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ABSTRACT

Stress has been analyzed as a major contributor to employee absenteeism and turnover limiting the potential success of an organization. It has been attributed to have negative impacts on employee emotionally, behaviorally and physically whereas, in organizations, studies that have been conducted in the work place have emphatically proven that extreme stress is detrimental to employee mental and physical well-being. The purpose of this study was establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The target population were all employees who are one hundred and sixty four in total (164) categorized in three ranks top management, supervisory and junior staff. Primary data were collected using questionnaires. The data were analyzed using social sciences (SPSS) Version 23.0 computer software. The model summary revealed that interpersonal relationships at work, work stress, changing nature of work explained 63.0% of the variations in employee job performance as indicated by the value of $R^2$ which implies that the are other factors not included in this model that account for 37.0% of changes in employee job performance. Regression results showed that interpersonal relationships at work had a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee job performance. Work stress revealed a negative and significant relationship with employee job performance. Further, regression results showed that changing nature of work has a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee job performance among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. From the study findings, the study concludes that work stress significantly influences employee job performance. It was also concluded that changing nature of work positively affects employee job performance. Based on research finding it can also be concluded interpersonal relationships at work positively affects employee job performance. The study recommends that work be broken into manageable units and shared among employees. This will ensure that no individual employee handles a bulk of work on his/her own. Employees should be encouraged to go on leave especially if it is a requirement in the organization. Employees should also be encourage to share any challenges for appropriate guidance and counseling from appropriate professionals in and out of the organization. The study recommends for periodic breaks of 15-30 minutes to allow the worker replenish and rejuvenate. There is also need for appropriate working hours for employees especially for those work that are very demanding and needs sufficient rests. Conscious efforts should be made to enhance social interaction among employees in the work setting such as acquisition of good and effective communication skills be adapted by employees in other to bring about good interpersonal relationship among employees to enhance job performance in the workplace. The study further recommends for appropriate team-building activities to enhance interpersonal relationship among employees. At team-building activities, employees may share work experiences and challenges with colleagues and even senior management for work environment improvement.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Globalization has led organizations to face stiff competition which has resulted to drastic changes at workplace causing a lot of pressure to employees. Developing countries like Kenya have undergone enormous social, economic and political changes. This has led to restructuring and merger of organizations with a drive to cut on operating costs, maximize profit and to have a wide base of customer niche to match with their ever-changing expectations. Stress level in the world is alarming. It affects employee both negatively and positively. On the positive side, it motivates employees to get more work done towards the deadline. On the negative side, it causes employees to feel overwhelmed and procrastinated. Too much stress depresses employee immune system (Webster 1998).

Stress at workplace is a common trend which has raised a lot of concerns in many organizations, manifesting itself via varying levels of job satisfaction, motivation, organization commitment and performance; as a result of this trend many scholars have conducted research with an aim to understand the magnitude of occupational stress. The definition of the term stress was initially considered to be linked with environmental pressure but later established to be related to psychological strain within the person and physical strains resulting from inadequate resources, high demands and pressures from work. Stress is the key challenge affecting the organization performance. It was revealed that Stressed employees are not likely to achieve their performance targets or the organization goals which may lead to huge losses in an organization. Merriam Webster (1998) defined stress as a physical, chemical or emotional factor that causes bodily or mental tension and may be a factor in disease causation. The survival of every organization is dictated by the level of productivity for it to thrive in the competitive world. Cooper etal, 1994 concluded that occupational stress is very costly in all the organizations and inefficiencies arising from it may contribute up to 10 percent of a country Gross National Product as per International Labor Organization (ILO) reports (Midgley, 1996).
This study is geared towards identifying the effects of occupational stress on employee performance with the aim of providing room for more studies to be conducted to seek interventions and strategies to be put in place to ensure stress level is manageable and have minimum effect on employee performance. This study is anchored on Transactional theory by Lazarus & Folkman (1991) and Interactional theory Interactional theory.

Ministry of Education was chosen for this study. It has four State Departments each with its distinct mandate headed by the Principal Secretaries. The departments include university Education and Research, Vocational Technical and Training, Post Training and Skills Development and Early Learning Basic Education. It is responsible for National policy in education systems in Kenya; access quality and affordable education, post-school, university education and research. Education is the key to future success of every country. Since the promulgation of the new Kenya Constitution 2010 which provides the right for basic education for all citizens. The Jubilee Government emphasized for education among other big four agenda priorities which has now demanded for 100% transition at basic level of education. This transition has really paused a lot of challenges ranging from inadequate resources, unequal distribution of resources, new curriculum, institutions unrest, trade union disputes, and curriculum mismatch with labour market among others. The challenges manifest themselves in form of employee stress which has adversely affected Education sector in Kenya.

Global economy is experiencing drastic changes which are directly influencing mergers and restructuring of the organizations with aim to retain competitive advantage workforces are constantly being retrenched, adoption of cultures of increased speed, efficiency and competition. Changes in the legislation in the public Sector have resulted to reforms in civil service which is currently operating with increased stress to employees as they adopt the changes. Work stress appears to be increasing (Szymanski, 1999).

The purpose of this study was to scrutinize the effect of Occupational stress on worker job performance. This research gathered diversified opinions on the subject matter and to allow for precision in the identification of causes of occupational stress in relation to every individual respondent.
1.1.1 Occupational Stress

Topper (2007) defined Occupational stress as perceived variance between employee capacities to perform the job and the set standards at workplace (environmental demands). The main perceived occupational stressors in an organization are job role demands, relationships at work, job content and conditions, organization culture, poor management practices, physical work environment, lack of change management policies, lack of support, role conflict and trauma.

Job-related stress symptoms can be psychological, physical and behavioral however, the magnitude of effect of stress differs with an individual. Stress is contagious at work place and if not addressed earlier by the management it can erode all the synergies within the organizations. Occupational stressors lead to inefficiency, increased staff turnover and absenteeism which are key to future success of any organization however, they manifest themselves through decreased quality and quantity of practice, high healthcare cost and decreased job satisfaction. Job performance outcome are adversely affected by occupational stress (Szymanski, 1999).

Occupational stress is a major challenge in the organizations; it is associated with decreased productivity, high rate of absenteeism, cardiovascular diseases, drugs and substance abuse (Meneze, 2005). Seibt et al., (2008) stated that prevailing stress among employees can be minimized by upgrading the working conditions and establishing employee reward and recognition systems in the organizations. Further investigation conducted by (Mark, Jonathan and Gregory, 2003) has established that job stress may lead to employee mobility and mortality therefore affecting both employee and organization performance. Human capital remains the core resource for organization to retain competitive advantage. This is attributed to employee job performance.

Stress is currently being referred as silent killer both among the employed and unemployed citizens. It manifests itself in the organizations inform of chronic absenteeism, negligence at work, low motivation, rampant cases indiscipline, alcohol and substance abuse, violence, social and financial constraints. These challenges impacts on employees both physical and psychological this has necessitated the provision of professional guidance and counseling services in the Public Service under the Ministry of State for Public Service (Counseling Policy,
Occupational stress has been of great concern to the management, employees and other stakeholders of organizations. Stress is a serious problem and very costly to many organizations (Cooper and Cartwright, 1994).

International Labor Organization (ILO) reported that inefficiencies arising from occupational stress may cost up to 10 percent of a country’s GNP (Midgley, 1996). Job related stress is linked to increased morbidity and mortality of employees (Mark, Jonathan and Gregory, 2003). Christo and Pienaar (2006) argued that the causes of occupational stress include perceived loss of job security, sitting for long periods of time or heavy lifting, lack of safety, complexity of repetitiveness job, lack of autonomy, inadequate resources; work schedules (shifts or overtime) and organization culture. Occupational stress is a sign of job dissatisfaction, job mobility, burnout, low performance and poor interpersonal relations at work (Manshor, Rodrigue, and Chong, 2003). Johnson (2001) it is therefore prudent for right interventions measures to be undertaken by identifying symptoms of stress, causes and strategizing the possible solutions. These measures enable employees to develop coping skills strategies to manage stress as well as to initiate corrective measures to curb the stressors. Employee Assistance to (EAPs) should be developed to minimize stress by creating a free environment where workers can communicate without fear of victimization.

1.1.2 Employee Job performance

Employee Performance is the ability to attain the set objectives within the defined parameters and timelines (Yusuf, Mohammed & Kazeem, 2014). It has further been defined as the overall expected result from employees’ behaviors achieved within a given timelines. It has been categorized as task and contextual performance. Task performance involves activities that directly generate goods and services from raw materials and it’s clearly reflected in job descriptions while Contextual Performance focuses on behaviors that support social and psychological climate such as collaborating with teammates and resolving conflict (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmidt, 1997).
Stup, (2003) outlined factors that contributes to the employee’s job output such as availability of resources, physical work environment, operating procedures, reward management systems, performance feedback, knowledge, skills and attitudes. Bartol and Martin (1998) considered motivation as powerful tool that reinforces and maintain behavior however; it can be deployed to re-energize employees to reach their full potential as they handle stressful engagement. According to Gibson, (2008) psychological factors affecting performance consists of perception, attitude, personality, motivation, job satisfaction and job stress. Performance Management process entails quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of activities. Results achieved are compared against expectations, with the aim to motivate, guide and improve decision making. It also provides an avenue for regular feedback which ensures improved productivity and high performing workforce (Lardenoije et al., 2005).

1.1.3 State Department for University Education and Research

The State Department for University Education and Research core mandate is to oversee implementation of activities in University Education institutions and in Science, Technology and innovation from the Presidential Circular No. 1 of June 2018 (Revised). The core function is management of university education policy and research. This sub sector comprises all the education and training offered in the highest institutions of learning leading to the award of degrees, it plays a crucial role in national development. The State Department has nine semi-autonomous government agencies with distinct mandates.

It is located at Jogoo House in Nairobi however it has some of its offices in Teleposta Towers and Utalii House. It currently operates in two main Directorates namely; University Education Directorate and Research Directorates. The administration department offer support services to the Technical Directorates through divisions that includes Human Resource Management and Development, Finance, Accounts, Information Communication and Technology, Planning, Procurement and Audit.
1.2 Research problem

Stress has been analyzed as a major contributor to employee absenteeism and turnover limiting the potential success of an organization. It has been attributed to have negative impacts on employee emotionally, behaviorally and physically whereas, in organizations, studies that have been conducted in the work place have emphatically proven that extreme stress is detrimental to employee mental and physical well-being. (Steers 1981). Costs associated with workplace stress includes high staff turnover, overtime payment, organization exits such as early retirement, retirement on medical grounds, conflict resolutions, resignations, increased request for transfers, medical and rehabilitation costs amount to direct cost all which are contributed by stress. Presentees are also associated with mistakes accidents and injuries which endanger the quality of work (Cooper et al, 2001).

Jones, (2003) established that stress impair decision making and creativity of an employee in most of the organizations employees are expected to work and make sound decisions that are within their jurisdiction however if coherent decisions are not made at the right time, it can cost the organization in its operations and financially. Stress can affect employee ability to concentrate on complex problems or issues, memory loss resulting to incomplete tasks, poor prioritization of tasks with tight deadlines stressful environment which can cause the employee to become resentful and overly protective of their jobs abandoning spirit teamwork and refusal to share information or resources with colleagues. On a wider scope, the effect of stress in an individual trickle down to the organization the person is working for and finally affects the whole community (Foley, Gale & Gavenlock, 1995; Kelly, 1995; Sarantakos, 1996).

The State Department for University Education and Research has unique structure characterized with bureaucracy in its operation, workload, unclear job structures, promotion issues, complex network of reporting relationships among other organizational issues that cause occupational stress however, like any other employees in private institutions, are constantly faced with many challenges such as organization dynamics, family issues which spill into the workplace, interpersonal conflicts, substance abuse, burnout, low morale, financial crises and time management among others. These challenges had impacted negatively on their psychological well-being and on their output at the workplace manifested through increased cases of
unruliness, absenteeism and laxity of duty, low inspiration, alcohol and substance abuse among other anti-social behaviors. These problems can be resolved by timely reaction, to address the problems as they arise, encouraging open communication and Rehabilitation to offer enhanced support and counseling. (Gichohi 2009)

Sikuku, (2017) conducted a research on the influence of organizational stress on performance among employees in Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) and found that all employees, whether at higher management levels, middle or lower levels experience stress and what varied was what stresses each of the categories of employees, managers are the most affected due to time pressure, deadlines and responsibility without autonomy.

Gichohi, (2009) conducted a study at the Government Press about correlation between job satisfaction and stress, it was established that stress was as a result of poor deployment of Human resource, poor communication, routine work, poor relationship between employees, nepotism, job ambiguity, unfair promotion policies, financial and social problems affected job satisfaction.

Vijayan (2017) analyzed the connection between impact of occupation stress and employee job performance with an example of 100 respondents working in an enormous milk preparing plant in Coimbatore in India with an assortment of employments. The results exhibited that there was a positive connection between employment stress and occupation execution. He recommended that management create conducive work environment as well as adopt programs to manage stress levels within the organization.

Dar, Akmal, Naseem, and commotion Khan (2011) conducted a study on the impact of stress on employee job performance in the production organizations in Pakistan and broke down the impact of workload on employment execution. The discoveries demonstrated that stress realizes emotional impacts such exploitation, ascent of control cases, work uncertainty, vague job, horrendous occurrences at work, harassing, tasks, work home interface, and monetary flimsiness among objective populace, poor focus, psychological barrier and poor basic leadership.
Steer (1981) conducted study of the role of occupational stress in the organization in the health sector found that stress is unavoidable and they cannot evade it. He recommended that management must strategize means to manage the stress among the employees through quick redress, encourage open communication and develop appropriate program that will enable employee to adopt coping mechanisms to manage stress.

There are scant research studies on occupational stress levels in Public Service in Kenya. It was in this light that this study sought to determine occupational stress levels in the public sector. The research available so far indicates that there has been no study that has critically analyzed the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance at the state Department of University Education and research hence the knowledge gap. This study therefore seeks to bridge the gap by answering the question. What is the effect of occupation stress on employee job performance at state department for University Education and Research?

1.3 Research Objectives

To establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research.

1.4 Value of study

The main aim of this study was to comprehend how occupational stress affects employee in terms of productivity and also to identify the factors responsible for job stress. There is a lot of concern arising from the increasing cases of stressed employees in organizations that are affecting their performance, which are being treated as indiscipline cases while the main root causes leading to stress are not being addressed. It is therefore important that this study may equip the managers in the organizations with the required knowledge that may be useful to identify and address them with an aim to improve employee productivity rather than to punish them. The information generated from this study may be significant to many organizations both private and public.
This study may form the bases for the organization's policy review and development to guide on employee management. The policies may be point of reference that may guide the managers on making sound decisions pertaining to employee conduct and behavior that result in low productivity. It may also guide the organizations to explore other policies that can enhance employee productivity such as reward management policy, training and development policy, employee wellness policy among others. Linkages between these policies may be established for the benefit of both employees and organization. The information generated from this study may help the managers and consultants to analyze the challenges related to employee stress and productivity by providing them with updated information. Due to globalization organizations have experienced a moving shift on how the stressors are trending and employee ability to cope. These trends require new tactics on how to be handled.

The study is mainly concentrated in the State Department for University Education and Research however, it may be of benefit to other Ministries and organization since this problem is universal in many organizations though the capacity differs from one organization to another. It may also guide the human resource managers on how to differentiate discipline cases and employee wellness concerns which has remained a major challenge to date. This knowledge may offer crucial solutions that may ensure improved performance for both employees and organizations.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section focused on theories through an intensive survey of the current writing on the impact of work related weight on worker work execution. The section gives the theoretical structure and the exploration gaps that demonstrate the connection between the factors of the investigation.

2.2 Theoretical Review


2.2.1 Transactional Theory

Transactional theory of stress emphases on the individual’s touching response related to their surroundings. It is connected with experience to particular workplace situations and individual’s evaluation of a difficulty in coping with the issues that arise” (Cooper, 2001). According to Folkman and Lazarus (1991), assessment comprises the successive processes of primary appraisal continuous-monitoring of environmental-conditions with a center on whether there are likely to be consequences for the individual’s happiness, and secondary evaluation, what can be done should such cost occur, that is, the identification of a possible managing strategy.

Coping refers to any effortful attempt to vary environmental circumstances or manage feelings regardless of outcome (Lazarus & Folkman 1991). This theory elaborates the need for the manager to devise ways and means to curb stress level through programs since today’s stress management programs are often not driven by sound theoretical models but instead by the needs of managers to lower employee’s stress level in the organization. It have significant implications on the current design and development of stress management programs, which often lack the required comprehensiveness and sensitivity to ensure long-term effectiveness and adaptability (Gardner, Rose, Mason, Tyler & Cushway, 2005).
2.2.2 Interactional Theory

The interacting hypothesis of stress center around how the individual connects with their workplace and how the individual comprehends the others in relation to their body behavior. It has additionally been delegated; Person-Environment Fit hypothesis French et al. (1982) and the Demand–Control hypothesis of Karasek (1979).

2.2.2.1 Person-Environment Fit theory

This theory describes the fit between the person and work environment how it influences individual behaviour or situational differences. This theory identified two basic aspects of fit; employee’s attitudes and abilities to meet the demands of the job and to which the job environment meets the workers’ needs, however the individual is required and encouraged to use their knowledge and skills at work. French et al., (1974) concluded that stress is likely to occur when there is lack of fit between the two aspects, he further explained that, the Person characteristics may include an individual’s biological or psychological needs, values, goals, abilities, or personality, while environmental characteristics could include intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, demands of a job or role, cultural values, or characteristics of other individuals and collectives in the person's social environment (Sikuku 2017).

Fit theory enables the individuals to understand others thus reinforcing interpersonal relationship at work place individual ability to adapt to changes within the environment. In line with this theory, employees become stressed due to both of internal factors (within themselves) and external factors (from outside themselves) within the organization which might result to low or high work performance in relation with on how they perceived these factors.

2.2.2.2 Demand – Control model

Karasek (1979) on his analysis on demand – control model, drew attention to the possibility that work characteristics may not directly be associated with worker’s health though, they may combine interactively in relation to health. The key idea behind the job demands-control model is that, control buffers the impact of job demands on strain and can help enhance employees' job satisfaction with the opportunity to engage in challenging tasks and learn new skills. The model is concerned with predicting outcomes of psychological strain and workers who experience high
demands paired with low control are more likely to experience work-related psychological distress and strain (Beehr et al. 2001).

This theory is based on two aspects; Height of strain (demands) which includes the requirements set at work which is classified as psychological stressors in the work environment. Decision latitude (control) addresses the freedom and autonomy an employee has to control and manage his own work. This latitude refers to the control that employees have when discharging their duties and how they want to perform these tasks based on competence they have and decision-making authority bestowed unto them. Robert Karasek (1979) emphasizes that employee, who have demanding jobs, experience a lot of stress if they cannot decide when to do the work. Employee’s experiences a lot of stress while they are pressurized with time and tight deadlines whereas if they are given autonomy to use their own time schedule even for high demanding tasks with complexity they can manage.

The discussion on the interactional and transactional theories of occupational stress exposed that the researchers have conceptualized these theories in different ways. The central point of interactional-theories of stress is the twenty four structural appearance of the person’s communication with their work environment, whereas, the transactional-theories of stress centers on the person’s moving reactions and cognitive development related to their environment.

2.3 Causes of Occupational Stress

Occupational job stress is an outcome of mismatch between the individual capabilities and organizational demands. Bernstein et al. (2008) define the sources of stress as every circumstance or event that threatens to disrupt people’s daily functioning and causes them to make adjustments.

The prevailing burden over the years has pulled in a great deal of consideration (Stewart, 1976), both work under burden and work over-burden can be inconvenient in any association (Frankenhauser and Gardell, 1975; Lundberg and Forsman, 1979; Szabo et al., 1983; Jones et al., 1998) a reasonable differentiation among quantitative and subjective outstanding task at hand has been set up (French and Caplan, 1970; French et al., 1974). Quantitative remaining task at hand alludes to the measure of work to be done at a given time while subjective outstanding task at
hand alludes to any trouble or challenge of that work. Both have been characterized to be real reasons for pressure. The impact of enormous outstanding task at hand outcomes into lower execution levels which thusly add to low resolve and high worker turnover in companies. Short cycle of tedious work is related with both physical and mental wellbeing. Kahn and Byosiere (1990) further contended that remaining task at hand is an element of amount, quality and time. Jones et al. (1998) built up elevated levels of pressure and stress-related ailments were because of attempting to comply with tight time constraints and work over-burden.

The outstanding burden has likewise been in connection to work pace, for example, how quick work must be finished and the idea of controls required which can be either self-managed frameworks or machine paced. Long working duration example with machine or frameworks paced work is unfavorable to both mental and physical wellbeing (Bradley, 1989). Work routines/strategic scheduling is a significant factor in occupation structure and work association be that as it may, absence of self-governance to command over staff work routines is a noteworthy wellspring of worry to laborers in numerous association (Narayanan and Nath, 1982; Orpen, 1981.

Warr (1992) recommends that manual work is for the most part connected with boundaries of remaining task at hand (over-burden or under burden), low degrees of basic leadership and interest, and low assignment assortment. Administrative work is for the most part connected with work over-burden, job related issues and vulnerability. French et al.(1982). Effect of long working hours on supervisors and found that they experience a scope of stress-related manifestations, for example, inordinate weariness and cerebral pains, were predominantly related overseeing intemperate outstanding burdens and all the while complying with unreasonable targets and time constraints (Townley, 2000).

Management change todays is inevitable and has been connected to significant level of vulnerability and if not all around oversaw it faces dismissal. Pritchett and Pound (1995) recognized, opposing change as one of the most widely recognized reasons for weight at work. Globalization went with the extraordinary inclination of numerous companies to satisfy clients need and expanded proficiency has prompted expanded utilization of information communication and technology (ICT) in the working environment. This has thusly come about to
changing nature of work that is presently described by conserving, re-appropriating/subcontracting of administrations, change in business designs; work advancement requesting laborers’ adaptability both as far as staff foundation and abilities; maturing workforce; self-managed work and cooperation, among others. Research on these territories is as yet continuous.

Organizational change has incredible effect in transit companies work may convey potential perils to worker wellbeing and prosperity consequently their effect should be observed anyway it is apparent that changes coming about because of improved the workplace can create better impact which are not hindering to staff. Windel (1996) learned about association receiving automatic cooperation upheld by social help and found that they are wellspring of expanded self-adequacy in connection to work requests that had expanded and prosperity diminished. He presumed that expansion in social help without anyone else controlling groups was not adequate to neutralize expanded requests brought about by the blend of a decrease in the quantity of staff and increments in administrative obligations.

Sauter et al. (1992) recognized three arrangements of companies with bosses, subordinates and partners as significant in each association, stressed relational connections cause staff to create domains in the working environment, poor communication, cooperation endure, communitarian endeavors lessen, and the trading of data is limited. Buck (1972) noticed that the conduct of Managers contributes contrarily to laborers' sentiments of employment weight. Lobban et al. (1998) found that supervisory styles, for example, giving guidance and way in which correspondence with staff is done assumes a progressively predominant job in the pressure procedure. Stressed relationship at work outcome to low resolve related with absence of certainty, receptiveness and trust in supervisory staff.

Research suggests that the impact of pressure influences companies straightforwardly this is described by; high pace of turnover, non-appearance and poor time keeping, impeded work execution and efficiency, an expansion in customer protests (Jones et al., 1988) and an expansion in worker pay claims for hospital expenses and mishaps (Barth, 1990; Lippe, 1990; Neary et al., 1992). Rubina et al. (2008) investigated work execution as aftereffect of association of three elements; ability, exertion and the idea of work conditions cooperating. Usman Ali et al. (2014)
noticed that there is an immediate connection among remaining burden, job struggle, and deficient monetary reward with pressure which prompts decreased worker effectiveness.

Spurgeon et al. (1997) remarked that disposition, inspiration, work necessities, social atmosphere and different parts of the authoritative influences worker wellbeing and execution results. Constant working can result to weakness which can likewise influence rest designs (Ryman et al., 1989). Amassing of rest obligation can antagonistically influence efficiency (Stampi, 1989). Human execution working seriously and constantly ought to be 2-3 days (Haslam, 1982; Naitoh et al., 1983). Execution impacts can be recognized in carefulness undertakings, those including subjective and verbal execution (Angus and Heslegrave, 1983; Haslam, 1982) be that as it may, physical execution of moderate power shows up increasingly impervious to debilitation (Patton et al., 1989).

Meneze (2005) demonstrated that rising degrees of occupation stress has turned into a test for the businesses and the more significant level of employment stress is related with low profitability, expanded non-attendance subsequently enjoying medication misuse or infirmity identified with pressure, for example, hypertension and cardiovascular issues. Deshinger (2003) broke down significant parts of representative employment execution that are probably going to be influenced by pressure; profitability, work fulfillment/spirit, non-attendance, basic leadership capacities, precision, inventiveness, regard for individual appearance, hierarchical aptitudes, civility participation, activity, unwavering quality, sharpness, constancy and lateness. Venkatraman and Ramanujam's (1986) execution estimation system depends on different markers of authoritative execution. These pointers are money related execution, operational execution and by and large viability. Monetary execution is shown by benefit while operational execution eludes to non-budgetary factors, for example, a piece of the overall industry and inner results which decides the endurance of an association.
2.4 Measures of Performance

Measuring performance is an ongoing process that focuses on tracking the progress, identification, and communication of performance results by the use of performance indicators. Performance indicator is a unit of measure that determines the trend of an organization towards defined business goals within a specific time frame. Unit of measure are quality, quantity, implementation of duties and responsibilities. Measuring performance is an incentive plan since it communicates the significance of established organizational goals Mangkunegara (2009).

Performance management is a continuous process of managing employee to achieve the required result. It involves defining the job expectations that are clearly communicated to the employee (Den Hertlog et alii.2004), availability of resources and good relationship between managers and staff is one factor that constitutes a conducive environment which is created by the employer to enable the employees to interact freely and consult. It also provides an avenue for regular feedback which ensures improved productivity and high performing workforce. Performance evaluation must be inclusive of all aspects pertaining employee achievements and work ethics. It mainly aimed to focus on evaluation process. Performance measurement provides the essential feedback to improve decision making in organizations at all levels Haden (2013). Ultimate success or failure of an organization is mostly determined by the employee performance (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995).

2.5 Empirical review and Knowledge Gaps

Dar, Akmal, Naseem, and Khan (2011) investigated on the impact of stress on employee job performance in the production organizations in Pakistan and broke down the impact of workload on employment execution. Information was gathered from 143 staff working with different global organizations, colleges, and banks. The discoveries demonstrated that stress realizes emotional impacts such as feeling absence of acknowledgment at working environment, exploitation, ascent of control cases, work uncertainty, vague job, horrendous occurrences at work, harassing, tasks, work home interface, and monetary flimsiness among objective populace, poor focus, psychological barrier and poor basic leadership. The outcomes uncovered a negative
connection between occupation stress and workers' activity execution and that activity stress essentially diminishes the staff' activity execution.

Steer (1981) in the study of role of occupational stress in the organization in the health sector found that stress is unavoidable and they cannot evade it. He recommended that management must be proactive to devise means to manage the stress among the employees by frequent stress audit and quick redress, encourage open communication and develop appropriate program that will enable employee to adopt coping mechanisms to manage stress. It was noted that there was need to conduct further research with aim to get more insight of holistic view of complex sources of stress and its effects.

Sikuku (2017) study on the influence of organizational stress on performance among employees in Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) established that stress affected performance of both organization and employees productivity negatively. It was further noted there existed a strong correlation between organizational stress and employees’ performance. It was recommended that seminars to train staff on stress management to be organized, counseling unit to be establishment and organizations to adopt open communication.

There are scant research studies on occupational stress levels hence need to conduct further research with aim to get more insight of holistic view of complex sources of stress and its effects. The research available so far indicates that there has been no study that has critically analyzed the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance creating knowledge gap.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the research methodology that was used to carry out the study. The research design, population, data collection procedure and data analysis, presentation and interpretation are well described.

3.2 Research Design

Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. Descriptive survey design has been chosen because the objective of the study is to describe, explain and validate generalizable findings. It also allows the researcher to use inferential statistics to analyze data.

3.3 Target Population

This study focused on State department for University Education and Research located at Jogoo House in Nairobi with some of its offices in Teleposta Towers and Utalii House. The target population were all employees who are one hundred and sixty four in total (164) categorized in three ranks top management, supervisory and junior staff as shown in table 3.1

Table 3.1

Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Jogoo House Frequency</th>
<th>Teleposta Towers Frequency</th>
<th>Utalii House Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior staff</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Data Collection

Primary data were gathered using the drop and collect self-administered questionnaire. Section A reflects questions on demographic data on respondent; section B reflects questions on occupational stress while section C reflects questions on employee job performance. The questionnaire were administered through drop and pick method.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data collected from this study was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies mean and standard deviation were used to analyze data. Regression analysis was done using simple linear to establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance. Results were presented in form of tables.

Regression Model

The model specifically took the form of

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon \]

Where

\[ Y = \text{Employee Job Performance} \]

\[ \beta_0 = \text{Constant} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{Workload stress} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Changing Nature of work} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Interpersonal Relationships at Work} \]
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter represents the findings, results and interpretation of the variables including the response rate, demographic information of respondents, descriptive statistics and regression analysis. Regression model was performed to establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. The dependent variable of the study was occupational stress (workload stress, changing nature of work and interpersonal relationships at work) and employee job performance.

4.2 Response Rate

The number of questionnaires that were administered was 164 and a total of 117 questionnaires were properly filled and returned but some of the employees returned the questionnaires half-filled and thus were not included in the study. The response rate result is shown in Table 2.

Table 4.1
Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreturned</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author 2019

Out of the 164 questionnaires administered 117 were filled and returned representing 71.3 percent. This response rate is considered satisfactory to make conclusions for the study. Bailey (2000) stated that a response rate of 50% is adequate while a response rate greater than 70% is very good. This implies that based on this assertion, the response rate in this case of 71.3% is therefore very good. The data collection procedures used could have attributed to this high response rate. These included pre-notification of study participants and voluntary participation.
by employees; drop and pick of questionnaires to allow for ample time to fill; assurance of confidentiality and anonymity and follow up calls to clarify queries from the work force managers.

4.3 Demographic characteristics

For the study to establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research, it was considered important to establish the background information of the respondents which included gender, marital status, age group, years of service, grade, academic qualification and type of engagement. The demographic characteristics are presented in Table 4.2
Table 4.2

Demographic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 55 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0- 5 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-L</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M and above</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author 2019
The findings in Table 3 indicate majority of workers 56.4% were males. Females were 43.6% of the workers population. The results imply that more males work at the State Department for University and Research compared to females. Gender is could affect the performance of the employees as it has been commonly observed. The results are in line with Saleem, Khan and Imran (2014) gender has a positive correlation with job performance.

Results further showed that 50.4% of workers were married, 23.9% were single while, 25.6% belonged to other marital status groups. The other marital status could be widow and divorcee. Marital status can have an effect on job performance and the effect may be positive or negative depending on the status. Married employees may perform better at work compared to divorced or widowed workers. Likewise, single employees may perform better at work place compared to married employees. Married employees may be committed to lots of family responsibilities including parenting which may affect job performance. According to Kemunto, Adhiambo and Joseph (2018) marital status has an influence on job satisfaction where the married were much happier in their jobs than the single among TSC teachers. Likewise, Padmanabhan and Magesh (2016) noted that unmarried employees can perform well than married employees since their commitment towards their family and other circumstances are considerably less when compared to the married employees.

Age group results revealed that majority 55.6% of workers were 26-40 years old, 20.5% were aged 41-54 years, 12.8% were aged above 55 years while 11.1% were aged Up to 25. The results imply that majority of employees are young and middle age. It is a common observation that the very old people may fail to function as effectively as the younger persons at certain tasks. This is mainly attributed to the age factor. The energy level of the old persons may be depreciating compared to the younger ones and perform certain tasks at the same efficiency as the young workers may be a problem. There are some notable differences between the older and younger people psychologically as well. At certain tasks the older people can perform better than the younger employees due to the experience factor, for example the older people can give better advices against the younger ones. The results align with Bertolino, Truxillo and Fraccaroli (2013) that employee age has a significant effect on employee job performance. According to Odhiambo, Gachoka and Rambo (2018) age diversity influence employee performance.
It was also established that majority 53.0% of employees had worked for 6-10 years, 23.1% 0-5 years, 13.7% for 11-20 years and 10.3% for over 20 years. The results imply that years of work may indicate the amount of work experiences a worker has and this may have an effect on overall employee job performance. The results agree with McDaniel, Schmidt and Hunter (1988) that year of work results to job experience which influences individual employee performance. Demographic results further indicated that most of employees 48.7% were in age group H-L, 30.8% in M and above and 20.5% were in grade A-G. The work group of an employee may influence their job performance. Work group is derived from work experience and thus have an effect on employee job performance.

It was also revealed that most 44.4% of employees were undergraduate, 21.4% were diploma holders, 17.9% had masters and above while 5.1% had secondary level of education. Employee academic qualifications have been linked to employee performance. Academic qualifications increasingly determine job performance in that it ensures that the person has the basics in learning. Better job performance is highly possible when a person has strong basic grounding in the task given. These basics allow a person to work, innovate, and communicate effectively in work place. The results are in line with Jaoko (2014) that academic qualification has a positive relationship with employee performance. However, Ariss and Timmins (1989) established no significant relationship has been found between the managers' college education and their performance at work.

It was further revealed that 51.3% of employees were on permanent engagement, 30.8% on contract and 17.9% were on temporary. Type of engagement may have an effect on employee job performance. Employees who are on temporary agreement may not perform well basing on the fact that they may be leaving the firm soon. Likewise, employees on temporary agreement may also perform well to impress the management so that they may be employed on permanent basis. Permanent employees may perform well in the organization or perform badly based on various individual circumstances. Employees on contract terms may opt to work smarter and perform better in order to have their contract extended when the current contract expires. It is not surprising that contract terms is preferred by many organizations because an employee will opt to work towards his/her best efforts for possible consideration during contract renewals. Compared
to temporary and permanent, contract engagement might be the best in enhancing employee performance.

4.4 Descriptive Analysis

This section contains descriptive analysis for workload stress and employee job performance. A likert scale with options of 15- Very great extent, 4- Large extent, 3 - Moderate extent, 2 - Low extent, 1 - No extent is used.

4.4.1 Occupational stress

The study sought to establish the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. The study evaluated occupational stress in terms of workload stress, changing nature of work and interpersonal relationships at work. For the purposes of interpretation no extent and low extent were interpreted together, large extent and very large extent were grouped and interpreted as one while moderate extent was interpreted alone. The results obtained are presented in Table 4.3.
### Table 4.3

#### Occupational stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational stress</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is enough staff at work</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers are inefficient</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of time pressure</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for too many employee / projects</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees energy level is completely finished by the end of the working day</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to complete quality work on time</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees feel like they have not achieved much in their work at the end of a working day.</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are times some employees suffer from illness such as muscle tension, nausea, headaches, increased heart rate etc.</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changing Nature of work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to use modern communication technology</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times employees are absent from work due to medical problems.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are receptive to changes and new ideas</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to cope with tight deadlines assigned to job tasks</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Relationships at Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have good working relationship with their colleagues.</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees interact freely with their bosses,</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes some employees feel like withdrawing from their colleagues.</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees perform their work with little or no supervision</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees willingly participate in team activities</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some employees get irritated even with slight provocation at their workplaces</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author 2019
Table 4.3 shows that majority of employees agreed that there is enough staff at work to low extent, with mean score of 2.2 and standard deviation of 1.0 implying that number of staff are limited compared to the available work load. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed that co-workers are inefficient to large extent with mean score of 3.6 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that some of workers were less efficient resulting as a result of occupation stress. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed that the high levels of time pressure with mean score of 3.7 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that time pressure results to occupation stress. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that responsible for too many employee / projects, with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that too overload by responsibilities results to work stress.

Results also showed that employees agreed to large extent that energy level is completely finished by the end of the working day to low extent, with mean score of 3.7 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that employees are completely exhausted after work because of too much work. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to moderate extent that employees are able to complete quality work on time with mean score of 2.5 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that employees are not working efficiently. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that sometimes employees feel like they have not achieved much in their work at the end of a working day with mean score of 3.9 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that most employees do not achieve much after the working day. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that there are times some employees suffer from illness such as muscle tension, nausea, headaches, increased heart rate etc, with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that too overload by responsibilities results to body pains.

Results in Table 4.3 further showed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that employees are able to use modern communication technology, with mean score of 4.0 and standard deviation of 1.0 implying that the staff are aware of the technological changes. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that at times employees are absent from work due to medical problems with mean score of 3.9 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying that work load may result to health problems. The results also showed
that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that employees are receptive to changes and new ideas with mean score of 2.5 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that workers are resistant to changes and new ideas. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to low extent that employees are able to cope with tight deadlines assigned to job tasks, with mean score of 2.1 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that keeping deadlines is a problem to most employees.

It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to small extent that employees have good working relationship with their colleagues, with mean score of 2.0 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that favourable working relationship is a problem among employees. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to low extent that employees interact freely with their bosses with mean score of 1.9 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying that employee relationships with bosses is strained. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that sometimes some employees feel like withdrawing from their colleagues with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that work stress results to strained relationship with workmates. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to low extent that employees perform their work with little or no supervision, with mean score of 1.9 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying that most employees work under supervision. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to low extent that employees willingly participate in team activities with mean score of 1.9 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that working as a team is a challenge for most employees. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that some employees get irritated even with slight provocation at their workplaces, with mean score of 3.9 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that work pressure derails employees’ emotional intelligence.

4.4.2 Employee Job Performance

The study sought to establish the level of employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. The study evaluated employee job performance in terms of error and mistakes, absenteeism, output of work and timeliness. For the purposes of interpretation no extent and low extent were interpreted together, large extent and
very large extent were grouped and interpreted as one while moderate extent was interpreted alone. The results obtained are presented in Table 4.4

Table 4.4

Employee Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Job Performance</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error and Mistakes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some employees in my organization make frequent errors and mistakes due lack of concentration</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees make errors due to work overload</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are not well guided by their supervisors</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are not motivated at work</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At times employees are absent from work due to medical problems</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse contributes to some employees absenteeism</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees get boredom whenever they think of getting to work</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees evade work for not meeting work timelines</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output of work</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to set target at work</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have adequate resources that facilitate them to meet set targets.</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely feedback enables employees improve on their output</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees training are conducted on need basis to enhance performance.</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees completes assignments within stipulated timeliness</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization provides timely feedback on performance</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees performance targets are time-bound</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to cope with Adhoc assignments with deadlines</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 shows that majority of employees agreed that large extent that some employees in the organization make frequent errors and mistakes due lack of concentration, with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that work mistakes and errors are common because of work load. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that sometimes employees make errors due to work overload with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that errors are common in the work place especially because of work pressure. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that employees are not well guided by their supervisors with mean score of 3.6 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that work supervisory is problematic at the work place. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that employees are not motivated at work, with mean score of 3.7 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that too much workload derails employee motivation.

Results also showed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that at times employees are absent from work due to medical problems, with mean score of 4.2 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying that occupation stress results to health problems. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that substance abuse contributes to some employees’ absenteeism with mean score of 4.1 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying that use of substance may derail employees’ productivity. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that employees get boredom whenever they think of getting to work with mean score of 4.2 and standard deviation of 1.0 implying that work stresses with time. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to large extent that sometimes employees evade work for not meeting work timelines with mean score of 3.8 and standard deviation of 4.1 implying that too overload make employees evade work by lying of healthy problems.

Results in Table 4.4 further showed that majority of employees agreed to low extent that employees are able to set target at work, with mean score of 2.3 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that employees mostly rely on the organization to set them targets. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to low extent that employees have adequate resources that facilitate them to meet set targets with mean score of 2.1 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that adequate resources are not always available in the organization. The results
also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that timely feedback enables employees improve on their output with mean score of 4.0 and standard deviation of 1.1 implying timely feedback results to improved productivity. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to low extent that employees training are conducted on need basis to enhance performance., with mean score of 2.2 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that employee training are few.

It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to small extent that employees completes assignments within stipulated timeliness, with mean score of 2.2 and standard deviation of 1.2 implying that work completion in time is a problem in the organizations. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that the organization provides timely feedback on performance with mean score of 3.7 and standard deviation of 1.3 implying that the organization tries to give prompt feedback to enhance job performance. The results also showed that majority of the employees agreed to large extent that employees’ performance targets are time-bound with mean score of 4.0 and standard deviation of 1.0 implying that most work in organizations are pegged on targets. It was also revealed that majority of employees agreed to low extent that employees are able to cope with adhoc assignments with deadlines, with mean score of 2.0 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying that keeping work deadlines is a problem in the organization.

4.5 Regression

This section contains inferential analysis for interpersonal relationships at work, work stress, changing nature of work and how occupational stress affect employee job performance. Inferential statistics in this section include model fitness, ANOVA tests and regression coefficients. The results presented in Table 6 present model summary of the regression model.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal Relationships at Work, workload stress, Changing Nature of work

Source: author 2019
Interpersonal Relationships at Work, workload stress, Changing Nature of work were found to be satisfactory in explaining employee job performance. This is supported by coefficient of determination also known as the R square of 63.0\%. This means that interpersonal relationships at work, workload stress, changing nature of work explained 63.0\% of the variations in employee job performance. Job-related stress symptoms can be psychological, physical and behavioral however, the magnitude of effect of stress differs with an individual. Stress is contagious at work place and if not addressed earlier by the management it can erode all the synergies within the organizations. Occupational stressors lead to inefficiency, increased staff turnover and absenteeism which are key to future success of any organization however, they manifest themselves through decreased quality and quantity of practice, high healthcare cost and decreased job satisfaction. The ANOVA results obtained are presented in Table 4.6

**Table 4.6**

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.872</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.624</td>
<td>64.086</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.390</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.263</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee job performance  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Interpersonal Relationships at Work, work stress, Changing Nature of work

Source: author 2019

The results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant. Further, the results imply interpersonal relationships at work, work stress, changing nature of work are good predictors of employee job performance. This was supported by an F statistic of 64.086 which was greater than the critical F-statistic of 2.6987 and the reported p value (0.000) which was less than the conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. The findings for F calculated (64.086) was also compared against the F critical value ($F_{3, 113}$) where $p \leq 0.05$ of 2.6987 calculated from the F
tables. Since the F calculated was greater than F critical (64.086 > (2.6987), the model is significant (F =64.086 < P =0.05). since F =64.086 at 0.00 the model is fit to explain relationship between occupational stress and employee performance.

Occupational stress is a major challenge in the organizations; it is associated with decreased productivity, high rate of absenteeism, cardiovascular diseases, drugs and substance abuse. Job performance outcome are adversely affected by occupational stress. Regression of coefficient results is presented in Table 4.7 To interpret the regression coefficient results, calculated p value is compared with 0.05 level of significance. If the p value is less than 0.05, then the relationship between variables is significant.

Table 4.7

Regression of coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload stress</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-4.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Nature of work</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>6.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships at Work</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>6.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee job performance
**Employee Job Performance Model**

\[ Y = 1.383 - 1.34X_1 + 0.294X_2 + 0.377X_3 \]

Where

\( Y = \) Employee Job Performance  
\( X_1 = \) Workload stress  
\( X_2 = \) Changing Nature of work  
\( X_3 = \) Interpersonal Relationships at Work

The constant value of 1.383 means that in the absence of interpersonal relationships at work, workload stress, changing nature of work, employee job performance is still positive. This implies that there are other factors that enhance employee job performance though not included in the model. The factors may include rewards and remuneration, motivation and competence.

Regression of coefficients showed that workload stress and employee job performance have a negative and significant relationship (\( \beta = -0.134, \ p = 0.000 < 0.05 \)). The regression of coefficient implies that if workload stress increases by one unit, the employee job reduces by 0.134 units. Job stress has become a common term in today’s work place. In every organisation, the main cause of low productivity appears to be stress at workplace. Employees need certain kind of motivation and job stress mitigating strategies to overcome the stress. Job stress is an outcome or response to certain stimuli in the environment. Nowadays, job stress has become more apparent and leads to low morale of employees and poor job performance. Job stress is prevailing in every employee’s day-to-day life and it impacts their job performance. The job stress can occur due to several factors like overwork, workload, poor work environment and strained work relationship at the work place. The results agree with Dar, Akmal, Naseem, and commotion Khan (2011) that work stress derails employee job performance in the production organizations revealing a negative connection between occupation stress and workers’ activity execution and that activity stress essentially diminishes the staff” activity execution. According to Sikuku (2017) there exist a strong correlation between organizational stress and employees’ performance.
The results also revealed that changing nature of work and employee job performance have a positive and significant relationship ($\beta=.294 \ p=0.000<0.05$). The regression of coefficient implies that changing nature of work by one unit, leads to increase employee job performance by .294 units. Nature of work shall be defined as the actual content of the job or work characteristics no matter whether these characteristics or the content of that work is positive or negative. The effects of a job upon the employees are also considered as contents of a job whether these effects are characterized as interesting or boring, diverse or regular, creative or degrading, easy or difficult, challenging or non-demanding. However the Nature of Work is so far known as the biggest indicator of employee job performance. Changing nature of work that is presently described by conserving, re-appropriating/subcontracting of administrations, change in business designs; work advancement requesting laborers' adaptability both as far as staff foundation and abilities; maturing workforce; self-managed work and cooperation, among others. The results agree with Benrazavi and Silong (2013) nature of work was positively related and motivational towards their willingness to work in teams. The results also agree with Bakotic and Babic (2013) that nature of work affects employees job productivity.

The results also revealed that interpersonal relationships at work and employee job performance have a positive and significant relationship ($\beta=.377, \ p=0.000<0.05$). The regression of coefficient implies that increasing interpersonal relationships at work by one unit, leads to increase employee job performance by .377 units. Interpersonal relationship is an important aspect in every organization, and it is one of the vital components in human relationship. Interpersonal relationships are necessary for existing systems and are the hub of organizations. Workplace relationships comprise those interpersonal relationships in which individuals are involved in the course of performing their jobs. Such relationships include supervisor-subordinate relationships, peer worker relationships, workplace friendships and customer relationships. Interpersonal relationships at work could be influenced by behavioral characteristics of these individuals. The dissimilar personal behaviors brought into the workplace often manifest through interactive processes at work. The results are in line with Abe and Mason (2016) that the relationship between interpersonal relationships and employee performance for the supervisors is weak and less significant relationship. According to Omunakwe, Nwinyokpugi and Adiele (2018) workplace interpersonal relationship like employee
communication and relational Justice were found to be the most significant predictors of Organizational Productivity. Moreover, Mohammed, Toryila and Saanyol (2018) noted that Interpersonal Relationship positively and significantly influences Job Performance among Employees.

4.6 Discussion of Research Findings

The study revealed that Interpersonal Relationships at Work, workload stress, Changing Nature of work were found to be satisfactory in explaining employee job performance explain 63.0% of the variations in employee job performance. Job-related stress symptoms can be psychological, physical and behavioral however, the magnitude of effect of stress differs with an individual. Stress is contagious at work place and if not addressed earlier by the management it can erode all the synergies within the organizations. Occupational stressors lead to inefficiency, increased staff turnover and absenteeism.

Regression of coefficients showed that workload stress and employee job performance has a negative and significant relationship. The regression of coefficient implies that when work stress increases by one unit, the employee job reduces by same units. Job stress has become a common term in today’s work place. In every organisation, the main cause of low productivity appears to be stress at workplace. Employees need certain kind of motivation and job stress mitigating strategies to overcome the stress. Job stress is an outcome or response to certain stimuli in the environment. Nowadays, job stress has become more apparent and leads to low morale of employees and poor job performance. Job stress is prevailing in every employee’s day-to-day life and it impacts their job performance. The job stress can occur due to several factors like overwork, workload, poor work environment and strained work relationship at the work place. The results agree with Dar, Akmal, Naseem, and commotion Khan (2011) that work stress derails employee job performance in the production organizations revealing a negative connection between occupation stress and workers’ activity execution and that activity stress essentially diminishes the staff’ activity execution. According to Sikuku (2017) there exist a strong correlation between organizational stress and employees’ performance.
The results also revealed that changing nature of work and employee job performance have a positive and significant relationship. The model results imply that changing nature of work by one unit, leads to increase employee job performance by same units. Nature of work shall be defined as the actual content of the job or work characteristics no matter whether these characteristics or the content of that work is positive or negative. The effects of a job upon the employees are also considered as contents of a job whether these effects are characterized as interesting or boring, diverse or regular, creative or degrading, easy or difficult, challenging or non demanding. However the Nature of Work is so far known as the biggest indicator of employee job performance. Changing nature of work that is presently described by conserving, re-appropriating/subcontracting of administrations, change in business designs; work advancement requesting laborers' adaptability both as far as staff foundation and abilities; maturing workforce; self-managed work and cooperation, among others. The results agree with Benrazavi and Silong (2013) nature of work was positively related and motivational towards their willingness to work in teams. The results also agree with Bakotic and Babic (2013) that nature of work affects employees job productivity.

Further, it was revealed that interpersonal relationships at work and employee job performance have a positive and significant relationship. The regression of coefficient implies that increasing interpersonal relationships at work by one unit, leads to increase employee job performance by same number of units. Interpersonal relationship is an important aspect in every organization, and it is one of the vital components in human relationship. Interpersonal relationships are necessary for existing systems and are the hub of organizations. Workplace relationships comprise those interpersonal relationships in which individuals are involved in the course of performing their jobs. Such relationships include supervisor-subordinate relationships, peer worker relationships, workplace friendships and customer relationships. Interpersonal relationships at work could be influenced by behavioral characteristics of these individuals. The dissimilar personal behaviors brought into the workplace often manifest through interactive processes at work. The results are in line with Abe and Mason (2016) that the relationship between interpersonal relationships and employee performance for the supervisors is weak and less significant relationship. According to Omunakwe, Nwinyokpugi and Adiele (2018) workplace interpersonal relationship like employee communication and relational Justice were
found to be the most significant predictors of Organizational Productivity. Moreover, Mohammed, Toryila and Saanyol (2018) noted that Interpersonal Relationship positively and significantly influences Job Performance among Employees.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings of the previous chapter, conclusion, limitations encountered during the study. This chapter also highlights the policy recommendations that policy makers, employers and employees can adopt to improve employee job productivity. Lastly the chapter presents suggestions for further research which can be useful by future researchers.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The study established the effects of occupational stress on employee job performance, among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research. The variables for the study were interpersonal relationships at work, workload stress, changing nature and employee job performance as the outcome variable. The study employed descriptive research design. The results were analyzed using social sciences (SPSS) computer software.

The model summary revealed that interpersonal relationships at work, workload stress, changing nature of work explained 63.0% of the variations in employee job performance as indicated by the value of $R^2$ which implies that there are other factors not included in this model that account for 37.0% of changes in employee job performance. The model is fit at 95% level of confidence since the F-value is 64.086. This confirms that overall the multiple regression model is statistically significant, in that it is a suitable prediction model for explaining how interpersonal relationships at work, workload stress, changing nature of work affects employee job performance.

Regression results showed that interpersonal relationships at work had a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee job performance. Workload stress revealed a negative and significant relationship with employee job performance. Further, regression results showed that changing nature of work has a positive and statistically significant relationship with employee job performance among staff at the State Department for University Education and Research.
5.3 Conclusion

From the study findings, the study concludes that work stress significantly influences employee job performance. Workload stress has significant impact on organization and employee job performance and may also terribly affect health of employees.

It was also concluded that changing nature of work positively affects employee job performance. Nature of work describes the various type of work. Some works are very demanding and result to occupation stress.

Based on research finding it can also be concluded interpersonal relationships at work positively affects employee job performance. Interpersonal relationships are necessary for existing systems and are the hub of organizations. Workplace relationships comprise those interpersonal relationships in which individuals are involved in the course of performing their jobs.

5.4 Recommendations

The study established that work stress derails employee job performance. The study recommends that work be broken into manageable units and shared among employees. This will ensure that no individual employee handles a bulk of work on his/ her own. The approach may help reduce work stress among employees. Employees should be encouraged to go on leave especially if it is a requirement in the organization. Employees should also be encouraged to share any challenges for appropriate guidance and counseling from appropriate professionals in and out of the organization.

Nature of work may limit employee potential job performance. Some work demands a lot of concentration and so may proof to be stressful to the workers. The study recommends for periodic breaks of 15-30 minutes to allow the worker replenish and rejuvenate. There is also need for appropriate working hours for employees especially for those work that are very demanding and needs sufficient rests.

Interpersonal Relationships at Work may help improve employee job performance. Conscious efforts should be made to enhance social interaction among employees in the work setting such as acquisition of good and effective communication skills be adapted by employees in other to
bring about good interpersonal relationship among employees to enhance job performance in the workplace. The study further recommends for appropriate team-building activities to enhance interpersonal relationship among employees. At team-building activities, employees may share work experiences and challenges with colleagues and even senior management for work environment improvement.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

The study focused on state Department for University Education and Research. Occupation stress and employee job performance vary across various organizations and the findings may not be generalized to other professions. Some professions demand proper work environment, enough rest and periodic employee rotation.

Some of the questionnaires were partially filled thus they were not included in the study.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

Some professions in fields like health institutions, auditing, and transport industry are characterized by certain degree of work demand. Further research should be conducted in these professions to compare level of occupational stress and employee job performance across various professions.

The researcher relied much on multiple linear regression model. Further research should entail comprehensive analyses by combining both quantitative and qualitative data. Use of interview may be employed seek more in-depth information from employees regarding occupation stress among them. The use of in-depth interview technique allows face to face conversation with employees where more critical information may be extracted from them. It also allows triangulation of findings by complementing quantitative data collected via questionnaire.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

The main objective of this questionnaire is to determine the effect of occupational stress on employee job performance at State Department of University Education and Research. Kindly respond to all questions Information that this questionnaire seeks to collect information to be used for academic purposes only. The response will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Please tick [✓] in the appropriate box

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Tick where appropriate

A. Gender

- Male ( )
- Female ( )

B. Marital status

- Single ( )
- Married ( )
- Others ( )

C. Age group

- Up to 25 ( )
- 26-40 ( )
- 41-54 ( )
- above 55 ( )

D. Years of service

- 0-5 years ( )
- 6-10 years ( )
- 11-20 years ( )
- over 20 years ( )

E. Grade

- A-G ( )
- H-L ( )
- M and above ( )

F. Academic qualification

- Secondary ( )
- Certificate ( )
- Diploma ( )
- Undergraduate ( )
- Masters and above ( )

G. Type of engagement

- Temporary ( )
- Contract ( )
- Permanent ( )
SECTION B: Occupational stress

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? On a scale of: 5- Very great extent, 4- Large extent, 3 - Moderate extent, 2 - Low extent, 1 - No extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Stress</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is enough staff at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers are inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of time pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for too many employee / projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees energy level is completely finished by the end of the working day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to complete quality work on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees feel like they have not achieved much in their work at the end of a working day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are times some employees suffer from illness such as muscle tension, nausea, headaches, increased heart rate etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changing Nature of work</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to use modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At times employees are absent from work due to medical problems.

Employees are receptive to changes and new ideas.

Employees are able to cope with tight deadlines assigned to job tasks.

**Interpersonal Relationships at Work**

Employees have good working relationship with their colleagues.

Employees interact freely with their bosses.

Sometimes some employees feel like withdrawing from their colleagues.

Employees perform their work with little or no supervision.

Employees willingly participate in team activities.

Some employees get irritated even with slight provocation at their workplaces.
SECTION C: EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? On a scale of: 5 = Very great extent, 4 = Large extent, 3 = Moderate extent, 2 = Low extent, 1 = No extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error and Mistakes</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some employees in my organization make frequent errors and mistakes due lack of concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees make errors due to work overload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are not well guided by their supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are not motivated at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At times employees are absent from work due to medical problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse contributes to some employees absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees get boredom whenever they think of getting to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes employees evade work for not meeting work timelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output of work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to set target at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have adequate resources that facilitate them to meet set targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely feedback enables employees improve on their output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees training are conducted on need basis to enhance performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees completes assignments within stipulated timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization provides timely feedback on performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees performance targets are time-bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to cope with Adhoc assignments with deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thank you for participating**