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ABSTRACT

In the course of their work, probation officers interact with various types of offenders, offenders’ families, the victims of the crimes, court officers, the police and other persons affected by the offences. As a result of this interaction it has been found that probation officers experience high levels of work-related stress. The main objective of the study was to evaluate the work-related stress amongst probation officers in Nairobi County. The study addressed the work-related stressors experienced by probation officers in the course of their work, how work-related stress experienced by probation officers affect the services offered to offenders and how probation officers cope with the work-related stress. A descriptive survey design was adopted by the study. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire fitted with a Likert scale that was administered to 45 probation officers in Nairobi County. All the completed questionnaires were entered into IBM SPSS® Version 23.0 software and data analyzed for quantitative and inferential statistics. The findings of the study indicated that a majority of Probation Officers in Nairobi experience Work-Related stress as they have high levels of job demand and low levels of job control. The study also found that this stress had correlation with turnover intent, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It was also found that probation officers coped with stress by mainly talking to colleagues, friends and family members. The study recommends that the department of Probation and Aftercare Services allows the officers more independence in how they conduct their duties, puts effort to reward the well performing officers and provides Clinical Supervision to allay the effects of Work-Related Stress amongst the probation officers.

Key words: Work-related stress, stressors, job stress, job satisfaction, occupational commitment, turnover intent, probation officers, correctional officers, probationers, offenders.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction

This study sets out to examine work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County. The current chapter provides the foundation of the study and describes its context as well as findings of key studies on work-related stress in the correctional field. Subsequent sections clarify the gaps in research identified by the researcher and outline the purpose of the study and the questions it aims to answer. This chapter also provides brief details on how the study will be conducted and who the researcher hopes will benefit from the findings of the study. Finally, key terms used within the chapter and in the rest of the study are defined.

1.1 Background of the Study

There is an increased interest in work-related stress over the past two or so decades based on the premise that a negative interaction between working conditions and human factors could lead to cognitive, behavioral, social and other disturbances among employees (International Labour Organization, 2016). According to Dewa, McDaid and Ettner (2007), between 19% and 30% of the working population is affected by work-related stress. It is possible, however, that the figure could be much higher. Albeit under-researched, one of the professions alluded to have considerably high levels of work-related stress is probation work (Pitts & Taylor, 2011). Earlier studies such as Thomas (1988) outlined work-related stressors such as excessive paperwork, time constraints, and remuneration issues as affecting probation officers in USA.

More recent studies have identified the key work-related stressors among probation officers as having to do with the nature of the job, specifically, interacting with offenders, a population group of often violent, aggressive and manipulative persons (Giovannoni, McCoy, Mays, &
Watson, 2015; Lewis, Lewis & Garby, 2013; Saylers et al., 2015; Vogelvang, Clarke, Sperna, Vosters & Button, 2014; Worrall & Mawby, 2013). Amidst reports that harassment and victimization by offenders is a significant cause of work-related stress, there have been debates on whether or not to equip probation officers in the USA with firearms (Rhineberger-Dunn & Mack, 2017). Worrall and Mawby (2013) argue that probation work is ‘edgework’, a term coined by Lyng (1990) to refer to occupations which involve a moderate to high level of risk-taking, and obvious threats to mental and physical wellbeing of employees. They claim that probation officers often ‘work on the edge’, having to befriend and empathize with offenders, while at the same time afraid of potential harm from these same offenders, and constantly being aware that incompetence on their part could lead to recidivism (Worrall & Mawby, 2013).

The nature of probation work also requires that probation workers take on multiple roles, on one hand, policing offenders by monitoring and reporting their behavior, while on the other assisting them to better re-integrate and become productive members of the community (Gayman & Bradley, 2013; Saylers et al., 2015). Achieving a balance between these two conflicting roles has been highlighted as a stressor (Gayman & Bradley, 2013). A more recent line of inquiry is that work-related stress in probation work is the result of high levels of emotional engagement, which as Knight and Mondi (2014) observe, lead to emotional exhaustion. Working with offenders demands a high level of emotional literacy, in essence, knowing how to express and regulate emotions, which is likely to generate higher levels of stress owing to emotional fatigue (Saylers et al., 2015). Among probation officers, role conflict together with role ambiguity, role overload and emotional exhaustion, factors collectively referred to as organizational climate, have been highlighted as contributing to work-related stress (Gayman & Bradley, 2013; Shultz, Wang & Olson, 2010). The impact of organizational climate is far-reaching. It has been linked to physical,
psychological, emotional and cognitive disturbances, including trauma and depression in probation officers.

Organizational climate is associated with burnout, a state of psychological, emotional and social withdrawal of an employee from work as a result of work-related stressors (Lewis et al., 2012; Saylers et al., 2015; Skowroński, 2016). One of the first studies to establish this was by Whitehead (1985) who reported that probation officers have higher levels of burnout and at shorter frequencies compared to other human service workers. Keinan and Malach-Pines (2007) established that, by and large, correctional officers experience higher levels of burnout in contrast to the general employee workforce, and to occupations considered extremely stressful such as police work. Comparing burnout experiences amongst correctional officers, Rhineberger-Dunn, Mack and Baker (2017) report that probation officers are the group having it worst as their burnout levels are higher than other correctional officers.

As a result of work-related stress, probation officers might experience problems with sleep and concentration (Pitts & Taylor, 2011). Severson and Pettus-Davis (2013) found that probation officers displayed symptoms consistent with vicarious trauma, such as hypervigilance, and disturbances in cognition and behavior as a result of supervising violent sex offenders. To meaningfully contribute to the client’s transformation, probation officers normally employ exploration of trauma, in which they explore clients’ past histories, in particular trauma stories (Lee, 2017). Through repeated exposure to accounts of victimization and violence, they risk being traumatized themselves (Lewis et al., 2013; Wood & Brown, 2014). As Gayman and Bradley (2013) found out, work-related stress in probation work is also responsible for depression among probation officers. Officers with higher levels of depression symptomology tended to rate their
organizational environment very severely in terms of work-related stress, which indicates that coping resources to deal with work-related stressors are inadequate (Gayman & Bradley, 2013).

According to the ILO (2016), when the physical and mental health and wellbeing of employees is compromised, the results are reduced staff motivation, low productivity, absenteeism, increased turnover, and ultimately, a negative organizational image. Among probation officers, the impact of work-related stress greatly exceeds the toll it takes on individual officers, as it affects their colleagues, inmates and the wider society. Cognitive disturbances caused by work-related stressors could lead to complacency and ineptitude in probation work. For instance, owing to trauma and burnout, officers might be prone to making poor judgments of the risk that offenders pose, they might be unlikely to work as need be with offenders in case management, and they might be more likely to either under-supervise or over-supervise offenders, which might lead to recidivism (Lewis et al., 2013). Additionally, work-related stressors in probation work are associated with high turnover and turnover intent (Blankenship & Slate, 2016; Burrell, 2012; Tipton, 2012). Put simply, when faced with work-related stressors and inadequate resources to mitigate them, probation officers might perform their jobs poorly or look for other jobs altogether.

Despite this, probation officers barely receive supervision or any on-job support to enable them deal with the stressful nature of their work (Giovannoni et al., 2015; Mackenzie, Cartwright, Beck & Borrill, 2015; Rhineberger-Dunn et al., 2017; Saylers et al., 2015; Severson & Pettus-Davis, 2011). Severson and Pettus-Davis (2011) outline forms of support such as debriefing, education and training, addressing security concerns, supportive supervision and lessening case workloads as effective coping strategies. There is no indication however that these strategies are employed or initiated by probation services departments.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

There is strong indication that work-related stress among probation officers is higher than in other professions and that it affects officers physically and mentally, in the process compromising their work (Lewis et al., 2013; Pitts & Taylor, 2011; Thomas, 1988). Despite this, work-related stress among probation officers seems to be a neglected area in correctional research. Majority of correctional literature focuses on occupational stress and burnout among institutional correctional officers, or among probation officers together with other prison officers, collectively referred to as ‘correctional officers’ (Garland, Hogan, & Lambert, 2013; Lambert, Hogan, Cheeseman & Barton-Bellessa, 2013; Lambert, Hogan, Griffin & Kelley, 2015; Trounson & Pfeifer, 2015; Viotti, 2016). Although there are similarities between correctional officers and probation officers, certain differences are also inherent. One is differences in the work environment, with probation officers spending majority of their time supervising offenders in non-institutional settings (Finney, Stergiopoulos, Hensel, Bonato & Dewa, 2013). Additionally, in comparison to correctional officers, probation officers are required to interact with often violent and manipulative offenders more intimately in both a counselling and a supervisory capacity which might affect their experiences of their job, and ultimately of work-related stress (Finney et al., 2013; Hanser, 2014; Worrall & Mawby, 2013). This dearth of studies on work-related stress specific to probation officers exposes a research gap which it is hoped this study will help fill.

Further, the studies conducted on probation officers, and which have outlined work-related stress as a significant problem among the population group, have mainly been conducted in the USA and in Europe (Gayman & Bradley, 2013; Jalbert & Rhodes, 2012; Knight & Mondi, 2014; Rhineberger-Dunn & Mack, 2017; Saylers et al., 2015). There are about 900 probation officers in Kenya, serving a population of about 40 million people, and an offender population of over 50,000
(United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, 2014). Although it is possible that just like officers in USA and in Europe their wellbeing and occupational effectiveness is compromised by work related stress, this has not been ascertained owing to a paucity of research specific to the Kenyan situation. Strong differences in the delivery of probation services in the USA or Europe and in Kenya make it unsuitable to generalize findings of existing studies to the Kenyan context. This study aims to fill this knowledge gap by investigating work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi. Specifically, this study aims to establish work-related stressors experienced by probation officers in the course of their work, how these stressors affect services offered to offenders, and how probation officers cope with work-related stress.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County.

1.4 Research Objectives

1. To establish the work-related stressors experienced by probation officers in the course of their work.
2. To find out how work-related stress experienced by probation officers affect the services offered to offenders.
3. To find out how probation officers cope with the work-related stress.

1.5 Research Questions

This study aimed to answer the following questions;
1. What are the work-related stressors experienced by probation officers in the course of their work?

2. How does work-related stress experienced by probation officers affect services offered to offenders?

3. How do probation officers cope with the work-related stress?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is anticipated to be of benefit to the following stakeholders;

1.6.1 Researchers and Scholars

It is anticipated that this study may be of benefit to researchers and scholars interested in work-related stress among correctional officers, and in particular probation officers. There seems to be a lack of research on the experiences of probation officers despite strong indication that they face higher work-related stress and burnout rates in comparison to other professions. The researcher hopes that this study could contribute to literature on probation within the Kenyan context, and will specifically help future researchers understand what work-related stressors affect probation officers in Nairobi, how work-related stress affects service delivery to offenders, and what coping mechanisms individual officers have employed to mitigate work-related stress.

There is still room for more research. Future research could investigate what types of offenders or groups of offenders evoke more stress among probation officers in Kenya. It is also likely that work-related stress among probation officers varies by jurisdiction and locality. This could be explored in depth by forthcoming studies. Additionally, future studies could compare work-related stress and burnout levels between probation officers and other professionals in Kenya, particularly those in the correctional setting, and evaluate the effectiveness of approaches aimed at mitigating work related stress and burnout among these professional groups. Finally, it is
possible that the effects of work-related stress spill over to the family life of probation officers. More research is needed to investigate the work-life balance of probation officers and the possibility of spillover and crossover of stress across the work and family domains.

1.6.2 The State Department of Correctional and Aftercare Services and other key stakeholders

It is anticipated that this research can be of use to the State Department of Correctional and Aftercare Services, the employer of probation officers in the country. The mission of the Probation and Aftercare Service (2017a) is to enhance the safety of the community and protection of the public by having non-custodial offenders supervised and re-integrated into the community. For this reason, the researcher assumes that the department will be interested in stressors faced by probation officers in Nairobi as a determinant of the efficacy of probationer’s supervision. According to the ILO (2016), when employers acknowledge and recognize work-related hazards and their impact on employees and address these, they create a safe and healthy work environment. Reducing work-related stress and burnout among probation officers has the capacity to increase productivity, employee motivation and job satisfaction, which would ultimately lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness of probation work. The researcher hopes that the study would influence policy and organizational practices to enable clinical supervision of probation officers.

1.6.3 Probation Officers

Coping mechanisms employed by probation officers may play a role in work-related stress and burnout. However, owing to lack of research on work-related stress among probation officers in Kenya, their coping mechanisms are unknown. Recognizing individual responses to work-related stressors and coping styles could help probation officers understand individual risk factors which predispose them to burnout. It is anticipated that this insight could lead to adopting more effective coping mechanisms. The researcher anticipates that the findings of this study will
influence policy, and that more support will be available to probation officers in the country to mitigate work-related stress. Therefore, through this proposed study, probation officers are likely to benefit by having their employers more attuned to their occupational needs, and through supervisory support systems which the researcher proposes.

1.6.4 Offenders

It is anticipated that the findings of this study will also be of use to offenders, who are the clientele served by probation officers. It is anticipated that they will benefit greatly from probation services offered by psychologically, emotionally and mentally healthy officers.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This proposed study seeks to examine work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County. Key study variables include work-related stress, impact of work-related stress on work performance, and coping mechanisms utilized by probation officers. For this purpose, a quantitative research design will be utilized, and data collected through the use of questionnaires.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Burnout: Burnout, as defined by Maslach (1978), one of the earliest researchers in the field, is a state of cynicism which develops when employees no longer care about their work, or the people they work with. A more concrete definition is provided by Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) who define it as a syndrome in which a worker or an employee displays emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and a diminished level of personal accomplishment as a result of doing a job.

Probation officer: In Kenya, probation officers are appointed by the Probation of Offenders Act Cap 64 which highlights their role as advising offenders on matters related to court and supervising offenders whom they are tasked with (Probation and Aftercare Service, 2017b).
Therefore, probation officers are officers of the court who work with probationers in a supervisory and rehabilitative capacity during the period of their probation sentence.

**Stress:** According to the ILO (2016), stress is a harmful reaction, which could be either physical or emotional to a state of disequilibrium in demands and resources available to individuals to deal with these demands.

**Stressors:** One of the earliest definitions of stressors was by Seyle (1974) who described them as events which bring about a response (could be either physiological or psychological), so that the organism is able to differentiate stimulus from a response. Stressors are events, agents or conditions which bring about stress.

**Vicarious traumatization:** Vicarious traumatization refers to changes in emotions, behavior and cognition which occur to frontline professionals exposed to first-hand narratives of clients who have been victimized. Vicarious traumatization occurs over time. According to Lewis et al. (2013), as a result of vicarious trauma, beliefs held by the individual such as those concerning safety might also change with time, and the professional might display among others, distrust about the intentions of others and increased cynicism.

**Work-related stress:** Work-related stress is stress which occurs within the workplace, and as a result of work-related stressors. The ILO (2016) defines work-related stress as a state of disequilibrium in demands in the workplace and the resources that a worker has to manage these demands. To this effect, the demands exceed the resources of the employee, his/her capabilities and knowledge and abilities.

**1.9 Chapter Summary**

It has been established that high incidence of work-related stress among probation officers is a likely phenomenon, owing to work-related stressors such as interacting with violent offenders,
role conflict, high levels of emotional engagement and high caseloads. This is compounded by the absence of support systems initiated at the department and organizational level, and which possibly aggravates the consequences of work-related stress experienced by officers. There is an absence of studies conducted in Kenya to examine this phenomenon. Therefore, the impact of probation officers’ work-related stress on service delivery to probationers is largely unknown. This study therefore aims to bridge this gap by examining work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County, its consequences, and officers’ coping mechanisms. The following chapter will discuss the theoretical model guiding the study, and will critically analyze current and relevant literature appertaining to work-related stress and the probation profession. The subsequent chapter will discuss the research philosophy guiding this study, together with the study’s research design, sampling criteria, data collection measures and ethical protocols to be followed when conducting this study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of the studies conducted in the area of work-related stress among probation officers. The review was done along the themes of; definition or work-related stress, stressors in probation work, consequences of work-related stress and the interventions for probation officers affected by work-related stress. Due to a paucity of studies on work-related stress among probation officers, especially in Kenya, this chapter additionally reviews studies conducted amongst other populations dealing with offenders including prison officers and police officers. The chapter also discusses two theoretical models on which the study is based and provides a conceptual framework that guides the study.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 The Cooper and Marshall’s (1976) Model of Job Stress.

This study uses the Cooper and Marshall’s (1976) model of job stress to conceptualize work-related stress amongst probation officers. The model describes five categories of sources of stress within a work place. The first category is Stressors Intrinsic to the Workplace and it describes factors that increase the difficulty and complexity of the duties that workers perform as well as the factors that make a workload too heavy for the staff to handle. (Finney et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2005).

The second category is role within the organization and is used to denote the concepts of role ambiguity and role conflict (Cooper & Marshall, 1976). Role ambiguity arises when the duties and expectations placed on the employee are unclear and Role conflict occurs when there are
contradictory and inconsistent demands placed on the employee (Cooper & Marshall, 1976; Finney et al., 2013).

The third category of workplace stressors is *career development* which incorporates the factors affecting the future of an employee within an organization including factors such as promotion, job security and ambition (Cooper & Marshall, 1976; Finney et al., 2013).

The fourth category, *relationships at work*, describes the interactions that occur between the employee and other individuals at the workplace such as their co-workers, subordinates, and supervisors (Cooper & Marshall, 1976).

The final category, the *organization's structure and climate*, describes how the management of the organization affects the employee. This includes such factors as organizational climate, organizational politics, employees’ influence on decisions and communication between the organization and staff (Cooper & Marshall, 1976; Finney et al., 2013).

### 2.1.2 Job Demands-Control (JDC) Model

The Job Demand-Control (JDC) model developed by Karasek (1979) holds that Psychological Strain results not from one particular aspect of the work but instead, it is a function of the demands of a work situation and the level of decision-making freedoms available to the worker facing those demands. Based on this model, workers who perceive their job as demanding yet believe they have some control over their work would be expected to experience improved personal and job-related outcomes. On the other hand, employees who consistently experience high levels of job demands but low levels of perceived job control are most at risk for developing negative outcomes such as psychological strain and decreased job performance (Brough & Williams, 2007).
Johnson and Hall (1988) revised Karasek's JDC model to include a third dimension, *perceived social support*, which they believed to moderate the relationship between job demands, job control, and psychological strain. The Job Demand-Control-Support (JDCS) model holds that psychological strain will be experienced under conditions of high job demands, combined with low levels of both job control and social support in the workplace (i.e., levels of perceived supervisor support and colleague support) and support received external to work (i.e., family/friends support (Brough & Pears, 2004). Brough and Williams (2007) additionally demonstrated that social support from supervisors strongly predicted high levels of job satisfaction while social support from work colleagues was not as strong but was yet significant.

### 2.2 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Stressors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stress Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job demands</td>
<td>- Turnover Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational</td>
<td>- Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job stress</td>
<td>- Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Karasek, 1979).

There are three categories of stressors that are theorized to lead to work-related stress. They include job demands, organizational justice and job stress. The work-related stress resulting from these stressors then has an impact on the workers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and
turnover intent. The effects of these factors is moderated by the level of control available to the employee (Karasek, 1979).

2.3 Empirical Review

2.3.1 Defining Work-Related Stress.

Stress is the psychological strain resulting from exposure to unusual or demanding situations, known as stressors (Finney et al., 2013). Palmer, Cooper, and Thomas (2003) state that stress occurs when the perceived stressors exceeds one’s perceived ability to cope. Work stress then is the response to organizational stressors in the workplace that pose a perceived threat to an individual’s well-being or safety (Finney et al., 2013; Cooper & Marshall, 1976). Work stress is also a function of individual level qualities which can work to exacerbate or alleviate the situation (Crank, Regoli, Hewitt & Culbertson, 1995).

Measuring the different levels of work stress across different occupations, Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor, and Millet (2005) considered other sources of work stress as; the impact a person’s working life has on their life outside of work (work-life balance), the amount of satisfaction people derive from their work, the amount of control and autonomy people have in the workplace, and levels of commitment in the workplace both from the employee to the organization and from the organization to the employee.

Whereas people working in the same environment or occupation will experience different levels of stress due to the combination of factors such as their personality type, varied relationships with colleagues and employers and the support mechanisms available to them (Johnson et al., 2005), it is expected that individuals working in high risk occupations will report higher levels of work stress (Faragher, Cooper & Cartwright, 2004). Johnson et al. (2005) using a sample of 26 occupations in the UK found significantly high levels of job stress in 6 occupations including
teachers, ambulance workers, social workers, customer service and call centre employees, prison officers and police officers all of which require higher levels of emotional engagement, an important stressor in producing higher level of work stress. Other notable stressors were the threat of violence (social work, police), lack of control over the job (call centres) and work overload (teachers) (Johnson et al., 2005).

Finney et al. (2013) distinguishes work stress from burnout. Whereas, work stress is the psychological strain from exposure to organizational stressors, burnout is defined as a syndrome characterized by feelings of exhaustion, cynicism, detachment, ineffectiveness and a personal lack of accomplishment (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). Burnout is an extreme and advanced form of work stress and is usually a result of long term work stress (Finney et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2005).

2.3.2 Stressors in Probation Work.

In a study to assess burnout and traumatic stress conducted amongst 309 probation officers in the states of Arizona, California, and Texas in USA, Lewis et al. (2013) found that probation officers who had specific types of clients on their caseloads were more likely to experience job stress than those who did not have those types of clients. Probation officers with clients with the following characteristics were more likely to experience job stress and burnout: violent recidivism against children, sexual recidivism, threats to probation officer or officer’s family, threats to kill probation officer, assault on probation officer, and/or committed suicide (Lewis et al., 2013).

Emotional labour is another important predictor of job stress among probation officers (Salyers et al., 2015). It is described as the need to keep a public image that is separate from how one may really be feeling. Salyers et al. (2015) report that probation officers, although stressed by work or family concerns, are required to keep those feelings away from their work with probation
clients. This attempt at suppressing emotions is however unsustainable and leads to depletion of resources and is found to be an important predictor of work-stress and even burnout among probation officers (Salyers et al., 2015).

In a study of 3,144 probation and parole officers across USA, Pitts (2007) provided subjects with a list of the most influential stressors for correctional officers. Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 7, how much stress each of the items caused them. Based on the responses, Pitts (2007) identified a list of the 15 most influential stressors, out of a total of 31 items, for probation/parole officers. The most common stressor was inadequate salary, while the least common was insufficient training. Pitts (2007) additionally, assessed perceptions of one’s educational competency as a source of stress for probation and parole officers. He found that educational competency was significantly related to stress, such that officers who felt that their educational training adequately prepared them for work as probation or parole officers had lower levels of stress than those who felt their educational training was inadequate.

In a report authored by Puzzanchera, Adams and Hockenberry (2012) on behalf of the National Center for Juvenile Justice, it was found that a big caseload was a significant stressor amongst probation officers working with juvenile offenders. The report found that there had been a drastic increase in the number of cases that lead to orders of probation between 1985 and 2009 which saw a concurrent increase in the levels of work stress and burnout. In addition, probation officers may have caseloads involving different demographics with varied needs including children, youth and adults presenting with matters ranging from minor offences and misdemeanors to more significant charges such as felony charges which presents additional stressors to the officers handling the matters (Puzzanchera, Adams, & Hockenberry, 2012).
In addition to the organizational factors of the job setting, such as staffing levels and supervisor responsiveness (Whitehead, 1987) probation officers also had potential stressors of coordinating with parents, schools, foster care system and such other significant players in the management and rehabilitation of their probationers which presented potential stressors at every turn (Steiner, Purkiss, Kifer, Roberts, & Hemmens, 2004).

In a cross-sectional study on burnout among prison officers at Kamiti Command in Nairobi, Gitau (2010), sampling 181 officers, found that marital status was one of the pertinent factors leading to burnout where most married participants, primarily male, reported higher levels of burnout than their unmarried colleagues owing mainly to the lengthy periods they spent away from their families due to distant and remote postings or because they were working late hours that did not allow them sufficient time with the families. Other factors leading to burnout were; low social support at the workplace, poor workplace relationships, heavy workload and lack of organizational support.

In a review of studies conducted on correctional officers using the Cooper and Marshall (1976) model, Finney et al. (2013) concluded that Organizational Structure and Climate had the most consistent correlation with job stress and burnout amongst correction officers. The stressors included lack of support from the superiors in the organization, lack of influence in the decision making process, unclear goals and policies and lack of organizational justice. The other four categories of stressors from the model; stressors intrinsic to the job, role in organization, rewards at work and supervisory relationships showed inconsistent findings, which is a different finding from many of the studies reviewed above and from a similar review from Schaufeli and Peeters (2000) which found relationships between job stress and factors such as stressful contact with
superiors, clients and colleagues, work overload, poor social status, poor pay, lack of influence in decision making and underutilization of knowledge and skills.

A study by Nyaga (2005) on occupational stress amongst 90 police officers sampled from 6 police stations in the then Nairobi Province found that about 67 percent of the interviewed officers reported feeling “psychologically burnt out”. The study reported that a myriad of organizational stressors led to low morale and high levels of occupational stress. These stressors include risk of being injured, lack of support from superiors, a perceived inefficiency from the justice system, work overload, bureaucratic obstacles such as delays in addressing problems faced by officers, poor housing, poor quality equipment and unjust criticism of the police by members of the public.

Additionally, Oweke (2014) conducted a causal comparative study using an ex-post facto design which sought to establish causes of work stress among police constables in Kisumu County. The study sampled a total of 451 constables and 12 OCSs and found that work environment, bureaucracy, heavy work-load and interpersonal relationship were the main causes of occupational stress amongst the police officers.

2.3.3 Consequences of Work-Related Stress.

Lambert, Barton-Bellessa, and Hogan (2015) in a study on correctional officers, conducted in a mid-western prison in USA exploring the association of emotional burnout with various factors including; life satisfaction, support for treatment versus punishment, absenteeism, views of sick leave, and turnover intent found that occupational stress had a significant negative effect on life satisfaction such that individuals who reported feeling less satisfied outside of the work environment were also more likely to indicate feelings of emotional burnout.
Lambert et al. (2015) additionally found that job stress and emotional exhaustion had an effect on what model correctional officers chose to use in addressing their clients’ problems. They stated that emotional exhaustion had a negative association with support for psychotherapeutic rehabilitation and a positive association with support for punishment concluding that emotionally strained officers appeared to look less favorably at rehabilitation and more favorably at punishment which was bound to have an effect on the outcomes of their clients. The influence of emotional burnout was also found to be positively related to absenteeism and misuse of sick leave (Lambert et al., 2015).

Lambert et al. (2015) also found that emotional burnout was positively associated with correctional staff turnover intent (desire to leave a workplace), a finding that is consistent with others from Belcastro et al. (1982), Carlson and Thomas (2006) and Lambert, Hogan, and Altheimer (2010).

Additionally Finney et al. (2013) states that among correctional employees, stress and burnout can also lead to negative personal, social and work outcomes including a decrease in life satisfaction, a decrease in positive social interaction and relationships, inability to cope with traumatic experiences, increased substance use and internal withdrawal. Decreased physical health, negative safety outcomes and an increase in work family conflict were also found to be related to correctional employee stress and burnout (Finn, 1998).

Nyaga (2005) states that some of the effects of work-stress among police officers in Nairobi at the time were tardiness, absenteeism, desertion, alcohol abuse, engaging in verbal and physical confrontations with colleagues, and higher chances of conflicts with spouses and other family members.
From an organizational position, correctional employee stress and burnout manifests itself in decreased job involvement, lower job satisfaction (Lambert & Paoline, 2010) reduced organizational commitment, an increase in turnover (Lambert et al., 2010) increased absenteeism (Dowden & Tellier, 2003) and higher use of sick days (Finn, 1998).

2.3.4 Interventions for Work-Related Stress.

According to Schaufeli and Peeters (2000) there are two approaches to managing stress at the workplace which are; individual based approaches (strategies that help employees to build skills to be able to cope with stress) and Organizational based approaches (strategies that change aspects of the work environment viewed so as to reduce or eliminate stressors). The individual based approaches are further divided into two categories which include Coping including strategies such as talking to friends, listening to music and downward comparison and secondly, Training which includes strategies such as relaxation training, cognitive restructuring and stress inoculation training (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Organizational based approaches on the other hand are broken into 3 broad categories which are Improving Human Resource Management, Improving Professionalization by for example creating a distinction between the duties and mandate of probation officers from those of police officers and other correctional staff to reduce role confusion and role ambiguity and the last category is Improving Social Work Environment (Schaufeli & Peeters 2000). These views have been echoed by Awa, Plaumann and Walter (2010) and Morse, Salyers, Rollins, Monroe-DeVita and Pfahler (2012) who proposed a variety of strategies to address work stress including cognitive restructuring, progressive muscle relaxation, social skills training and providing educational information.

Salyers et al. (2015) found that most of their study participants had very little information on strategies for managing work stress and burnout while others passively encountered ways that
helped lessen the stress and burnout. Most of the participants reported vacation as a way of coping with stress while others reported pursuing social support at the workplace and creating an enriching environment at home (with friends and family) as a way of coping with work stress (Salyers et al., 2015).

Additionally, in view of the salience of interactions between probation officers and their supervisors in leading to stress, Salyers et al. (2015) recommended interventions that could equip supervisors with strategies to better support officers including strategies to increase trust between probation officers and their supervisors. White, Aalsma, Holloway, Adams and Salyers (2015) also found that there was need to improve organizational climate through strategies that enhance the personal resources of probation officers such as giving officers more opportunities to participate in decision making at the workplace and providing recognition for professional achievements through such incentives as promotion, bonuses, awards and verbal praise.

Clinical supervision was also reported as being a significant factor in management of work stress among probation officers and other correctional officers (White et al., 2015; Morse et al., 2012; Mothersole 2008). Clinical supervision aims to build stress management skills among officers and enhances cognitive-behavioural skills to use to address work stress (Morse et al. 2012). White et al. (2015), recommended third-generation cognitive behavioral interventions specifically Mindfulness and Meditation with particular focus on acceptance, diffusion, and values to identify and alleviate workplace stressors. These views are also held by Oweke (2014) in a study on occupational stress among police constables in Kisumu County which recommended that the Police Service should employ the services of professional counselors, psychologist and psychiatrists in the police stations to manage occupational stress amongst police constables in that county.
2.4 Chapter Summary

Work-related stress results from a situation where perceived occupational stressors exceed employees’ perceived ability to cope with the stressors. Several stressors resulting from probation work were identified including: emotional labour, threats to safety of the officers, work overload and negative organizational climate. The work stress has been found to have adverse effects on the occupational, personal and social outcome of the probation officers. Interventions for the work-stress should address various factors including equipping the officers with coping strategies as well as equipping the supervisors with skills to best support the officers. Clinical supervision was noted as being important in addressing work-related stress using such methodologies as mindfulness and meditation and cognitive behavioral strategies.

The following chapter will discuss the research philosophy guiding this study, together with the study’s research design, sampling criteria, data collection measures and ethical protocols to be followed when conducting this study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This study is an evaluation of work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County. The current chapter outlines how the study was carried out and the main methods that were used to answer the research questions. It describes various aspects of the study including the study site, research design, study population, data collection and ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive survey design. Seuring, Müller, Reiner and Kotzab (2005) state that a descriptive design determines those involved in the research topic, what their role is, when, where and how these subjects are affected by the research topic and the implications if the study is not carried out. The study used an adaptation of the “Juvenile Probation Officer Work Environment Questionnaire” from Greenwood (2016) to collect data from the probation officers in Nairobi County.

3.2 Research Population

The study was conducted amongst probation officers in Nairobi County. The County Probation Department is comprised of 7 probation stations namely Makadara Probation Station, Makadara Hostel, Kibera Probation Station, Milimani Chief Magistrate’s Probation Station, Milimani High Court Probation Station, Mathare Hospital Probation Station and Ngong Probation Station. The study was carried out among the entire population of probation officers in the 7 stations which adds up to 45 officers. The population was comprised of 31 female officers and 14 male officers. The probation officers were in different job groups ranging from job group J to job group P. Job group J is the entry level for probation officers comprising of officers under the
training and supervision of senior probation officers and with a lower caseload compared to the more senior officers. As they rise through the job groups, officers get more duties in addition to the supervision of offenders with job group P mainly comprising heads of stations who direct and oversee the activities of the probation stations (Probation and Aftercare Service, 2017b).

3.3 Sampling Design

This study collected data from the entire population of probation officers in Nairobi County. This is because the department does not have a big number of officers that would necessitate sampling. Additionally, the question of generalizability does not arise as the findings were from accounts of a significant majority (93%) of the officers in the department.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study collected data using a questionnaire adapted from Greenwood’s (2016) “Juvenile Probation Officer Work Environment Survey.” The original survey was developed from a combination of several scales which include the Job Demands and Control Scale (JDCS) (Jackson, Wall, Martin, & Davids, 1993), an organizational justice scale (Qureshi et al., 2013), a job stress scale (Cullen, Link, Wolf, & Frank, 1985), a job satisfaction index (JSI) (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951), a social support scale (Cullen et al., 1985) and a turnover intent scale (Lambert, 2006). Additionally, as indicated in the Job Demand-Control-Support model by Johnson and Hall (1988), the questionnaire used by this study includes several moderating variables that have been posited to impact on work-related stress including gender, age, job group, marital status and level of education (Greenwood, 2016). [See Appendix 1].

The indices used in this study were adapted from past research and they had Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients of between 0.74 and 0.91 as follows; Job Demands and Control Scale
(0.83), the Organizational Justice scale (0.91), the Job Stress Scale (0.84), Job Satisfaction Index (0.79), Social Support Scale (0.83) and the Turnover Intent Scale (0.74).

3.5 Research Procedures

The study was a cross-sectional study utilizing a descriptive survey design using a questionnaire adapted from Greenwood (2016). The questionnaires were self-administered. The study collected data from the entire population of probation officers in the 7 probation stations in Nairobi County. The population was comprised of 31 female officers and 14 male officers who include line officers, senior probation officers and heads of probation stations.

3.6 Data Analysis

The questionnaires were adequately checked for data quality. Quantitative data was coded and entered into an excel spread sheet and thereafter transformed to an SPSS data file for analysis. Descriptive statistics were conducted through frequency counts and means to capture the distribution of responses on the key issues addressed in the study objectives. A descriptive analysis of the variables in the study was presented in table format and a correlation matrix was created to identify the relationships existing between study variables.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

All the data collected in the study was kept in a safe place. Approval to undertake the study was obtained from the USIU-A Institutional Review Board as well as from the Office of the Director of Probation and Aftercare Services in Nairobi. The study participants were fully informed about the study and were required to give consent before they took part in the study. The participants were informed that their participation in the study would be purely voluntary and that they could withdraw from participating at any time. Participants were not required to write their names or give any personal identification in the questionnaire. It is not expected that the participants suffered
any physical or psychological harm from the study. There was no direct benefit to the study participants, but it is anticipated that the study has generated information that may help improve the personal, social and occupational outcomes of the participants.

3.8 Chapter Summary

This was a cross-sectional study utilizing a descriptive survey design. A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from the entire population of probation officers in Nairobi County. To protect the participants from any harm, the study took all ethical considerations into account; including getting clearance from the university Institutional Review Board, clearance from the office of the Director of Probation and Aftercare Services in addition to seeking informed consent from the study participants. The subsequent chapter will present the results of the data collected from the participants.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the analyzed data and interpretation of the findings obtained from the field. It presents background information of the participants and findings of the analysis based on the objectives of the study as well as a summary of key findings. Descriptive and inferential statistics have been used to present the findings.

4.2 General Information

The study aimed to collect data from the entire population of probation officer in Nairobi County which added up to 45 respondents from which 42 filled in and returned the questionnaires making a response rate of 93%. All the 42 questionnaires returned were filled in appropriately and were thus suitable for analysis. This response rate was satisfactory to make conclusions for the study as it was deemed representative enough. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a response of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent. Based on the assertion, the response rate was excellent. Figure 4.1 demonstrates the response rate for the study.
The findings obtained indicated that 76% (32) of the respondents were female while 24% (10) were male. The findings indicate that the majority of the probation officers in Nairobi County are female as shown in Figure 4.2.
4.2.2 Highest Level of Education Achieved

The study determined the highest level of education achieved by the study respondents. The findings show that 57% (24) of the respondents had attained Bachelor’s degrees, 38% (16) were holders of Master’s Degree while 5% (2) had attained other qualifications (diplomas). The findings are presented in Figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3 Highest Education Level Attained](image)

4.2.3 Marital Status

The marital status of the officers who participated in the study was as follows; 88% (37) of the respondents were married, 10% (4) were separated while 2% (1) were divorced as shown in Figure 4.4.
4.2.4 Age of Respondents

The findings on the age of respondents indicate that 36% of the respondents were aged 31-40 years, 26% were aged 51-60 years, 24% were aged 41-50 years and 14% were aged 20-30 years. The findings imply that majority of the probation officers in Nairobi County were aged more than 31 years, as shown in Figure 4.5.
4.2.5 Current Job Group

The findings obtained indicate that 29% of the probation officers were in job group K, 22% were in job group J, 21% were in job group L, 19% were in job group M, 7% were in job group P and finally 2% were in job group N. The findings are presented in Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.6 Respondent Job Group

4.2.6 Current Probation Station

The study determined that 26% of the respondents were from the Kibera Station and a similar number from Makadara Court. 14% of the respondents were working at the Milimani Chief Magistrates Court, 12% at Makadara Hostel, 10% at Mathare Hospital, 7% were at Milimani High Court and 5% at the Ngong Station. These findings are illustrated in Figure 4.7.
4.2.7 Length of Employment in the Department

The study determined that 26% of the respondents had worked for more than 15 years, same as those who had worked for 1-5 years, while 24% had worked for 6-10 years and a similar percentage for those who had worked for 11-15 years. The findings are presented in Figure 4.8.
4.2.8 Number of Probationers Supervised

The findings indicated that 43% of the respondents were supervising 1-10 probationers, 26% had 11-20 probationers, 14% had 21-30 and a similar percentage for those with more than 50 probationers while 3% had 41-50 probationers. See Figure 4.9.
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4.2.9 Supervision of Other Probation Officers

The study also wanted to find out if the respondents supervised other probation officers and determined that 24% of the respondents supervised other probation officers while 76% did not.

4.2.10 Other Duties

The study found that 50% of the respondents had other duties while 50% did not have other duties. For the respondents with additional duties, 59% were performing administrative duties, 14% had rehabilitative duties and 9% were tasked with compiling their stations’ monthly returns with a similar percentage engaged in noting of court cases and holding stakeholder meetings. The findings are presented in Figure 4.10.
4.3 Work-Related Stressors Experienced by Probation Officers

The first objective of the study was to determine the work related stressors experienced by probation officers in Nairobi County. The work related stressors were grouped into job demands, organizational justice and job stress. Descriptive analysis was done using frequencies, means and standard deviations.

The researcher adopted a table of means and standard deviations to present the results. The mean results are given on a scale interval where a mean value of up to 1 is an indication of total disagreement; 1.1 – 2.0 is an indication of disagreement by the respondents; 2.1 – 3.0 is an indication of the respondents being neutral (neither agree nor disagree), 3.1 – 4.0 is an indication of agreement by the respondents and a mean value of 4.1 and above is an indication of total agreement by the respondents (Likert, 1932).
4.3.1 Job Demands

The questions in this section set to determine the demands that probation officers experienced in the course of their duties and how much control they had over those demands. The questions comprised a demand and control index. Items in the index were summed up and high scores indicated high demands and low control while low score denoted less job demands and more control.

The findings indicate that a majority of the respondents were neutral (neither agree nor disagree) on the whether they decided on the order in which they did things ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.093$); whether they set their own pace of work ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 1.147$); whether they chose the method to use in carrying out their work ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.226$); whether they decided how to go about getting the job done ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.117$); whether they could vary how they did their work ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.137$) and on whether they had to concentrate all the time to watch for things going wrong ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.413$).

The respondents however agreed that they regularly needed to react quickly to prevent problems arising ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.159$); that they had to keep track of more than one process at once ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 1.021$); that they had to solve problems that have no obvious correct answers ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.107$) and that they came across problems in their job they had not met before ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.067$). The findings are presented in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Descriptive Findings on Job Demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you decide on the order in which you do things?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.69 (1.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you set your own pace of work?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.62 (1.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you choose the method to use in carrying out your work?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.85 (1.226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you vary how you do your work?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.80 (1.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you decide how to go about getting your job done?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.59 (1.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to react quickly to prevent problems arising?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.13 (1.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to concentrate all the time to watch for things going wrong?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.95 (1.413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to keep track of more than one process at once?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.56 (1.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to solve problems that have no obvious correct answer?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.26 (1.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you come across problems in your job you have not met before?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.62 (1.067)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Organizational Justice

The findings indicate that the probation officers felt that the department was neither fair nor unfair in rewarding them when they consider the amount of effort they have put in their work ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.090$), the responsibilities they have at work ($M = 2.98, SD = 1.084$) and the stresses and strains of their job ($M = 2.58, SD = .958$). Additionally, the respondents felt that the probation department was neither fair nor unfair in rewarding them when they took into account the amount of education and training they had ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.086$) and in rewarding them when they considered the work they had done well ($M = 2.65, SD = 0.893$).
The officers also felt that the department was neither fair nor unfair in the promotion process in the department ($M = 2.32$, $SD = 1.141$); in opportunity they had for input into organizational decision-making at the probation department ($M = 2.93$, $SD = 1.492$); in the appeal process for decisions they felt were unjust at the probation department ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.032$) or in explaining decisions that have a significant effect on them ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.023$).

Majority of the respondents however reported that the probation department was fair in the process of evaluation of job performance at the department ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.840$); and that the probation department treated them with respect and dignity ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.955$).

### 4.3.3 Job Stress

The findings show that a majority of the probation officers were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) on whether they felt tense or anxious when they were at work, ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 0.883$); whether their job made them frustrated or angry ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 0.964$); whether they felt that they had much to worry about when they were at work ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.018$); whether they were calm and at ease when they are working ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 0.923$); and whether they felt under a lot of pressure when they are at work ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 0.951$). The respondents however agreed that there are a lot of aspects about their job that made them pretty upset about things ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.208$).

### 4.4 How Work-Related Stress Experienced by Probation Officers affect Services Offered to Offenders

The second objective of the study was to find out how work-related stress experienced by probation officers affects the services offered to offenders in Nairobi County.
4.4.1 How Work-Related Stress affects Turnover Intent

The findings indicate that a majority of the officers neither agreed nor disagreed with the following statements: that it is likely that they will be at this job in a year from now ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.145$); that they have actively searched for a job with outer employees in the last year ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.163$); that working at the probation department is sometimes so depressing that it’s hard to do a good job ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.025$); that when they leave work, they usually remain tired for the rest of the day and evening ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.093$); and that sometimes they seem to be just going from pay check to pay check with no real feelings about their job and what happens there ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.167$). The respondents however agreed that they often leave work tired ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.954$). The findings are illustrated in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Work-Related Stress and Turnover Intent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is likely I will be at this job in a year from now</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.20 (1.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have actively searched for a job with outer employees in the last year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.33 (1.163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working at the probation department is sometimes so depressing that it’s</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.77 (1.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard to do a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often leave work tired</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.20 (0.954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave work, I usually remain tired for the rest of the day and</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.83 (1.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I seem to be just going from paycheck to paycheck with no real</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.71 (1.167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings about my job and what happens here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 How Work-Related Stress affects Organizational Commitment

The findings show that the respondents strongly agreed that they are willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the organization be successful ($M$...
= 4.18, \( SD = 0.903 \)). A majority of the respondents also agreed that they would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization (\( M = 3.03, \ SD = 1.250 \)); that they find that their values and the organization’s values are very similar (\( M = 3.50, \ SD = 0.987 \)); that it would take very little change in their present circumstances to cause them to leave the organization (\( M = 3.31, \ SD = 1.142 \)); and that often, they find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its’ employees (\( M = 3.26, \ SD = 1.044 \)).

However, most respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that they could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work as similar (\( M = 2.80, \ SD = 1.137 \)) and that for them this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work (\( M = 2.68, \ SD = 1.185 \)). The findings are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Work-Related Stress and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.18 (0.903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this organization</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.88 (0.980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.03 (1.250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.50 (.987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work as similar</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.80 (1.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.31 (1.142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its’ employees</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.26 (1.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.68 (1.185)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 How Work-Related Stress affects Job Satisfaction

The findings indicate that majority of the respondents agreed that their job is usually interesting enough to keep them from getting bored \( (M = 3.44, SD = 1.050) \); that they feel fairly well satisfied with their present job \( (M = 3.44, SD = 0.950) \); that most days they are enthusiastic about their job \( (M = 3.68, SD = 0.917) \); that they like their job better than the average worker does \( (M = 3.51, SD = 0.898) \); and that they find real enjoyment in their work \( (M = 3.39, SD = 0.997) \). The findings are shown in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job is usually interesting</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.44 (1.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough to keep me from getting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly well satisfied</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.44 (0.950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely dislike my work</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.22 (0.725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.68 (0.917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my job better than the</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.51 (0.898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average worker does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real employment in my</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.39 (0.997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 How Probation Officers Cope with Work-Related Stress

The final objective of the study was to determine how probation officers cope with the work-related stress.

The findings indicated that the majority of the officers strongly agreed that their supervisors encourage them to perform their duties in ways that they would be proud of \( (M = 4.10, SD = 1.008) \) and agreed that fellow officers often encourage each other to perform their duties in a way
that they would be really proud of \((M = 3.95, SD = 0.795)\). Most respondents agreed that officers often compliment other when they have done a good job \((M = 3.90, SD = 0.700)\); and that they have close friends outside the workplace with whom they get together often \((M = 3.90, SD = 1.008)\). Most respondents, further, agree that when their job gets them down, they can turn to their families for the support they need to feel better \((M = 3.69, SD = 1.000)\); that they have friends who can help them out when things are going wrong \((M = 3.67, SD = 1.028)\); that they have people in their family that they can talk to about the problems they have at work \((M = 3.63, SD = 1.043)\) and they have a friend that lives nearby that they can confide in and tell their problems to \((M = 3.57, SD = 1.129)\).

Conversely, the respondents agree that their supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, even when such mistakes are not their faults \((M = 3.88, SD = 0.942)\); that their fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong \((M = 3.49, SD = 1.143)\); and that no one in their family can really understand how tough their job can be \((M = 3.36, SD = 1.122)\). The findings are presented in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5 Coping with Work-Related Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often encourage us to do the job in a way that we would be really proud of</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.10 (1.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often encourage each other to do the job in a way that we would be really proud of</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.95 (0.795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.90 (0.700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not counting people that I work with, I have close friends that I can get together with pretty often</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.90 (1.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not to the fault of those blamed</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.88 (0.942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.76 (1.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my job gets me down, I always know what that I can turn to my family and get the support I need to feel better</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.69 (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not counting my fellow employees, I have friends that will help me out when things are going wrong</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.67 (1.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have people in my family that I can talk to about the problems I have at work</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.63 (1.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a friend that lives nearby that I can confide in and tell my problems to</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.57 (1.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.49 (1.143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one in my family can really understand how tough my job can be</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.36 (1.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My station/department offers external ways (such as therapy/clinical supervision) to address problems arising from work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.25 (1.104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Correlation Analysis Findings

Correlation test was utilized to examine the relationship between the independent variables (job demands, organizational justice and job stress) with the dependent variables (turnover intent, organizational commitment and job satisfaction). The correlation test was conducted at 5% level of significance with a 2-tailed test.
The findings illustrated in Table 4.6 show that job demands have a moderate positive and significant association with turnover intent \((r= 0.382^*, p= 0.014)\). However, job demands had a negative significant relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction with coefficients \((r= -0.398^*, p= 0.010)\) and \((r= -0.437^{**}, p= 0.004)\) respectively. The findings also indicate that organizational justice does not have a significant association with turnover intent \((r= -0.110, p=0.494)\). Organizational justice also has no significant relationship with organizational commitment or job satisfaction with coefficients \((r= -0.240, p= 0.131)\) and \((r= -0.206, p= 0.196)\) respectively. Further, job stress does not have a significant association with turnover intent \((r=0.266, p=0.093)\). Job stress also has no significant relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction with coefficients \((r= -0.135, p= 0.401)\) and \((r= -0.006, p= 0.973)\) respectively. These findings are summarized in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6 Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Demands</th>
<th>Organizational Justice</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Turnover Intent</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Demands</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Justice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intent</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the results and interpretation of the findings obtained from the field. The findings of the analysis were based on the objectives of the study. Descriptive and inferential statistics have been used to discuss the findings of the study. Correlation analysis on the dependent and independent variables of the study were conducted. Results were presented in chart and table
forms to allow for the interpretation and discussion according to the trends in the results. The next chapter will present the summary of findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations that were made in the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter comprises a summary of the key findings, a discussion of the findings, conclusions based of the findings and recommendations of the study to the key stakeholders and future researchers. The chapter sections are based on the research objectives outlined in chapter one of the study.

5.2 Summary of the key findings

The main objective of the study was to evaluate the work-related stress amongst probation officers in Nairobi County. The study sought to find the work stressors experienced by probation officers in the course of their work, how the stressors affect the services offered by the officers and how they cope with the work-related stress. A descriptive survey design was adopted by the study.

The work-related stressors were grouped into job demands, organizational justice and job stress. Under job demands the study found that the officers experience high levels of job demand with a majority reporting having to react quickly to prevent problems from arising, having to keep track of more than one process at a time, encountering problems they had not encountered before as well as encountering problems which had no obvious solutions. The officers interviewed seemed to have moderate levels of control over how they performed their duties with most reporting that, to a moderate extent, that they set their own pace of work, chose the methods to use to carry out their work and that they decided on the order in which they did things. High levels of
job demands that are not accompanied by high levels of job control is indicative of high levels of work-related stress. This is consistent with the Job Demands and Control Theory (Karasek, 1979).

On organizational justice, the study found that the probation officers were largely ambivalent when queried on the fairness of the department. Most felt that the department was neither fair nor unfair in rewarding them when they considered the amount of effort they had put in their work, the responsibilities they had at work, the stresses and strains of their job as well as the amount of education and training they had. The officers also felt that the department was neither fair nor unfair in the promotion process in the department, in opportunity they had for input into organizational decision-making at the probation department, in the appeal process for decisions they felt were unjust at the probation department, or in explaining decisions that had a significant effect on them. Majority of the respondents however reported that the probation department was fair in the process of evaluation of their job performance and that the department treated them with respect and dignity.

The study found that most officers felt very little loyalty to their department and that they often found it difficult to agree with the organization’s policies on important matters relating to their welfare. It was also found that job demands (which were found to be high) had a negative significant relationship with organizational commitment meaning that; as levels of job demands increased the organizational commitment decreased.

The correlation analysis also found that job demands had a moderate positive and significant association with turnover intent indicating that high levels of demands as is the case in the study would cause the officers to want to leave the department for other employers. Job demands were also found to have a negative significant relationship with job satisfaction indicating
that with job demands being high, the officers were unlikely to derive much satisfaction from their work.

On coping with work-related stress, a majority of the officers reported that they received encouragement and support from their supervisors and their colleagues as well as support from their families and friends. The officers however stated that that their supervisors and colleagues often blamed others when things went wrong, even when such mistakes were not their faults. It was also found that there was a complete absence of any form of evidence-based, external means (such as therapy/clinical supervision) to address work related stress amongst the officers.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Work-Related Stressors Experienced by Probation Officers

The findings in the present study showed that the probation officers encountered high levels of job demands that were not tempered by commensurate levels of control which resulted to high levels of job stress. These findings are consistent with Greenwood (2016) who, in a study on work-related stress amongst juvenile probation officers in Texas, USA found that there was moderate-levels of both timing and method control paired with high levels of monitoring demand, and moderate-to-high levels of problem-solving demand and thus high levels of job stress which indicated a negative association between job demands and job control. The findings are also consistent with Karasek (1979) who, in the Job Demands and Control Theory posits that when job demands are high and control is low, job strain will occur as well as Brough & Williams (2007) who found that workers who viewed that their job demands as high and that they had low levels of control over their work, experienced negative job-related outcomes.

The present study found that the department was neither fair nor unfair in rewarding officers when considering the amount of effort they put in their work, their responsibilities, the
stresses and strains of their job as well as the amount of education and training they had. This is in line with this Pitts (2007) who found that the most common stressor for probation officers was inadequate salary. Also in line with this finding is Gitau (2010) who found that factors leading to burnout were; poor workplace relationships, heavy workload and lack of organizational commitment. Finney et al. (2013) also agrees that lack of influence in the decision the making process, unclear goals and policies and lack of organizational justice led to job stress. Nyaga (2005) also found that the stressors leading to occupational stress amongst police officers in the then Nairobi Province included; a perceived inefficiency from the justice system, work overload, bureaucratic obstacles such as delays in addressing problems faced by officers, poor housing, poor quality equipment and unjust criticism of the police by members of the public.

The present study found that job demands had a moderate positive and significant association with turnover intent and job demands were also found to have a negative significant relationship with job satisfaction. The findings are consistent with Mitchell, Mackenzie, Styve, and Gover (2000) who found stress to be significantly correlated to turnover intent and Lambert and Paoline (2008) who found that high levels of job stress were inversely related to job satisfaction among corrections officers.

5.3.2 How Work-Related Stress affect Services Offered

The study found that job stress and had an effect on probation officers with most reporting being exhausted and feeling anxious at the work place. Job stress had a negative association with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The findings are supported by Lambert et al. (2015) who determined that the influence of emotional burnout was also found to be positively related to absenteeism and misuse of sick leave. Lambert, Barton-Bellessa, and Hogan (2015) further noted that there was an effect of job stress on life satisfaction such that individuals who
reported feeling less satisfied outside of the work environment were also more likely to indicate feelings of emotional burnout.

Job stress was also found to have a negative effect on officers’ turnover intent with most reporting that they actively sought employment elsewhere in the last one year. This is in line with Lambert et al. (2015) who found that emotional burnout was positively associated with correctional staff turnover intent, a finding that is consistent with others including from Belcastro et al. (1982), Carlson and Thomas (2006) and Lambert, Hogan, and Altheimer (2010).

5.3.3 How Probation Officers Cope with Work-Related Stress

This study found that strategies used by probation officers in Nairobi to cope with job stress included what Schaufeli and Peeters (2000) regarded as Individual Based Approaches which include talking to friends, colleagues and family members. The officers also seemed to rely on a warm social environment at the work place reporting that they received encouragement and support from their supervisors and colleagues when they encountered difficult situations at the workplace. These findings are echoed by Salyers et al. (2015) who found that interaction between probation officers and their supervisors was a salient factor in leading to or reducing stress. The finding was also in line with Adams and Salyers (2015) who found that there was need to improve organizational climate through strategies that enhance the personal resources of probation officers such as giving officers more opportunities to participate in decision making at the workplace and providing recognition for professional achievements through such incentives as promotion, bonuses, awards and verbal praise.

The present study however found that there was a complete absence of evidence-based, external means (such as therapy/clinical supervision) to address work related stress amongst the officers. This is similar to a finding by Salyers et al. (2015) who found that most of their study
participants had very little information on strategies for managing work stress and burnout while others passively encountered ways that helped lessen the stress and burnout. The finding is however contrary to findings by Mothersole (2008) who state that Clinical Supervision helped employees cope with stress by building stress management skills among officers and enhancing cognitive-behavioural skills to use to address work stress. These views are also held by Oweke (2014) in a study on occupational stress among police constables in Kisumu County which recommended that the police service should employ the services of professional counselors, psychologist and psychiatrists in the police stations to manage occupational stress amongst police constables in that county.

5.4 Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussions of the study, the following conclusions were made in the study based on the objectives of the study.

5.4.1 Work-Related Stressors Experienced by Probation Officers

The study concluded that work related stressors for probation officers in Nairobi County were caused by lack of decision on the order in which probation officers do, lack of a way in which the officers can set their own pace of work, lack of a method to use in carrying out their work, no decisions on how to go about getting the job done, officers feeling tense or anxious in the workplace and being under a lot of pressure when they are at work. These stressors led to negative organizational outcomes.

5.4.2 How Work-Related Stress affect Services Offered

The study concluded that stressors experienced in the workplace by probation officers led to the officers desiring to leave their jobs within a short period, actively searching for a job with outer employers, often leaving work tired, feeling very little loyalty to their organizations, and
often finding it difficult to agree with the organization’s policies on important matters relating to its’ employees. This negatively affected services being offered to the probationers.

5.4.3 How Probation Officers Cope with Work-Related Stress

The study concluded that the supervisors often encouraged probation officers to do the job in a way that they would be really proud of, their fellow officers often encouraged each other to do the job in a way that they would be really proud of and that they had friends that would help them out when things were going wrong.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the discussions and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were made in the study.

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Work-Related Stressors Experienced by Probation Officers

The study recommends that the management and supervisors of probation officers need to device ways of enhancing the independence of probation officers so that the officers can set their own pace of work, come up with a method to use in carrying out their work and help them whenever they feel anxious or nervous. This will help the probation officers avoid stress which reduces organizational commitment and hence low organizational performance.

5.5.1.2 How Work-Related Stress affect Services Offered

The study recommends that the management need to reward performing employees in order to improve employee loyalty to their organizations. The rewards can be effected at the station level where individual stations can employ methods of acknowledging the contributions of officers, through strategies such as praise, monetary rewards and the like and at the departmental level by expediting probation officers’ schemes of service, promotion as well as improving their
allowances and salaries. The department should also involve employees in the formulation of policies which will help them contribute to important matters relating to employees welfare.

5.5.1.3 How Probation Officers Cope with Work-Related Stress

The study recommends that officers receive regular Clinical Supervision and debriefing sessions to allay the effects of work-related stress and burnout from continued contact with the probationers and offenders. It is also recommended that the stations form structured peer supervision sessions where officers can discuss challenges encountered in the course of their duties and draw from the support of their colleagues. This study further recommends that the department and individual stations employ a variety of strategies to address work-related stress including; providing educational materials on coping with work-related stress, regular trainings or strategies for coping with work-related stress and facilitating further interventions for the officers who may be adversely affected by the work-related stress.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

This study did not delve beyond social support in evaluating how probation officers deal with work-related stress and thus does recommend that future researchers evaluate additional strategies used by probation officers to cope with stress especially in Nairobi and other places in Kenya that are yet to start employing such evidence-based methods as clinical supervision and debriefing.

This was a case study of work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County which limits the scope of generalization to Nairobi and similar counties. Therefore, other researchers could expand on the study by undertaking similar studies in other counties especially the rural and marginalized counties.
In addition, the study adopted quantitative approaches in data collection. The researcher therefore recommends that other scholars carry out research on the same subject area using qualitative methods to enable the respondents give their views without being closed to responses.

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a discussion of the key study findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study. The study found that Probation Officers in Nairobi experience Work-Related stress due to having high levels of job demand and low levels of job control. The study also found that this stress had correlation with turnover intent, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It was also found that probation officers coped with stress by mainly talking to colleagues, friends and family members. These study discussed results with reference to findings from related studies and gave recommendations to stakeholders and future researchers.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Consenting Information:

Title of the study: An Evaluation of Work-Related Stress among Probation Officers in Nairobi County.

You are being invited to take part in a research study because you are a probation officer. The questions asked in this study are designed to obtain a picture of what general work environment is like for probation officers in Nairobi County. More specifically, this study will ask questions about your work environment, job characteristics, job-related attitudes, and social support. The study will also include demographic and caseload-specific questions.

The results of this study will be strictly confidential and you are NOT required to give personal information such as names, phone numbers or address.

This questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

There is no compensation being offered for participating, but your participation is greatly appreciated. There are two goals for this study. The first goal is to gain insight into the work environment stressors for probation officers and the effects that environment may have on them. Second, the findings from the study may provide useful information for POs and other officials to improve the work environments thus benefiting the entire department.

This study is completely voluntary. While full participation is appreciated, you can stop at any time or skip questions you do not feel comfortable answering.

Any inquiries about this study should be directed to Joe M. Tarichia at tjmwenda@gmail.com or jtarichia@usiu.ac.ke. A summary of the findings will be provided to participants upon completion of the study, if requested.
Appendix 2
Consenting Form

Study number: ___________________

I ____________________________ hereby agree to participate in the study being carried out by Joe M. Tarichia on work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County. I agree to fill in the questionnaire measuring work-related stress. I understand there is little risk in the study on top of the answering of questions, and I will not pay anything to take part in the study. I also realise that there is no direct benefit to me or monetary compensation, but the study will hopefully lead to improvement in the working conditions for probation officers. I also understand that the study is purely voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time and my withdrawal will not in any way deny me any benefits to which I am entitled to.

Participant’s Name_________________________ Telephone no____________________

Participant’s signature__________________________ Date_________

Witness’s Name________________________

Witness’s signature _____________________ Date ___________________

Signature of principal investigator (or authorized representative) _____________
Appendix 3

Debriefing Letter.

Thank you for taking part in this study. The study’s main aim is to examine work-related stress among probation officers in Nairobi County and how that may affect their attitude towards their work, their output in-turn how these social factors affect their work.

Previous studies have reported high levels of stress among probation officers due to such factors as having close contact with offenders (who may pose such challenges as aggression, and manipulation), high emotional engagement, role ambiguity (unclear expectation of the officers) and low remuneration among others. This study aims to find whether these factors are similar in probation officers in Nairobi County.

While there was no monetary benefit to taking part in the at the work-place and personal outcomes such as relations with colleagues family members and friends and study it is anticipated that the study will generate information that can help improve the personal, social and occupational outcomes of the probation officers.

All the information we collected in the study will be confidential. All the questionnaires shall be kept under lock and key and destroyed once the study is over. There shall be no way of identifying individual participants as the study is interested in the general patterns that emerge when the collected data is analyzed.

Any inquiries about this study should be directed to Joe M. Tarichia at tjmwenda@gmail.com or jtarichia@usiu.ac.ke. A summary of the findings will be provided to you upon completion of the study, if requested.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Joe M Tarichia.
Appendix 4

Probation Officers’ Work-Related Stress Questionnaire.

Principal Researcher: Joe M. Tarichia.

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   Other (Please specify)

2. What is the highest degree you have received?
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Doctorate (e.g. PHD)
   Other (Please specify)

3. What is your marital status?
   - Married
   - Single
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

4. What is your age?
   - 20 – 30
   - 31 – 40
   - 41 – 50
   - 51 – 60
   - 61+

5. What is your current job group?
   - J
   - K
   - L
   - M
   - N
   - O
   - P
   - Q
   - R
   - S

6. What is your current probation station
   - Kibera
   - Makadara Court
   - Makadara Hostel
   - Mathare Hospital.
   - Milimani CM’s Court
   - Milimani High Court
   - Ngong

7. How many years have you been employed under the department?

8. How many probationers do you currently supervise?
9. Do you supervise other probation officers?
   - Yes
   - No

10. Do you have other duties in your station beyond caseload supervision?
    - Yes
    - No

11. If you answered yes in question above please specify below.

Work environment stressors

8. The following questions describe the characteristics of work environments. For each question, please indicate how much each of the following questions relate to your current work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you decide on the order in which you do things?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you set your own pace of work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you choose the method to use in carrying out your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you vary how you do your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you decide how to go about getting your job done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to react quickly to prevent problems arising?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to concentrate all the time to prevent things from going wrong?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to keep track of more than one process at once?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to solve problems that have no obvious correct answer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you come across problems in your job you have not met before?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The following questions relate to perceptions of fairness within work environments. For each question, please indicate how you feel about the fairness of your current work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very unfair</th>
<th>unfair</th>
<th>Neither fair or unfair</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>Very fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How fair has the probation department been in rewarding you when you consider the amount of effort that you have put forth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair has the probation department been to you when you consider the responsibilities you have at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair has the probation department been in rewarding you when you take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into account the stresses and strains of your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How fair has the probation department been in rewarding you when you take into account the amount of education and training you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair has the probation department been in rewarding you when you consider the work you have done well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the promotion process at the probation department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the process of the evaluation of your job performance at the probation department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the opportunity you have for input into organizational decision-making at the probation department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the appeal process for decisions you feel are unjust at the probation department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the probation department in explaining decisions that have a significant effect on you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the probation department in treating you with respect and dignity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair is the probation department overall in how it treats employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job stress.

10. The following statements relate to characteristics of work environments. Please indicate your level of agreement with how much each statement relates to your current work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I am at work, I often feel tense or anxious?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time when I am at work, I don’t feel that I have much to worry about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m usually calm and at ease when I am working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job stress consequences.
11. Do you find some aspects of your job more satisfying, fulfilling, and enjoyable than other parts?
   - Yes
   - No

12. Do you desire to voluntarily leave/quit your job?
   - Yes
   - No

13. In the last 6 months, have you thought about quitting your current job?
   - Yes
   - No

14. Turnover intent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is likely I will be at this job in a year from now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have actively searched for a job with outer employees in the last year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working at the probation department is sometimes so depressing that it's hard to do a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often leave work tired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave work, I usually remain tired for the rest of the day and evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I seem to be just going from paycheck to paycheck with no real feelings about my job and what happens here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The following statements relate to how people feel about their work environments. Please indicate your level of agreement with how much each statement relates to your current work environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work is similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its’ employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 16. work-stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely dislike my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my job better than the average worker does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. Social support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often encourage us to do the job in a way that we would be really proud of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not to the fault of those blamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow officers often encourage each other to do the job in a way that we would be really proud of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My station/department offers external ways (such as therapy/clinical supervision) to address problems arising from work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have people in my family that I can talk to about the problems I have at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one in my family can really understand how tough my job can be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my job gets me down, I always know what that I can turn to my family and get the support I need to feel better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not counting people that I work with, I have close friends that I can get together with pretty often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a friend that lives nearby that I can confide in and tell my problems to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not counting my fellow employees, I have friends that will help me out when things are going wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>