



## **Effect of Occupational Stress on Employee Performance of the Judicial Service Commission Employees in Kenya**

**Faith Mbinya & Dr. Thomas Mose**

**ISSN: 2616-8421**

# Effect of Occupational Stress on Employee Performance of the Judicial Service Commission Employees in Kenya

<sup>1</sup>Faith Mbinya & <sup>2</sup>Dr. Thomas Mose

<sup>1</sup>Postgraduate Student, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

**How to Cite This Article:** Mbinya, F., & Mose, T. (2022). Effect of Occupational Stress on Employee Performance of the Judicial Service Commission Employees in Kenya. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 6(3), 88 - 106. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6028>

## Abstract

Employee performance is the key to success of an organization. Every individual employee must work toward the company's vision and mission. The performance of employees is influenced by how businesses manage, up skill, and motivates their employees. This study sought to investigate the effects of occupational stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya. Specifically, the study sought to; establish the effects of workload stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya, to determine effects of role ambiguity stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya, to establish the effects of working conditions stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya and to determine effects of work relationships stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. In this study, a descriptive research design method was used. The target population comprised of 5,157 employees in the Kenyan Judiciary comprising of 635 magistrates and kadhis and 4,522 staff. The study sample size comprised of 362 employees. The study relied on both primary and secondary data. Questionnaires were used to collect primary data. The data was also entered using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Data that was obtained from the research instruments was summarized using Descriptive Statistics. To test hypothesis HA1 to HA4, Pearson's Correlation Analysis was used. The study results were presented through use of tables and figures. The study concludes that workload stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. In addition, the study concludes that role ambiguity stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. Further, the study concludes that working condition stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. The study also concludes that work relationship stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. From the results, the study recommends that the management of judicial service commission should ensure effective strategies to manage workload stress are formulated and implemented to enhance employee performance.

**Keywords:** *Occupational Stress, Employee Performance*

## **1.1 Background of the Study**

It is important for organizations to understand and motivate its employees as they make significant contributions to the organization (Pradhan & Jena, 2017). Employees are very important to an organization for it to succeed. Employee performance is viewed as an activity in which an employee is able to perform the task assigned to them successfully, subject to the normal constraints of reasonable utilization of the available resources (Jena & Pradhan, 2014). Bataineh (2017) highlights employee's performance as a combination of efficiency and effectiveness of the employee's daily tasks to meet the goal of the organization. It is also the contribution, work quantity and quality, and the productivities. It is an index of employees' productivity (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019).

Employee performance may be affected by various factors such as environment which stimulate and support or affect performance of an employee, job characteristics like different skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback also have an effect on psychological states, which in turn have an effect on individual and work out comes, including job performance (Tripathy, 2014). Occupational stress is a universal phenomenon with severe effects such as health, performance and well-being of employees in an organization (Ashwani, 2015). It is also a harmful physical and emotional reaction that emerges when the work is not consistent with employees' capabilities and their needs (Mai & Vu, 2016). According to Muwafaq (2015), occupational stress is a major obstacle to organizational goal. It leads to negative effects such as lack of efficiency, performance decreases, reduce interest in working, ignorance of colleagues and low responsibility. Nadia, Shabnam and Sobia (2014) indicates that stressors include workloads, workplace conflicts, role ambiguity and role conflict.

Bhaga (2010) opines that intensive stress has an effect on the employee's physical and mental health of the worker, which eventually leads to burnout among employees and decrease in performance. Occupational stressors contribute to organizational inefficiency, ineffectiveness, job dissatisfaction, intentions to quit, turnover, absenteeism, low productivity, huge medical bills on the organization, social vices (alcoholism, and drug abuse) and health-related sickness such as hypertension and cardiovascular problems (Shinde & Anjum, 2014). Despite the fact that stress is seen to have negative effects, studies reveal that an acceptable level of stress, in the form of pressure, anxiety, and fear is necessary for motivating the employees (Trivellasa *et al.*, 2013; Nadinloyia *et al.*, 2013).

The Judicial Service Commission is an independent Commission established under Article 171 of the Constitution. Its mandate as stipulated in Article 172 of the Constitution is to promote and facilitate the independence and accountability of the Judiciary and the efficient, effective and transparent administration of justice. JSC functions are to recommend to the president persons for appointment as judges; review and make recommends on condition of service for judges (other than their remuneration), judicial officers and staff of the Judiciary; receive complaints against, investigate and remove from office or otherwise disciplining registrars, magistrates, other judicial officers and other staff of the Judiciary; prepare and implement programmes for the continuing education and training of judges and judicial officers; and advise the national government on improving the efficiency of the administration of justice.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Employee performance is the key to success of an organization. Every individual employee must work toward the company's vision and mission. The performance of employees is influenced by

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6028>

how businesses manage, up skill, and motivates their employees (Ashwani, 2015). According to the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) (2020) report, more than 85% of employees are not engaged in their workplace. This has an adverse effect on their performance.

There are also job stressors that may affect employee performance. The occupational stress has a significant negative impact on employees' physical, emotional and behavioral as well as economic implications to organizations. Stressed workers experience health problems like depression. They are also demotivated and less productive (Ozkan & Ozdevecioglu, 2016). According to SHRM (2020), approximately 100 million workdays are being lost due to stress and nearly 50% to 75% disease is related to stress. As Rahman (2015) notes, stress results in high portion of absence and loss of employment, the ratio of stress effects in the organization are increasing on alarming rate which affects both the employee performance and goal achievement. Occupational stress causes approximately 40% of turnover and 50% of workplace absences. The annual cost of occupational stress and its effects in Kenya is estimated to be over Ksh. 10 Billion to employers and Ksh. 25–30 Billion to the economy (KNBS, 2020). Occupational stress is inevitable, and if not managed well, it leads to increased risk of depression, intentions to quit, turnover, low productivity and death (Addison & Yankyera, 2015).

Irawanto and Primasari (2015) researched on the effect of occupational stress on work performance of female employees in Indonesia. However, the study only focused on female employees while the current study will focus on male and female employees. Khalid and Pan (2020) studied the impact of occupational stress on job burnout among bank employees in Pakistan. However, this study focused on how stress affects job burnout. Ajayi (2018) studied the effect of stress on employee performance and job satisfaction in Nigerian banking industry. However, this study focus was on the banking sector. Kahora (2016) researched on the perceived effects of occupational stress on employee job performance among non-teaching staff at the University of Nairobi. The reviewed studies have focused on different concepts and were conducted in different context. This study aims to determine how occupational stress affects employees in the public sector. This study to investigate the effects of occupational stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

- i. To establish the effects of workload stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya
- ii. To determine effects of role ambiguity stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya
- iii. To establish the effects of working conditions stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya
- iv. To determine effects of work relationships stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya

### **2.1 Theoretical Review**

This study was anchored on the Person-environment-fit model, Demand Control support model, The Job Demands Resources Model and the Effort-Reward Imbalance Model.

### **2.1.1 Person-environment-fit model**

The Person-Environment-Fit model states that the congruence level or fit between an individual and his working environment can have major effect on health, prosperity and performance (French, Caplan & Harrison, 1982). The key assumption of the person environment fit theory is that stress originates when there is misfit between person and environment- from both components combined because factors of each component relate to another. Stress emerges when an individual observes that working environment is not good or is not fit according to his desire and he is not satisfied from work. These inconsistencies create stress which has negative impact on the health of employees. If the demands of the job do match with the knowledge, skills and abilities of the individual, the result will be the healthy working environment. If there is high gap between the person and his environment, it will create problems. When demands of the job exceed abilities of the individual, the stress will be the outcome (Sonnetag & Freese, 2003).

This model demonstrates the difference between personal feelings about reality and objective reality and between the objective working environment (real demands and rewards) and objective person (real skills, resources and wants). The stress will result if there is any misfit between the combinations of these elements (Cox et al., 2000). This model also provides protective system to lessen the subjective imbalance by rejection, evaluation of wants and managing and objective imbalance can be reduced by learning new expertise (Buunk et al., 1998). Work Environment involves job demands, duty expectations, and company standards. To be fit with the environment, person has to respond with his capability (learning, skills, preparation, time, and vigor) to the environmental demands. The concept of this theory is that the larger the inconsistency between person and environment, the higher the probability of stress and there will be need to deal with this stress (Bickford, 2005). The main focus of this theory is on the wants, beliefs and skills of the individual.

### **2.1.2 Demand control support model**

The job demand-control model is a model of job stress which is broadly used to show the relationships between job stress and employee health. The basic theme of this model is that stress occurs when employees have high demand and low job control. High level of stress will affect negatively to the health of an employee. When job demand is low and job control is high, the skills of an employee may decrease. Another aspect of this model was social support at work (Johnson & Hall, 1988). The demand control support (DCS) model states that main cause of work stress is work content. There are two hypotheses in DCS model: strain hypothesis (high stress jobs result in poor health outcomes, and demands, support and control have high independent effects) and buffer hypothesis (negative effect of high job demands is moderated by job control and social support).

Strain hypothesis is fully supported by results whereas the support for buffer hypothesis is ambiguous (Van der Doef & Maes, 1998). Hypothetical support show that demand control theory clearly explains the working conditions that are responsible for stress. This model has an ability to accurately anticipate negative effects on the health (Sharit & Salvendy, 1982). When comparing with Person-Environment fit model, (Baker, 1985) states that Karasek's Demand-Control model is appropriate because of the concept of control which is different from demand and measured as



a separate variable. Demand and control are separate variables and the originators of stress and the difference between them permits investigation of their effects jointly and separately.

### **2.1.3 The Job Demands-Resources Model**

The Job Demands-Resources model takes advice from various theories and tries to show the effect of job demands and resources on health and organizational responsibility (Llorens, Bakker, Schaufeli & Salanova, 2006). Demands are the environmental elements of a job which need exertion and may lead to physical and psychological disorders. Resources are job elements that help to achieve goals at work, decrease demands and encourage progress. Therefore in the presence of working environmental demands and resource, health deterioration and ambition are affected. Burnout (from tiredness and distrust) and work engagement (from ability and loyalty) are supposed opposite mental conditions that directs to health lose (Llorens et al., 2006). Organizational responsibility is negatively affected by burnout because of the bad health or improved by work engagement by ambition.

The Job Demands-Resources is an interesting model which assumptions can be used in any working context irrespective of the specific demands or resources (Llorens et al., 2006). This model can be enhanced on the basis of DCS model by expressing that the various resources can lessen the effects of demands on stress related outcomes (Bakker, Demerouti & Euwema, 2005). There is significant negative relationship between job demands and organizational commitment which is mediated by burnout and the relationship between job resources and organizational commitment is mediated by engagement (Llorens et al., 2006). There is little support for Job Demands-Resources model which is extremely based on the DCS model and only the work characteristics are focused in most of the studies on this model (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2007).

Individual differences are significant in the Job Demands-Resources model but investigation of work characteristics can also help us to decide elements that are related to individual's outcomes (Bakker et al., 2005). (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007) added the personal resources in this model to expand the research. Personal resources are the attributes that help in flexibility and positivism and that the association between environment and effects should be mediated and moderated by these resources. The addition of personal factors in this model and also joining important work environmental factors will lead to productive future research.

### **2.1.4 Effort–Reward Imbalance Model**

Siegrist's Effort–Reward Imbalance (ERI) model proposes that where there is an imbalance between work effort and reward, such that the effort is greater than the reward, work stress results, which may lead to a range of adverse health outcomes. The model also proposes that over-commitment (personal motivation to work excessively) increases the risk of adverse health outcomes and that there is an interaction effect of over-commitment. It posits that failed reciprocity between high efforts spent at work and low rewards received in turn elicits strong negative emotions and stress reactions with adverse long-term effects on health. Rewards include salary, promotion prospects, job security, self-esteem and recognition.

According to the department of medical sociology at Dusseldorf University (2008), the model of ERI at work claims that an imbalance between (high) effort and (low) reward is maintained under the following conditions: 1. Work contracts are poorly defined or employees have little choice of alternative workplaces (e.g. due to low level of skill, lack of mobility, precarious labor market); 2. Employees may accept this imbalance for strategic reasons (this strategy is mainly chosen to improve future work prospects by anticipatory investments); 3. The experience of high cost / low gain at work is frequent in people who exhibit a specific cognitive and motivational pattern of coping with demands characterized by excessive work-related commitment. Overcommitted men and women suffer from inappropriate perceptions of demands and of their own coping resources more often than their less involved colleagues, because perceptual distortion prevents them from accurately assessing cost-gain relations.

## **2.2 Empirical Review**

Empirical research is based on observed and measured phenomena and derives knowledge from actual experience rather than from theory or belief. The following are the empirical reviews in relation to the variables of the study.

### **2.2.1 Workload in Occupational Stress**

Heavy workload and inadequate staff to cover duties were the most significant associated factors of stress for Iranian hospital employees. Several studies have highlighted work overloads and duration taken to complete a task as significant contributors to work stress among health care professionals (Al-Aameri, 2003; Grunfeld et al., 2000). An excessive workload increases job tension and decreases job satisfaction, which, in turn, increases the likelihood of turnover (Aiken et al., 2002; and Strachota et al., 2003). Inadequate staffing also inversely influences the quality of provided health care services and patient outcomes (Whitman et al., 2002).

According to a study by Atmaja and Suana (2019) stated that work overload cause occupational stress since employees, who are research respondents, become irritable and offended. Employees feel like a failure at work because even though they provide the best service to tourists in restaurants, they are still scolded by superiors. The same was stated by (Pratiwi et al., 2019) that the number of tasks that must be done in a limited time or accept a job that is too difficult or beyond the limits of a person's ability will cause physical and mental fatigue that will eventually lead to burnout. With a different research object, namely students, (Kusuma, 2018) found the same thing. Students with a lot of assignments and must be completed in a limited time, causing them to feel exhausted so that their learning achievement has decreased. This shows that the excess workload on students also causes burnout.

Usman Ali et al. (2014) found that workload, role conflict, and inadequate monetary reward are the prime reasons of causing stress in employees that leads to reduced employee efficiency. Deshinger (2003) suggested that different aspects of employee job performance that are likely to be affected by stress include productivity, job satisfaction / morale, absenteeism, decision making abilities, accuracy, creativity, attention to personal appearance, organizational skills, courtesy cooperation , initiative , reliability, alertness ,perseverance and tardiness.

### **2.2.2 Role Ambiguity and Occupational Stress**

Fogarty et al., (2000), study noted that occupational stress occur in the profession of public accounting or auditors, internal auditors, and management accountants. Research on stress and burnout in the auditor profession is increasingly being done because excessive occupational stress can have a negative impact on performance and health. Excessive stress experienced by auditors can also have a negative impact on agencies such as increased absenteeism, low productivity, high employee turnover rates, and job dissatisfaction (Wiryathi et al., 2014). This results in the auditor having to work extra, involving emotions and not a little effort to do his job (Fogarty, et al 2000). If such conditions continue, the auditor can experience occupational stress (Maslach, 1982 in Fogarty et al., 2000). Role ambiguity arises also when individuals do not have clear authority or knowledge about how to do the assigned work (Idris, 2011). The lack of clarity occurs when role expectations are not clearly understood and employees are not sure what to do (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Auditors often only have a small amount of information that is sufficient to do their work or what is their responsibility in their current role (Jones et al., 2010). This lack of information or unclear direction and direction causes mental fatigue, because under conditions of ambiguity the individual needs high energy and mentality, leading to burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1984).

### **2.2.3 Working Conditions and Occupational Stress**

The work environment is a major determinant in employee engagement or disengagement. A study by Roelofsen (2002) indicates that improving the working environment reduces complaints and absenteeism while increasing productivity. There is adequate empirical evidence linking workplace conditions to job satisfaction (Wells, 2000). In recent years, employees comfort on the job, determined by workplace conditions and environment has been recognized as an important factor for measuring their productivity. Khan et al. (2011) investigated in their study the impact of workplace environment and infrastructure on employees' performance among a sample of 150 respondents from the education sector in Pakistan and concluded that incentives at workplace had a positive impact on employee's performance while infrastructure at workplace had no significant impact on employees.

In the study carried out by Jibowo (2007) on the effect of motivators and hygiene on job performance among a group of 75 agricultural extension workers in Nigeria. The study basically adopted the same method as Herzberg et al, (1959) and it shows some support for the influence of motivators on job performance. In another study carried out by Centres and Bugental (2007), they also based their research on Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation, which separated job variables into two group; hygiene factors and motivators. They made use of sample of 692 subjects to test the validity of two-factor theory. And it was discovered that at higher occupational level, "motivators" or intrinsic job factors were more valued, while at lower occupational level, "hygiene factors" or extrinsic job factors were more valued.

### **2.2.4 Work Relationships and Occupational Stress**

Poor professional relationship at work and lack of social support at the workplace were important predictors of occupational stress among Iranian hospital employees. Social support, supportive relationships with colleagues and group cohesion reduce the occurrence and the impact of job stress (Piko, 1999; & Steinhardt et al., 2003). The findings further revealed that organisational policies had the strongest correlation with employee occupational stress. Structural and

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6028>



organisational changes such as restructuring, downsizing, right sizing and re-engineering can result in a change in the nature of work for many employees and eventually their lay-off or relocation. These organisational changes may result in excessive work demands, time pressure and role conflicts, which cause stress for employees (Giga et al., 2003).

Unfairness and inequality at work (lack of organisational justice) were also reported as main occupational stressors among hospital employees in this study. Findings from the study showed that treating people unfairly could result in a series of negative or stress-related reactions that increase the risk of poor physical and mental health. These findings are consistent with those findings of McCann et al. (2009) and Wilkinson (2005).

### 3.0 Research Methodology

Since this study encompasses both quantitative and qualitative approaches by examining social research data and converting the data to a numerical form and subject it to statistical analyses, a descriptive research design method was used. The population of the study comprised of employees within the Kenyan Judiciary. According to judiciary staff establishment report (2021), there are currently 5,157 employees in the Kenyan Judiciary comprising of 635 magistrates and kadhis and 4,522 staff who shall form the target population of this study. Stratified random sampling was used to determine the sample size of the study. The statistical formula suggested by Kothari (2004) below was used.

$$n = \frac{z^2 \cdot p \cdot q \cdot N}{e^2 (N-1) + z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}$$

Where;

$N$  = size of population

$n$  = size of sample

$e$  = acceptable error (the precision)

$z$  = standard variate at a given confidence level

$p$  = sample proportion

$q = 1 - p$

Where;

$N = 5,157$ ,  $e =$  at 95% confidence level is 0.05,  $z = 1.96$ ,  $p = 0.5$ ,  $q = 0.5$

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \cdot (0.5) \cdot (0.5) \cdot (5,157)}{0.05^2 (5,157-1) + (1.96)^2 \cdot (0.5) \cdot (0.5)}$$
$$n = 362$$

Substituting these figures into the formulae gives a minimum sample size of 362 respondents. To select four categories of staff which constitutes the sample units, disproportionate stratified random sampling method was used to ensure the sample representative of the four sample units of the employees of Kenyan Judiciary.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6028>

**Table 1: Sample size**

Employee Sample Units	Population	Sample
Magistrates and Kadhis	635	40
Court Officers	1,362	88
Court Assistants	2,873	183
Office Assistants	287	51
<b>Total Number of Employees (respondents)</b>	<b>5,157</b>	<b>362</b>

The study used primary and secondary data. Data was collected by use of questionnaires administered by the researcher, interviews and observation of relevant documents, structures and material at hand. In addition, data from secondary sources were incorporated after checking on their relevance and reliability to the study. A pilot study was conducted to establish the validity and reliability of the study instruments.

The data was also entered using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Data that was obtained from the research instruments was summarized using Descriptive Statistics. To test hypothesis HA<sub>1</sub> to HA<sub>4</sub>, Pearson’s Correlation Analysis was used. To test hypothesis HA<sub>5</sub>, the below Multiple Regression model was used;

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where;

Y = is the dependent variable (employee performance)

a = a constant value

X<sub>1</sub>- X<sub>4</sub> are the independent variables

X<sub>1</sub>= Symptoms of occupational stress

X<sub>2</sub>= Sources of occupational stress

X<sub>3</sub>= Copying mechanisms of occupational stress

X<sub>4</sub>= Relapse to occupational stress

β<sub>0</sub> = the regression constant

β<sub>1</sub>-β<sub>4</sub> = regression coefficients

ε = error term (the difference between the observed and estimated dependent variable).

The results of the analysis was presented using tables and charts.

#### 4.0 Findings and Discussions

This section discusses the data analysis as well as the interpretation of the findings. The main objective of the study was to investigate the effects of occupational stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya.

#### 4.1 Response Rate

From the 362 questionnaires 356 were completely filled and returned hence a response rate of 98.3%. The response rate was considered as suitable for making inferences from the data collected.

#### 4.2 Descriptive Statistics

##### 4.2.1 Workload Stress and Employee Performance

From the results in Table 2, the respondents agreed that work overload causes occupational stress. This is supported by a mean of 3.928 (std. dv = 0.840). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.831 (std. dv = 0.804), the respondents agreed that Introduction of new technology at the work place can cause work stress; for example, use of computer and internet to access organizational email etc. Further, the respondents agreed that disparities in pay and benefits may cause occupational stress. This is shown by a mean of 3.696 (std. dv = 0.937).

The respondents also agreed that lack of enough training on new concept can cause occupational stress. This is shown by a mean of 3.689 (std. dv = 0.876). From the results, the respondents agreed that lack of interest on the job may cause occupational stress. This is supported by a mean of 3.675 (std. dv = 0.897).

**Table 1: Workload Stress and Employee Performance**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Work overload causes occupational stress	3.928	0.840
Introduction of new technology at the work place can cause work stress; for example, use of computer and internet to access organizational email etc	3.831	0.804
Disparities in pay and benefits may cause occupational stress	3.696	0.937
Lack of enough training on new concept can cause occupational stress	3.689	0.876
Lack of interest on the job may cause occupational stress	3.675	0.897
<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>3.691</b>	<b>0.854</b>

##### 4.2.2 Role Ambiguity Stress and Employee Performance

From the results in Table 3, the respondents agreed that they have time to unwind or have a place to relax after work. This is supported by a mean of 3.984 (std. dv = 0.811). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.920 (std. dv = 0.923), the respondents agreed that they regularly go for leave e.g. paternity, annual etc. or any off. Further, the respondents agreed that the Judiciary offers them recreational retreats away from work. This is shown by a mean of 3.901 (std. dv = 0.648).

The respondents also agreed that they have time to exercise off work. This is shown by a mean of 3.854 (std. dv = 0.928). From the results, the respondents agreed that there is enough support system from their supervisor or other people at work. This is supported by a mean of 3.726 (std. dv = 0.711). The respondents further agreed that judiciary provides you with mental wellness programs or facilities. This is supported by a mean of 3.675 (std. dv = 0.876).

**Table 2: Role Ambiguity Stress and Employee Performance**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
You have time to unwind or have a place to relax after work.	3.984	0.811
You regularly go for leave e.g. paternity, annual etc. or any off.	3.920	0.923
The Judiciary offers you recreational retreats away from work.	3.901	0.648
You have time to exercise off work.	3.854	0.928
There is enough support system from your supervisor or other people at work.	3.726	0.711
Judiciary provides you with mental wellness programs or facilities	3.675	0.876
<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>3.865</b>	<b>0.839</b>

**4.2.3 Working Conditions Stress and Employee Performance**

From the results in Table 4, the respondents agreed that Judiciary offers its staff enough time to meet their targets. This is supported by a mean of 3.923 (std. dv = 0.738). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.909 (std. dv = 0.900), the respondents agreed that Judiciary has placed conducive working conditions for its employees to undertake their duties. Further, the respondents agreed that Judiciary has enough psychosocial support systems for its employees at workplace. This is shown by a mean of 3.865 (std. dv = 0.843).

The respondents also agreed that Judiciary has employee groups that support and encourage each other in cases of occupational stress. This is shown by a mean of 3.837 (std. dv = 0.811). The respondents further agreed that Judiciary has a comprehensive medical scheme that helps its employees who are managing occupational stress. This is supported by a mean of 3.745 (std. dv = 0.987). The respondents also agreed that there is a policy guiding on occupational stress. This is shown by a mean of 3.675 (std. dv = 0.897)

**Table 3: Working Conditions Stress and Employee Performance**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Judiciary offers its staff enough time to meet their targets.	3.923	0.738
Judiciary has placed conducive working conditions for its employees to undertake their duties.	3.909	0.900
Judiciary has enough psychosocial support systems for its employees at workplace.	3.865	0.843
Judiciary has employee groups that support and encourage each other in cases of occupational stress.	3.837	0.811
Judiciary has a comprehensive medical scheme that helps its employees who are managing occupational stress.	3.745	0.987
There is a policy guiding on occupational stress	3.675	0.897
<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>3.8434</b>	<b>0.883</b>

#### 4.2.4 Work Relationships Stress and Employee Performance

Table 5 shows that the respondents agreed that unhealthy interactions in the work place may cause occupational stress. This is supported by a mean of 3.968 (std. dv = 0.905). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.959 (std. dv = 0.885), the respondents agreed that there is trust among employees in achieving organisational goals. Further, the respondents agreed that there is support and dialogue by supervisors in the organization during work activities. This is shown by a mean of 3.900 (std. dv = 0.605).

The respondents also agreed that organization guidelines and procedures are shared to all promptly. This is shown by a mean of 3.855 (std. dv = 0.981). From the results, the respondents agreed that there is feedback of quality of work done among employees and from supervisors. This is supported by a mean of 3.786 (std. dv = 0.874). The respondents also agreed that employees are seen as assets by management by appreciating exceptional employees. This is supported by a mean of 3.703 (std. dv = 0.786).

**Table 4: Work Relationships Stress and Employee Performance**

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unhealthy interactions in the work place may cause occupational stress	3.968	0.905
There is trust among employees in achieving organisational goals	3.959	0.885
There is support and dialogue by supervisors in the organization during work activities	3.900	0.605
Organization guidelines and procedures are shared to all promptly	3.855	0.981
There is feedback of quality of work done among employees and from supervisors	3.786	0.874
Employees are seen as assets by management by appreciating exceptional employee's	3.703	0.786
<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>3.811</b>	<b>0.849</b>

#### 4.2.5 Employee Performance

From the results, the respondents agreed that employee performance in the Judiciary is a collective activity that involves both the employer and employees. This is supported by a mean of 3.984 (std. dv = 0.997). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.905 (std. dv = 0.830), the respondents agreed that employee performance in the Judiciary causes Occupational Stress among its employees. Further, the respondents agreed that performance measuring and evaluation causes stress among Judiciary employees. This is shown by a mean of 3.828 (std. dv = 0.563).

The respondents also agreed that performance setting and targets are among leading causes of occupational stress in the Judiciary. This is shown by a mean of 3.789 (std. dv = 0.851). From the results, the respondents agreed that performance indicators and key result areas provide breeding grounds for occupational stress in the Judiciary. This is supported by a mean of 3.786 (std. dv =



0.897). In addition, as shown by a mean of 3.717 (std. dv = 0.876), the respondents agreed that individual targets versus team performance cause occupational stress among Judiciary employees.

**Table 5: Employee Performance**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Employee performance in the Judiciary is a collective activity that involves both the employer and employees.	3.984	0.997
Employee performance in the Judiciary causes Occupational Stress among its employees.	3.905	0.830
Performance measuring and evaluation causes stress among Judiciary employees.	3.828	0.563
Performance setting and targets are among leading causes of occupational stress in the Judiciary.	3.789	0.851
Performance indicators and key result areas provide breeding grounds for occupational stress in the Judiciary.	3.786	0.897
Individual targets versus team performance cause occupational stress among Judiciary employees.	3.717	0.876
<b>Aggregate</b>	<b>3.832</b>	<b>0.824</b>

### 4.3 Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics in the current study focused on correlation and regression analysis. Correlation analysis was used to determine the strength of the relationship while regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between dependent variable (employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya) and independent variables (workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress).

#### 4.3.1 Correlation Analysis

The present study used Pearson correlation analysis to determine the strength of association between independent variables (workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress) and the dependent variable (employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya) dependent variable. Pearson correlation coefficient range between zero and one, where by the strength of association increase with increase in the value of the correlation coefficients. The current study employed Taylor (2018) correlation coefficient ratings where by 0.80 to 1.00 depicts a very strong relationship, 0.60 to 0.79 depicts strong, 0.40 to 0.59 depicts moderate, 0.20 to 0.39 depicts weak.

**Table 6: Correlation Coefficients**

		<b>Employee Performance</b>	<b>Workload Stress</b>	<b>Role Ambiguity Stress</b>	<b>Working Conditions Stress</b>	<b>Work Relationships Stress</b>
<b>Employee Performance</b>	Pearson Correlation	1.000				
	Sig. (2- tailed)					
<b>Workload Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.820**	1.000			
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.002				
<b>Role Ambiguity Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.837**	.289	1.000		
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.001	.061			
<b>Working Conditions Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.842**	.172	.193	1.000	
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.003	.079	.084		
<b>Work Relationships Stress</b>	Pearson Correlation	-.912**	.185	.189	.279	1.000
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.002	.079	.083	.0721	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the results, there was a very strong relationship between workload stress and employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $r = -0.820$ ,  $p$  value =0.002). The relationship was significant since the  $p$  value 0.002 was less than 0.05 (significant level). The findings are in line with the findings of Usman *et al.* (2016) who indicated that there is a very strong relationship between workload stress and employee performance

Moreover, the results revealed that there is a very strong relationship between role ambiguity stress and employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $r = -0.837$ ,  $p$  value =0.001). The relationship was significant since the  $p$  value 0.001 was less than 0.05 (significant level). The findings conform to the findings of Jones *et al.*, (2017) that there is a very strong relationship between role ambiguity stress and employee performance.

Further, the results revealed that there is a very strong relationship between working conditions stress and employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $r = -0.842$ ,  $p$  value =0.003). The relationship was significant since the  $p$  value 0.003 was less than 0.05

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6028>

(significant level).The findings are in line with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2016) that there is a very strong relationship between working conditions stress and employee performance

The results also revealed that there was a very strong relationship between work relationships stress and employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $r = -0.912$ ,  $p$  value =0.002). The relationship was significant since the  $p$  value 0.002 was less than 0.05 (significant level). The findings are in line with the results of Phiri (2015) who revealed that there is a very strong relationship between work relationships stress and employee performance

#### 4.3.2 Regression Analysis

Multivariate regression analysis was used to assess the relationship between independent variables (workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress) and the dependent variable (employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya)

**Table 7: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.935	.874	.875	.10654

a. Predictors: (Constant), workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress

The model summary was used to explain the variation in the dependent variable that could be explained by the independent variables. The r-squared for the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable was 0.874. This implied that 87.4% of the variation in the dependent variable (employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya) could be explained by independent variables (workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress).

**Table 8: Analysis of Variance**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	122.027	4	30.508	1260.66	.001 <sup>b</sup>
1 Residual	8.511	351	0.0242		
Total	130.538	355			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress

The ANOVA was used to determine whether the model was a good fit for the data. F calculated was 1260.66 while the F critical was 2.422. The  $p$  value was 0.001. Since the F-calculated was greater than the F-critical and the  $p$  value 0.001 was less than 0.05, the model was considered as a good fit for the data. Therefore, the model can be used to predict the influence of workload stress, role ambiguity stress, working conditions stress and work relationships stress on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya.

**Table 9: Regression Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.158	0.077		2.519	0.001
	workload stress	0.389	0.110	0.388	3.536	0.003
	role ambiguity stress	0.491	0.105	0.492	4.676	0.001
	working conditions stress	0.381	0.101	0.382	3.770	0.002
	work relationships stress	0.450	0.090	0.451	5.000	0.000

a Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

The regression model was as follows:

$$Y = 0.158 + 0.389X_1 + 0.491X_2 + 0.381X_3 + 0.450X_4$$

From the results, workload stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $\beta_1=0.389$ , p value= (0.003). The relationship was considered significant since the p value 0.003 was less than the significant level of 0.05. The findings are in line with the findings of Usman *et al.* (2016) who indicated that there is a very strong relationship between workload stress and employee performance

The results also revealed that role ambiguity stress has significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya, ( $\beta_2=0.491$ , p value= 0.001). The relationship was considered significant since the p value 0.001 was less than the significant level of 0.05. The findings conform to the findings of Jones *et al.*, (2017) that there is a very strong relationship between role ambiguity stress and employee performance.

Furthermore, the results revealed that working conditions stress has significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya, ( $\beta_3=0.379$ , p value= 0.002). The relationship was considered significant since the p value 0.002 was less than the significant level of 0.05. The findings are in line with the findings of Khan *et al.* (2016) that there is a very strong relationship between working conditions stress and employee performance

In addition, the results revealed that work relationships stress has significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission employees in Kenya ( $\beta_4=0.450$ , p value= 0.000). The relationship was considered significant since the p value 0.000 was less than the significant level of 0.05. The findings are in line with the results of Phiri (2015) who revealed that there is a very strong relationship between work relationships stress and employee performance.

## 5.0 Conclusions

The study concludes that workload stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. Findings revealed that number of tasks, duration of task

completion and task distribution influences employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya

In addition, the study concludes that role ambiguity stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. Findings revealed that uncertain role definition, undefined responsibilities and undefined tasks influences employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya.

Further, the study concludes that working condition stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. Findings revealed that communication, workplace safety and physical environment influences employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya.

The study also concludes that work relationship stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. Findings revealed that employee-employer relations, employee-employee relations and employee-supervisor relations influence employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya.

## **6.0 Recommendations**

The study found that workload stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. This study therefore recommends that the management of judicial service commission should ensure effective strategies to manage workload stress are formulated and implemented to enhance employee performance.

In addition, the study found that role ambiguity stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. This study therefore recommends that the management of judicial service commission should ensure all tasks are clearly defined in terms of their completion time and the role of each employee is clear.

Further, the study found that working conditions stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. This study therefore recommends that the management of judicial service commission should ensure there is proper working environment for their employees to improve performance.

The study also found that work relationship stress has a significant effect on employee performance of Judicial Service Commission in Kenya. This study therefore recommends that the management of judicial service commission should ensure there is good relationship between the employees and their seniors to enhance performance.



## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A., & Ramzan, M. (2013) Effects of Job Stress on Employees Job Performance: A Study on Banking Sector of Pakistan, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 11, Issue 6 pp 61-68 <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1166168>
- Akinboye J, Akinboye D, Adeyemo D (2002) Coping with Stress in Life and Work
- American Institute of Stress (AIS). (2019) 42 Worrying Workplace Stress Statistics. In.; September 2019. <https://www.stress.org/workplace-stress>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 170 –180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170>
- Bataineh, K. A. (2017). The Impact of Electronic Management on the Employees' Performance. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 8(5), 86-100. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jms.v8n5p86>
- Benjamin GA, Darling E, Sales B. (1990) “The prevalence of depression, alcohol abuse, and cocaine abuse among United States lawyers.” *International Journal Law Psychiatry* 13:233–246. ISSN 0160-2527. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2527\(90\)90019-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2527(90)90019-Y)
- Casaleiro, P., Relvas, A.P. and Dias, J.P., (2021.) A Critical Review of Judicial Professionals Working Conditions’ Studies. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 12(1), p.2. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.334>
- CIPD. 2020. Wellbeing at work, Factsheet 29th April, CIPD, 1-7. [Google Scholar]
- CIPD. 2021. Wellbeing at work, Factsheet 27th April, CIPD, 1-7. [Google Scholar]
- Cummins RC. Job stress and the buffering effect of supervisory support. *Group Organ Stud*. 1990;15:92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960119001500107>
- Department of Medical Sociology, Duesseldorf University (2008). Effort-reward imbalance at work: Theory, measurement and evidence, Duesseldorf.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1982). *The mechanisms of job stress and strain*. London: Wiley.
- Idris, M.A., Dollard, M.F., & Winefield, A.H. (2011). Integrating psychosocial safety climate in the JD-R model: A study amongst Malaysian workers. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde*, 37(2), Art. 851, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i2.851>
- Iskandar M., Ahmad R. & Martua R. H. (2014). Factors Influencing Employees’ Performance: A Study on the Islamic Banks in Indonesia, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 5 No. 2;
- Islami, X., Mulolli, E., & Mustafa, N. (2018). Using Management by Objectives as a performance appraisal tool for employee satisfaction. *Future Business Journal*, 4(1), 94-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbj.2018.01.001>
- Judiciary, Kenya. (2014). *The Judiciary Human Resource Policies and Procedures Manual*. Judiciary. Nairobi

- Judiciary, Kenya. (2015). *Institutionalizing Performance Management and Measurement in the Judiciary*. Judiciary Nairobi
- Judiciary, Kenya. (2017). *Sustaining Judiciary Transformation (SJT) A Service Delivery Agenda, 2017-2021*. Judiciary. Nairobi
- Kelly, J. (2021, October 8) Indeed Study Shows That Worker Burnout Is At Frighteningly High Levels: Here Is What You Need To Do Now <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2021/04/05/indeed-study-shows-that-worker-burnout-is-at-frighteningly-high-levels-here-is-what-you-need-to-do-now/>
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Quantitative Techniques*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Lin, C. Y., & Kuo, T. H. (2007). The mediate effect of learning and knowledge on organizational performance. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570710816748>
- Llorens, S., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2006). Testing the robustness of the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(3), 378–391. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.3.378>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Essential organisational behaviour*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Sharit, J., & Salvendy, G. (1982). Occupational stress: Review and reappraisal. *Human Factors*, 24(2), 129–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872088202400201>
- Siegrist J, Starke D, Chandola T, Godin I, Marmot M, Niedhammer I & Peter R (2004). The measurement of Effort-Reward Imbalance at work: *European comparisons*. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58, 8, 1483-1499 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00351-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00351-4)
- Siegrist, J., and M. Wahrendorf (Eds.) (2016). *Work Stress and Health in a Globalized Economy: The Model of Effort-Reward Imbalance*. New York: Springer International.
- Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1998). The Job Demand-Control (-Support) Model and physical health outcomes: A review of the strain and buffer hypotheses. *Psychology and Health*, 13, 909-936. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870449808407440>
- Wee, L., Yeap, L., Chan, C. et al. Antecedent factors predicting absenteeism and presenteeism in urban area in Malaysia. *BMC Public Health* 19, 540 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6860-8>
- Whitman, G.R., et al. (2002) The Impact of Staffing on Patient Outcomes across Specialty Units. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 32, 633-639. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200212000-00008>
- WHO. (2020). *Protecting workers health*. [who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/protecting-workers'-health](http://who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/protecting-workers'-health). [Google Scholar]
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121>