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Abstract

This study analyses the hazards and support factors perceived by national humanitarian staff working at Lutheran World Federation (LWF) in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya. Fourteen in-depth interviews with participants from the staff was analysed from a theoretical perspective provided by stress management theories. This was contrasted with an Effort and Reward Imbalance (ERI) questionnaire completed by the same participants.

The result indicate that the perception of hazards and support factors differ between local staff, from the county of Turcana, and national staff, from other parts of Kenya. This highlights the need to adapt staff care to local hazards and to the different needs of national and local staff. The result also indicates that the organisational support actions corresponding to a participatory climate, such as collaboration between staff, trust to work within a given mandate, and appreciation, prevented several psychosocial hazards often found to affect humanitarian staff. The result from the ERI questionnaires show that staff perceive efforts at work, but that 75% of the participants perceive more rewards than efforts.

The study contributes to the humanitarian field by focusing on local staff care, a topic often overshadowed by the focus on international staff care. The study also explores the impact on staff care in the context of protracted displacement, a circumstance found to work both as a hazard and a support factor.
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1. Introduction

“The best thing we can provide our beneficiaries are our relief workers.”

Ky Luu, Director of OFDA (Porter & Emmens, 2009, 45)

In situations requiring humanitarian interventions, focus is on beneficiaries needs. The contexts can be demanding, with hard environments and protracted problems such as war, conflict, poverty, famine and natural disasters. The humanitarian staff work is also exposed to these contexts, together with witnessing personal tragedies. Altogether this creates a demanding context, challenging the mental health of the humanitarian staff. UNHCR (2016b) has found that the risk for staff involved in humanitarian interventions, and the risks of mental health and behaviour problems are higher than for the general population. Several researchers studying the mental health of humanitarian workers highlight the impact of challenging living conditions, high work demand, and increasing risk of violent traumas, as factors impacting on depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and burnout (Lopes Cardozo et al., 2012; Ager et al., 2012). Antaeres Foundation report that 30% of aid workers report symptoms of PTSD after field assignments (McDonald, 2015), UNHCR (2013) showed that 47% of their staff experience difficulty sleeping and 57% reported symptoms of sadness, unhappiness, or emptiness. Different assignments within the humanitarian work appear to play a role. UNHCR (2016d) found a higher risk of affected mental health for those who work primarily with persons of concern\(^2\), showing increased incidents of burnout and secondary trauma. Even if the effects on mental health are most studied, research have confirmed that also work-related stress negatively affects the physical health (Clarke & Cooper, 2004 in UNHCR 2016, 14).

This thesis explores the understanding of the challenges to humanitarian staff wellbeing, and the support found to mitigate the negative impact. Some stress is unavoidable considering the nature of the work, while other stress can be prevented or reduced by actions from the individual staff member, management and supervision, team or the agency as a whole (Antaeres Foundation 2012). Humanitarian agencies have though

\(^2\) UNHCR (2016d) use the term “persons of concern” for refugees, internally displaced persons, asylum seekers, returnees, and stateless people.
shown little interest to evaluate their staff care (Porter & Emmens 2009), thus not learning what is working as mitigating factors. This thesis assumes the perspectives of the workers themselves.

It needs to be mentioned that stress, to some extent, can be positive and a source of personal growth. But it can also lead to negative emotional consequences, creating a problem for the individual, and impacting the function of the team and agency. Stressed out staff is more often involved in accidents, has a higher rate of illnesses, show less commitment to the agency and have higher turnover rates, resulting in loss of skilled staff and increased costs in recruitment and training. By reducing stressors, i.e. something causing a state of tension, stress can be prevented or reduced (Antares Foundation, 2012).

Several stressors affecting humanitarian workers originate from organisational factors (Burton, 2010; Lopez Cardozo et al. 2012). Still, not much research has been done on how humanitarian actors work to mitigate the negative consequences of stress, and to improve staff care practices (Porter & Emmens, 2009). Porter and Emmens (2009) believe that the lack of consistent definition of care-staff practices in the humanitarian sector, influence the low interest. With the lack of a definition, actors choose between different guidelines on staff care practices. Among the frequently found international guidelines are: “IASC guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Complex Emergencies” (IASC, 2007), “The Sphere standards: Humanitarian charter and minimum standards in disaster response” (The Sphere standards, 2011), “Guidelines for managing stress in humanitarian workers” (Antares Foundation, 2012), “Code of good practice in the management and support of aid personnel” (People in Aid, 2003); and “UNHCR Managing the Stress of Humanitarian Emergencies” (UNHCR, 2001). Jointly, the guidelines point out the importance and obligation to look after staff wellbeing. The Sphere standards (2011, 7) states that humanitarian aid worker agencies should “provide appropriate management, supervision and psychosocial support, enabling aid workers to have the knowledge, skills, behaviour and attitude to plan and implement an effective humanitarian response with humanity and respect”. The IASC guidelines (2007, 87) underlines the moral obligation and responsibility for organisations to provide support to mitigate possible psychosocial consequences to staff exposed to extremes. Even if these guidelines exist, Porter and Emmens (2009) found that not even existing minimum standards were applied by a number of actors.
The guidelines point out the importance and obligation to look after staff wellbeing. The pervading definition of individual wellbeing, is to not only look at the absence of physical or psychological illness but see it as a state of optimal functioning (Burke, 2014). Staff-wellbeing is given attention for being important to benefit the individual, but also for keeping organisations effective by keeping staff healthy (IASC, 2007). There is a widespread recognition of the cost of workplace stress for both individuals and organisations (Curling & Simmons, 2010), but little attention is given by humanitarian agencies to evaluate their staff care (Porter & Emmens, 2009). In a review made for People in Aid & InterHealth, less than one-third of the organisations used any kind of evaluation of staff care practices (Porter & Emmens, 2009). It would economically make sense to focus more on staff care, to cut the high costs associated to work-related stress. In the global market, it is estimated that 4-5% of GDP is lost in work-related health loss and associated productivity (Kortum, 2014). There is nothing indicating that productivity in the humanitarian sector does deviate from others when it comes to loss because of work-related health loss, making is costly not to care about staff and to not learn from interventions of improvements.

Good staff care and psychosocial support are important assets in stress managements (Antares Foundation, 2012). The literature though, reveals an organisational ambivalence to this. On one side, there is a rising interest in the importance and need of staff welfare, but on the other hand, staff welfare is seldom prioritised by donors when funding is low and budgets cuts are needed (Porter & Emmens, 2009). An organisation that last years have worked in a opposite way to this is the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) Kenya- Djibouti program. Together with their donor, Church of Sweden (CoS), focus has been given to staff care also in times of limited funding. The two organisations have cooperated under a long-term humanitarian project, “East Africa refugee program,” extending between 2014 and 2017 in five countries in Horn of Africa (HOA). An evaluation of the project found that staff indicated signs of good staff welfare (Huser & Kamau, 2016), without looking more into the causes of this. This rare finding, in a humanitarian sector where reports mostly indicate negative impact of staff welfare, raised a wish to look deeper into the findings of staff welfare.
1.1 Aim and objectives

This research is conducted to analyse the perception of national humanitarian staff, working in Kakuma Refugee Camp, aiming to understand both the hazards and the support factors they perceive at work, and what organisational factors they find supportive to staff welfare. The perceptions will be viewed through the lens of management stress theories, and contrasted with results from an Effort and Reward Imbalance questionnaire that will provide information of how participants at work experience the balance between experienced efforts and rewards.

The majority of studies on staff care have reached out to international staff working abroad, while only a few have focused on local humanitarian staff. Therefore, this research also aims to contribute to focus on local staff care, having in mind that local humanitarian actors contribute to 90% of the humanitarian workforce often working in the areas of protracted crises with people of concern (UNHCR, 2016d).

1.2 Research questions

Based on this background, the following main research question was developed:

What hazards and supportive factors do national staff at Lutheran World Federation’s (LWF) program in Kakuma perceive in their daily work?

The following sub questions were formulated to answer the research question:

1. What organisational interventions are perceived supportive to mitigate the negative effects arising from the working circumstances?

2. What image of staff-welfare is presented when using a Effort-Reward Imbalance questionnaire?

1.3 Relevance to the field of Humanitarian Action

The impact of working in the humanitarian sector is well documented (McCall & Salama, 1999; Putman et al., 2009; Ager, 2012), but little research has been conducted on how organisations work to mitigate negative consequences and improve the conditions for staff (Porter & Emmens, 2009). It is established that stress for humanitarian workers can be prevented or reduced, but this requires actions from the agency and the management (Antares Foundation, 2012). Actions and interventions are seldom reported or made
available for others to analyse and learn from. With this background, this research is highly relevant, as LWF in Kakuma has focused on staff care and appear to have found strategies to improve staff welfare. If staff perceive these strategies as successful, they might be helpful for others to use.

The focus on local humanitarian workers also makes this research relevant, as this group has a low representation in reports connected to staff welfare. Existing findings show that the work-related stressors are not identical between international and local humanitarian workers (Antares Foundation, 2012). Increased knowledge on local staff welfare can contribute to increase the focus on this, in this way also contribute to more sustainable and preserving humanitarian aid.

1.4 Methodology

This research will look at stress management from the angle of perception by staff working in humanitarian settings. The research has its roots in the interpretative paradigm, aiming to understand peoples’ lived experiences from their own perspectives (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2011). With the interpretative approach, the research focus on the meaning that people attach to their experiences instead of focusing on measurable facts. The approach recognise that social, cultural, historical, and personal contexts are interlinked with the way people experience their world. To obtain data, research design often combines interviews with observations.

Qualitative research can be designed in different ways. This study was conducted using a mix of different research methods. First, a literature review laid the base to understanding the context, and orient the research based on previous findings. Second, observations and in-depth interviews were used in combination during the stay in Kakuma. The observation method can provide studies with a deeper understanding observing and checking definitions or terms participants use during interviews, or setting they have described (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2011). In this research, observations took place in the working environment of participants, focusing on their everyday working life. A semi-structured interview guide was used for the data collection (Appendix 1). The purpose of using a semi-structured interview guide was to be open to follow new ideas brought up by participants. Interviews and observations took place during a six-week research trip to Kenya in March and April 2017. The period was divided between LWF’s country office in Nairobi, and the program in Kakuma Refugee Camp in Turcana.
county. Additional interviews were also conducted with persons at different management positions within LWF in Kenya, aiming to understand the organisational structure and get the perspective on staff care from the management’s perspective.

Finally, an Effort-Reward Imbalance (ERI) questionnaire was used at the end of each in-depth interview. The ERI is a standardised questionnaire, measuring the Effort put into work and the Rewards received back, calculating the association and interaction between them both (Siegrist, Li & Montano, 2014). The method was used to complement the in-depth interviews, measuring both conscious and sub-conscious perceptions of work. The ERI is a well-known future predictor of physical and mental health outcomes in occupational health psychology (van Vegchel et al., 2005), and was in UNHCR’s (2016d) staff wellbeing report found to be a better predictor for mental health outcomes, than more often used predictors measuring exposure to traumatic events.

1.4.1 Case study

Case studies are a commonly used in social science, often used to study a specific case and later draw generalisations out of it (Seal, 2005). In this research, the case study has been limited to humanitarian work at Kakuma Refugee Camp under LWF’s program in Kakuma. LWF has worked in Kakuma since the establishment of the camp in 1992 and is experienced working in this protracted displacement. Their area of work has been developing with the context, following the interest of donors and assigned areas given by UNHCR. Some personnel have worked in Kakuma since the opening, others are new, making up a mix of experiences and perspectives. The LWF office in Kakuma consist of 322\(^3\) national staff, composed by persons with a diverse educational background and experience from humanitarian work (Langat, 2017). No international staff is working at the office in Kakuma. These circumstances, describe an ordinary humanitarian actor working in prolonged refugee camps, making them suitable for a case study.

When choosing the case study, the security situation was also taken into account. Kakuma was assessed to be safe during the time of the research.

---

\(^3\) Numbers from mid-March 2017
1.4.2 Sampling procedure

The process of recruiting participants was divided into different stages: defining the study population, defining criteria for participants, and the process of recruiting participants (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2011). The first step went hand in hand with finding the organisation for the cases study. The results from the evaluation of the “East African Refugee program” was promoted during my internship at Church of Sweden (CoS), raising an interest to look closer at the signs of staff wellbeing. CoS shared the contacts to LWF’s country manager in Kenya, that quickly replied with a consent from him and from the Sub-Program Manager (SPM) in Kakuma, to come and talk to their local staff in Kakuma. Reaching this point, the topic was identified to be of interest for the researcher, for the organisation itself and from the donor perspective of CoS.

The second step involved identifying participants. The aim was to select 12–16 participants from the 322 working national staff. Consideration was given to reflect the diversity of staff, and the diversity of the work performed by LWF. A list of criteria was put together for the further selection. Besides being a national worker, the participant should have a fixed-term contracts, something over 90% of the nationals have. Participant should also work in a programme in one of four sectors, whose main tasks involves daily interaction with refugees or host communities. 240 staff fulfilled these criteria, as the remaining 92 worked within finance and administration, logistics, M&E, and program management. Awareness was also given to gender balance, levelled number between the four sectors, and between grades of employment. LWF uses a grading system for employment, where grade 1 represents a job requiring low education and experience, and grade 6 is a job with high need of education and experiences. In Kakuma grade 1 – 4 is used for those working within the programs, and level 5 for those in management positions. Grades from 4 and above are connected with specific benefits, making it interesting to balance the number of participants with grade between 1 – 3, and 4. With this list of requirements, 14 participants were selected with the support from the HR manager. Participants were invited through their sector leaders to the interviews. In the end, two participants from the original list were unable to come and were replaced by colleagues matching the same criteria.
1.4.3 Interview procedure

Interviews in Kakuma were conducted between 20th – 31st of March 2017, and took place in private settings at LWF’s office facilities. Most participants had not been informed beforehand of the aim of the interview, which left the interviewer in control to introduce the topic. The aim of the research was explained, emphasising their voluntary participation. Assurance was given of confidentiality, and information given about the possibility to avoid answering questions. Finally, consent from all participants was obtained to record the interview. Several participants expressed positive surprise of themselves being in focus of a study, instead of the refugees.

The interviews were conducted in English and followed a semi-structured interview guide (Appendix 1). At the end of each interviews the participant was asked to complete the ERI questionnaire (Appendix 2). In the research planning, consideration was given to find the best moment to introduce the questionnaire. One option was at the beginning of the interview, to avoid being biased by the content of the interview. Another option was at the end, after having created an alliance with the participant. At last, the second option turned out to be the most natural. All interviews where recorded, transcribed, and coded into categories used to build up the discussion.

Additional interviews were conducted at LWF’s office in Nairobi with the Program representative, CoS’ project coordinator for the East Africa Refugee Program, and the project coordinator for CBPS. Additional interviews in Kakuma were conducted with the Sub-Program manager and the HR manager.

1.5 Limitations and ethical dilemmas

In a qualitative research, the researcher needs to be aware of her/his influence on participants. In this study, a Swedish researcher interview national workers in Kenya, and it cannot be ruled out that the researchers background has impacted participants answers. In an attempt to mitigate the consequences, a pattern of self-reflexivity has been involved during the different step of the research procedure, and measures taken to reduce the impact.

When using interviews, it is important to create a trustful relationship. The limited time spent in Kakuma was not optimally concerning this, as the interview was the first contact with participants. Therefore, focus was given to create an interview
environment that quickly made participant confident to share their experiences. The non-verbal feedback from participants, of relaxed body language only a few minutes into the interview, is interpreted as success of this approach. Interviews were conducted in English and took between 30 and 60 minutes. Kenyans working at LWF are mostly fluent in English, but misunderstandings due to language cannot be ruled out. To reduce this risk, questions were repeated from different angles with any sign of misunderstanding.

Using sector leaders to invite participants to interviews could risk participants to link the interview with the organisational management, which would influence the answers and the participants feeling of voluntarily participation. Given the limited time, this was the best way found to contact the participants. To mitigate the risks, focus was given on explaining confidentiality and state the independence from management. No participants showed or expressed anything that would indicate feelings of obligation to participate, or reluctance to express a certain view. Another action to increase participants confidentiality, was to find a balance of presenting the research findings in a transparent way but keeping a high level of anonymity.

1.6 Thesis outline

This thesis consists of six chapters. In the first chapter, the aim and main topics of the study was introduced, followed by a discussion of the research process, limitations and ethical dilemmas encountered during the process. The second chapter provides background and a broader understanding of the context where participants are working. The humanitarian work in protracted displacement will be introduced, followed by a recent history of Kenya’s role as a refugee host country, then narrowing down to the setting of Kakuma Refugee Camp. This will be followed by an introduction to LWF’s program in Kakuma and its employment structure. Chapter three presents the theoretical framework of organisational hazards for humanitarian workers, followed by a model presented by WHO on Healthy work environment. The Effort- Reward Imbalanced model, used to compare and contrast the interviews, will then be presented. The fourth chapter presents the research findings from the interviews, followed by the results of the ERI questionnaire. The fifth chapter analyses the results from chapter four, using the model of healthy organisations, connecting it to the actual humanitarian setting. Finally, the sixth chapter presents the conclusions, together with policy recommendations and suggestions for further research.
2. Background

This chapter is designed to provide background information to understand the setting and the premises of work for the humanitarian workers at LWF’s program in Kakuma. First, protracted displacement will be introduced, followed by describing Kenya as hosting country for refugees, and then narrow down to Kakuma and Kakuma refugee camp. Secondly, LWF’s project in Kakuma will be introduced, together with central cooperation allies, altogether impacting the staff welfare.

2.1 The context of protracted displacement

During 2015, UNHCR (2016) globally recognised 6.7 million persons as refugees in a protracted displacement situation. The UNHCR definition of a protracted displacement is “a situation where 25,000 or more refugees of the same nationality have been in exile for five years or longer in a given asylum country” (2016, 8). The trend shows that this group is increasing, growing with 400,000 persons within the year 2014 – 2015. Crawford et al. (2005) mention that it is common to believe that displacements last for a few years, but that the sad truth is that most will persist for many years. They reviewed cases between 1978 – 2014, finding that less then 1 out of 40 refugee crises were solved within three years. A rapid solution was rare, more common lasting over decades. According to UNHCR (2016) the average duration of a protracted refugee crisis is 26 years, each crisis having its own complex system of needs.

In Horn of Africa (HOA), most displacements have lasted for over 20 years, making this refugee camps a mix of people who have stayed many years, and new arrivals (World Bank Group & UNHCR, 2015). They point out armed conflicts to be the major course of displacement in this area, mixed with other complex circumstances as drivers of displacement. Several reports point out that a missing holistic approach in these prolonged displacements, leaves a well-documented gap of needs between the humanitarian and development responses (Ferris 2013; Crawford et al. 2015; Sigfried 2016). Crawford et al. (2015) describes that this gap leaves persons with little or no prospect of achieving one of three possible durable solution: 1) return home; 2) integrate in the host country; or 3) settle down in a third country.
2.2 The context of Kenya – the host country

Kenya has been the host for a large number of refugees since the 1990s. Today, UNHCR (2017b) counts Kenya as one of the large host countries in the region, hosting 494,863 registered refugees and asylum seekers in December 2016. But Kenya is also mentioned by UNHCR as an example of a protracted refugee situation, having had refugee camps for the past 20 years.

Lindley (2011) describe how Kenya’s current approach is connected with their historical response, going back to the early 1990s when a massive displacement took place from Somalia. The registered Somali population in Kenya peaked in 1992, with 285,000 persons. Parallel to these, 12,000 Sudanese refugee minors crossed the border to Kenya, known as the “lost boys of Sudan”. Between 1996 and 2006, the refugee influx declined, but only a limited number of refugees already in the country could return to their home countries. In 2006, a new wave of displacement started in the region, creating two groups of refugee population: the long-term refugees in protracted displacement from 1990s, and the refugees from 2006 and forward.

Since the 1990s, Kenya has responded to the refugee displacement with providing temporary protection in remote areas. Two camps were created in the 1990s, Dadaab in the North-East close to Somalia, and Kakuma in the North-West close to Uganda and South Sudan. UNHCR was left in charge of the camps, with strict restrictions of how refugees could move outside of the camps. Up to today, Kenya’s legislation restricts refugees to special areas (Lindley, 2011). This way of dealing with refugees is described by Dev (2003) to be common for host countries in Africa. Dev (2003) calls these countries “a reluctant host”, meaning that they believe that long time refugee settlement will negatively impact their own population, and therefore want to keep them separated. A movement pass is required to leave the camps, mostly authorised for a specific reason, like higher education, medical treatment, resettlement, or to escape major security threats in the camp (Lindley 2011, 36). For refugees, unable to return to their home countries, the only way to leave the camps is therefore by applying for third country resettlement. Calls have been made for long term response approaches to the prolonged displacement in HOA, but still most response remains under the humanitarian short-term umbrella (Huser & Kamau, 2016). This includes the response to Kakuma Refugee Camp, that will be introduced in the next section.
2.3 The context of Kakuma Refugee Camp

Kakuma Refugee Camp is located in the north-west region of Kenya, close to the border to Uganda and South Sudan. The camp is placed beside the town of Kakuma, in the semi-arid dessert of Turcana county. The camp was established 1992, with a capacity for 125,000 persons, a number exceeded in 2014. In the beginning of 2017 the camp hosted 164,571 registered refugees and asylum seekers (UNHCR, 2016b), comprising 31% of the refugees and asylum seekers in Kenya (UNHCR, 2017). The camp covers 15 square kilometres and is divided into four minor camps, Kakuma I-IV, each divided into zones and blocks.

A new, additional, refugee settlement was created in 2016, 25 km from Kakuma town near Kalobeyei township, as response to the Kenyan government’s decision to close the refugee camp in Dadaab. The new settlement, Kalobeyei settlement, is planned to promote a more self-reliant community, and is opened for new refugees, for resettlements from Dadaab, and for host population in Kalobeyei. The settlement is expected to be developed during the next 14 years (UNHCR, 2016b).

The camp in Kakuma was planned to be a temporary solution with focus on providing basic humanitarian assistance, thus it is not tailored to the current needs and situation of either refugees or host communities (UNHCR, 2016b). In many ways, it resembles how the World Bank Group & UNHCR (2015) describes a typical refugee camp: a poor, underdeveloped and economically marginalized, placed in a remote area in the host countries. The camp of Kakuma have limited basic service, and limitations in livelihood opportunities. Temperatures frequently reach 42 °C, and the flat ground gives movements for winds to blow and bring sand and gravel into every corner. The arid surroundings make it hard for crops to grow, and the access to water is limited. Bore hole have been drilled to cover the needs of refugees and host population, but not enough for all needs. In the fight over resources, refugees are not allowed to keep animals, to prevent an increasing conflict with the nomad local population that rely to 70% on livestock. The nomads move livestock within Turkana county and into Uganda in search of water and graze. Some refugees have started small businesses, but the market is limited as potential customers consist of other refugees, a small number of NGO staff, and local Kenyans. Organisations working in the camp can only offer work on voluntarily basis, as the Kenyan law prohibits employments of refugees (Horn, 2009).
2.3.1 Refugee population

UNHCR (2016b) estimate the refugee community to make up 15% of the Turkana population. The refugee population consist of 19 nationalities, the largest groups come from South Sudan, Somalia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, Ethiopia, and Burundi— in descending order (UNHCR, 2017). Some Sudanese minors, that arrived 25 years ago have resettled to third countries, but others remain in the camp. This creates a diversity of old and new arrivals, some born in the camp and others who have never seen their country of origin. Close to 100,000 are children, making up 64% of the total refugee population, and 75% are under the age of 25 years.

The most frequent emotional problems of refugees in Kakuma, have been found to be hopelessness, fear, sadness, anger, and worry (Horn, 2009). Horn reflects on that most of these problems relate to stressors in the camp, rather than past experiences. The current living situation with poverty and lack of ways to improve the economic situation, lack of food, insecurity, idleness, and Kakuma’s harsh physical environment were found to be the biggest contributors to the emotional problems.

2.4 Organisational Cooperation

LWF and CoS are members of ACT Alliance (2015), a coalition of 144 churches and church related organisations, working together, targeting areas of humanitarian aid, development, and advocacy. The two organisations cooperate under this umbrella, CoS as a donor and LWF as an implementing partner. During 2014-2017, CoS Humanitarian programme, with the support from Sida as the core donor, initiated a pilot programme in five countries in the HOA: “The East African Refugee Programme”. The main implementing partner is LWF. This program has more of a long-term thinking approach, even if the funding’s from Sida is given on a yearly base, making it a new donor approach to LWF in Kenya (Huser & Kamau, 2016).

CoS also earmarks money for staff care, which has been used for salary increase, teambuilding activities, counselling, and facility improvements (Hernander, 2017).
2.4.1 Community Based Psychosocial Support

Within the ACT Alliance, the two organisations have approved to work with the Community Based Psychosocial approach (CBPS). The approach is based on several concepts: IASC Mental Health and psychosocial Support (MHPSS) guidelines; the humanitarian principles; the Core Humanitarian Standards; and a right-based approach, as well as the moral and ethical base of faith – altogether seeking to foster a deeper reflection that underpins actions taken within the support. With CoS as the leading actor within the alliance in this aspect, the LWF program in Kenya has received support to implement this further during the last years. Huser and Kamau (2016) describe how CBPS is used as tool to translate ideas of respect, dignity, empowerment, participation and accountability into action. Instead of asking what needs to be done, the focus is to how the support is provided.

Increased focus has been given to staff care, being one of the twelve areas of focus within CBPS. The ACT Alliance (n.d 19) include mental and physical health and staff wellbeing, together with the organisational management system within the staff care perspective, addressing both stress from relief activities and from the organisation itself. It is recognised that staff stress can originate from a multitude of factors, raising awareness of physical exhaustion, organisational factors, new leadership, antagonism between staff or between different professions. Providing staff with adequate time to rest and recuperate, and with recreational downtime is seen as ways to increase productivity. Good leadership, through appreciation and recognition is also seen as a way to make staff happy and effective. The approach to staff care is summarised in the phrase: “Neglecting staff care is not acceptable to the workers, and is harmful to the very populations we are trying to help” (ACT Alliance, n.d, 20).

2.5 Lutheran World Federation – program in Kakuma

The Kakuma refugee camp falls under the jurisdiction of the Kenyan Government and the Department of Refugee Affairs. UNHCR is the administrative leader of the camp, assisted by several organisations, one being LWF. The Lutheran World Federation Department for World Service (LWF/DWS) has worked in Kakuma Refugee Camp since the establishment in 1992. In 1999 the work was extended to assist the host community, being people affected by drought, poverty, and by the presence of refugees. With the
opening of Kalobeyei settlement, the program also covers support to this area. The core work is divided into the four sectors: education, community service & livelihood, peace & safety, and child protection & youth development. Each sector has a sector-head in charge to oversee the running of the program. Different programs have different donors, and some programs are delegated from the donor UNHCR.

Out of the staff of 322 nationals working in Kakuma, 204 are male and 118 are female. 240 of them work in programs under a sector, together with 1,897 incentive workers. The incentive workers are refugees, that according to Kenyan regulations are not allowed to be employed by humanitarian organisations. Their involvement in programs is though essential, and they receive a smaller compensation for their work–an “incentive”.

2.5.1 Program overview

The programs in the four sectors cover a diversity of tasks, and interactions with the refugee and host community. The sector of education run six programmes, involving the biggest number of staff: 121, and a large number of incentive workers. The education platform is anchored within UNHCR protection and durable solution mandate, and the school curriculum is approved by Kenyan agencies (LWF, 2015). Programs serve learners aged 4 – 5 in pre-school, and learners in grade 1 – 8 in primary school up to 13 years. Children with needs of special education caused by hearing, physical, or multiple disabilities, are supported either at schools or at home. A large number of overaged learners with unfinished primary school degrees, are targeted with a school program. To help retention, a mid-day snack is provided in primary and preschools, the only hot meat some children get during the day.

The sector of Community Service & Livelihood run nine programs, involving 40 national staff besides the incentive workers. These programs are primarily directed to people with specific needs, rising from disabilities, from being a teenage mother, single parents, elder, chronic illnesses, or youth at risk. Focus is given to ensure that the most vulnerable people can access material assistance, support and specialist care, addressing their psychological, physical, and social needs, all to enable them to fully participate in the community. Several programs train persons in business skills or vocational training to improve their chances to sustain themselves and their families. Even though the main objective is to secure food supply, it also involved Disaster Risk Reduction, e.g. training host community in animal health and support yearly livestock
vaccination. Community service also covers the assistance to the Reception Centre in Kakuma and Kalobeyei, and the Transit Centre in Nadapal at the border to South Sudan. The centres serve as temporary accommodation facilities for about the two weeks it takes to formally register with UNHCR and the Department for Refugee Affairs (DRA), and prepare the steps into the camp. Basic assistance is given in form of food and basic items, together with information, psychosocial support and child-protection.

The sector of peace and safety run twelve programs, involving 36 national staff and a large group of incentive workers. The work is liaised with the Government of Kenya’s security apparatus, with UNHCR field safety unit and the host community. This sector aims to provide safety and protection in the camp using both physical guarding, monitoring and by raising awareness. Programs work to create awareness and structures of inclusion to deal with peace and conflicts. Groups of elected women, youth, religious leaders and zone leaders, are trained to work with peace and resolutions within their zones, while others are elected to represent the community in solving issues or conflicts within the community, between zones, and between refugees and host community. A training of 14 days is offered to new arrivals, often pointed out by LWF staff for its important role in the integration into the camp, and positive impact on the peace and security. The training covers topics of communication skills, available services, how to handle problems, and traumas and self-awareness.

The sector of child protection and youth development involve 43 national staff and a group of incentive workers. The focus is to enhance prevention and protection of children in Kakuma Refugee Camp and in the host community. With 64% of the refugee population being children, attention can only be given to priority cases, defined as unaccompanied minors, separated children, or children with other vulnerability or risk of exploitation. Case managers identify and follow the priority cases, starting at the transit- and reception centres. Some case managers work towards children in the host community, in some ways considered more vulnerable than the refugee population, as they are commonly involved in child labour to help sustain their families. Programs also focus on mitigating the high level of idleness in the youth population from the limited opportunities to be involved in activities or work. Activities to develop capacity and skills within art and sport, aim to decrease the risk exposure, such as drug abuse and involvement in criminal gangs. Two popular activities are “Kakuma got talent” and the Kakuma football league.
2.5.2 Donors

It is important to keep in mind that LWF does not have any funding of their own, but fully rely on donors to cover salary and staff care. It is a challenge to retain the funding in between times of emergency and high influx, highlighted in media, as donors show low interest to the needs in protracted displacements. The organisation also struggles with balancing donors’ different ways of calculating staff related costs. Staff with the same education and experience, doing the same job, can have different salary depending on who is funding the project, easily creating tension between staff (Hernander, 2017).

LWF took the strategical decision to work toward harmonising salaries within and between the camps of Kakuma and Dadaab. Progress has been made, but work remains. The primary tool has been to use a system to calculate salary, based on education and experience. The system consists of six grades, where grade 1 represents a job requiring low education and experience, and grade 6 is a job with high need of education and experiences (Hernander, 2017).

Latest years increased salaries can be connected to decreased numbers in staff turnover, though no indicators have been used to provide exact numbers. CoS is the only donor earmarking money for staff care, highlighting the importance for LWF to focus on this (Hernander, 2017).

2.5.3 Employment

Two types of contracts are offered to staff at LWF’s program in Kakuma: fixed-term contracts and temporary contracts. With fixed-term contracts, staff are employed for a specific period, no longer that a year, depending on the time and money provide to a project by a donor. The temporary contract can last up to one year but is usually used for short term assignments or when funding is uncertain. As donors tend to think short term, the contracts tend to be short term. But, the last years the HR management has strategically worked to move staff to fixed-term contracts, to increase the group that can access the benefits connected to them, in addition to the salary. One such benefit is the annual leave, entitling everyone to 24 days with full pay. Female employees are entitled to three months’ maternity leave with full pay. Another benefit is the medical insurance, covering medical treatment for the employee and some family members (Langat, 2017).

Additional benefits are connected to the employment grades from grade 4, such as the benefit of rest and recuperation (R&R). For every week worked, staff is
compensated with one free day for being on duty 24/7. The R&R is expected to be used every 8 – 10 weeks, but the employer’s approach is flexible. The R&R can be combined with annual leave, permitting staff to stay with their families up to three weeks. LWF cover transport costs connected to R&R leave (LWF/DWS, 2016).

Another benefit in Kakuma is the housing provided inside the LWF compound, where LWF has access to 45 single rooms. The rooms have basic equipment, and three meals are served each day. The compound is not for families, but a special section has recently been constructed for mothers returning from the maternal leave. Staff in grade 1 – 3 live outside the compound, make their own housing arrangements (LWF/DWS, 2016). When opportunities are given, LWF declares an openness to promote staff within the organisation based on employee qualifications, merit, ability, and experience. This opens for promotions even without academic degrees or diplomas (LWF/DWS, 2016).

2.5.4 Recent employment history

Looking back, LWF-Kakuma had a high turnover in 2014 (Onyango, 2017). Only in the management team, the turnover that year was 100%. In 2015, the turnover reduced to 14%, and in 2016 the numbers were down to 8%. Statistics for 2017 show that the trend has stabilised. The new management team starting in 2014 – 2015 identified several factors to impact the high turnover: job-related stress, receiving little appreciation, and a general feeling of that salary was comparatively low and had not been revise for some time. The high pressure created divisions between groups, high micro management, people watched their backs, and staff looked for opportunities to leave the organisation. The new management started work to change the identified areas. The current SPM, Mr. Collins Onyango, explains the orientation in the following way:

“It is a difficult area to fundraise, it is always a big debate about to prioritise the beneficiaries or the staff. But there is no argument about, without beneficiaries there is no business for us as humanitarians being around, but with all the priority into that, we must always know that it will not happened without the people, the humanitarian staff”.
Emphasis has been put on revising conditions and salary, and staff have actively got involved in decision-making, to make them feel as being back in charge again. Mr. Onyango summarise the goal for the changes as follows:

“If staff are not motivated, if the welfare is not taken care of, if they don’t feel that they want to do this, it is not that they have to do it but they want to do it, then we already lost even before we start the fight”.

Staff motivation to work has increased since then, but it is a constant process and a struggle to find funding to continue improving the staff care program and raise salaries for the employees.

2.6 Chapter summary

This chapter has provided background information to understand underlying aspects that together influence the context of work of the humanitarian workers at LWF in Kakuma refugee camp. The next chapter will present the theories that will be applied to analyse the results.
3. Theoretical framework

Chapter one presented humanitarian workers’ exposure to stressors, amongst them several found to originate from organisational factors. This chapter will introduce theories on occupational stress management, making out the base for the analysis in this study. This will be followed by a presentation of the Effort-Reward Imbalance theory.

3.1 Occupational stress and worker health

Work-related stress can be defined as “the response people may have when presented with work demands and pressures that are not matched to their knowledge and abilities, and which challenge their ability to cope” (Leka & Jain, 2010). There are three important aspects of this definition. The first is the recognition that stress is the response to stimuli and can lead to ill-health. The response does not have one single form, but can be physiological, cognitive, or emotional. The second aspect is that stress, which in itself is not a disease, can lead to mental or physical ill-health. The third aspect is the perception of the individual’s own work and coping skills, which is central in the stress equation (HaSPA, 2012).

The wide aspects of occupational stress might be one reason that no universal definition of staff care has been accepted. Different guidelines provide slightly different definitions. This thesis uses the definition expressed by People in Aid (Porter & Emmens, 2009, 10) where “staff” refer to the people that directly deliver an organisation’s projects and programmes, and to whom an organisation has a clear duty of care. Further, “staff care” include the relationships within the management line and with colleagues, and its purpose is to create a healthy and productive workforce, along with improving quality of work. This definition embraces a wide range of aspects affecting staff and their wellbeing and is supported by other research highlighting that both individual aspects and workplace experiences impact staff wellbeing and mental health (Burke, 2014; Burton, 2010). The range of the impact is not insignificant, but it is estimated that mental illness due to organisational factors, is between 10 – 25%, on global level across different sectors, depending on the workplace (Burton, 2010, 29).

Experiences of work-related stress are tightly connected with psychosocial hazards (Burton, 2010; WSHQ, 2012). Psychosocial hazards relate to the close relationship between the psychological and social conditions of the workplace and the
harmful effect they can have on workers mental and physical health (Burton, 2010). The term “psychosocial hazards” is defined by the International Labour Organisation as the interactions among job content, work organisation and management together with environmental conditions, and employee’s competence and needs (Leka & Jain, 2010). However, there is no universal guidance describing the hazards on a more detailed level, and neither guidance of how workers should be protected from those (Burton, 2010). These means organisations need to decide which definitions to use in their staff care plans, a choice that will impact on how the work is shaped.

3.2 Psychosocial hazards

WHO (Leka & Cox, 2008) tackle the issue of workplace stress by identifying nine areas of psychosocial hazards shown to have the greatest risk on workers’ health: (1) Job content: the lack of variety, short work cycles, fragmented or meaningless work, underuse of skills; (2) Workload: work overload or underload, time pressure; (3) Work schedule: inflexible schedules, long or unsociable hours; (4) Control: low participation in decision-making, lack of control over workload; (5) Environment and equipment: inadequate equipment, poor environmental conditions; (6) Organisational culture and function: poor communication, lack of support for problem-solving and personal development; (7) Interpersonal relationships at work: conflicts, poor relations with supervisor or co-workers, lack of social support; (8) Role in organisation: role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility for people (9) Homework interface: conflicting demands of work and home, low support at home, career problems.

It is interesting to compare these psychosocial hazards with the hazards UNHCR (2001, 12) found for humanitarian workers. UNHCR divide the hazards into the following six groups: (1) Environmental stress, resulting from e.g. challenging climate where the work take place, remoteness, isolated location, shortage of shelter, and water and resources in general; (2) Organisational environmental stress, influenced by elements of hierarchy, bureaucracy, allocation of resources, and management; (3) Social and interpersonal factors, including conflicts with co-worker’s, unskilled supervision, or family problems; (4) Personal factors, increasing the vulnerability of the individual; (5) Biological factors, include degree of fitness, acute or chronic physical illnesses, traumas or fatigue; (6) Psychological factors, that may arise from traumatic events in the past or present, lack of self-confidence and feelings of insecurity.
When comparing the two lists of hazards presented by WHO and UNHCR, we can see that they overlap in most parts. A difference, is that UNHCR has an added focus on personal, biological, and psychological factors. UNHCR include personality in the personal factor, mentioning that persons with high standards, being result oriented, and wanting to make a difference, are often found within the humanitarian work. These qualities increase the vulnerability to stress when needs are overwhelming, and resources are limited (UNHCR, 2001). Personal factors also include the history of mental illness or crucial stressors before deployment and have shown to impact the wellbeing of humanitarian workers and their reactions during missions (Lopez Cardozo et al. 2012). All these personal factors are found important for organisations to have in mind during recruiting (Lopes Cardozo et al. 2012).

When looking at the list of hazards impacting staff’s wellbeing, some are more frequently mentioned in research. Workload, ability to achieve work goals, and long working hours, are most frequently mentioned, closely followed by status of employment contract, feeling of undervalued and/or unable to contribute to decision making (UNHCR 1016d; Curling & Simmons, 2010, 95), unclarity of tasks, quality of supervision, job insecurity and lack of career perspectives, and provision of institutional psychosocial support mechanisms are repeatedly mentioned (UNHCR, 2016d). All of these hazards are factors that the organisation can affect.

3.3 Humanitarian organisations way of target psychosocial hazards

As several of the psychosocial hazards are related to the organisations, it is important to look at how organisations have approached the issue. A review from People in Aid show a huge diversity in organisations approach staff to care programs. Some organisations have well-developed staff care systems, others have just started to implement their systems, while others do not believe it is needed. A correlation was found between the organisational culture and the approach to staff care, regarding the objective to fulfil only minimum standards or going beyond the requirements. A core factor impacting the organisational focus of staff care, was found to be how the funding was directed. When specific stand-alone funding had been allocated for staff care, this had the biggest impact on the existence of staff care, compared with when funding was wrapped within a program budget. Only 40 % of organisations had designated funding schemes for staff care. (Porter & Emmens, 2009).
A literature review of studies undertaken until 2015 on national humanitarian workers, shows the organisational structure to be determinant of the workers (Strohmeier and Scholte, 2015). A failure to provide adequate support often result in high levels of psychological distress among the humanitarian workers. A longitudinal study of international humanitarian workers looked at the associations between personal, organisational, and work-related stressors, and negative mental health outcomes, burnout, and life satisfaction. The study highlighted several concrete actions organisations can take that had a positive impact. One action was to provide the best possible living accommodation, workspace, and reliable transportation. It was also found important to ensure a reasonable workload when possible, a suitable management and recognition to staff for achievements. Also, to encourage the involvement in social support and peer networks, and to have a generous policy related to telephone and internet usage paid by the organisations, was found to have an impact (Lopez Cardozo et al., 2012). This found actions complements earlier findings, where the organisational factors of creating a culture of support can work supportive to workers (Eriksson et al., 2009) and the provision of institutional psychosocial support mechanisms has been found to mitigate risks of mental health outcomes (McCall & Salama, 1999).

An increased interest to address psychosocial hazards has been seen in humanitarian organisations interest. Curling & Simmons (2010) compared answers from humanitarian organisations in 2003 and 2009, showing an increased positive rating of staff support services. Even with this increased interest, most organisations still tend to engage with staff distress on an ad hoc basis (Porter & Emmens, 2009). A proactive work requires a joint effort between several departments within the organisation, involving health and travel medicine, occupational health and employment law, human resource and management systems, each department playing a role to cover the emotional, cognitive, spiritual, and physical wellbeing of the staff. A more proactive approach is requested in several studies, as the negative consequences for aid workers are well documented (Curling & Simmons 2010; Porter & Emmens 2009).

3.3.1. Local and cultural adaption

An organisational staff care approach needs to be adapted to the context where it is used. There is no such thing as “one size fits all” approach to staff care (Porter & Emmens 2009; Burton 2010; Bhagat et al. 2010). The minimum standards create a baseline to guide the services of humanitarian aid organisations, but the service needs to be adapted to the
organisational structure, to the work assignments and the cultural setting. Psychological strains differ across cultures and nations, and the service needs to be adapt to the setting where it operates. For example, Rabi (2010) found that problem-focused coping was more helpful for persons from more individualistic national contexts, meanwhile emotion-focused coping was found more effective for persons in more collectivistic contexts. Most research has been focusing on the needs of international humanitarian workers, despite that national staff contribute to 90% of the humanitarian workforce (Ager, 2012). Staff care is needed for both national and international staff, but the needs are not identical. Antares Foundation (2012) compared the needs and found that national staff have higher significant levels of depression, and higher signs of anxiety. Stressor highlighted more in this group was economical or financial problems, reports of unequal treatment between national and international staff, together with high workload, separation from family, travel restrictions and lack of recognition from beneficiaries.

What becomes clear is that multiple aspects need to be included to produce a well elaborated staff care program. There is no “one size fits all”, but that does not mean that every organisation need to start from scratch in their work.

3.4 Healthy organisations

WHO (Burton, 2014) has taken a step further, not only looking at how staff can be healthy, but also at the interrelationship between healthy staff and healthy organisations. They conclude that an organisation is a healthy workplace when it is “one in which workers and managers collaborate to use a continual improvement process to protect and promote the health, safety and wellbeing of all workers” (Burton, 2014, 16). A healthy organisation is good for the wellbeing of their workers but has also been shown to perform better and to be more successful. Healthy organisations are the most prominent key to competitive organisation advantage (Biron, Burke & Cooper, 2014).

A healthy workplace, is identified by WHO (Burton, 2014) to involve four areas of influence that organisation needs to address: The physical work environment; The psychosocial work environment; Personal health resources in the workplace; and Enterprise community involvement. These four are not seen as separated entities, but overlap each other, as shown in Table 1. The Physical Work Environment and Psychosocial Work Environment, are seen to be related more to workplace related casual factors, while Personal Health Resources and Enterprise Community Involvement more
relate to external factors, still influencing the workplace (Mcdonald, 2011 in Biron, Burke & Cooper, 32). The four areas are based on the psychosocial hazards (Chapter 3.1), and to successfully create a healthy workplace requires a process of continual improvement and managements system approach (Kortum, 2014). The model is to be seen as a framework, recommended to be adapted to the workplace, culture and country, since not “one-size-fit-all” (Burton, 2014).

The Physical Work Environment is the part of the workplace facility that can be detected by human or electronic senses. It includes structures, air, furniture, products, materials and processes that are present in the workplace, and can affect the physical or mental safety, health and wellbeing of workers. If the worker performs his or her tasks outdoors, that location is the physical work environment. Examples of this is noise, excessive heat or pandemic threats, food, hepatitis B, malaria, and HIV. Those hazards can result in illnesses and injuries, and needs to be recognized, assessed and controlled at the workplace.

The Psychosocial Work Environment includes the organisation of work and the organisational culture with its attitudes, values, beliefs and practices. Those affect the mental and physical wellbeing of employees, and can cause emotional or mental stress, and are also referred to as workplace stressors. Examples of psychosocial hazards are poor work organisation (e.g. problems with work demands, reward and recognition, workloads, support from supervisors, job clarity, poor communication); organisational culture (e.g. lack of policies and practice related to dignity or respect for all workers; harassment and bullying); command and control management style (e.g. lack of:

Table 1 Four areas to influence Healthy Organisations. Burton, 2014, 83

The Physical Work Environment

Psychosocial Work Environment

Personal Health Resources

Enterprise Community Involvement
consultation, two-way communication, constructive feedback, respectful performance management); inconsistent application and protection of basic worker rights; lack of support for work-life balance. Those hazards need to be recognized, assessed and controlled to try to eliminate them or modify the source. Examples of interventions are providing supervisor and co-worker support, have open and honest communications, train workers on stress management techniques, and raise awareness and provide training for workers.

Personal Health Resources means the supportive environment, health services, information, resources, opportunities and flexibility that is provided to support or motivate the workers efforts to improve or maintain a healthy personal lifestyle, as well as to monitor and support their ongoing physical and mental health. This could be workplace conditions causing workers to experience difficulties adopting a healthy lifestyle or remaining healthy, for example lacking access to healthy meals at work and poor quality or quantity of sleep as a result of workplace stress.

Enterprise Community Involvement relate to the connection between the community where the enterprise exists, and the effect this community has on the workers. The communities where workers live affect their and their families’ health and wellbeing with its physical and social environment. Examples of community issues affecting the workplace is polluted water sources, lack of access to primary health care, and lack of infrastructure or safety to encourage active transport to and from work.

All the four areas are equally valued as influencing the wellbeing (Burton, 2014). It is specially highlighted the importance of seeing psychosocial workplace hazards as levelled with physical working environment, as the last one is often given priority (Kortum, 2014).

3.4.1 Participatory climate

A key intervention found in healthy workplaces is participation in decision making from workers (Burton, 2014, 49). Several researchers refer to this as “Participatory climate”, defined as a work environment where employees have open communications with supervisors and colleagues, and opportunity to actively participate in the decision-making, based on sufficient and timely information (Likert 1967, second source Seki; Ishikawa & Yamazaki, 2014, 183). An overview of the research in this field was made by Seki, Ishikawa and Yamazaki (2014), who found the participatory climate to increase the manageability of growing demands, and also buffer negative effects of high work
demand on depression. Signs were also found showing that where the employees participation was rooted in the organisational climate, employees spontaneously made decisions to solve job stress related problems. A participative climate was found to create healthy and motivated employees, increasing the organisational effectiveness by an increase work motivation. The correlation between participative climate to employees’ health and work motivation was stronger than to work demand and work control.

3.6 The Effort-Reward Imbalance Theory

The Effort-Reward Imbalance Theory (ERI) dates back to 1996, when Siegrist introduced this social theory to test work-related stress. Since then the theory has gained popularity and has been tested, modified, and verified with empirical evidence (de Jonge et al. 2000; Siegrist et al. 2004; van Vegchel et al. 2005). The theory focuses on the connection between the efforts employees put into the work and the reward they get in return. An imbalance between the two is experienced if the costs are higher than the rewards, leading up to negative emotions in the exposed persons.

The model assumes that work effort is a part of a contract deeply rooted in social reciprocity. The employee receives a reward for the effort, in the form of money, esteem, or career opportunities. This contract often fails to provide a symmetrical exchange between the requested effort and the given reward, and the imbalance can be subconsciously experienced in everyday experience, or might be known and accepted (Siegrist 1996, 31). A reason for accepting this imbalance might be the strategic reason of improving the future chance of a job. The imbalance between a higher effort and a lower reward, conscious or sub-consciously experienced, results in strain reactions and negative emotions that may contribute to the development of physical or mental diseases (de Jonge et al. 2000; Siegrist et al. 2004; van Vegchel et al. 2005).

3.6.1 Extrinsic ERI hypothesis

The imbalance between high effort and low reward, is also called the “Extrinsic ERI hypothesis”. The complete ERI model, shown in Table 2, includes the “Intrinsic overcommitted hypothesis”, looking into how personal factors may increase the risk of poor health. The two hypotheses differ in empirical support, and a review of 45 ERI studies from around the world, showed the Extrinsic ERI hypothesis was found to have
gained most empirical support (van Vegchel et al., 2005). The same study also found Reward to be the important underlying factor.

The imbalance between effort and reward, are found to predict future risk of poor health, like Cardiovascular health diseases (Siegrist, 1996), or increased risk of emotional exhaustion, psychosomatic health issues, physical health symptoms, job dissatisfaction (de Jonge et al., 2000; Siegrist et al., 2004) and poor job-related wellbeing (van Vegchel et al., 2005).

ERI was used in a UNHCR (2016 d) report about staff wellbeing and mental health. Different instruments were used to measure staff wellbeing and mental health, and ERI was found to have the strongest predictive value for risk of mental health outcomes (anxiety, depression, PTSD, secondary stress, and burnout). The conclusion of the report, is taken as base for the model suitability to be used on humanitarian workers in this thesis.

3.6.2 ERI Analysis

There are different versions of the ERI model, but all of them build on self-reported data. This study uses the long version questionnaire, with 16 items, for which participants were asked to indicate how each statement best reflected a typical work situation (Appendix 2). The statements cover a range of stressful experiences at work, including macroeconomic labour market aspects, such as job security and salaries. The long version includes six statements to measure Effort, covering topics on demands at work. The statements are answered on a four-point Likert scale, ranging between: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly agree. Each statement generates as value between 1 – 4. When summing the value of the six statements a sum between 6 and 24 is calculated, and the higher the score the more effort is assumed to be experienced at work. In the same way, Reward is measured with ten statements, covering topics of different rewards. The
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statements are answered on a four-point Likert scale, ranging between: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly agree. Each statement generates a value between 1 – 4. When summing the value of the ten statements a sum between 10 and 40 is calculated, and the lower the score the fewer occupational rewards are assumed to be received (Siegrist, Li & Montano 2014).

The data analysis consists of associating the two single scales, getting an interaction between the effort and the reward scale that captures an imbalance at an individual level (Siegrist et al., 2004). The interaction scale is calculated using an “ER ratio”, adjusting for the unequal number of statements. The ER ratio is calculated using the formula $ER = k \frac{E}{R}$, with the effort sum $E$ as enumerator, reward sum $R$ as denominator and $k$ being the number of reward items (10) divided by the number of effort items (6). With $k = \frac{10}{6} \approx 1.67$, this gives $ER \approx 1.67 \frac{E}{R}$. If ER is 1, the participant report 1 effort per reward. When ER is below 1 the efforts are fewer than the rewards, and if ER is over 1 efforts are higher than the rewards (Siegrist, Li & Montano, 2014).

3.7 Chapter Summary

This theoretical chapter has discussed the conceptualization of the hazards that humanitarian workers encounter in their work. The focus has been on how organisations tend to engage in mitigating these hazards. An impacting factor is how funding is directed towards these issues. Organisations tend to work with a more ad hoc approach, even though a failure to provide adequate support often result in high levels of psychological distress among the humanitarian workers.

The Healthy Organisations model involves areas in need of attention by organisations, to create a healthy workplace. Healthy organisations are positive to the wellbeing of the workers, and also shown to perform better and to be more successful. This study uses the Healthy Organisation model to sort the findings and compare the perceptions from participants with organisational hazards commonly found in the humanitarian work.

Additionally, the Extrinsic ERI hypothesis was presented. The hypothesis looks at the conscious and subconscious perceived balance experience between efforts and rewards at work and will be used as a complement to the in-depth interviews.
4. Research findings

This chapter will start by presenting the result from the in depth-interviews, followed by the results from the ERI analysis.

A total of 14 participants contributed to the study through both the interviews and the questionnaire. All participants were national staff, employed at LWF’s program in Kakuma with fix-term contracts. A description of the participants is presented in Table 3. Three staff members participated from each sector, except for Community & Livelihood, where more interviews were conducted due to the large diversity of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Child protection: 3 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and security: 3 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: 3 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community service &amp; Livelihood: 5 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years of employment at LWF</td>
<td>2 – 5 years: 6 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 9 years: 5 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 17 years: 3 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Grade 1 – 3: 8 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4: 6 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male: 7 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 7 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of origin</td>
<td>Turcana county: 8 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Down-country: 6 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of work</td>
<td>Refugee community: 12 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host community: 2 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Participants (n=14)

The participants have worked at LWF between 2 and 17 years. LWF does not have an official track of staff employment time, but the HR manager estimate the average length of employment at LWF in Kakuma to be between 3 and 5 years. The employment years shown in Table 3 reflect each person’s total years of employment. Not all employments are continuous, sometime interrupted by studies or other work, before returning back to LWF. One staff member was previously employed by LWF at another refugee camp before coming to Kakuma, and those employment years are included in the total amount.

Six out of the eight participants employed at grade 1 – 3 are from Turcana county, while four out of the six employed at grade 4 are from other parts of Kenya, or
down-country as they say. Two of the participants focus their work on the host community and were included in order to allow observations of potential differences to those focusing on refugees. The size of staff crew might be considered a good number to keep participants answers confidential. Still, the staff members live and work close to each other, with good insights into each other’s lives. To maintain confidentiality, the quotes from participants will only be referred to by number and grade, without any reference to age or unit.

4.1 Environmental factors

The location of the refugee camp influence several factors that participants not originally from Turcana view as negative in their working conditions: the high temperatures, the dust, the remoteness, and the lack of resources in Kakuma town. Combined, these factors are expressed as making it a tough place to live in. The participants from down-country find the weather affecting both their energy and sleep quality. Relief from the heat is found inside offices at the compound, where air conditioners cools the air as long as the generator is working. Meanwhile, participants originally from Turcana express that they are not being bothered by the environmental challenges:

‘You know, I am a Turcana, this is my county, and even the sun and these challenges – I am used to them. So, I don’t have any challenges from my side, I am enjoying my work’. (Informant 5. Grade 4)

Contrary to this, persons from down-country often mention that “you need to have passion” or “we sacrifice ourselves“ when talking about coming to Kakuma. Besides the weather, the remoteness is striking. Several stories describe the shock connected with the first drive to Kakuma, spending over 24 hours on partly bad roads. The remoteness also contributes to Kakuma town being rather underdeveloped, without much to offer. Supplies are limited, and prices are fluctuating highly depending on the supply. The circumstances of Kakuma seems to take Kenyans from down-country by surprise and some even find the conditions too overwhelming to complete the duration of the contract. A couple of participants shared stories like this:
‘I know a man we hired, a deputy child protection officer, he worked for one week and he left. He said, I cannot be here, it is too much for me’ (Informant 13. Grade 4)

Additionally, the housing in Kakuma town is expressed as difficult to get due to the high demand. Even after having found a place to stay, the quality is mostly poor, complicating the daily life as most housing do not include power or water. One participant expressed it like this:

‘…in Kakuma there is no good housing system, people end up living in shanties, with no power, no water, no security, nothing. And this place is very insecure, gunshots sometimes, so this is also discouraging staff cause. Only a few are hosted inside here (the compound)’. (Informant 13. Grade 4)

Participants from down-country living in Kakuma find the housing conditions so hard, that some hesitate to renew their contract. Meanwhile participants from Turcana do not express to be impacted. Participants in grade 4, with the benefit of housing in the compound, express that this probably has prolonged their stay.

The remoteness also impacts family life. Everyone from outside the vicinity have left their families, spouses, and children around Kenya. This is expressed to be the most challenging factor related to work. Calls and text messages from their families are expressed to be important energizers to keep them going until the next time they see each other. That normally happens when going home on R&R, annual leave, or school breaks for teachers. When it comes to participants from Kakuma, they live together with their families and loved ones outside the compound.

4.2 Organisational factors

Workload is perceived to be high, with long working days, and a variety of assignments to meet commitments and needs of the refugee community, host community and donors. There is always case work to do, trainings to arrange, trainings to report, committees to attend, community work, meeting with donors, visits from donors, weekly reports, monthly reports, supervision and innovation, and planning for new programs among many other things. As one participant expressed the work situation:
'Like internationally standard, if we look at minimum standards for child protection, a case manager or case worker should handle 25 cases at the most. Our case, if you divide the number of children of concern we are supporting and the number of caseworkers we have, each national staff has 111 cases! That is …you can see the gap. If we include the incentive staff, then we reduce it to 40 – 46 cases per person. You find this is too huge. People are overwhelmed.’ (Informant 13. Grade 4)

The number of working hours remain high even between the times of high influx of refugees. The limited funding creates frustration when it leads to feelings of insufficiency for the needs expected to be covered. This is visible in the educational sector, where teachers work in classrooms with 150 – 200 learners. Overcrowded classrooms, lack of teaching material, and varying needs between learners creates a challenging work setting:

‘Sometimes you find that the most challenging is when the class is overcrowded. You find that you have multiple disabilities in the same room. It becomes very challenging, cause at the same time there is physically impaired, there is mentally challenging learners there are hearing impaired learners, there are the visually impaired learners. All of them are using the same unit, and all of them are at different levels of performance functional skills. All of them are at different levels, so you will find how to attend all of them because all of them need your attention.’ (Informant 1. Grade 1 – 3)

Even if the workload is high, everyone expresses that their assignments within their program or unit is clear. No one mentions an unclear assignment, but instead underline that they are entrusted to work freely within their mandate. A system of supervision and support is present and can be used with confidence when cases are found hard to handle on one level. This freedom under responsibility is a source that brings joy to the work:

‘… about the not micro management style of work. LWF makes their staff work freely. XX is not my supervisor, he is not my boss, he is my colleague, he doesn’t micromanage me. /…/ Staff do the work the way they know it is best to do it.’ (Informant 10. Grade 4)

Staff are trusted within their work and trusted with deeper involvement in the organisational life. Staff representatives are involved in solving sudden funding cuts,
updated on decisions, listened to, and invited to think innovatively about arising needs. The bottom-up structure creates participation and proudness, when staff see results of their input. This structure, built on trust and interaction, is mentioned by participants at every grade as a reason for appreciating their job. Interaction takes place both within teams and between teams in programs and units. The team is a place for support, where staff work in collaboration no matter how the team is composed, consisting of both nationals and incentive workers. Collaboration and interaction is extended between teams, units, and across grades, and is a source of job satisfaction. Almost all participants comment on this, how interaction expands their knowledge:

‘But it also come with interacting with other units and sectors, and each sector has its own way of doing things, so at the end of the day you really get enriched, interacting with different sectors within the organisation. So, it helps you develop more skill.’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)

Several refer to LWF’s reputation as “LWF University”, an organisation where staff come, work, and are trusted with assignment that allows them to grow and learn. This gives LWF staff a reputation of being hardworking, flexible, and interested in learning.

When problems turn up or conflicts arise, structures are in place to handle them. Participants feel confident to use those structures, but only rarely find a real need for them. Quarrelling or fighting between LWF staff are found to be so rare that most have never seen it. Staff might be complaining between each other, but the issue is always solved in a good way. Instead, when asked to describe the atmosphere within and between teams, the most common response is “unity”. The same word is used to describe the relation with management, including the Sub-Program Manager (SPM):

‘…any staff having any issues is able to reach any person. Like, if I have an issue, which I feel I need to share with maybe the SPM, as a person I can go and knock on the SPMs door and go to have a talk to him. So, it is kind of opened doors where staff are welcomed to come and express their issues to the management. Actually, you will also be given feedback appropriately.’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)

The unity includes an openness to listen to the needs and ideas on an individual level, but also create forums for staff to meet with or without the management, to receive information, respond, and discuss their concerns. Participants feel free to raise their
matter and know they will be treated with dignity and respect. The relation with persons in management positions is often described as close relatives, instead of bosses.

4.2.1 Perceptions on organisational Improvements

Participants that have worked for some years with LWF Kakuma, brings attention to the important improvements that LWF has made during the last years, impacting the staff welfare. They describe how severe the situation was in 2014 and how it slowly started to change in 2015. One participant expresses it like this:

‘There was a time it was a high turnover in LWF. Yes, now things have improved, LWF have improved in terms of salaries. There was a time people come and said, “it is not worth it, with the money I am getting as salary, I have to stay away from my family”’/…/ But over the years LWF have improved the salary for staff and the benefits, and the turnover has drastically decreased.’ (Informant 10. Grade 4)

Both management and participants describe a change somewhere around 2014 – 2015 with a beginning trend of decreasing staff turnover. Participants mainly give the salary increments credit for this change, but also mention the importance of improved communication with management which was previously lacking and resulted in frustrated staff not knowing what was going on. The medical insurance has also been improved and is considered reliable today. The teambuilding activities and the changed organisational structure, allowing participation and work under trust are also mentioned as important.

Beside these organisational factors, concrete improvements such as an improved Internet connection has facilitated field work and family connections. Improvements in some offices, the gym being constructed in the compound, and the replacement of the canteen from the 1990s are all mentioned as valuable and supportive. More improvements are requested, often related to worn premises, confined spaces, and lack of equipment. This is expressed as negatively affecting the work motivation. Despite this the staff recognise the management’s recent effort to make improvements as a way to take care of staff:

‘…at least staff welfare is taking care of. They are trying, and specially our HR she is come up with somethings that makes out staff comfortable, and our
SPM, mister Collins, is concerned. Yes, he is very concerned with the staff.’

(Informant 4. Grade 4).

4.3 Community factors

Working with refugees in the multicultural setting of Kakuma Refugee camp is described as having both pros and cons. Participants express a love for their job, to a large extent based on the intercultural setting, where working with persons from different nationalities make a positive impact on their own lives. On the other hand, a passion to endure is expressed to be required because of the challenges related to the refugee community. A common challenge is the “language barrier”. The official language in Kenya is Kiswahili, but English is also commonly used in the camp too. Refugees themselves speak a variety of languages reflecting their geographical and cultural background. One place where this challenge becomes visible is in the schools. A large number of the newcomers are minors, quickly introduced to school, which creates challenges for the teachers:

‘You find yourself explaining, and you want to put a concept for them to understand. You use body languages, you use Kiswahili, you sometimes use English, but they are not getting it. That becomes hectic. So, for something you really want to stress out, you take one of the learners to interpret, a learner that understands more. When it has been translated, they feel very happy, but it is not good, and it is not recommended. But our financial is not good.’

(Informant 3. Grade 1 – 3)

The solution to language barriers is often to find a person from the same country to translate, which also creates frustration since it complicates the work.

Teachers are aware that, for most learners, education is one of the few options to get out of the camp, and use this to encourage learners to study hard. Another way to get out of camp is to get resettlement to a third country. One of the accepted conditions for resettlement is security reasons when life is threatened. One participant explained:

‘…it is so stressy, when you know the aim of some of the cases. They just want resettlement. In the process of looking for resettlement they will make it stressful, they even tell you lies – “this is what I am going through –
somebody wants to kill me”, but there is nobody who wants to kill her or him. It is so stressy! You have to write it, just what they are saying, but it is so stress when you know it is not true, but you have to assist.’ (Informant 4, Grade 4)

As possible long-time changes are limited, and vulnerability is high, this affects the work environment of staff. It is frustrating to be lied to or to meet the stress of frustrated refugees that have been denied support that would reduce their vulnerability due to limited funding. The limited resources also affect the work of cooperating organisations. When another organisation has limited funding, that affects their effectiveness, also impacting on LWF’s work. An example of this can be seen in the process of cases of security. LWF assess refugees’ cases of security up to a certain level, and then forwards them to UNHCR. If the case process is delayed, the clients comes back to the LWF office, asking for answers and clarifications:

‘…our unit deal with insecurity cases. And when you save these cases, sometimes they are not worked on, on the next level. The clients keep coming back to the office. And you tell the client: please just go to UNHCR field post, they will give you report. But because they (UNHCR) have not worked on the cases, they come back to us. //.../ It is so challenging, because the clients, the people of concern, will see us as if we are not working, as if we have no interest in helping them. Yet, we have done our work.’ (Informant 4. Grade 4)

Being seen as responsible for things that are out of their control creates frustration and takes up resources that is needed to manage the work they are responsible for.

The need of the refugees is somewhere between humanitarian and developmental. The needs and the vulnerability are not likely to disappear in the short term, neither for the refugees nor the host community. In some ways, the host community is seen to be more vulnerable compared to refugees, who are given a basic support structure from the humanitarian community. The needs of the host community are more of a developmental kind than short term, but the long-term needs are currently met with humanitarian assistance, relying on the humanitarian imperative of do-no-harm and impartiality. Staff working with the host community are often from the host community themselves, and they express only proudness of being able to serve their own community.
Participants working in programmes spanning over a long time express a tangible proudness to do so and a motivator is to be able to see a clearly visible impact. Being able to work with a program over years and see it grow and have impact, is a motivator for staying at LWF.

Participants across all settings, no matter their assignment, often reflect on their job within the bigger picture of a humanitarian setting. One common focus is to see how their job can impact peace and peacebuilding. As some refugees return to their countries of origin, the hope is that they returned equipped to have a positive impact on the future of their countries. A participant from the school describe:

‘I use to tell them, peace in southern Sudan will come from one person, only one person. We don’t know who that person is. It might be you sitting in the class.’ (Informant 2. Grade 1 – 3)

Even participants not working directly in the peace and security sector often describe how their job impact peacebuilding.

4.4 Supportive factors

With LWF being a faith-based organisation, it comes natural for participants to express how their faith has a large supportive impact on their work and stay. Besides this, it is the support from family that is seen as most essential, especially for those coming from down-country. For some, the decision to come to Kakuma is described as a family decision. Calls from home, text messages, and the family time during R&R gives support and energy to face the work. The R&R and the flexibility with how it is handled is expressed as one essential benefit:

‘LWF as employer tries to take care of the staff. We have R&R, if I can count that as support, cause… You come here you are on call 24/7. But each week you are given a day, and after eight weeks you have accumulated eight days, and you can have your break and go home, rest and come back. Actually, that helps us a lot, because at the eight weeks you are done, you are like… (laughing). So, at that time you can go home and rest and come back. That really motivates us to work.’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)
Besides the energiser of R&R, the transportation support in connection to the periods of leave is expressed as highly supportive. The benefit of the medical insurance, covering both the employee and some family members, is also highly valued. Participants mention it to be unusual that an insurance extends to family members, and some express this to be a reason that makes them stay if ever tempted to look for other jobs.

Another source of support is found in colleagues. When the working hours are over, strength is found by talks or common activities. LWF in Kakuma offers interaction areas within the compound, for example a large TV in the mess hall and a badminton court. A gymnastic building is also planned for 2017. Many of these support factors have been developed based on input from staff. One example was the concern that persons who had worked for several years left LWF with empty wallets. It was then suggested by staff to create a saving credits society, and today staff are invited to deposit money that can later be disbursed for personal needs or when the employment ends. The saving credit society also provides loans for larger needs or investments. This response from LWF is seen by participants as a true evidence of real staff care, extending even after the employment.

4.4.1 Feedback, motivators and appreciation

The overall care perceived from the employer motivates participants to keep working for LWF. Other motivators are found in the appreciation and recognition they receive for their work. It can take different shapes, but everyone agrees that getting feedback is both supportive and motivating. As one participant explain:

‘Through the feedback I know I am doing the right thing, and it makes me like my job’. (Informant 14. Grade 1 – 3)

Although feedback is important for everyone, the impact varies with the source. Everyone agreed on that feedback from management, supervisors, and from the SPM in particular, has the highest impact. During the interviews, it is often mentioned that the SPM as good at giving praise, both in private and in public. Feedback and recognition from colleagues, for individual and team accomplishments, is also considered important. Positive feedback from refugees also work as a motivator, either through a “thank you” or a smiling face after a time of struggle. A few participants also mention increased funding from donors as feedback and recognition for well operated programs. Appreciation is moreover perceived from the small gifts staff sometimes receive, for example T-shirts with the LWF
logo, just as teambuilding trips to Lake Turcana are mentioned to be gestures of appreciation with motivating effects.

However, there are three ways that are the most important for how appreciation and recognition is being perceived by LWF staff: salary, salary raise, and job promotion. Most of these aspects are mentioned with dissatisfaction. The low salaries, compared to other similar organisations, is the most frequently mentioned dissatisfaction about working with LWF. Salary is seen as a recognition of good work, and the low salary could then indicate that participants don’t feel valued. Participants are however aware of the relationship between salary and funding, and recognize that management cannot completely control it. The honest effort by managements to raise salary, together with the progress made the last years, is seen as a sign of appreciation. Every effort to raise salary raise is appreciated, and received as show of appreciation:

‘Appreciation is best shown through salary increment! It is sometimes like peanuts, but we still appreciate it.’ (Informant 14. Grade 1 – 3)

Beside salary increments, promotions are expressed as the best way to recognise good work. The possibility of promotion motivates hard work, especially for those who have already receive it once. One participant expresses it like this:

‘… if you do better they can actually give you another position than is higher than the one you have. For example, maybe if I work harder, I will be given the position of officer. That is one appreciation LWF can give, to motivate to staff.’ (Informant 6. Grade 1 – 3)

Even if promotions work as a motivator to some, others are more negative when talking about promotions. On an individual level, several express that they are not sure why they have not yet been promoted, despite having worked on the same position for a long time. Applying for a higher position without getting any response on why someone else is promoted instead, is expressed as very discouraging.

4.5 Perception of stress

The topics previously discussed in section 4.1 – 4.4 have not been found to differ between units, grades, gender, or other groups – except from the already mentioned difference between being from Turcana or down-country. But when it comes to how participants
experience stress, there is a clear division. On a direct question, half of the participants did not identify anything stressful in their work. The other half described stressful circumstances, involving low salary, high workload, exhaustion, sleeping problems, and traumatising stories. The difference between the two groups is not strictly related to grades, but a trend suggests that participants with grade 4 experience a higher level of stress. The stress does not seem to be related to gender, or to the participant originally being from Turcana or not. No single factor has been found to explain the difference between the groups. Instead several factors are expressed to impact. One such factor relates to hearing traumatising stories:

‘…someone comes to you and share a touching story, and you realise at the end of the day you left with that story. You carry it in your heart, it affects you somehow. You are somehow “oh my God, this is what this person went through”. So at times those stories cause you stress, cause you think it is just too much for this person to go through. So sometimes you get fatigue of hearing these stories, they really affect you…’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)

Staff across all programs work closely with people of concern or vulnerable people, and are exposed to their stories. Some programs however, are more exposed to hearing narrations described as depressing or traumatising. Participants from different units describe that staff working in transit and reception centres, and child protection, are more exposed. LWF staff are involved in assisting newcomers with psychosocial support, and with identifying and assisting unaccompanied minors or separated children. The stories they hear on a daily basis are more intense, as the experiences are recent and mixed with desperation, fear and anger:

‘I think in some sectors, like reception centre, staff meet with refugees in the first time they come to the camp, like…a refugee has runaway, has been raped, is angry, is bitter, maybe someone has been killed. In that state I am coming to you. So, you see, I just want to share and talk, and I am bitter and I am all those kind of things. As you listen to me, it affects you. So, this staff, they need more staff care’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)

All staff hear stories or see things that are tough and affect them, but some are exposed more repeatedly and more intensely. Staff from these areas of work also express a frustration arising when bureaucracy creates loopholes. One such repeated stressor is to
see refugees get stuck in the reception centres for longer than the normally two weeks it takes to be placed in the community. This could happen for security reasons and prolong the stay up to several months. During this time, the refugee cannot leave the reception area, and is supposed to rely on the basic non-food items given the first day: a mat, a blanket, a mug, a soap, and a mosquito net. Additional soap is not given in the reception centre but expected to last as it is until the community placement. To see persons, especially children, staying for months within the fence, with needs of soap and clothes creates frustrations and irritation with the system for staff. This frustration has occasionally driven staff to act with their own money, as a response to maintain the human dignity:

‘Sometimes it has forced myself, to raise my hand to my pocket and buy them a soap, because I sympathise with what they are going through.’ (Informant 14. Grade 1 – 3)

The humanitarian systems lack of flexibility, creates an internal stress that can only be solved by acting in unconventional ways, like assisting with personal funding. Participants working in transit and reception centres also mention two other stressors: personal health and security risks. In the transit and reception centre, refugees have to stay for at least two weeks as part of Kenya’s regulation to screen asylum seekers in order to ensure they do not pose any risk to the public health and the local population (Kenya Gazette Supplement, 2016, 407). Assessment and survey by LWF staff takes place before this time is over, and there is a stress of being exposed to health risks and not knowing how to protect themselves nor feeling supported by vaccination, except in cases of big outbreaks. This stressor is combined with a feeling of security risks at the transit centre. The transit centre is located some distance from Kakuma, at the border to South Sudan, without any security personnel and with the police some hundred meters further inside Kenya. Gun shootings have occurred around the transit centre during nights, leaving staff worried:

‘Yes, we are worried, when it is night time we just go to sleep, pray, and when it is morning you say thank you to God for another day. Cause this place is not safe.’ (Informant 8. Grade 4)

This stress can only be identified in a limited group of staff working at the border, but stands out from the rest making it important to be mentioned.
As discussed in 3.2, a common stressor relates to the working contracts. It is possible to distinguish two different reactions to contracts, even if everyone has fixed-contracts for one year or less. One group find it a source of high stress, not knowing if the contract will be extended at the end of the period. The other group, trust that funding will appear, and contracts will be renewed:

‘I think we are reconciled with the fact that it will keep on doing like that. We are normally…always…somehow, funds are there to survive the whole year. But, before getting used to that! I used to think about start packing because it was June and I was giving six months’ contract. But now, I think it doesn’t affect people so much, because somehow, ways are found to maintain all of us. And if people leave, maybe very few.’ (Informant 9. Grade 4)

Those who trust in renewed contracts have worked with LWF for some years, and have experienced it several times, even if it might involve changing tasks.

Just as stress is perceived differently, the level of knowledge of how to cope with stress differs. One group of participants, cutting through grades, gender, and units, describe their lack of knowledge on how to handle individual stress. This group overlap to a high extent with those expressing the offered counselling as not being enough. This group express a wish to learn more about self-care techniques and secondary trauma. Other participants express to have self-care procedures they find supportive, which increases their wellbeing. Among these, a number distinguish themselves by the awareness of stress reducing techniques, and approaches to reduces their stress in their daily work. These participants have gone through a more extensive training offered by the CoS, focusing on CBPS and including staff care. One of those participants describe it like this:

‘We were trained how to manage stress, to care for yourself so you won’t have pressure on you. We who have done this course, have come to another platform compared to the ones who haven’t do it.’ (Informant 13. Grade 4)

Participants with the extended training, unanimously express how radically the new knowledge has affected their everyday work, and reduced feelings of being stressed.
4.6 Experienced Effort-Reward Imbalance

After looking at the results from the interviews, this section will proceed to look at the results from the ERI questionnaire. With only 14 questionnaires involved, the score calculation was made by hand and using Excel to consolidate scales. The result of each participant’s ERI is shown in Table 4. The average for the group is 0.84, showing that as group the participants experience more rewards that efforts. Out of the 14 participants, 4 have an ERI over 1, expressing to experience more efforts than rewards. These four persons constitute 25% of the group, and even if their score does not indicate an extreme imbalance, the trend still needs to be considered.

Table 4 ERI distribution among participants n=14

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ERI model the total imbalance of efforts and reward are in focus, but it is still interesting to look closer at the answers from each question, with some standing out from the rest. Table 5 show the results from Effort, indicating the average of the 14 participants. The range is between 1 and 4, and the higher the number, the more efforts are experienced. Question 5 has the highest number, indicating a physically demanding job, closely followed by question 3 indicating high levels of responsibility, and question 6 indicating increasing demands of the job during the last few years.

Table 5. Effort

| Q1. | I have constant time pressure due to heavy work load | 2.6 |
| Q2. | I have many interruptions and disturbances while performing my job | 2.1 |
| Q3. | I have a lot of responsibility in my job | 3.1 |
| Q4. | I am often pressured to work overtime | 2.6 |
| Q5. | My work is physically demanding | 3.2 |
| Q6. | Over the past few years, my job has become more and more demanding | 3.1 |
| **Average** | **2.8** |

Continuing with Reward, Table 6 indicates the average score of the 14 participants. The Range is between 1 and 4, and the lower the number the less rewards are experienced. Question 10 stands out with the lowest number, indicating poor promotion prospects, closely followed by question 16, indicating inadequate salary compared to the effort and achievements. On the other hand, questions 7 and 8 indicate high scores on respect and
fair treatment, and question 13 indicate occupational positions that adequately reflects the education and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7.</th>
<th>I receive the respect I deserve from my superior or a respective relevant person</th>
<th>3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8.</td>
<td>I experience adequate support in difficult situations</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9.</td>
<td>I am treated unfairly at work</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10.</td>
<td>My job promotion prospects are poor</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11.</td>
<td>I have experienced or I expect to experience an undesirable change in my work situation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.</td>
<td>My employment security is poor</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13.</td>
<td>My current occupational position adequately reflects my education and training</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.</td>
<td>Considering all my efforts and achievements, I receive the respect and prestige I deserve at work</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.</td>
<td>Considering all my efforts and achievements, my job promotion prospects are adequate</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16.</td>
<td>Considering all my efforts and achievements, my salary/ income is adequate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average | 3.1 |

*Table 6. Reward*

The only previous results from a ERI questionnaire within the Humanitarian sector, is found in UNHCR (2016d, 39) report on staff wellbeing. The report was completed by 21% of UNHCR’s staff and affiliated workforce, and showed that 72% reported higher Effort than Rewards. When comparing this result with the result from participants mentioned above, 72% against 25%, the difference is striking. The results cannot be compared right off, as staff within UNHCR work in a variety of different settings. Still, this can be interpreted as possible different approaches to organisational hazards affecting staff, something that will be analysed in the next chapter.
5. Analysis

This chapter will present an analysis of the results from chapter 4, based on the theories from chapter 3.

Humanitarian workers are surrounded by a diversity of stressors affecting their wellbeing, several originating from organisational factors. For this reason, it is interesting to look closer at the results from the ERI questionnaire, providing a sample of how participants find the balance between experienced efforts and rewards. The Imbalance for the whole group (n=14) is 0.84. Being below 1, it reveals that more rewards than efforts are experienced. The group as whole, find that stressful experiences at work are balanced with rewards of different kinds. Looking closer at the numbers, 25% of the group of 14 experience an imbalance with higher efforts than rewards. Research predicts an increased risks of mental health outcomes, physical health symptoms, and job dissatisfaction for this small group (de Jonge et al., 2000; Siegrist et al., 2004). Comparing this result of n=14 with the numbers from UNHCR (2016d), it is striking to find that 25% of the participants compared to 72% of the UNHCR staff experience a higher effort than reward. The ERI model only gives a snapshot view, but suggests that LWF in Kakuma, to some extent, has found ways to balance the Effort and Rewards for the employees. Another aspect that may influencing the result, are the impacts of different settings involved: the protractedness of Kakuma vs a bigger diversity within the settings where UNHCR work, including more emergency settings.

The result still indicate that participants are exposed to Efforts. A closer look at the results of each ERI questions in Table 5 and 6, reveals that staff perceive efforts, but those are mitigated by rewards. This is in line with other studies that have shown that even if Efforts exist, Reward is the factor that makes the difference in the outcome (Van Vagchela et al., 2005).

To analyse the ERI results closer, they will be set in relation with the hazards and supportive factors experienced by participants. The WHO model of Healthy Organisations (presented in 3.4) will be used to sort the information within the four areas found to influence a healthy organisation: (a) The Physical Work Environment, (b) The Psychosocial Work Environment, (c) Personal Health Resources in the Workplace and (d) Enterprise Community Involvement.
5.1 The Physical Work Environment

The area of Physical Work Environment is described in detail in section 3.4. In this research, this area is assumed to overlap with UNHCR’s category of “Environmental stress” (3.2) that includes climate, remoteness, isolated location, shortage of shelter, and water and resources in general.

The hazards in this area are among the first participants mention. There are two hazards standing out mentioned as more important for the wellbeing: location and housing. The location of the Refugee Camp brings a hard climate, physical isolation, and remoteness from close family, all mentioned as hazards with a large negative impact. These hazards are only perceived by 6 out of the 14 participants, all of them being from “down-country”. The 8 participants from Turkana county do not mention these hazards spontaneously in the interviews, and some even deny them to be hazards when asked directly. Instead they mention to be adapted to the climate and have their loved ones close. This difference is a clear indication that “national humanitarian workers” cannot be considered one homogenous group experiencing the same hazards. Even to persons from the same country, the context is so foreign in Kakuma that several express an experience of cultural shock when arriving from down-country to Kakuma. Just as Antares Foundation (2012) mention the awareness of different needs between international and national workers, it seems to be a necessity to have the different needs between local and national workers in mind.

Even if the root causes of this hazard cannot be addressed by organisations, there are several supporting factors identified that mitigate the hard conditions. The improved Wi-Fi decrease the feeling of remoteness from family and friends and facilitates work, the provision of drinking water supports to handle the heat, subsidized lunch for teachers to provide energy for long working days, and AC in the offices and reliable transportation to the field, facilitating the everyday work.

The second key issue, housing, is a factor that overlaps several areas in WHO’s model, but will be discussed here because of its close relationship to the environment of Kakuma. Just as with the issue of location, the issue of housing is only mentioned as a hazard by those from down-country. The few rooms available in Kakuma together with the poor quality makes life hard even after working hours. The issue becomes central as it negatively influences the willingness to stay and work. LWF has
mitigated this hazard for employees at grade 4 by providing rooms in the compound, and in this way impacted to prolong several stays. This move by LWF is in line with the recommendations of Lopez Cardoza et. al (2012, 12), recommending "the best possible living accommodations", to be central to improve staff wellbeing for humanitarian organisations. An expansion to support all staff from *down-country* with some housing support, would be a further step for LWF to mitigate the needs for staff.

The spread area of work also shows to impact on the physical work environment. A number of staff are working and living at the transit centre in Nadapal at the border with South Sudan, experiencing different hazards such as security risks connected to the remote location. LWF has taken action in an attempt to mitigate these needs, providing generator power until 10 pm, a TV, and a volleyball court, but participants still express to be overshadowed at night-time by feelings of insecurity. The Wi-Fi improvements that have had a positive impact on the staff working in Kakuma, have not reached the staff at Nadapal, adding to the feeling of being isolated.

WHO include pandemic threats in The Physical Work Environment. Only those working in the transit centre express concern regarding this when meeting new refugees and asylum seekers arriving to Kenya. Staff express a fear of being exposed to Tuberculosis and Hepatitis B, without being sure of how these diseases transmit or how to protect themselves. This creates a work-related stress, that according to the WHO model should be addressed by employer.

Most hazards identified in the area of Physical Work Environment are related to participants from *down-country* or those working at the transit centre in Nadapal. But there is a hazard expressed to impact the wellbeing and the work motivation of participants across all sectors and grade: the offices. Some improvements have been made, but worn out offices, worn premises, lack of space, and lack of equipment are mentioned frequently. Participants working with cases of confidentiality address the lack of facilities to handle these sensitive cases, clashing with their professional values and tearing on the mental wellbeing. This need is seen as closely connected to the long-term existence of the camp. The protractedness creates a need of long-term maintenance of buildings, offices, and equipment that is hard to fit within a humanitarian donor budget.
5.2 The Psychosocial Work Environment

The area of Psychosocial Work Environment is described in section 3.4. In this research, the area is seen as overlapping with UNHCRs categories “Organisational Environmental Stress”, and “Social and Interpersonal Factors” (presented in section 3.2), embracing the relationships with co-workers, and problems of balancing work and family.

When looking at the concepts within these areas, they constitute the factors most often mentioned to impact the wellbeing of humanitarian workers. The top three individual hazards confirmed to have an impact on the mental health of humanitarian staff are found here: “workload”, “ability to achieve work goals”, and “long working hours”. This is followed by “status of employment contract”, “feeling of undervalued and/or unable to contribute to decision making” (UNHCR 1016d; Curling & Simmons, 2010, 95), “unclarity of tasks”, “quality of supervision”, and “job insecurity and lack of career perspectives“ (UNHCR, 2016d). All of these hazards are repeatedly mentioned and have their roots within the organisational structure and therefore possible to influence. This research confirms two of the three top hazards: work with high workload and long working hours. Workload commitment stretch over a diversity of needs, demands, and requests from different donors and beneficiaries. Case-workers working with cases of child protection exceed the recommended number of maximum 25 cases per worker (CPWG, 2012, 138), and even in times of low influx the workload is high as the needs in the refugee camp tend to be persistent.

Looking at the remaining hazards, the result diverges from previous research. Participants know what is expected from them, relate to the possibility to work freely within a given mandate and do not find it hard to achieve goals. The supervision structure is good and reliable, and staff approach supervisors with confidence of receiving adequate support. Even with a hierarchical organisation, supervisors or managers are referred to as friends or colleagues. This could be related to the management decision to structure work based around interaction and collaboration between grades and sectors, to inspire and promote learning between sectors and programmes. The interaction creates a feeling of collegial trust, mentioned as a central reason for job satisfaction. The interaction and collaboration together with the trust to work within a mandate is expressed as motivator to reach the organisational goals.
The psychosocial work environment described above, can be seen as an example of an organisational structure opened to peer support. The peer support was found by both Lopez Cardozo et al (2012) and Eriksson et al., (2009) to be a central organisational action, having a positive impact on staff welfare. This it is also found to be confirmed by participants, being the peer support part of what can be identified as a participatory climate. The participatory climate includes an open communication with supervisors and colleagues, and give opportunity to actively participate in decision-making, based on sufficient and timely information (Likert 1967, second source Seki; Ishikawa & Yamazaki, 2014, 183). Participants confirm that they are involved in the organisational life and decision-making, where a bottom-up structure invite staff to take an active role. Several forums, with and without management, create arenas for everyone to raise a matter. Participants from grade 1 – 3 even underline how rare this participation is, that everyone is listened to and invited to raise the voice without exception. The rareness of this finding is confirmed by Curling and Simmons (2010), stating it is as rare for humanitarian workers to be able to contribute in the decision-making. Participants see the result from their input in decisions, something that motivates further contributions to the development and increase the feeling of responsibility to achieve the work and the organisational goals. This reaction is confirmed in the findings of Seki, Ishikawa and Yamazaki (2014), mentioning that a participative climate creates motivated workers.

The participation climate also seems to play a role when it comes to recognition. Recognition of work is found to be a key intervention for organisations to increase the staff wellbeing (Lopez Cardozo et al., 2012). Findings in this thesis confirm the importance of recognition of the wellbeing of staff, especially when appreciation is combined with actions. Recognition from colleagues and management is confirmed by all grades, but recognition from the SPM has the highest impact. Appreciation is also perceived from benefits connected to the fixed contracts, such as medical insurance and transportation support, but also from flexible management, small gifts and teambuilding. This show that there are different ways to experience recognition and appreciation. Still, three ways of recognition are mentioned to matter the most: salary, salary increments, and promotions. The findings in some way contradict each other. On one hand, participants express to feel recognised by the employer, but on the other hand no one is satisfied with the salary, and only those that have experienced job promotions sees this as recognition. Participants who after some years of work have not experienced
promotion, seem to get discouraged, not understanding what is excepted from them. Even if the three most important ways of recognition do not seem to be satisfying, everyone still express to feel appreciated and recognised. The key to this contradiction might be found in the participatory climate. It was mentioned as not worth to work for other organisations with higher salary due to the risk of losing the freedom of work under high trust, or losing the high level of participation within the organisation. So, it appears that the participatory climate provides recognition that to some extent can compensate for the missing absent recognition. An important factor is that the staff perceive that the management is working hard to improve the salary, even if they do not always succeed.

The participatory climate has also resulted in the “saving credit society”, an organisational intervention that further reinforces the perception of having an employer that cares. The idea was proposed by staff to reduce vulnerability when leaving the organisation, and to create a possibility to borrow money for needs or investments. The need expressed here are economical stressors, confirmed by Antares Foundation (2012) to be more common for national workers. The organisational stress response, to create and organise the saving society, could be seen as a cultural and local adaptation of staff care. There is no “one-size-fits-all” model to staff care (Porter & Emmens 2009; Burton 2010; Bhagat et al. 2010), and in this case the local adaptation made the staff perceive that the employer’s care extends to the time after employment.

Other research has found unequal treatment of staff with the humanitarian setting to be a factor creating stress (Antares Foundation, 2012; Ager et al 2012). This stress factor has not been found in this research. On the contrary, the atmosphere between co-workers, and between staff and management is described as collaborative and with a spirit of unity. Teams are described by participants as including everyone from incentive workers to the supervisor. The existence of discrimination, bullying, or harassments is denied, and instead an interaction built on dignity and respect is described. A few years back, there was a harder tone between colleagues, but today it has changed to a respectful tone. The organisational attitude towards balancing family and work is also perceived to be respectful and supportive. As described in section 5.1, staying away from the family is a major hazard, but the findings indicate that the organisational interventions work to mitigate this. The Wi-Fi connections and the flexibility of use of R&R and annual leave are helpful to uphold contact with loved ones and increase the motivation.
Finally, job insecurity is a hazard for humanitarian workers (Curling & Simmons, 2010; UNHCR, 2016d). The findings in this research do not point in one single direction but sort out two groups: one stressed-out and one relaxed. The stressed-out group include those that have not worked for long time in Kakuma, and the more relaxed group consist of employees that have worked with LWF for some years or those who believe jobs will be available as long as the camp remains. With the camp’s 25-year anniversary the risk to lose the job is not tangible as long as work is well managed, and as long as you are open to change sector when donors change funding. This last way or approach is rather pragmatic when working under humanitarian contracts. The explanation can probably be found in the context of working in a displacement that has lasted for long, without an end in sight, combined with the feeling of having an employer that cares about you.

When looking through all the factors covered within the area of Psychosocial Work Environment, this research can only clearly confirm the presence of two: “workload” and “long working hours”. The remaining findings goes against other research. The participatory climate has key role in this, wish is a conclusion supported by Burton (2012, 49) stating that a participatory climate is a key psychosocial factor to a healthy workplace.

It is also relevant to involve the ERI results in the discussion. The ERI questionnaire cover topics only found within the area of The Psychosocial Work Environment, meanwhile Burton (2014) push for all four areas equal influence on the wellbeing. In this study, the two different models of describing participants perceptions are seen to complement each other and interestingly they point into the same direction – highlighting issues within the Psychosocial Work Environment to be core to the wellbeing. This do not reduce the importance of the other areas. It can instead be seen to underline the finding of Kortum (2014) of the importance of looking at Psychosocial workplace hazards as having at least the similar impact as Physical Working Environment, a standing point often forgotten.

**5.3 Personal Health Resources in the Workplace**

The area of Personal Health Resources in the Workplace is described in detail in section 3.4. In this research, the area is found to overlap with UNHCR’s categories “personal factors”, “biological factors”, and “psychological factors”.
This area focuses on both the physical and the mental health of workers. When looking at the hazards and support factors identified here, several are already mentioned, like the physical and mental impact of working and living in Kakuma (5.1), and the supportive organisational structure (5.2). Other support is pro-actively oriented, such as the volleyball court and the gym being constructed. The decision to build a gym is highly appreciated and might be seen as a need only identified in humanitarian staff in a protracted displacement, where the employment time tend to stretch out over years. Especially staff in the lower grades express cross cutting trainings, covering different humanitarian sectors, like gender and peace, to positively affect the sense of coherence in their work, as it equips them to better understand the context where they are working. A central supportive factor in this area is the health insurance provided as benefit with the fixed contracts. Knowing that the insurance cover them both personally as well as extends to their family, is a pro-active support that reduces the stress of the staff. This insurance design is seen as a sign of LWF’s appreciation and is an important part in staff retention.

It is not easy to strictly separate the hazards that affect the psychological or the mental health of staff, as they are closely related. Stress impact on humanitarian workers’ mental health is a most studied area (Clarke & Cooper, 2004 in UNHCR 2016, 14), and the lack of institutional psychosocial support mechanisms is a frequently mentioned hazard (UNHCR, 2016d). The interviews describe how staff are regularly confronted with refugees’ hopelessness, fear, sadness, and anger arising from the stress of living in a situation with poverty and lack of ways to improve the economic situation. This confirms the findings of Horn (2009). The work environment increases the risk of burnout and secondary traumatisation (UNHCR, 2016d). Participants agree that even though everyone is exposed to secondary traumas, those working in the areas of reception and transit centre together with child protection caseworkers, are more intensely and repeated exposed. LWF has organised counselling to mitigate the effects, but the opinion diverges of its actual impact. One group find the regular counselling supportive, while the other find it non-functioning. A strong wish to improve the personal strategies to handle secondary traumatisation and stress was identified. Only a few participants expressed to have developed personal strategies to deal with this, leaving others to struggle without knowing were to obtain this tool. Participants in the long-term training on CBPS provided by CoS, stands out by expressing a higher level of awareness of stress
reducing techniques, not only how to cope with traumatising stories but how to reduce work-related stress.

Difficult stories and encounters are only one of things that can create work-related stress. Several stress factors affecting the humanitarian workers originate from organisational factors. As shown in The Psychosocial Work Environment (5.2) the results of high workload and long working hours are confirmed, while the other hazards cannot be confirmed. So, does this affect the overall feeling of stress? On a direct question if work was experienced as stressful, half the group said “no” while the other half confirmed stress based on high workload or low salary. The division between those two do not completely correspond to grade 1 – 3 and 4, but a trend suggests that participants from grade 4 experience higher level of stress expressed to be related to high workload. While participants from grade 1 – 3 express to be stressed, from the low salary. With half the group not feeling stressed at work, this indicates that the organisation has found ways to prevent stress. The participatory climate is suggested to have a key role in this too, which would align with Burton’s (2012, 49) findings about its importance in a healthy workplace.

UNHCR point out the need to look at the impact of personal factors on the humanitarian worker, as there are personal qualities that can make staff vulnerable (UNHCR, 2001). Lopez Cardozo et al. (2012) found this to be of importance mostly during the recruitment process, as incidents in a person’s recent history can increase the person’s vulnerability during the employment. This study, has not focused on personal qualities, as it requires different assessment methods, but it can be noted that staff express the need to sacrifice themselves to work in Kakuma. At the same time, they love their work. Combining those comments to the individual ERI index, there are trends that would be interesting to further analyse using the ERI model of “Instrictic overcommitted hypothesis” (3.6.1), as overcommitment is also found to increase the risk of poor health (Siegrist et al. 2004; van Vegchel et al. 2005). This is however out of scope of this study.

5.4 Enterprise Community Involvement

The area of Enterprise Community Involvement is described in detail in section 3.4. It relates to the connection between the community where the enterprise exists, and the effect the community has on the workers. It is not seen to overlap with any category listed by UNHCR, but this area can still be of use by looking at the context created by the
protractedness and the connections this create. In this way, the model is adapted to the workplace and context.

There are three communities mentioned as connected to the participants in the study: the refugee community, the host community, and other humanitarian organisations in the network in Kakuma. The relationship with these communities are expressed as both hazards and support factors, impacting the wellbeing of staff. The relationship has been created between the three communities over 25 years and are still developing.

The activities towards the refugee community might at the first glance be perceived as unidirectional: one gives and the other receives. But the participants describe a more complex interaction. The interaction with refugees is seen as personally developing, due to the chance to work with persons from many different countries. But it also creates hazards, like language challenges, making work difficult. Positive feedback, from either individuals or representatives of the refugee community, is frequently experienced, and work as energizers to continue working. This finding contrasts Antares Foundation (2012), that found a lack of appreciation from beneficiaries to be a source of stress to national workers.

As mentioned in 5.3, encountering hopelessness, fear, and anger together with lies consumes energy. When working in this environment, findings from the interviews indicate that long-time interventions directed towards refugees are found to be supportive for staff. Working in programs stretching out over time, with expected long-term changes for refugees, creates motivation to keep working for LWF to see the result of the work. This creates a proudness of being part of work that makes a difference.

The relationship with the host community, and the programs to support them, have been developed during the years. Compared with some other humanitarian contexts, the locals themselves are not survivors of any specific incident. Instead, the Refugee camp happened to be placed where the host community was living, and they came to live side by side with a refugee community for over 25 years. The host community live in a vulnerable situation, and actions are taken to reduce the effects of the refugee camp and decrease the vulnerability. LWF programs towards the host population is handled by staff from the host community. They do not experience any conflict having this position, but instead mention the pride in being part of improving the
situation for their own people, reducing vulnerability and reducing potential of conflicts between the refugee community and the host community.

The relationship with the network of the humanitarian community is mostly expressed as a hazard. Organisations must cooperate, but when cases are not being handled by the next organisation in line this creates extra work and irritation for workers in the first organisation. This can also result in negative feedback from refugees, even if the LWF staff have done their part and someone else is responsible for the next action. The bureaucratic impact, is also especially noticeable when cases are not following the norm, sometimes this creates frustration when perceived to impact the human dignity.

5.5 Chapter Summary

When looking at the results through the lens of the theories presented in chapter 3, a picture appears where both hazards and support factors, affecting the wellbeing, can be found in the physical work environment, the psychosocial work environment, the personal health resources in the workplace, and in the enterprise community involvement. Organisational acts working to mitigate the hazards, are found within all four areas, expressed to increase the wellbeing of staff, working as motivators and increasing staff retention.
6. Conclusions and recommendations

This chapter presents the conclusions of the study together with recommendations for future research.

6.1 Conclusions

Previous research has shown that humanitarian workers are exposed to several hazards affecting their wellbeing. Some stressors are considered unavoidable because of the circumstances surrounding the work, while other stressors originate from sources that are possible to prevent or reduce through actions from the individual, management, or the agency as a whole. With this in mind, a qualitative study was designed to answer the question:

What hazards and supportive factors do national staff at Lutheran World Federation’s (LWF) program in Kakuma perceive in their daily work?

The study was conducted as a case study, using observations and in-depth interviews, in Kakuma refugee camp. The setting of this camp works as an example of a protracted displacement with its 25 years of existence. Unfortunately, protracted displacements are a field within the humanitarian action that is affecting an increased number of individuals.

The findings were organised using the WHO model for Healthy Organisations, specifying four areas of importance for an organisation to be considered healthy to staff: the physical work environment; the psychosocial work environment; the personal health resources in the workplace; and enterprise community involvement. Within all four areas hazards and support factors were found. Among the hazards in research as to affecting humanitarian workers, the following were confirmed: environmental stress resulting from challenging climate; remoteness, isolated location; shortage of shelter, water and resources; status of employment contract; job insecurity; and provision of institutional psychosocial support. None of these hazards were confirmed by all participants (n=14), but experiences of different hazard were found to be influenced by the following areas: origin of the person, from the area of Kakuma or from down-country; between those working in grade 1 – 3 versus those in grade 4; between those that had worked at LWF a few years versus longer time; related to a specific working place; or related to personal aspects that are out of the scope of this
study. This indicates that within the group of national staff, the needs of staff care may differ depending on origin, education, experience, or place of work, already before personal factors are considered.

An underlying factor, found to work both as a hazard and a support factor, is the duration of the protractedness. Time takes its toll, affecting facilities and equipment as maintenance is not prioritised by donors, but the protractedness has also shown to decrease stress relating to job contracts and allow investments in support, such as a gym building. To a large extent, the protractedness has a negative impact on refugees’ wellbeing and reactions, which in turn affect negatively on humanitarian staff. On the other hand, findings indicate that time impact can have positive sides. Long-term projects can have a supportive effect on staff, when their work is perceived to create positive long-term changes for refugee or host community. The satisfaction that comes with this, has an impact on staff retention. Within the context of the protracted displacement, staff from the host community working with the host community do not express any hazards in their job. Instead they only express proudness to be a part of improving the situation for their own community. These positive aspects that protractedness can bring along if used well, is something to consider when planning for actions that will stretch out in time.

Support factors were found in all four areas of WHO model for Healthy Organisations. To receive support from family was a core factor, making it essential to prioritise actions that can facilitate this. The support from colleagues, and positive feedback from refugees, is also perceived supportive, together with the support provided by the organisation in different ways. The organisational support was further explored through this sub-question:

*What organisational interventions are perceived supportive to mitigate the negative effects arising from the working circumstances?*

The findings show that the LWF program in Kakuma engage in different interventions. There are interventions of a practical character, like providing water, lunch, AC, housing, and Wi-Fi, which mitigate the effects of hazards connected to the challenging climate, remoteness, isolated location, and shortage of shelter, water and resources. Other interventions are built into the organisational structure, like providing flexible ways to handle leave and R&R, providing a medical insurance, and focusing on fixed term contracts. Interventions are also built into the organisational structure, impacting factors
usually found to create organisational environmental stress, or social and interpersonal stressors.

In this study, the usually stressors found have not been confirmed. This is among the most interesting findings from this study, indicating that the LWF working structure, management support, and assignments, are perceive as supportive. Staff feel free to work with trust within their mandate, find themselves invited to participate in the organisational life and impacting decisions and issues of interest, but are also encouraged to collaborate and interact with colleagues. All of this works in a proactive way, positively impacting on the staff welfare and developing motivation. The findings confirm positive effects on staff welfare when organising work according to a participatory climate. The rewards of working within the participatory climate are also found to mitigate the hazards of dissatisfaction with salary and promotion, compensating the experienced lack of recognition through these factors.

The findings also indicate that several of the supportive organisational interventions could not have been done without having a donor with an interest in staff care, setting aside money for this purpose. This shows that one donor can impact the staff care of a receiving organisation by directing money and focus.

The need to adjust the organisational staff care to local or cultural needs is confirmed by the findings. For example, the effects of introducing a saving credit society has been found to be highly supportive for staff.

Still, even if many hazards are met with support or actions of mitigation, there are still hazards impacting on the wellbeing, raising the second sub question:

*What image of staff-welfare is presented when using an Effort-Reward Imbalance questionnaire?*

The findings from the ERI questionnaire reveal that the group as a whole experienced more rewards than efforts in their work, and this is interpreted as a consequence of the participatory climate. The questionnaire provided a snapshot of the staff welfare, including several factors previous found to negatively affect humanitarian workers. The ERI results indicate that the LWF program in Kakuma to some extent has succeeded to reduce these organisational hazards or mitigate the negative consequences of stress. The results of the ERI reveals that staff perceive efforts, but those are mitigated by rewards. But, when looking at the individual scores, 25% of the participants experienced more efforts than rewards. The ERI theory predicts that this group has an increased risk of
emotional exhaustion, psychosomatic health complains, physical health symptoms, and job dissatisfaction. The group might be considered small, but it indicates that there is more work to be done to improve staff welfare, reduce the risk of individual suffering, and at the same time, keep the organisation effective.

6.2 Policy recommendations

Based on the findings, some important recommendations for the direction of future humanitarian work can made:

- Arrange the organisational structure, work, and management to enable a participatory climate. This will reward the organisation with motivated staff, with an increased feeling of responsibility to perform the work and meet the organisational goals, but will also have a mitigating effect on other hazards.
- Staff care needs to be adapted to meet the local hazards and the different needs of national and local staff.
- In contexts of protracted displacement, consider involvement in long-term programs. This do not only benefit refugees, but also create positive motivation and welfare for the staff.

6.3 Further research

Based on the findings, the following suggestions are made for further research in the field:

- This research has only scratched the surface of the positive effects of the participation climate within the humanitarian setting. Does it only work in a protracted crisis, or can the structure be implemented in a more acute setting?
- The ERI model of overcommitment could be used and extended to further investigate the more personal factors of humanitarian workers in the ERI model, to complement the input to staff care.
- This research has shown that the participatory climate can be implemented within the humanitarian setting. It would be interesting to further investigate the driving force in reaching a participatory climate. Is it a result of working with the CBPS approach, where participation, respect, and empowerment in the humanitarian response spill over on the staff care, a single donor’s decision to focus on staff care, or the individuals in management positions? Most likely, it is a successful
combination of several factors, but the impact of each could be further analysed and studied.

- One question, on the edge of this research, is the relationship between staff support and incentive workers. Within the context of a protracted displacement a lot of work currently rely on them. It would be interesting to compare the work conditions of incentive workers and their needs of staff support to a group of national workers.
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Appendix 1. Semi-structured interview guide

Opening statement
You may already know that I am a student from Sweden. I am studying the NOHA program in International Humanitarian Action at Uppsala University. This is my fourth semester, and this is part of my studies. I am interested to get the perspective from national humanitarian staff, how you perceive staff care and staff welfare. I have got permission to use LWF in Kakuma as a case study. For this purpose, I would like to interview you. I will record this interview to help my memory, and I will later transcribe it. No one else than I will have access to the material. When used, it will be confidential and you name will not appear anywhere.

You have been asked to take part in this interview, but I want to highlight that your participation is voluntary. If you at any time want to stop the interview, or don’t want to answer a question feel free to let me know. However, your experiences are very valuable. Is this ok with you? Do you have any questions or concerns you would like to share before we begin?

Opening questions
• How long time have you been working with LWF?
• Have you worked with other humanitarian organisations before?
• What made you apply for this job?
• Describe a typical day at work
• Describe what you like about your job

Challenges - support
• Describe what challenges you find with you work
• What in your work would you say is very stressful
• When things are difficult – from where do you find support?
  i. Probe: Colleges, management, counselling, family
• In what way do you feel that LWF support you?
• How do you experience to work with refugees?
  i. Probe: long – short term
• In what way do you get appreciation/ recognition for the work you do?
  i. Probe: refugees, peers, management, others…
• Something that worries you?

Team – management
• Who would you describe the atmosphere in your team?
i. Probe: Use 3 words
   • Describe the interaction between groups
     i. Probe: Different teams/ groups/ management /incentive workers
   • Suppose there is a conflict, how is it dealt with?

Work at LWF

   • If you look back at the last 3 years, can you remember any improvements that has affected your working situation?
   • What three improvements would you wish for?
   • Can you tell me about some trainings/ workshops last 2-3 years that made an impact on how you do your work?
     i. Probe CBPS training?
   • Housing situation- Compound?

Closing questions

   • Would you recommend your work at LWF to a friend or family? Why?
   • Do you think you will be working here in 2 years?

Present ERI Questionnaire
# Appendix 2. ERI questionnaire with item coding


<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>I have constant time pressure due to a heavy work load</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>I have many interruptions and disturbances while performing my job</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>I have a lot of responsibility in my job</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>I am often pressured to work overtime</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>My work is physically demanding</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Over the past few years, my job has become more and more demanding</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>I receive the respect I deserve from my superior or a respective relevant person</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>I experience adequate support in difficult situations</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>I am treated unfairly at work <strong>Reverse coding</strong></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>My job promotion prospects are poor <strong>Reverse coding</strong></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>I have experienced or I expect to experience an undesirable change in my work situation <strong>Reverse coding</strong></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 My employment security is poor **Reverse coding**

13 My current occupational position adequately reflects my education and training

14 Considering all my efforts and achievements, I receive the respect and prestige I deserve at work

15 Considering all my efforts and achievements, my job promotion prospects are adequate

16 Considering all my efforts and achievements, my salary/income is adequate
Appendix 3. Map of Kakuma Refugee Camp

Obtained at https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/58199.pdf, 2017-12-15
### Appendix 4. List of interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-20</td>
<td>Informant 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-20</td>
<td>Informant 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-20</td>
<td>Informant 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-21</td>
<td>Informant 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-21</td>
<td>Informant 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-22</td>
<td>Informant 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-22</td>
<td>Informant 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-23</td>
<td>Informant 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-25</td>
<td>Informant 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-27</td>
<td>Informant 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-27</td>
<td>Informant 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-28</td>
<td>Informant 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-28</td>
<td>Informant 13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-28</td>
<td>Informant 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turcana county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-07</td>
<td>Hernander, Lennart</td>
<td>Program representative LWF Kenya-Djibouti</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-16</td>
<td>Langat, Diana</td>
<td>HR manager LWF Kakuma</td>
<td>Turkana county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-03-30</td>
<td>Onyango, Collins</td>
<td>Sub-Program Manager, LWF Kakuma</td>
<td>Turkana county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>