministers of the gospel engagement with the congregation. It was found that full time clergy engaged in several unique activities which posed several stress to them than part time clergy.

Cornick (1998) drew attention to significant changes in the statistical profile when reviewing the first two decades of the United Reformed Church. According to Cornick, between 1972 and 1995 there was a reduction in congregation of 49% from 200,000 to 102,000 and a reduction in ministers of the gospel of 56% from 1841 to 813. However, the reduction in the number of buildings over the same period was much less severe; here there was a reduction of 15% from 2080 to 1784. Brierley (2005) noted that these trends continued to follow the same pattern over the next five-year period. In 2000, congregation had declined further to 92,787, 46% of the number recorded in 1972. In 2000 there were 750 ministers of the gospel, 41% of the number recorded in 1972. Commenting on ways in which these statistics could be interpreted, Cornick (1998) suggested that, maintaining the front-line of mission with a falling ratio of congregation to churches has caused difficulties in providing ministry for all churches, and the denomination still struggles to find an appropriate pattern of ministry which is both responsive to its own needs yet also ecumenically responsible.
Summary of Literature Review

The review of literature has dealt with theoretical related literature, conceptual issues, and the empirical related literature. From the review of literature, it is evident that there are many sources of occupational stress. These include emotional burnout, exhaustion, detachment, fatigue, and detachment; emotional exhaustion which can result in diminished interest in work, fatigue, and detachment; depersonalization(which can result in diminished contact with co-workers, and the public) self-absorption, negative attitude, towards others as well as dissatisfaction, or the perception of unsatisfactory personal accomplishment, which can also result in feelings of failure, fatalism, diminished competence, and incapacity to respond to further environmental demands.

There are several theories that have been proposed to explain the sources and the development of occupational stress. Psychological model of occupational stress is one of such theories that identifies personality and organisational factors as the major sources of stress.

Personality has always been considered a major mediator of stress reactivity. That is, although certain events are regarded as normatively stressful, sensitivity to stressors varies between individuals. That is, individuals with different personalities will respond similarly to physical threats, but different responses to ego threats are related to personality differences. Again, most theories of occupational functioning agree that personality makes a significant contribution to performance and well-being, while acknowledging that the relationship between personality and environmental factors is dynamic and complex. Sociologists who propounded
the sociological model of occupational stress argue that for every occupational illness or stress, there are physiological and ergonomic components whose effects are mediated by the social environment. What has been the case for occupational stress is that while gaining recognition that such conditions are public issues, solutions continue to be sought in the individual. The major contribution of sociological approaches to occupational stress and illness is that occupational health and safety has increasingly become an industrial relation issue between capital and labour. Research observed that an individual’s personal characteristics interacted with their work environment to determine strain, and consequently behaviour and health. This concept was developed into the Person – Environment Fit model, which suggests that the match between a person and the work environment is key in influencing their health.

Among the clergy, research suggests that occupational stress appears to be a source of family stress among pastors. From the literature reviewed it was discovered that portions of scripture, their interpretation and practice poses stress on ministers of the gospel.

In the management of stress among ministers’ research reveals that ministers are able to lean on other components of scripture and prayer to reduce the effect of stress on them. Another research suggested that one source of stress among ministers of the gospel is that they set unrealistic high task standards. Anything short of complete success is perceived as failure. This become a source of clergy stress.

To reduce stress is to make a list of task priorities. Time-task management involves integrating tasks into the cycles for maximum
effectiveness. This kind of integration involves prudence, good judgment and discernment. Research however, suggested that a good start would be to list task priority according to category such as church, family and personal categories. The next chapter presents the research methods used for the study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter discusses the design of the research, the population, sampling techniques and research instrument. It also present data collection procedures and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

The quantitative descriptive survey design was used for the study. This enabled me to collect information on the current state of source of stress and its management strategies among minister of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis. Descriptive survey design seeks to explore and describe events as they are.

Descriptive design helped me to explore from ministers of the gospel the sources of stress. Again, I also elicited responses regarding the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis. The descriptive research design was deemed best for the study because, according to Cohen, Morrison and Manion (2004), in descriptive survey design, researchers gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared. Also, the descriptive survey helps to deal, essentially, with questions concerning what exists with respect to variables or prevailing conditions in a situation (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990). As recommended by Leedy and Omrod (2010), this method is suitable for purposes of making generalisations from a sample
to a population so that inferences could be made about the characteristics, opinions, attitudes and past experiences of the population. Descriptive survey design provides a more accurate and meaningful picture of an event or phenomenon and seeks to explain people’s perception and behaviour on the basis of data gathered at a particular time (Frankel & Wallen, 1993). Comparatively, other research designs such as case study, experimental and historical surveys would not have been appropriate to use for this study looking at the stated objectives and the time period for the study (Babbie, 2005). I wanted to know from ministers of the gospel the sources of stress and its management strategies. So, the design was appropriate for me to elicit information from ministers of the gospel concerning sources of stress and management strategies.

But the design is not totally devoid of bias. The design makes use of deductive reasoning and sometimes getting a sufficient number of questionnaire which will be used is problematic. Confidentiality is also a primary weakness of the design. Often subjects are not truthful as they feel the need to skew their responses to a desired result of the study. Osuola (2001) in buttressing the points on the weaknesses of the descriptive research, pointed out that, “designing a quality investigation requires particular attention to two central factors: appropriate sampling procedures, and precision in defining terms in eliciting information” (p. 201). He continued by adding that, while descriptive research is a prerequisite for finding answers to questions, it is not in itself sufficiently comprehensive in providing answers and that it cannot also provide cause-and-effect relationships.
Notwithstanding these challenges, the design remains the best and most appropriate for this study.

**Population**

The target population for this study was 500 pastors serving in the Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. This population involved pastors who attend the monthly meetings of their various denominations, Pastors at Ghana Evangelism Committee and Pentecostal Council conferences, as well as individual independent Charismatic church pastors in their local churches.

**Table 1: Population Distribution of Number of Pastors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatics</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

**Sample and Sampling Procedure**

A sample size of 217 ministers of the gospel were used for the study. The sample size was obtained with the help of the Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) formula for determining sample size. According to Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970), a population of 500 has a corresponding sample size of 217.

The proportionate sampling procedure was used to compute the number of respondents from each of the denomination. Proportionate sampling procedure is a method for gathering participants for a study, used when the population is composed of several subgroups that are vastly different in
number. The number of participants from each subgroup is determined by their number relative to the entire population, thus mathematically:

\[
\frac{\text{Total population of a school}}{\text{Total population of all the school}} \times \text{Sample size}.
\]

Table 2- Sample Distribution of Number of Pastors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
<th>Number of Pastors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>(\frac{106}{500} \times 217)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>(\frac{157}{500} \times 217)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatics</td>
<td>(\frac{237}{500} \times 217)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

The convenience sampling procedure was used to select respondents for the study. Here, respondents who were convenient to the researcher during the time of data gathering were used for the study. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) noted that convenient sampling involved choosing the nearest individuals to serve as respondents and continuing that process until the required sample size was obtained. The purposive sampling procedure was employed to also ensure that pastors from the various categories in terms of type of church, age of pastors, sex of pastors as well as size of congregation were selected. In all, a total number of 217 pastors were selected for the study.

Instrument

A questionnaire was used to collect the data. This instrument was self-designed. The reasons why questionnaire was employed in this study was that according to Gay (1987) it is much more efficient than an interview procedure in that, it requires less time, it is less expensive, and permits collection of data
from a much larger sample. To Gordor, Akar and Howard (2006), questionnaires are less expensive than other methods such as interview and observation. Also, the use of questionnaires in this research promised a wider coverage since respondents could be approached more easily, establish rapport with them, explain the purpose of the study and clarify individual items.

In addition, questionnaires provided a standard procedure for collecting primary data that are comparable, irrespective of who collected them. The use of questionnaires also enhanced the accuracy of recording and made data processing easier. The use of questionnaires was especially useful as it ensured anonymity allowing the respondent the freedom to express their views without being identified. However, one disadvantage of questionnaires is the possibility of low response rate. The questionnaire was in three parts. The first part has 10 items which was used to collect demographic data of respondents. Under this part the data included age, gender of participants, educational/pastoral background, marital status and church denomination and number of years served. Part two of the questionnaire elicited responses on sources, and coping strategies of stress. The items in part two for the questionnaire were structured along the line of a four-point Likert-type scale. Options on the scale ranged from 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree and 4=Strongly agree.

The questionnaire contained 38 items and was in three parts. The first part contained ten (10) items on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The second part contained twelve (12) items for sources of stress among ministers whiles the third part had fifteen (15) items for stress management strategies.
Both the second and third parts were of four-point Likert scale type. According to Best and Khan (1989), the Likert scale type enables respondents to indicate the degree of their beliefs or feelings about a given statement or object. With the four-point Likert scale, respondents are requested to say whether they strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or are undecided with each statement as an indication of their perception towards the object of inquiry.

**Validity and Reliability of the Instrument**

To ensure content validity of the instrument used, the questionnaire was given to my supervisors for scrutiny, since content validity is determined by expert judgment. Apart from this, a pre-test was conducted in order to determine reliability of the instrument. The pastors who participated in the pre-testing were selected from all the three denominations. Some grammatical errors were made in the instrument but on the whole the instrument was deemed effective to undertake the intended study. In this direction, the questionnaires were administered to 40 pastors in the Greater Accra Region. The Cronbach alpha value was 0.76. Kline (1999) opines that after calculating the Cronbach alpha value, if it is found to be 0.70 or above, then the instrument is reliable.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The data collection was done by the researcher and two trained research assistants. As a form of in-service training for the research assistants, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to them and took them through the questionnaire to ensure that they understood all the items on the questionnaire. The researcher obtained an introductory letter from the Head,
Department of Educational Foundations, University of Cape Coast, to the district heads of the church denominations for permission to collect the data among their ministers. The pastors were briefed on the purpose of the study and the items on the questionnaire were explained to them. Questionnaires were completed and picked up the same day ensuring a hundred percent return rate. The data collection process lasted for three weeks.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis was done with the aid of the Statistical Product for Service Solution (SPSS) version 21.0. Data on personal profiles of respondents were analysed using frequencies and percentages. Data on research questions 1 and 2 were analysed using frequencies. Hypotheses 3, 4, 9 and 10 were tested with the use of independent samples t-test. Hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were tested with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at significance level 0.05.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussions of findings. The purpose of the study was to investigate the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis and management strategies used by them. Ten hypotheses were postulated to guide the conduct of the study.

The analysis is in these sections. Section A is the Biodata and section B covers results and discussions.

Personal Profile of Respondents

This section presents the background information of respondents. The items include name of denomination, gender, age, marital status, number of children, educational level, level of ministerial training, type of ministerial engagement, rank in ministry and number of years in ministry. The results are shown in Tables 3 to 11.

Table 3- Denomination Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatics</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Table 3 shows that 48.0% were Charismatics pastors while 21.0% were Orthodox pastors.
Table 4 presents gender of pastors involved in the study.

Table 4- Gender Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

From Table 4 the majority of the respondents were males 89.9% while 10.1% were females. The results therefore showed that more male pastors dominated in the study than female pastors. This shows that pastoral works in all the denominational groupings are male dominated.

Table 5 presents the age distribution of respondents involved in the study

Table 5- Age Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 29 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 40 years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2016)

In terms of age distribution of respondents, Table 5 shows that the 30 to 40 age brackets were in the majority 35.5%. The 41 to 50 age brackets 28.1%, the above 50 years’ group 24.9%, and those below 30 years 11.5% followed in that order. Probably age was a determining factor when it comes
to ministry work. As many denominations think that ministry is for matured individuals. This may probably be the reason why below 29 years’ bracket appears to be in the minority. Having 30 to 40 age group to be in majority may also mean that churches are engaging relatively young people in ministry which suggest that the future of the denominations may be bright since this age group are likely to work for more years before retirement. The 41 to 50 and above 50 years’ group also suggest that these experienced ministers in the metropolis may help mentor the younger ones to help the church grow from strength to strength.

Table 6 presents the marital status distribution involved in the study.

Table 6- Distribution of Respondents based on Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Table 6 shows that those who were married were more 74.2% followed by those who were single 23%, the widowed 1.8%, and the divorced 0.9% respectively in terms of marital status. This may mean that probably marriage is required for most of the church denominations for entering into ministry. It is therefore possible that apart from the one church who mostly find themselves among the charismatic groups most of the ministries in the
orthodox and the Pentecostal churches may require marrying before active ministry, in order to stand in the position of handling marital issues in the church.

Table 7 presents the number of children distribution of respondents involved in the study.

Table 7- Distribution of Respondents based on Numbers of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No child</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

The results from Table 7 showed that, majority of the respondents 64.5% had between 1 child and 3 children, followed by 20.7% who had between 4 – 6 children, 0.5% had more than six children while 14.3% had no child. Ministries with 1 -3 children probably maybe as a result of the fact that ministers in the Cape Coast metropolis are well informed about effective ways of planning one’s family. It may also imply that most ministers are still in the process of giving birth and so it may be wrong to conclude that they have less number of children. Ministers with no children may not necessarily mean they are barren but probably are newly married and have not yet started having children. Others may also be trusting God for issues.
Table 8 presents the education level distribution of respondents involved in the study.

Table 8- Distribution of Respondents based on Highest Level of Ministerial Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Ministry</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Ministry</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Theology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree in Theology</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Table 8 shows that, 4.6% of the respondents had the highest level of ministerial training (doctorate) with 20.7% having the lowest (certificate in ministry). However, those who had diploma in theology were in the majority 26.3% followed by those with certificate in ministry. This probably may imply that, most of the ministerial training programmes have their basic training as diploma in theology; these may be the reason for having the majority of the ministers in this category. Having 18.0% of pastors with degree in theology and 10.6% having master’s degree is an indication that ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis are working hard to improve their status in education. This is likely to enhance their performance and also boost their self-esteem. Roberts, Flannelly, Weaver and Figley (2003) identified self-
esteem as one source of stress among pastors. This agrees with this finding that as ministers aspire for higher education their self-esteem could be raised for effective work in their field.

Table 9 shows the ministerial engagement distribution of respondents involved in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Engagement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Table 9 shows that majority 57.1% of the ministers were engaged in full time ministry. In a research conducted by Fuller institute of church growth among 1000 Pastors, Beebe (1991) indicated that, many pastors are expected to be chief executive officers of their congregations as well as their spiritual guides and to participate in all church activities. This submission seems to agree to the finding of this research, giving why majority of the ministers in the Cape Coast metropolis are in full time ministry. However, a significant number is seen as part time. This may probably mean they are assistant pastors whose role would be to assist their senior ministers.

Table 10 presents rank in ministry distribution of respondents involved in the study.
Table 10- Distribution of Respondents based on Rank in Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Fr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Rev</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Table 10 shows the rank of the respondents in ministry. It was found that 7.8% were evangelist, 30.9% pastors, 6.5% Apostles and 4.6% were prophets. Also the results of the study revealed that 0.9% were bishops, 41.5% were Reverend, 1.8% were Reverend fathers, 0.9% were Rt. Reverend while 5.1% had other ranks. Ranks among ministers differ from denomination to denomination. In the orthodox churches titles like bishop, Rt. Rev. and Rev. Fr. are used whilst in the Pentecostal setting Rev. is used by the majority. Apostle title is used in some denominations to signify a higher position. In Ghana Pastor is generally used to represent ministers of the gospel in many churches and so the ranks may not necessarily mean one is higher in title than the other.
Table 11 presents years in ministry distribution of respondents involved in the study.

**Table 11 - Distribution of Respondents based on Years in Ministry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Ministry</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 yr.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yrs.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 yrs.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>217</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

The years the respondents had served in ministry were assessed. This data is presented in Table 11. It showed that the minority of the ministers 7.8% had served for less than one year, the majority 29 percent had served for between a year and five. However, 20.7 percent had served for between 6 – 10 years, 12% for between 11 – 15 years, 16.6% had served for 16 – 20 years while 13.8% had served for more than 20 years. This data shows that the Cape Coast metropolis is blessed with both experienced and inexperienced ministers. This probably may mean that most of the ministers might have been transferred from other regions quite recently. The finding could also mean that there are other denominations who do not transfer their ministers easily. Having a blend of ministers serving for longer years in the metropolis could facilitate mentoring to enhance growth in ministry among the younger ones as well as newly transferred ministers to the metropolis.
Research Question One

What are the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis?

The purpose of research question one was to find out the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Respondents were requested to respond to twenty-two (22) items. A four-point likert scale, ‘strongly agree’ (4), ‘agree’ (3), ‘disagree’ (2), and ‘strongly disagree’ (1) was associated with the items outlined on the questionnaire.

Two hundred and seventeen ministers of the gospel provided responses and the results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12- Analysis of Results of Sources of Stress among Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Sources of Stress</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inadequate financial support from the congregation</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizing Church programmes</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not getting required Support from Church Leaders</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Insufficient resources</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meeting expectations of the congregation</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Managing Church Projects</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Congregation not growing</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Financial demand from the head office</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meeting Schedules</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conflict between home and work demands</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparing for Sermons</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Having only Little support from</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 shows that the most predominant source of stress among ministers of the gospel was “Inadequate financial support from the congregation” (M= 3.10, SD= 2.12). Finances tend to cushion the affairs of activities that ministers embark on. Hence, ministers of the gospel whose congregation is not financially sound would create stress related issues for such ministers. These findings are in line with the study conducted by Croucher (1982) on stress and burnout in ministers. In his study he identified anxiety over financial problems as a major source of stress among ministers of the gospel.

Ministers of the gospel financial strength in one way or the other is dependent upon the financial strength of the congregation. This is in the sense that, the tithe and offerings paid by the congregation are used to pay ministers of the gospel. Hence, it is believed that congregation whose financial
disposition is weak will have an adverse effect on the minister in charge as well. The finding is supported by research finding of Price (2001) which stated that clergy salaries are a significant source of emotional and somatic (bodily) stress. He added that pastors’ salaries have been relatively flat for two decades. Low salaries, as we all know, represent a large decrease in purchasing power. The special reference made to support from the congregation suggests most of the pastors’ salaries and other remunerations are determined by the congregation. This may mean that the same resource supposed to be used for running the administration and the church project is used to pay salaries and other benefits of the minister. Beebe (2007) identifies the professional engagement theory as the main cause of burnout; the imbalance between what individuals give to their job and what they receive in return. If ministerial career is characterized with a 24-hour engagement, then one may expect to receive a return that matches with whatever they put in and if that is not forth coming could result in real stress.

Followed next by “Organising Church programmes” (M= 3.0968, SD=0.80210). This finding is consistent with the findings of Roberts, Flannelly, Weaver and Figley (2003) which revealed that one major source of pastors’ stress was “be-at-the-church syndrome”. Pastors who over-burdened themselves with organizing numerous church programmes experienced a lot of stress. Why pastors will have to over- burden themselves with numerous church programmes raises a lot of questions in the mind of the researcher. This probably may mean competition among ministers, with new churches coming up in the metropolis. It may be very challenging for churches to loose members without coming up with different types of programmes: this may be
one reason why pastors stress themselves up in programme organisation. It may also mean a strategy to prevent members of their congregation from attending various prayer programmes organized by some prophets across the length and the breath of the country and thereby stressing pastors up.

The third source of stress was “Not getting required Support from Church Leaders” (M=2.71, SD=0.91). This finding is consistent with the findings of Morelli (2005) who stated that an aspect of the work environment that may pose stress is a lack of support from supervisors or immediate line managers. The result of the analysis confirmed the study conducted by Le Blanc et al (2000) which state that lack of social relations at work accounted for job related stressors. He further opined that low social support and low participation could be stressful. Respondents indicated that insufficient resources (eg: tools, technology and funds) is one of their major sources of stress. These findings are again, in line with Halbeslesben (2006) which state that major environmental resources can reduce stress and burnout as well as enhancing positive well-being.

The least sources of stress among ministers of the gospel included the following: “My gender puts stress on me” (M=1.95, SD=0.99). This ranked 22nd“Problems with my spouse” (M=2.22, SD=1.10), ranked 21st and, “My ill-health” (M=2.41, SD=1.03), ranked 20th. That “My gender puts stress on me” was the least source of stress for ministers of the gospel suggests that gender is not a significant source of stress for ministers in the Cape Coast metropolis.
Research Question Two

What are the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel?

Research question two was to find out the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Respondents were requested to respond to sixteen (16) items. A four-point likert scale, ‘strongly agree’ (4), ‘agree’ (3), ‘disagree’ (2), and ‘strongly disagree’ (1) was associated with the items outlined on the questionnaire.

Two hundred and seventeen ministers of the gospel provided responses and the results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13- Analysis of Results of Stress Management Strategies among Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Stress Management Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Delegating duties to others</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Employing good time management strategies</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reading the Bible</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Having quality sleep everyday</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Exercising Regularly</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Good Leadership skills</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Seeking counselling from professional counselors</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Taking annual leave</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Singing songs of praise</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress Management Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td><strong>Stress Management Seminars</strong></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing daily schedules of work</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Adequate resources available</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Confiding in spouse</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Confiding in friends</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, (2016)

The results in Table 13 revealed that the most used stress management strategy among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis was “Delegating duties to others” (M= 3.19, SD= .75 ranked 1st). It was closely followed by “Employing good time management strategies” (M= 3.15, SD=0.71 ranked 2nd). With regard to time management skills, Turkel and Leblebici (2001) demonstrated that time management is the most efficient method to balance activities. Time management skills can help employees make the most effective and efficient use of time. According to Morelli (2005), learning to say “No” or wait are valuable ways to manage time, and this can go a long way in reducing stress. The third ranked management strategy, was “Bible reading” (M=3.14, SD=79). Tan (2007) illustrated how prayer and scripture reading can explicitly be used in Christian cognitive – behavioral therapy (CBT) in reducing stress which agrees with the findings of this study. Although in this study prayer ranked 7th it still gives a strong indication that it is a very effective means by which individuals who lean on its support can have a real relief from stress. This finding agrees with the earlier researcher like Ackummey (2003), who stressed that intercessory prayer and scripture have the strongest effects on the cognitive symptoms of
depression. Miller (2011) identified increased intimacy with God as one of the major stress management strategies. “Having quality sleep everyday” ranked forth with (M= 3.09, SD=.74): This finding is also in line with the findings of Ackummey (2003), which identified sleep and relaxation as very effective way to reduce stress. “Exercising regularly “ranked 5th (M= 3.07, SD=.73): Exercise as indicated by many research, provides a way of discharging tension, resulting in heightened feeling at well-being (Ackummey, 2003). Croucher (1982) also pointed out that three to four times a week by walk, swim, play tennis, prepare and regularly breathe deeply will prevent acute stress. Exercise and sleep help reduce adrenal arousal. The management strategy that came out to be the least among the ministers happened to be “Confiding in friends” (M= 2.31, SD=.83): this implies that ministers of the gospel resort least to confiding in friends for the purpose of managing their stress. This finding somehow, disagreed with the findings of Kowalski (2000) who focused more on social resiliency especially for seeking input from others. He believes that a trusted person may see new ways to deal with the situations, because in his view no one can deal with all life’s stresses alone. He emphasised more on the establishment of Unions and social support groups to help decrease stress levels. The less use of “confiding in friends” by ministers to manage stress appears to be out of the ordinary/a misnomer since most research findings support the use of friends as one of the best and most frequently used strategy people resort to when they are most stressed. The observation suggests the ministers might not have built or developed enough friendship with either members of their congregation, those in the community or colleagues because of unfamiliarity with people around them. This
condition normally arises when one is newly posted to a new station/location and requires time to develop trust in their newly found friends in the new location.

**Hypothesis One**

H₀: There is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

The purpose of research hypothesis one was to find out the significant difference that existed in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted and the result is presented in Table 14.

**Table 14- ANOVA Test of Sources of Stress among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>41.265</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.468</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to investigate whether difference existed in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age. The results are shown in Table 14. The p-value was .591 (p>0.05) with an F-value of 527. This implies that there is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis on the basis of age. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis
which states that, there is a significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis on the bases of age was rejected. This however suggests that the age of ministers in the Cape Coast Metropolis did not pose stress to them. This probably may mean that because majority of them according to the demographic result of this study were between the 30- 40 age bracket and may be zealously working hard in order to achieve their ministry goals, could be the reason why their age may not pose stress to them. Age of ministers could probably lead to stress in situations where their retirement is almost due and have most of their goals not achieve especially financial goals. This may imply that as the individual minister gets near to his or her retirement age without adequate resources to support self and family could pose stress as stated by Beasley- Murray (1995) financial difficulties is one source of stress among ministers of the gospel. Minsters who are near retirement without adequate financial resources are likely to experience psychological or emotional stress.

**Hypothesis Two**

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

$H_1$: There is a significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age.

Research hypothesis two tested whether significant difference existed in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted at 0.05 level of significance and the result is presented in Table 15.
Table 15- ANOVA Test of Stress Management Strategies among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>37.562</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.705</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 15 that the F – value of .270 was not significant because the α value of .847 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Two which stated that “there is no significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of age” was accepted. In other words, age of ministers of the gospel makes no difference in the stress management strategies. Hence, both younger and older ministers of the gospel managed stress equally. The revelation of this hypothesis could be attributed to the fact that probably, ages of ministers of the gospel did not defined the stress management strategies that could be used to manage stress. Stress management strategies that would be employed by young ministers would also be adopted by old minister since they all engaged in the same ministerial works. Hence ministers of the gospel having the same experience in terms of management of stress regarding age. The finding of hypothesis two is in agreement with previous findings of Aldwin, Sutton, Chiara and Spiro (1996) who conducted a study and state that controversies exist concerning the influence of age on the stress management strategies. They examined age differences in coping with stress using both semi structured interview questions and a management checklist in young and old
ministers of the gospel. Despite extensive probing, nearly a quarter of the old reported having had no problems and they expended less management effort even when they did have problems. Young aged ministers were more likely to appraise their problems both as challenges and as annoyances than the older ministers.

The findings of Woolston (2015) on a study of stress management strategies however, reported that at any age, stress is a part of life. Young and old ministers alike have to face difficult situations and overcome obstacles. It was found that while young ministers struggle to establish a career, achieve financial security, or juggle work and family demands, older ministers may face failing health or dwindling finances or simply the challenges of retaining their independence.

**Hypothesis Three**

H₀: There is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

H₁: There is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

Research hypothesis three determined the significant difference that existed in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender. Independent samples t-test was conducted and the result is presented in Table 16.
Table 16- Independent Samples t-Test of Sources of Stress among Ministers on the Basis of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.571</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 16 that the sources of stress among female ministers of the gospel (M = 2.81, SD = .46) was a little higher than the sources of stress among male ministers of the gospel (M =2.75, SD .44; t (-215) = -.571, p >0.05. Hence, the t-value of -.571 was not significant because the α value of .569 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Three which stated that “there is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender” was accepted. In other words, gender of ministers of the gospel makes no much difference in the sources of stress they have. Hence, both male and female ministers of the gospel experienced almost the same level of stress. On the contrary, most research on female dominated professions like nursing reveal that women go through a lot of stress because work life, however, is not independent from family life. Menzies (1960), opines that stress may result from the combined responsibilities of work, marriage, and child care. Women continue to juggle multiple roles, including those roles related to the home and family, for which the women may have sole or major responsibility. Asberg (2008) examined the role of gender in individuals’ experiences of stress and found that female ministers of the gospel tend to have higher levels of stress.
than male ministers of the gospel. They indicated that women had higher levels of stress than men in their sample of surveys collected from 1983, 2006, and 2009. Asberg (2008) further found that in their sample of undergraduate males had lower levels of stress than undergraduate females ($N = 239$). Asberg and colleagues suggested that stress may be more readily acceptable for females than for males. In addition, scholars have suggested that the gender socialization process of encouraging males to be more independent and responsible and females to be more dependent on others could influence how males and females respond to stressful events (Dedovic, 2009). Lavoie and Douglas (2012) conducted a metric and scalar invariance across gender in both community and psychiatric samples. They explained that prior literature has found females to have higher mean scores than males, but that in their study the stress measure operated in an equivalent manner across males and females. Allen and Stoltenberg (1995) also found in their study of college students that women had significantly higher mean scores of kin and non kin supports as well as satisfaction with supports than men ($N = 182$). Barbee (1993) described that gender roles ascribed to female ministers of the gospel, such as providing nurturance and expressing emotions openly, may allow them to seek and obtain social support more than male ministers of the gospel who are encouraged to be autonomous and in control of emotions. Puskar (2010) discovered that males had significantly higher mean scores than females. Past literature has shown the need for future research to incorporate a holistic and detailed understanding of the stress management process among female ministers of the gospel and male ministers of the gospel on a conceptual and empirical level.
Hypothesis Four

**H₀:** There is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

**H₀:** There is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.

Research hypothesis four tested whether significant difference existed in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender. Independent samples t-test was conducted and the result is presented in Table 17.

Table 17- Independent Samples t-Test of Stress Management Strategies among Ministers on the Basis of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.222</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 17 that the sources of stress management among female ministers of the gospel (M = 3.06, SD = .27) was a little higher than the sources of stress management among male ministers of the gospel (M = 2.933, SD .43; t (-1.222) = 215, p = .223. However, the t – value of -1.222 was not significant because the α value of .223 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Two which stated that “there is no significant difference in stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender” was accepted. In other words, gender of ministers of the gospel makes no difference in the stress management.
strategies. Hence, both male and female ministers of the gospel management stress level were almost equally. These findings were at variance with findings of Watson and Sinha (1998) who conducted a study on gender differences in the management of stress and found out that males tended toward isolation and suppression as coping mechanisms while females tended toward altruism. In commenting on these results Watson and Sinha (1998) say that the differences may reflect cultural expectations that males will withdraw and that females will act in a helpful and nurturing way. Although Watson and Sinha point to culture as a mediating influence on the behaviour of males and females in the face of stress, the earlier mentioned research by (Taylor, 2000).

Contradictory results regarding gender differences about coping strategies have been reported (Matud, 2004). Matud again reported that women scoring significantly higher than men on emotional and avoidant coping, while also suffering from more stress. Different coping strategies, such as destructive coping and constructive coping, have been discussed in studies involving police personnel (He, 2002; Patterson, 2003). Hughes’ (1989) study of Australian Clergy identified the support gained from meeting with other clergy as significant for a majority of the informants (68%). The same study identified that the area for further training that clergy are most likely to name as important is the area of ‘people skills.’ This included counselling, psychology, pastoral care, marriage counselling and youth work. Australian NCLS research of 1996 suggested that the most common method for clergy dealing with stress was speaking to someone (Kaldor & Bullpitt, 2001). The two most significant categories for such conversation were spouse and ministerial colleagues. In Pryor’s (1986) Victorian study amongst UCA
clergy, 57% of informants named their spouse as the most significant source of support. The value of interacting with others is evident in research conducted by (Pryor’s, 1986). The research concluded that meaningful interaction is an antidote to loneliness and that interactive clergy who are intentional about connecting with colleagues and others have greater levels of enjoyment and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis Five**

$H_0$: There is no difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry? (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).

$H_1$: There is a difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry? (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).

The purpose of research hypothesis five was to find out whether significant difference existed in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted and the result is presented in Table 18.

**Table 18- ANOVA Test of Sources of Stress among Ministers on the Basis of Type of Ministry (Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>41.265</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.468</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)
It can be seen in Table 18 that the F-value of .527 was not significant because the significance value of .591 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Five which stated that “There is no difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry” was accepted. In other words, type of ministry of ministers of the gospel makes no difference in the sources of stress they have. Hence, both Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic ministers of the gospel experienced stress equally. The findings of research hypothesis five could be explained as among all the three denominations ministers who participated in the study; the level of stress exposed to them from the three denominations were the same. Perhaps, church members from these three denominations did mount approximately the same amount of stress on their ministers hence ministers of the gospel from the three denominations experiencing the same amount of stress. It could also be that probably ministers of the gospel who participated in the study had almost the same numerical strength in terms of their congregation. Here, the tendency for ministers of the gospel experiencing the same amount of stress is highly guaranteed since the numerical strength of their respective congregations were approximately same.

**Hypothesis Six**

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry. (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).

$H_1$: There is a significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry. (i.e. Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches).
The purpose of research hypothesis six tested the significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry. One-way analysis of variance was conducted at 0.05 level of significance and the result is presented in the Table 19.

Table 19- *ANOVA Test of Stress Management Strategies among Minister on the Basis of Type of Ministry (Orthodox, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35.709</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.276</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 19 that the F – value of 1.697 was not significant because the α value of .186 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Six which stated that “there is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry” was accepted. In other words, type of ministry of ministers of the gospel made no significant difference in the stress management strategies. The findings of hypothesis six could be attributed to the fact that the management of stress strategies are not limited to a particular minister of a denomination. All ministers in all denominations are exposed to stress management strategies and therefore it is expected that ministers of the gospel from all the denominations would manage stress appropriately. That was what the study revealed. It could also be that probably ministers of the gospel occasionally meet to discuss how they could manage
stress. This would make ministers of the gospel to have the same experience with regard to management of stress.

**Hypothesis Seven**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significance difference in the Sources of Stress among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of Years in Ministry.

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significance difference in the Sources of Stress among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of Years in Ministry.

Research hypothesis seven found out whether significant difference existed in the source of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted and the result is presented in Table 20.

Table 20- *ANOVA Test of Sources of Stress among Ministers on the Basis of Years in Ministry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.442</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>39.026</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.468</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 19 that the F – value of 2.641 was not significant because the significance value of .084 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis seven which stated that “difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry” was accepted. In other words, years of ministry of ministers of the gospel made no difference in the sources of stress they had. Hence, all ministers of the gospel experienced stress equally. Ideally, there should have
been significant difference existed in the source of stress regarding years of ministry of ministers of the gospel. A minister of the gospel who had served for more than 20 years should have had appropriate and smart ways of avoiding some stresses than a minister who served for less than 5 years. However, the study results revealed no significant difference. This could be due to the fact that probably ministers of the gospel irrespective of the number of years in ministry did not care about the level of stress they experienced. Hence all ministers of the gospel regarding the number of years served in ministry experienced the same amount of stress.

**Hypothesis Eight**

H$_0$: There is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

H$_1$: There is a significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.

Research hypothesis tested the significant difference that existed in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in the ministry. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted and the results are presented in Table 21.

Table 21- *ANOVA Test of Stress Management Strategies among Ministers on the Basis of Years in Ministry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>34.777</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.276</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)
An analysis of variance was conducted to investigate whether differences existed in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry. Table 21 depicts that with regard to stress management strategies on the basis of years in ministry the P-value was .165 (p>.05) with an F-value of 1.819 as shown in Table 20 implies that there was no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry. These findings corroborate with previous findings of Aldwin, Sutton, Chiara and Spiro (1996) who reported in their study that no years in ministry difference existed in management of stress efficacy. They further mentioned that management of stress is common or same to approximately all ministers of the gospel in terms of numbers of years in ministry. By implication all ministers of the gospel from the three denominations would manage stress the same way albeit the number of years in ministry.

Hypothesis Nine

H₀: There is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministerial engagement.

H₁: There is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministerial engagement.

The purpose of hypothesis nine was to find out whether significant difference existed in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministerial engagement. Independent samples t-test was conducted at 0.05 level of significance and result is presented in Table 22.
Table 22- *Independent Samples t-Test of Sources of Stress among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of type of Ministerial Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial engagement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 22 that the sources of stress among full time ministers of the gospel (M = 2.78, SD = .46) was a little higher than the sources of stress among part time ministers of the gospel (M = 2.70, SD = .39; t (1.266) = .215, p > 0.05. Hence, the t– value of .215 was not significant because the α value of .207 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Nine which stated that “there is no significant difference in the sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement” was accepted. In other words, ministerial engagement of ministers of the gospel made no difference in the sources of stress they experienced. Hence, both full time and part time ministers of the gospel experienced almost the same level of stress. This finding is at variance of research findings of England Miles and Bell (2012) who reported in their study that despite the fact that both full time and part time ministers of the gospel were all exposed to stress, difference existed in their experience of stress. Their study which was conducted in the rural congregations in the United States of America revealed that full time ministers of the gospel experienced much stress than part time ministers of the gospel. The study used recent data from United Methodist Church clergy in North Carolina to test
extant depictions of ministers of the gospel engagement with the congregation. It was found that full time clergy engaged in several unique activities which posed several stress to them than part time clergy.

**Hypothesis Ten**

H₀: There is no significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

Hypothesis ten determined whether significant differences existed in the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement. Independent samples t-test was conducted at 0.05 level of significance and the result is presented in Table 23.

**Table 23- Independent Samples t-Test of Stress Management Strategies Among Ministers of the Gospel on the Basis of Ministerial Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Engagement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, (2016)

It can be seen in Table 23 that the stress management strategies among full time ministers of the gospel (M = 2.97, SD = .40) was a little higher than the sources of stress among part time ministers of the gospel (M =2.89, SD .42; t (1.540) = .215, p >0.05. Hence, the t–value of .215 was not significant because the α value of .207 was larger than 0.05 level of significance. Hence Null Hypothesis Nine which stated that “there is no significant difference in
the stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement” was accepted. In other words, ministerial engagement of ministers of the gospel made no difference in the stress management strategies they experienced. Hence, both full time and part time ministers of the gospel managed stress at the same level. The finding is in line with previous findings of Cornick (1998) who maintained that the ability to manage stress effectively from the perspective of ministers of the gospel (full time) is not different from the part time ministers of the gospel. By implication, with regard to stress management strategies from the perspective of full time ministers of the gospel and part time ministers of the gospel respectively were same.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, findings are highlighted and implications for counselling strained from the findings. Some recommendations are put forward for the consideration of ministers of the gospel and other stakeholders in the profession. Suggestions are also proposed for further research.

Summary

Overview of the Study

The study assessed the sources and management strategies of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. A descriptive survey was employed for the study and a questionnaire used to solicit for respondents’ view with respect to the issue under study. The respondents were sampled using the convenience sample technique. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze research questions on sources and adopted management strategies. The hypotheses were tested with the independent sample t-test and analysis of variance.

Key Findings

1. It was found from the study that the most predominant source of stress among ministers of the gospel was “Inadequate financial support from the congregation”.

2. The study also revealed that the leading way ministers of the gospel managed stress was “delegating duties to others”.
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3. The study indicated that, there is no significant difference in the following targeted areas:

   a. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis on the basis of type of ministry.
   b. Stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of type of ministry.
   c. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis with regards to their ages.
   d. Management of stress among ministers of the gospel in the Cape Coast metropolis with regards to their ages.
   e. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.
   f. Stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of gender.
   g. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.
   h. Stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of years in ministry.
   i. Sources of stress among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.
   j. Stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel on the basis of ministerial engagement.

Conclusions

Stress is part of our everyday life and every individual goes through stress. Whereas unmanaged stress could be problematic for an individual, it is
also a “necessary evil” because a little amount of stress is needed to propel an individual for an activity. Ministers of the gospel who participated in this study indicated that they also go through stress and that there are several of these sources of stress. It could however be concluded that these ministers of the gospel had immense knowledge of how to manage them. It is however not surprising that there were no statistically significant differences in the sources and management strategies of stress with the various categories of ministers of the gospel. This is an interesting development which actually defies the perceptions held by many authors.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are made.

1. The general working conditions of ministers of the gospel should be improved by church governing councils.

2. More seminars, conferences, workshops and symposia are to be organized by church management, to expose ministers of the gospel to the sources of stress and also to sharpen their management skills for stress.

3. Churches should engage the services of professional counsellors who can help ministers to manage their occupational stress.

4. Counsellors in churches should be able to furnish their ministers with comprehensive counselling on effective time management skills.

5. Church counsellors can adopt counselling techniques such as cognitive restructuring to disabuse ministers on wrong thought patterns which result in stressing them.
6. Counsellors in churches should reach out to both young and old ministers of the gospel to offer them with effective ways of managing stress.

7. Ministers should be encouraged to join social support groups with their peers from different denominations so as to share their concerns and engage in prayer for themselves.

**Implications for Counselling**

The study implies that church councils, leadership of ministers of the gospel and stakeholders must be counselled to understand the effects of bad stress on ministers of the gospel in order to put in place appropriate health and safety measures to enable them manage stress effectively.

Individuals who aspire to become ministers of the gospel must be counselled on the realities of the profession before enrolling into it to prevent future regrets and stress.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

1. This study assessed sources of stress and its management strategies among ministers of the gospel in Cape Coast metropolis. The study could be replicated in other regions to find out what persists there.

2. Stress is a very important issue and it is noted that everybody goes through stress. It is therefore suggested that further study should be conducted to look at the effects of stress among ministers of the gospel.

3. The current study revealed ministers of the gospel’s poor engagement in social groups. As a result, a study can be conducted to investigate the relationship between minister’s engagement in social groups and their stress level.
4. Since the current study is quantitative in character, a qualitative study would also help to reveal some deep seated conditions of the ministers of the gospel which the current study could not address.
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INTRODUCTORY LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

UNIVERSITY POST OFFICE
CAPE COAST, GHANA

22nd March, 2016

Dear Rev./Bishop/Apostle,

THESIS WORK
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Please, we introduce to you Rev. Mrs. Janet Anyetey, an M.Phil (Guidance and Counselling) Student from the, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Cape Coast

As part of the requirements for successful completion of the programme, she is expected to work on a thesis entitled:

“Sources of Stress and its Management Strategies among Ministers of the Gospel in Cape Coast Metropolis”.

She has opted to make a study at your establishment for the project. We would be most grateful if you could provide the opportunity for the study. Any information provided will be treated as strictly confidential.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs. Mercy Akoto-Peprah)
Principal Administrative Assistant
For: HEAD
APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

SOURCES OF STRESS AND STRESS MGT STRATEGIES

QUESTIONNAIRE (SOSSMASQ)

Introduction: The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out the sources of stress and its management strategies among Ministers of the Gospel in Cape Coast Metropolis. It is purely an academic study and your name and personal following questions as truthfully as possible.

PART 1 – PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Name of your denomination:

..............................................................

2. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. Age: Below 30 [ ] 30 - 40 years [ ] 41 - 50 years [ ] above 50 years [ ]

4. Marital status: Single [ ] Married [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

5. Number of Children: 1 – 3 [ ] 4 – 6 [ ] more than 6 [ ]

6. Your highest level of education is:

“A & O” level [ ] SSSCE [ ] WASSCE [ ]

Diploma[ ] Undergraduate [ ]

Graduate [ ] Postgraduate [ ] any other

(Please, indicate) ..............................................................
7. Your highest level of ministerial training is:
   Certificate in ministry [ ]  Diploma in Ministry [ ]  Diploma in Theology [ ]  Degree in Theology [ ]  Masters [ ]  Doctorate [ ]

8. Type of ministerial engagement: Full-time [ ]  Part-time [ ]

9. Rank in Ministry: Evangelist [ ]  Pastor [ ]  Apostle [ ]  Prophet [ ]  Bishop [ ]  Rev. [ ]  Rev. Fr. [ ]  Rt. Rev. [ ]
   Other (Please, indicate) .................................................................

10. Number of Years in Ministry: Below 1 year [ ]  1-5 years [ ]  6-10 yrs. [ ]  11-15yrs. [ ]  16-20yrs. [ ]  above 20yrs. [ ]

---

PART II – SOURCES OF STRESS AMONG MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL

In this section, please respond to each item by ticking (√) according to whether you Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Agree (A), or Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Source of Stress</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Preparing for sermons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organizing church programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My meeting schedules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not getting required support from my church leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Having only little support from my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Managing the church projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conflict between home and work demands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Insufficient resources: (eg. tools, technology, or funds).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Little or no performance feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Meeting expectations of the congregation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Congregation not growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Inflexible work schedule of the church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The size of the congregation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Financial demand from the head office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Inadequate financial support from the congregation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My ill-health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Inappropriate workload (whether too much or too little).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Unclear job expectations by my superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My gender puts stress on me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Life crises put stress on me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Problems with my spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part III Stress management strategies among ministers of the gospel

In this section, please respond to each item by ticking (√) according to whether you **Strongly Disagree (SD)**, **Disagree (D)**, **Agree (A)**, or **Strongly Agree (SA)**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>As a minister, I manage my stress by:</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Taking my annual leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Reducing my daily schedules of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Having quality sleep everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Exercising regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Delegating duties to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Reading the Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Singing songs of praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Praying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Confiding in friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Using good leadership skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Ensuring that adequate resources are available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Attending stress management seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Employing good time management strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Seeking counsel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seling from professional counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Confiding in my spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you.