



Influence of Occupational Stress on Quality Family Relationship among Clergy: A Case of Christ is the Answer Ministries, Kenya

Veronica Kaari Makena

Department of Counseling Psychology,
Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya

Dr. Anne G. Wambugu

School of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya

Prof. Nathan H. Chiroma

Africa College of Theology, Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda

[Doi:10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p135](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p135)

Submitted: 20 April 2023

Accepted: 16 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Copyright 2023 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

4.0 OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Makena V.K., Wambugu A.G. & Chiroma N.H.. (2023). *Influence of Occupational Stress on Quality Family Relationship among Clergy: A Case of Christ is the Answer Ministries, Kenya*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 19 (16), 135.

<https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p135>

Abstract

The role of clergy can be demanding, as they are tasked with providing spiritual guidance and support to their congregation. This responsibility can result in occupational stress, which can affect the clergy and their family relationships. This study investigated the influence of occupational stress on quality family relationships among clergy in Christ Is the Answer Ministries, Kenya (CITAM). A pragmatist lens which informs the adoption of mixed methods research design was used. Out of a sample size of 135, 115 respondents comprising 57 pastors, 40 spouses, and 18 children participated in the study. Ethical considerations were adhered to by receiving the necessary approvals and licenses before commencing the study. Primary data was collected using questionnaires and focus group discussions which were all done online. Quantitative data were analyzed using the linear regression technique in SPSS Version 28 and presented through tables. The qualitative data were transcribed and analysed using a thematic analysis approach with the identification of key themes. Findings showed that the clergy families have

high-quality family relationships ($\bar{x}=3.4635$, $\sigma_x = .37655$). Thematic analysis revealed that having intentionality and maintaining clear boundaries between work and personal life would help clergy improve the quality of their family relationships. The study recommended that churches should collaborate with family therapists to offer therapy sessions to all members of the clergy.

Keywords: Occupational Stress, Family Relationships, Self-Care, Clergy

Introduction

Over the past few decades, research has validated that the work of a clergy is a stressful profession (Clarke et al., 2022). It has also been demonstrated that occupational stress can occur due to pastoral work that places substantial demands on clergy (Lee & Rosales, 2020). A study that was conducted by Repetti and Wang (2017) revealed that because of their call to ministry, clergy who perform several roles in the church are prone to occupational stress. There are unrealistic expectations on clergy from the congregations, church officials like deacons, elders, heads of departments and ministry workers that have contributed to the levels of stress experienced by clergy (Webb & Chase, 2019). Despite their work with Christian congregations, clergy are not immune to stress related to their job (Ruiz-Prada et al., 2021; Suleman et al., 2018). If a clergy member is highly stressed when leaving work, they may carry that stress with them into their home environment (Hamm, & Eagle, 2021). The interaction with the spouse and the children will depend on how well the clergy is able to handle the effects of that stress. Conversely, if a person does not experience work-related stress, it may have a positive effect on their family relationships (Hayes, 2020; Lockwood, 2020). Occupational stress can diminish a person's sense of personal achievement, affecting both their work quality and their relationships with loved ones. Therefore, it is crucial to understand how occupational stress impacts the family relationships of clergy members, as they are just as susceptible to its effects as any other worker (Lee & Fung, 2023).

Quite a number of studies that focused on marital relationships of the clergy and their partners have been conducted (Adams et al., 2017; Madukwe et al., 2019) while others have mainly targeted the clergy alone with little emphasis on the spouse and children (Guzman & Teh, 2016; Maina et al., 2018). Most of the studies have been inclined on the effectiveness of coping strategies and management of the stressors tormenting the clergy (Chan & Wong, 2018) with a few studies on the impact on children. At the same time, much of the earlier research with clergy families was done with samples drawn from denominations in the western world and did not include reports from spouses and children. This study drew samples from the Kenyan context in one denomination and included spouses and children in the research.

Quality of Clergy Family Relationships

Quality family relationships has been defined as the degree to which the interaction within the family fulfills the member's need for support, affection and warmth and contributes to positive functioning in life (Robertson et al., 2018; Verrastro et al., 2020; Woods & Priest, 2020). This definition is shared by Goldberg-Looney et al. (2015) and Martin-Storey et al. (2021) who surmise that quality family relationships is depicted in family bonding and other progressive family dynamics. The definition, conceptualization, and measurement of quality family relationships have been the subject of a growing body of literature (Robertson et al., 2018; Verrastro et al., 2020; Woods & Priest, 2020). Martin-Storey et al. (2021). Kim et al. (2021) dimensionalised quality family relationships into three facets: family contentment, family conflict and family support. The study by Kim et al. (2021) defined family conflicts as disagreements or disputes that arise among family members due to a variety of reasons, including differences in values, beliefs, opinions, and behaviors. Family conflict was indicated by frequent arguments, feelings of irritation, insulting one another, and disputing over family chores. Family conflicts can have a significant impact on everyone involved, and they can be challenging to resolve. They can lead to feelings of anger, frustration, sadness, and resentment, and can even result in estrangement between family members.

Wajanathawornchai and Blauw (2018) approached the assessment of the quality of family relationships based on the perspective of satisfaction. This involved evaluating different aspects of the family according to one's own standards and assessing how well those standards were met. It also involved considering whether the evaluator wanted to maintain the current state of the family, whether they felt content with the family, and whether they perceived the family relationship conditions as outstanding. Indicators of togetherness include helping and supporting each other, spending time doing things together, feeling of togetherness, pride in being part of the family, and getting along with family members (Grevenstein et al., 2019 & Murray et al., 2021). Expressiveness is indicated by talking openly at home, sharing personal problems, and beginning discussions with ease around one another (Dunbar et al., 2020).

Samau and Schoeffel (2015) identified that the relationship between clergy and their children is among the most adversely affected by clergy occupational stress. One of the explanations provided for this is that these children are frequently brought up in residences owned by the church, which are situated within the church premises (Sielaff et al., 2021). Consequently, they are frequently involved in church-related chores and activities that potentially rob them of their natural development as children (Prince, 2019; Wilson & Darling, 2017). Aulthouse (2013) noted that children whose parents

are clergy are usually treated differently from their peers, leading to their alienation. This has been associated with their rebellion when they reach their teenage and afterward (Nkonge, 2020; Samau & Schoeffel, 2015).

Family Contentment on Quality Family Relationships

Family contentment was indicated by a sense of satisfaction, happiness, and fulfillment that members of a family experience when they are living together in a harmonious and loving environment (Young & Casey, 2019). It involves having positive relationships with one another, communicating effectively, showing respect, and understanding, and supporting each other in times of need. Potts (2020) further postulated that family contentment is essential for creating a healthy and supportive home environment, where children can grow and develop to their full potential, and where adults can find comfort, solace, and joy. It helps to promote a sense of belonging and identity and provides a foundation for building strong social connections and support networks (Clarke, 2021). Lee (2017) conducted phenomenological research on the topic of the quality of family relationships of male clergy and their association with family support and satisfaction. Family contentment was conceptualized in the study as a function of clergy roles and boundaries, work, and family stress (Joynt, 2018; Potts, 2020). Similar findings were reported by Fee (2018) who found that maintaining healthy support systems plays a part in family contentment. Further, Jones (2021) postulated that contentment has salient factors namely genuine family interactions, family boundaries, and a healthy support system as key antecedents.

Similar findings were reported by Fee (2018) who found that maintaining healthy support systems plays a part in family contentment. Further, Jones (2021) found out that contentment has salient factors namely genuine family interactions, family boundaries, and a healthy support system as key antecedents. The study utilized a very small sample, hence raising concerns about the reliability of empirical evidence. Whereas concerns over sample adequacy are secondary in qualitative studies (Young & Casey, 2019), there is a need to utilize large samples so as to ensure that findings are closer to reality. In this study, a mixed methods design was utilized to estimate the predictive power of occupational stressors on quality family relationships.

Family Conflict on Quality Family Relationships

In family studies, there is a dominant conflict perspective that focuses on a range of factors such as marital conflicts, communication patterns, parent-child disagreements, sibling relationships, inheritance disputes, conflict management, counseling, use of coercion, obstacles faced by women, relationships, and stress (Joynt, 2018). Many social researchers concur that

various social phenomena occur within families, and one of them is conflicts (Simpson, 2022). Family conflicts are defined as disagreements, arguments, or discord between members of a family. It can arise due to a variety of reasons such as differences in values, beliefs, personalities, lifestyle choices, financial issues, or power struggles. Family conflicts can cause emotional distress and have a negative impact on relationships, communication, and overall family dynamics. Misunderstandings and jumping to conclusions can sometimes lead to conflicts between individuals. If these conflicts are not resolved through peaceful means, they can escalate into arguments and resentment. It is natural for people to have disagreements and conflicts, especially in family settings. However, when conflicts persist and become a recurring issue, it can negatively impact relationships, leading to stress, depression, anxiety, and resentment.

Obrenovic et al. (2020) observed that conflicts in relationships arise due to various reasons such as the existence of intense negative emotions, misunderstandings or prejudices, ineffective communication or misunderstandings, or repeated unfavorable actions. Clergy encounters various forms of conflict such as discontent with the congregation, the magnitude and density of their work and disputes with authorities (Simpson, 2022). These sentiments were echoed by French et al. (2018) who in a study named family conflict and stress found that interest conflicts occurred when there is competition for needs that are perceived as incompatible. When one or more parties believe that meeting their own needs requires sacrificing the needs and interests of others, this leads to conflicts of interest. Clergy who encounter occupational stress and have little time for the family could have a clash that may affect the ability to act impartially or objectively as far as the quality time that is spent with the family (Pascucci et al., 2022).

The clergy often face a dilemma where they are pulled between the growing expectations of their families in their roles as spouses and parents to their children, and the rising demands of their employers to perform at their best in their job roles and to go beyond their official duties. The various roles that individuals must fulfill often lead to family conflict (Speight & Speight, 2017). due to the conflicting demands placed on them. The demands of one role often make it difficult to fulfill the demands of another role, resulting in an incongruence of expectations.

Family Support on Quality Family Relationships

Studies conducted in many countries around the world (Berry, 2022; Bloom, 2019; Clarke et al., 2021; Eagle et al., 2019) have found that positive, caring, and nurturing relationships are among the most important conditions for family well-being. The presence of strong family support can affect the relationships among members of a family. Family support pertains to the

various ways in which family members offer emotional, financial, and practical aid to each other. It also refers to the emotional bond, unity, and sense of togetherness among family members (Clarke, 2021). The unity and support of family members are crucial because the welfare of families affects the overall welfare of society. According to Kim (2021), family support also refers to the level of emotional connectedness or separation among family members. It is characterized by mutual support, open communication, shared values and beliefs, and a strong sense of commitment to the family unit.

Noh and Ross (2020) concur that high levels of family support are associated with positive outcomes such as better mental health, greater life satisfaction, and stronger resilience in the face of challenges. The above definitions point to the importance of family support in fostering cordial interactions between and amongst the members of a given family structure for there to be quality family relationships (Kim et al., 2021). The clergy frequently feel a calling to assist others, but this enthusiasm is challenging to maintain due to the chronic and traumatic stress that comes with their job (Butler et al., 2019). Due to the distinct stressors that come with being a professional minister, the clergy requires specialized support that addresses both systemic and personal factors to develop resilience (Sielaff et al., 2021).

In a study to determine the support that family members have towards one another and its association with quality family relationships, Noh and Ross (2020) found that society places great importance on unity, social structure, and peaceful relationships among family members. Similarly, Choi et al. (2020) agreed that shared values and beliefs are commonly held by family members as they offer support and play a significant role in shaping how individuals behave and interact with one another. Shared values and beliefs can be related to religion and culture and they help to create a sense of unity and common purpose among members. By spending time together, families have more chances to communicate, address any occupational stress that they encounter and express their physical, emotional, and spiritual needs, which results in a greater dedication to the family relationships as a whole (Lee & Fung, 2023).

Similarly, in a study conducted by Zeng et al. (2021), family support was measured by the support dimension of the family adaptability and showed that family support can promote internal resources like resilience which is vital to coping with stress (Olson et al., 2019; Maleki et al., 2023). Eagle et al. (2019) believed that family members should demonstrate empathy towards each other, particularly by considering each other's feelings as a way of support. They noted that caring for each other can be shown by taking an interest in what every family member says or does, and making an effort to understand each other (Muzenda, 2020). The main-effect model of family support (Fosco et al., 2020) suggests that having positive relationships with

family members can offer individuals under stress support and aid in promoting quality family relationships. The findings of this study concur with the suggestions made by Francis and DLitt (2018) that clergy, like any other human being, need to be supported emotionally and socially so that they can make friends and have fun.

Consistently, family support has been identified as a crucial factor affecting the outcomes of family relationships. Studies have indicated that a lack of family support is a significant factor in predicting (Currier et al., 2019; Edwards et al., 2020) and perpetuating (Hough et al., 2018) occupational stress. Different theories have tried to clarify the connection between family support, stress, and overall well-being, proposing that family support acts as a shield against the negative effects of occupational stress on family relationships (Pietkiewicz & Bachryj, 2016). According to Shaw et al. (2021), a perceived absence of family support could be a significant contributor to the prevalence of occupational stress among clergy members. Studies have indicated that clergy often feel socially disconnected (Potts, 2021) and may not seek support from their families or external sources, as suggested by a study conducted by Büssing et al. (2017). Using a standardized psychometric assessment, the studies (Currier et al., 2019; Edwards et al., 2020; Hough et al., 2018; Pietkiewicz & Bachryj, 2016) examined the symptoms of occupational stress experienced by active Christian clergy who held leadership positions in a religious congregation.

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a mixed methods design that was anchored on pragmatism philosophy. In keeping with mixed-methods research design, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods was adopted (Sileyew, 2019). Asenahabi et al. (2019) indicate that a mixed-methods design can integrate and synergize multiple data sources which can assist to study complex problems (Gibson, 2017; Kimmons, 2022). The application of mixed methods enabled purposive data consolidation which allowed the researcher to seek a wide view of the study by enabling her to view a phenomenon from different perspectives and research lenses. The research adopted the convergent mixed methods (Creswell, 2018; Leedy & Ormrod, 2019), in which the researcher merged quantitative and qualitative data to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem (Flick, 2018; Kelle et al., 2019).

Sampling and Data Collection Methods

This study adopted purposive sampling as a non-probability sampling technique, where the researcher selected individuals who met specific criteria

relevant to the research question and objectives (Casteel & Bridier, 2021). Primary data constituted the data type for this research and entailed the collection of original data directly from the participants to achieve the purpose of the study (Paterson & Leung, 2016). On the quantitative front, a structured questionnaire was administered to the participants. The questionnaires were administered through Kobo Toolbox software platform through email addresses and WhatsApp numbers that the researcher had obtained from the senior pastors of the selected assemblies. Quantitative data facilitated the determination of effect sizes through inferential analysis of numeric data whereas qualitative analysis enabled the clarification of inferences drawn through the establishment of the salient themes from non-numeric data (Flick, 2017). Two Focus Group Discussions (FGD) were conducted through Zoom, a cloud-based video conferencing platform that allowed the participants to communicate with each other remotely. One discussion group was held for the clergy with 6 participants and one for the spouses with 7 participants. The participants were selected using both purposive and convenient sampling methods.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were entered into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 28.0) software where numeric data were analyzed. The data were subjected to a process of cleaning by checking and appropriately treating missing values, investigating outliers, and weeding out inconsistent responses (Chai, 2020). Data analysis was performed on the dataset using descriptive statistical techniques summarization and visualization through the computation of percentage scores, mean scores, and standard deviations. Data was then presented through tables (Sharma, 2018). A composite index was generated to represent the extent to which the various constructs manifested in the sample. Accordingly, data transformation facilitated the determination of a composite score for clergy quality family relationships. The discussions from the focus group were recorded and transcribed using Zoom online software system (Hennink et al., 2019). The recording from Zoom was transcribed verbatim using the Maxqda program 2022 Verbi Software. The data generated from the focus groups was subjected to a qualitative data analysis process using the thematic technique (Roller, 2019) and were presented in narrative or verbatim form. This entailed reporting quantitative findings and discussing them considering the qualitative themes obtained (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Ethical Considerations

The researcher adhered to institutional requirements of research by obtaining ethical clearance from the University's Ethics Review Committee, a research license from the National Commission of Science, Technology, and

Innovation (NACOSTI) and a letter from CITAM headquarters giving permission to carry out the research among the clergy. The participants were given an informed consent form which they voluntarily signed before their involvement in the study. The researcher made every effort to respect the privacy of research participants and safeguard their identity throughout the process.

Results and discussion

Descriptive Analysis of Quality of Clergy Family Relationships: Contentment

Table 1 shows the minimum and maximum values, plus the means and the standard deviations of the responses posed by the respondents to the quality of clergy family well-being measures. It shows that the quality of clergy family life was measured using a 5-point scale on which the clergy or their spouses or children who are part of the respondents recorded how they felt about the different measures of well-being as was posed in the measure statements.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for Family Contentment*

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
In our family we spend a lot of time doing things together at home	115	1	5	3.82	.908
I am proud to be a part of our family	115	1	5	4.75	.635
In our family we really get along well with each other	115	1	5	4.30	.775
In our family we begin discussions easily	115	1	5	4.09	.793

On average most of the respondents agreed with the supposition of the statement, “In our family, we spend a lot of time doing things together at home,” (\bar{x} =3.82, σ =.908, N=115). The results showed that more than average of the respondents agreed that they have time to spend together as they do things at home and as a family. This finding supposes that the clergy often and regularly have time to spend with their families. Spending time together improves the quality of family and improves their congruence and improves the psychological well-being of the clergy (Hricová, 2020).

On average, most of the respondents depicted a high level of contentment in their families and this was evident in how they reacted to the statement, “In our family, we really get along well with each other,” (\bar{x} =4.30, σ =.775, N=115). The result findings indicate that there is a high level of family

contentment and possibly overall quality of clergy family relationships in CITAM, Kenya.

Regarding the statement “In our family, we begin discussions easily”, on average most of the respondents agreed that they easily began conversations with one another ($\bar{x}=4.09$, $\sigma_x=.793$, $N=115$). The analysis strongly suggests high levels of family contentment among the clergy in CITAM, Kenya. This finding concurs with the findings by Lyte (2021) which showed openness and ease of talking and interacting while maintaining a healthy support system indicated the levels of contentment in the family

Respondents confirmed that as being part of clergy families they received other as follow:

“Sometimes as well, there are times when congregants will decide to treat you out, whether to take you out for a cup of coffee or something”
FGD/005/P

“Other times, there are some material support here and there, yeah”
FGD/006/S

Descriptive Statistics for Family Contentment Composite Score.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the family contentment composite score. It shows the maximum and minimum values, means and intervals and confidence levels.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics for Family Contentment Composite Score*

			Statistic	Std. Error
Family Contentment Composite Score	Mean		4.2368	.05632
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	4.1253	
		Upper Bound	4.3484	
		5% Trimmed Mean	4.2924	
	Median	4.2500		
	Variance	.362		
	Std. Deviation	.60129		
	Minimum	1.00		
	Maximum	5.00		
	Range	4.00		
	Interquartile Range	.75		
	Skewness	-2.042	.226	
	Kurtosis	7.106	.449	

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the family contentment composite score. The table shows that on average, most of the respondents from CITAM, Kenya has high levels of family contentment ($\bar{x}=4.2368$, $\sigma_x = .60129$). Potts (2020) held that some of the factors in the family which can be

used to determine family contentment include clergy roles and boundaries, work, and family stress (Dunbar et al., 2020).

Descriptive Statistics for the Quality of Clergy Family Relationships: Family Conflict

Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values for the different responses.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics for Family Conflict*

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
In our family, we argue a lot	115	1	5	2.63	1.155
In our family, we are really mad at each other a lot	115	1	5	2.04	1.068
In our family we lose our tempers a lot	115	1	5	2.22	1.143
In our family we often put down each other	115	1	5	1.73	1.009
My family members sometimes are violent	115	1	5	1.38	.866
In our family we raise our voice when we are mad	115	1	5	2.25	1.203
In our family we can talk openly in our home	115	1	5	4.25	.955

As shown in Table 3, regarding the statement, “In our family, we argue a lot,” on average most clients agreed that they argue a lot in the family which points to the possibility of instability and squabbles in the clergy families which suggests low quality of the clergy family life ($\bar{x}=2.63$, $\sqrt{x}=1.155$, $N=115$). In their study on the effect of a pastor’s church ministry on family stability in Nairobi County, Maina et al., (2018) included constant argument and raising of voice as some of the indicators of conflict in the family. Most of the respondents expressed disagreement with the given statement, “In our family, we are really mad at each other a lot,” ($\bar{x}=2.04$, $\sqrt{x}=1.068$, $N=115$). Regarding the statement, “In our family we lose our tempers a lot,” most of the respondents on average disagreed with the statement ($\bar{x}=2.22$, $\sqrt{x}=1.143$, $N=115$), which indicates that they do not lose their tempers a lot in their families. This means that the families are showing low levels of conflict and high levels of togetherness.

Most of the respondents, on average, held that they almost never put each other down, as suggested by the statement, “In our family, we often put down each other.” ($\bar{x}=1.73$, $\sqrt{x}=1.009$, $N=115$). The findings imply that instances of putting each other down within the families of the respondents are infrequent, indicating that most of them rarely engage in such behavior towards each other. In response to the statement, “My family members

sometimes are violent,” most of the respondents on average disagreed that there was physical violence in their families. This showed that most of them opposed the presence of violence in their families as proposed in the statement ($\bar{x}=1.38$, $\sqrt{x}=.866$, $N=115$). Maina et al. (2018) held that violence among family members is a valid measure of conflict in the family. Again, Omungo et al. (2020) agreed that the presence of conflicts in the family suggests poor quality of family relationships. Hence, the study findings suggest that many respondents tended to reject the existence of violence in their families, implying that such families are likely to have low or negligible levels of violence.

Descriptive Statistics for Family Conflict Composite Score

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for the family conflict composite score. It shows the skewness, means and standard deviations and confidence levels of the data in the composite score.

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics for Family Conflict Composite Score*

			Statistic	Std. Error
Family Conflict Composite Score	Mean		3.9998	.06511
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.8708	
		Upper Bound	4.1288	
		5% Trimmed Mean	4.0454	
	Median	4.1429		
	Variance	.483		
	Std. Deviation	.69514		
	Minimum	1.71		
	Maximum	5.00		
	Range	3.29		
	Interquartile Range	.86		
	Skewness	-.949	.226	
	Kurtosis	.705	.449	

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for the family conflict composite score. The table shows that on average, most of the respondents and their families are strongly coherent with one another ($\bar{x}=3.9998$, $\sqrt{x}=.69514$). Butler et al. (2019) argued that when studying the effects of occupational stress on quality family relationships, it is inadequate to solely examine the clergy themselves while neglecting their families. This is because the negative effects of occupational stress experienced by clergy can also extend to their family members.

Descriptive Statistics for the Quality of Clergy Family Relationships: Family Support

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics for the quality of clergy-family relationships, focusing on the aspect of family support. The table shows the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values for the respective responses given by the respondents.

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics for Family Support*

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
In our family we really help and support each other	115	1	5	4.55	.694
In our family we work hard at what we do in our home	115	1	5	4.46	.813
In our family there is a feeling of togetherness	115	1	5	4.72	.739
In our family we sometimes tell each other about our personal problems	115	1	5	4.17	.921
My family members really support each other	115	1	5	4.36	.926

As shown in Table 5, on average, most of the respondents agreed with the statement, “In our family, we really help and support each other,” ($\bar{x}=4.55$, $\hat{\sigma}_x=.694$, $N=115$). In other words, the families of the clergy recognized the importance of providing mutual support and assistance to each other, including the clergy, whenever any member of their family required help and support. On average most of the respondents agreed that they worked hard as a family in everything that they did at home. This is evident in how they responded to the statement, “In our family, we work hard at what we do in our home,” ($\bar{x}=4.46$, $\hat{\sigma}_x=.813$, $N=115$). Moreover, on average, most of the respondents felt that their families had great feelings of togetherness. This was evident in the way they responded to the statement, “In our family, there is a feeling of togetherness,” ($\bar{x}=4.42$, $\hat{\sigma}_x=.739$, $N=115$). The respondents believed that the way they lived and interacted with one another had a sense of family togetherness which according to Kim et al. (2021) can be measured using aspects such as spending time with each other, getting along together, discussing with family before making important decisions, talking together about family rules, and spending holidays together.

The expectations placed on the clergy member by their congregation or religious organization can also impact family togetherness as confirmed by the respondents as follows:

“The congregation is annoying, sometimes there are congregants that you have trusted and pastored for many years, really sacrificed for them but they can betray you. And when you have that kind of a wound or that kind of anger within you, you realize that you can project that to your family without knowing. Whereby you get at home you are somehow in deep thought, perhaps your spouse is asking you what's happening, you don't feel like you want to talk about it, and you sometimes even can respond awkwardly.”FGD/003/P

“As a pastor I help him and because the work is so much, both of us are tired and overwhelmed. And when we get back home there are other things I must attend to. And then the last one is that the members of the congregation whenever they have a need in their home, they will look for the pastor even if it is on Monday when you are resting you just get a knock on your door, and you will have to sort them out.”FGD/005/S

On average, most of the respondents showed a high level of family togetherness and family support in the way they reacted to the statement, “In our family, we sometimes tell each other about our personal problems,” ($\bar{x}=4.17$, $\hat{\sigma}_x=.921$, $N=115$). The ability to share the intricate personal details of one’s life with the family was confirmed by Dunbar et al. (2020), as part of the strong indicators that the families are closely knit and highly expressive to one another, which is a sign of family togetherness and fewer conflicts in the family, which points to a better quality of clergy family relationships.

Descriptive Statistics for the Family Support Composite Score

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for the family support composite score. It shows the confidence, levels, error margin, minimum and maximum values, and the mean and standard deviation of the responses.

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics for the Family Support Composite Score*

			Statistic	Std. Error
Family Support Composite Score	Mean		4.3912	.05821
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	4.2759	
		Upper Bound	4.5065	
		5% Trimmed Mean	4.4593	
	Median	4.5500		
	Variance	.386		
	Std. Deviation	.62149		
	Minimum	1.20		
	Maximum	5.00		
	Range	3.80		

Interquartile Range	.80	
Skewness	-2.048	.226
Kurtosis	6.892	.449

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for the family support composite score. The table shows that on average, most of the respondents had very supportive clergy families ($\bar{x}=4.3912$, $\hat{\sigma}_x=.62149$). The findings concur with the findings by Kyere (2019) in Ghana which revealed most of the clergy find support from their spouses and their children who know the level of difficulty of their work and do all they can to make sure that they are doing great in their family and jobs.

Descriptive Statistics for The Quality of Clergy Family Relationship Composite Index

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistical analysis of the quality of clergy family relationships composite score.

Table 7. *Descriptive statistics for Quality of Clergy Family Relationships Composite Score*

			Statistic	Std. Error
Quality of Clergy Family Relationships Composite Score	Mean		3.4635	.03527
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.3936	
		Upper Bound	3.5333	
		5% Trimmed Mean	3.4757	
	Median	3.4375		
	Variance	.142		
	Std. Deviation	.37655		
	Minimum	2.13		
	Maximum	4.19		
	Range	2.06		
	Interquartile Range	.46		
	Skewness	-.537	.226	
	Kurtosis	1.126	.449	

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistical analysis of the quality of the clergy family relationships. The table helps in exploring the different aspects of the quality of clergy family relationships including the aspects such as family support, family conflict and family contentment. The descriptive statistical analysis shows that on average most of the respondents had better quality clergy family relationships ($\bar{x}=3.4635$, $\hat{\sigma}_x = .37655$).

Qualitative data revealed two salient themes regarding the quality of clergy family relationships and the themes are discussed to further explore the quality of clergy family relationships at CITAM, Kenya.

Theme 1: Spiritual Calling

A salient theme especially among the pastors is spiritual calling. The theme manifested through subthemes such as gratitude, well-being, spirituality, comfort and security. The respondents at CITAM, Kenya hold their clergy works with such high regard that even if there is nothing they gain from the calling, the calling alone means a lot to them because many of them consider the calling itself a blessing, assuming the repercussions which come with their calling. Cases that emphasize the weight with which the respondents hold their calling are comments from the respondents when asked about the blessing they have received from being in a pastor's family:

"It's been a blessing in the sense that we have an opportunity to minister as pastors. It is the calling that God placed in me. Yeah, besides that, it is spiritual, and I see it as blessing me and my family. There is also friendship that comes, yes, that fulfilment friendship and provision." FGD/004/P

Another response on the spiritual calling experienced by being part of a clergy family in CITAM, Kenya:

"For me to be a part of a pastor's family, has been a blessing in so many ways that I am not even able to quantify, but one of them is that I have been exposed to a lot of Godly support and growth in terms of my spiritual walk because I have had to be intentional and as a family we are very intentional in how we grow in our spiritual life." FGD/002/S

Theme 2: Support

Another salient theme, especially among the pastors' spouses was support. The theme manifested through sub-themes such as emotional support, prayer, social support, financial and material support. Chan and Chen (2019) held that congregational needs which come from handling congregational needs and expectation are some of the major sources, among rigid work schedules, bureaucracy, denominational frameworks, conflicts between personal and congregational interests of clergy occupational stress. The following verbatim respondents' excerpts prove the presence of support to the clergy families from the congregants and the Church fraternity. This was in response to the discussion on the blessings of being a member of clergy family;

"About the connections getting to meet people that otherwise you would not have met. And having some of the different congregations that you get to serve in, you also get friends and they become your family friends, your personal friends. And so that has been one of the blessings." FGD/006/S

“We receive different favours because of God from the people that we serve. We do not ask for it but because working as a pastor is a higher calling, members support us. The support that we receive from the congregation is significant.” FGD/001/P

From the foregoing verbatim excerpt, the respondents recognize that being a member of the family of a clergy comes with high expectations but nonetheless, the support which comes in many forms, including the financial outweigh the expectations.

The spiritual support specifically mainly comes from the spouses who are pastors who ensure that the teachings of the Bible and the spiritual disciplines are applied and followed in their own houses before taking care of the spiritual needs of the members of the congregation as confirmed by two respondents.

“And personally, I have been intentional not to take up any fulltime job. I would rather do things that make me more available so that I can do simple things like just picking the children and dropping them to school, reading Bible stories and teaching them songs. My husband is not available and cannot even commit to pick the children from school because his work is very unpredictable. A lot of times, he comes home when the children are asleep. I help him here.” FGD/002S

The descriptive statistical analysis revealed that on average, the clergy CITAM, Kenya had a moderately high quality of clergy family relationships. The seventeen-item, 5-point scale revealed that most of the respondents had high quality of clergy family relationships. Examining the composite scores yielded that the respondents had high levels of family contentment ($\bar{x}=4.2368$, $\sqrt{x}=.60129$), low levels of family conflict ($\bar{x}=3.9998$, $\sqrt{x}=.69514$), and high levels of family support ($\bar{x}=4.3912$, $\sqrt{x}=.62149$). The respondents score above average on the 5-point scale showing that they have high quality of family relationships.

Conclusion

This research study has contributed to the body of knowledge by investigating the influence of occupational stress on the quality of clergy family relationships at CITAM, Kenya. It has also investigated the effects family contentment, family conflict and family support on the quality of clergy family relationships. The main conclusion which can be drawn from the findings of the study is that even though occupational stress is high among the clergy and it adversely affects the quality of clergy family relationships, most of the respondents still showed high quality of clergy family relationships. In light of the findings of the study, recommendations were made as follows: (1)

The Church should encourage and promote the activities and practices such as counseling and self-care which will improve the quality of clergy relationships so that the clergy are well-equipped to handle the needs and expectations of the members of the congregation. (2) It would be beneficial for the Church to work in partnership with marriage and family therapists to provide education and support to their clergy on effectively managing occupational stress. This should include not only addressing overall stress reduction strategies, but also specifically targeting the different variables of occupational stress that may impact the clergy's well-being. (3) The Church should promote the clergy to actively and intentionally take good care of themselves so that they do not experience the burnout which is associated with serving the expectations of the members of the congregation.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References:

1. Adams, C. J., Hough, H., Proeschold-Bell, R., Yao, J., & Kolkin, M. (2017). Clergy burnout: A comparison study with other helping professions. *Pastoral Psychology*, 66(2), 147–175. Doi.org/10.1007/s11089-016-0722-4
2. Asenahabi, B. M. (2019). Basics of research design: A guide to selecting appropriate research design. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, 6(5), 76-89. <https://DOI:10.21512/lc.v16i1.7752>
3. Aulthouse, M. E. (2013). *Clergy families: The helpless forgottens' cry for help answered through reality therapy*. <https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/clergy-families-the-helpless-forgottens-cry-for-help.pdf?sfvrsn=11>
4. Berry, S. A. (2022). *The Case for Rest: A Qualitative Analysis of Self-Care Amongst African American Pastors and Ministry Leaders Through a Global Pandemic* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia International University). www.proquest.com/openview/b2893f140840a429379cf390dfa1611
5. Bloom, M. (2019). *Flourishing in ministry: How to cultivate clergy wellbeing*. Rowman & Littlefield.
6. Büssing, A., Baumann, K., Jacobs, C., & Frick, E. (2017). Spiritual dryness in Catholic priests: Internal resources as possible buffers. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 9(1), 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/re10000063>
7. Butler, L. D., Mercer, K. A., McClain-Meeder, K., Horne, D. M. & Dudley, M. (2019). Six domains of self-care: Attending to the whole person. *Journal of Human*

- Behavior in the Social Environment*, 29(1), 107-124.
<https://DOI:10.1080/10911359.2018.1482483>
8. Casteel, A. & Bridier, N. L. (2021). Describing populations and samples in doctoral student research. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 16(1), 339-362. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4766>
 9. Chai, C. P. (2020). The importance of data cleaning: three visualization examples. *Chance*, 33(1), 4-9. <https://Doi:10.1080/09332480.2020.1726112>
 10. Chan, K., & Chen, M. (2019). Experience of Stress and Burnout among Pastors in China. *Journal of Pastoral Care & Counseling*, 73(4), 232-237. [Doi.org/10.1177/1542305019886533](https://doi.org/10.1177/1542305019886533)
 11. Chan, K., & Wong, M. (2018). Experience of stress and coping strategies among pastors' wives in China. *Journal of Pastoral Care & Counseling*, 72(3), 163-171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1542305018782518>
 12. Choi, D. W., Han, K. T., Jeon, J., Ju, Y. J., & Park, E. C. (2020). Association between family conflict resolution methods and depressive symptoms in South Korea: a longitudinal study. *Archives of women's mental health*, 23, 123-129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-019-00957-5>
 13. Clarke, M. A. (2021). *Understanding clergy resilience: A mixed methods research study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan). <https://hdl.handle.net/10388/13496>
 14. Creswell, J., W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. London, UK: Sage.
 15. Currier, J. M., Rojas-Flores, L., McCormick, W. H., Hwang Koo, J., Cadavid, L., Pineda, F. A., Le Roux, E., & Givens, T. (2019). Spiritual struggles and ministry-related quality of life among faith leaders in Colombia. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 11(2), 148-156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000194>
 16. Dunbar, S., Frederick, T., Thai, Y., & Gill, J. (2020). Calling, caring, and connecting: burnout in Christian ministry. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 23(2), 173-186. <https://DOI:10.1080/13674676.2020.1744548>
 17. Eagle, D. E., Hybels, C. F., & Proeschold-Bell, R. J. (2019). Perceived social support, received social support, and depression among clergy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(7), 2055-2073. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518776134>
 18. Edwards, L., Bretherton, R., Gresswell, M., & Sabin-Farrell, R. (2020). The relationship between social support, spiritual well-being, and depression in Christian clergy: a systematic literature

- review. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 23(10), 857-873. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1838459>
19. Fee, C. (2018). *CausesLyte of burnout among church leaders: A qualitative phenomenological study of pastors*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Walden University. Retrieved from: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article¼6356&context¼dissertations>
 20. Flick, U. (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*. London, UK: Sage.
 21. Fosco, G. M., & Lydon-Staley, D. M. (2020). Implications of family cohesion and conflict for adolescent mood and well-being: Examining within-and between-family processes on a daily timescale. *Family Process*, 59(4), 1672-1689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12515>
 22. Francis, L. J., & DLitt, D. D. (2018). Resilience and Wellbeing in Ministry: An empirical enquiry within the Church of Scotland. <https://www.churchofscotland.org.uk>
 23. French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and social support. *Psychological bulletin*, 144(3), 284. doi: 10.1037/bul0000120
 24. Gibson, C. B. (2017). Elaboration, generalization, triangulation, and interpretation: On enhancing the value of mixed method research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(2), 193-223. <https://Doi:10.1177/1094428116639133>
 25. Goldberg-Looney, L. D., Sánchez-SanSegundo, M., Ferrer-Cascales, R., Smith, E. R., Albaladejo-Blazquez, N., & Perrin, P. B. (2015). Adolescent drinking in Spain: Family relationship quality, rules, communication, and behaviors. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 58, 236–243. <https://doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.09.02>
 26. Grevenstein, D., Bluemke, M., Schweitzer, J., & Aguilar-Raab, C. (2019). Better family relationships—higher well-being: The connection between relationship quality and health related resources. *Mental health & prevention*, 14, 200160. <https://Doi.org/10.1016/j.mph.2019.200160>
 27. Guzman, N. E. Q., & Teh, L. A. (2016). Understanding the stresses and coping resources of Filipino clergy families: A multiple-case study. *Pastoral psychology*, 65(4), 459-480. [Doi.org/10.1007/s11089-016-0698-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-016-0698-0)
 28. Hamm, A. K., & Eagle, D. E. (2021). Clergy Who Leave Congregational Ministry: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of*

- Psychology and Theology*, 49(4), 291-307.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00916471211011597>
29. Hayes Sr, T. O. (2020). A Phenomenological Investigation of the Resilience and Success of African-American Pastors Serving in the Church of God in Christ. <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/2743>
 30. Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Weber, M. B. (2019). What influences saturation? Estimating sample sizes in focus group research. *Qualitative health research*, 29(10), 1483-1496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318821692>
 31. Hough, H., Proeschold-Bell, R., Liu, X., Weisner, C., Turner, E., Yao, J. (2018). Relationships between Sabbath observance and mental, physical, and spiritual health in clergy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 68(2), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-018-0838-9>
 32. Hricová, M. (2020). The mediating role of self-care activities in the stress-burnout relationship. *Health Psychology Report*, 8(1), 1-9. [Doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2019.89988](https://doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2019.89988)
 33. Jones, P. D. (2021). *Perceived Factors Contributing to Job Burnout among Lutheran Pastors: A Qualitative Study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/bd0abee435f8bdb4cab5fd473a259206/>.
 34. Joynt, S. (2018). Exodus of clergy: ‘When the fight is just not worth it anymore’—The role of conflict in responding to the call. *In die Skriflig*, 52(1), 1-9.1. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v52i1.2331>
 35. Kelle, U., Kühberger, C., & Bernhard, R. (2019). How to use mixed-methods and triangulation designs: An introduction to history education research. *History Education Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116639133>
 36. Kim, S. S., Gil, M., & Kim-Godwin, Y. (2021). Development and validation of the Family Relationship Assessment Scale in Korean college students’ families. *Family process*, 60(2), 586-601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12559>
 37. Kimmons, R. (2022). Mixed Methods: How does one go about doing good mixed methods research? In R. Kimmons (Ed.), *Education Research*. BYU Open Textbook Network. https://open.byu.edu/education_research/mixed_methods.
 38. Kyere, A. (2019). *For God and man: A Study of the Clergy-Wife*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana.

39. Lee, A. A. (2017). *Ministry longevity, family contentment, and the male clergy family: A phenomenological study of experience of ministry*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Liberty University. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/2b17554e7eaf171ca6b955b2e21bb2a6/1>
40. Lee, C. & Rosales, A. (2020). Self-regard in pastoral ministry: Self-compassion versus self-criticism in a sample of United Methodist Clergy. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 48(1), 18-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091647119870290>
41. Lee, H. C., & Fung, J. (2023). Associations Between Work–Family Conflict, Psychological Distress, and Well-Being Among Taiwanese Clergy. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 51(1), 32-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00916471221099543>
42. Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2019). Practical research. *Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice-Hall*. *Open Journal for Educational Research*, 3(2), 67-80. <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017059151>
43. Lockwood, R. (2020). *Pastoral stress: The urgent need for self-care*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Liberty University. <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/2574>
44. Lyte, A. Q. (2021). *Pastors Coping with Burnout and Exhaustion* (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/2362e4506ff4484c7bcbf56e405b29df/1>
45. Madukwe, A. U., Njoku, E. C., & Dinneya, C. C. (2019). Occupational stress, transfer and age as predictors of job satisfaction among Imo Anglican clergymen. *African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 9(1). <https://journals.aphriapub.com/index.php/AJSBS/article/view/850>
46. Maina, J. W., Kaaria, Z., Kivanguli, G. (2018). Effect of pastor's church ministry on their family stability in Nairobi County, Kenya. *European Scientific Journal*, 14(29), 36-52. <https://Doi:10.19044/esj.2018.v14n29p36>
47. Maleki, A., Moghaddam, K., Cloninger, P., & Cullen, J. (2023). A cross-national study of youth entrepreneurship: The effect of family support. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 24(1), 44-57. <https://DOI:10.1177/14657503211054284>
48. Martin-Storey, A., Dirks, Ajiba M., Holfeld, B., Dryburgh, N. S. J., & Craig, W. (2021). Family relationship quality during the COVID-19 pandemic: The value of adolescent perceptions of change. *Journal of Adolescence*, 93(2021), 190-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2021.11.005>

49. Murray, C. E., Ross, R., & Cannon, J. (2021). The happy, healthy, safe relationships continuum: Conceptualizing a spectrum of relationship quality to guide community-based healthy relationship promotion programming. *The Family Journal*, 29(1), 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480720960416>
50. Muzenda, V. T. M. (2020). *The impact of domestic violence on family cohesion: exploring a pastoral approach in the Masvingo Diocese* (Doctoral dissertation).
51. Nkonge, G. (2020). *The influence of pastoral church leadership on the behavior of pastors' children: a case study of East Africa Pentecostal churches in Meru County*. (Unpublished Thesis). Pan Africa Christian University. Pan Africa Christian University]. Kenya. <http://dspace.pacuniversity.ac.ke:8080/>
52. Noh, H. K., & Ross, N. (2020). Family conflict. *Psychological Studies*, 65(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-019-00486-2>
53. Obrenovic, B., Jianguo, D., Khudaykulov, A., & Khan, M. A. S. (2020). Work-family conflict impact on psychological safety and psychological well-being: A job performance model. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 475. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00475>
54. Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (2019). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family process*, 18(1), 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1979.00003.x>
55. Omungo, R., Kihara, M., & Wachira, T. (2020). Prevalence of depression among older clergy from selected mainline churches in Nairobi, Kenya. *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research*, 5(2), 394-403. <https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2020.v05i02.009>
56. Pascucci, T., Hernández Sánchez, B., & Sánchez García, J. C. (2022). Being stressed in the family or married with work? A literature review and clustering of work-family conflict. *European journal of management and business economics*, 31(2), 239-265. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-06-2021-0191>
57. Paterson, A., & Leung, D. (Eds.). (2016). Research methods for accounting and finance. *A guide to writing your dissertation*. Oxford, UK: Goodfellow Publishers Ltd. https://goodfellowpublishers.com/free_files
58. Pietkiewicz, I. J., & Bachryj, D. (2016). Help-seeking attitudes and coping strategies among Roman Catholic secular clergy. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 8(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000019>

59. Potts, D. J. (2020). *As for Me and My House: Keys to a Flourishing Family and a Fulfilled Ministry*. Wipf and Stock Publishers. <https://books.google.co.ke/books>
60. Potts, D. J. (2021). Suffering in silence: Examining the silent suffering of the wives of Christian clergy, advocating for their voice and value. *Journal of Pastoral Care & Counseling*, 75(1), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1542305020968050>
61. Repetti, R., & Wang, S. W. (2017). Effects of job stress on family relationships. *Current opinion in psychology*, 13, 15-18. [Doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.010)
62. Robertson, P. N. E., Norona, J. C., Lenger, K. A., & Olmstead, S. B. (2018). How do relationship stability and quality affect wellbeing? Romantic relationship trajectories, depressive symptoms, and life satisfaction across 30 years. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(1), 2171–2184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1052-1>.
63. Roller, M. R. (2019). A quality approach to qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences compared to other qualitative methods. *Qualitative Social Research*, 20(3), 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.3.3385>.
64. Ruiz-Prada, M., Fernández-Salineró, S., García-Ael, C., & Topa, G. (2021). Occupational stress and catholic priests: A scoping review of the literature. *Journal of religion and health*, 60, 3807-3870. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-021-01352-0>
65. Samau, B. & Schoeffel, P. (2015). Pastors' daughters: boundary ambiguity or the Fishbowl Effect? *Journal of Samoan Studies*, 5(1), 88-96. <http://dlibrary.aiu.ac.ke:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/488>
66. Sharma, B. (2018). Processing of data and analysis. *Biostatistics and Epidemiology*, 1(1), 3-5. <https://doi.org/10.30881/beij.00003>
67. Shaw, M., Lukman, R., Simmons, L. W., & Reynolds, R. (2021). Clergy wholeness study: How occupational distress, depression, and social support inform the health of clergy. *Journal of Pastoral Care & Counseling*, 75(1), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1542305020968046>
68. Sielaff, A. M., Davis, K. R., & McNeil, J. D. (2021). Literature review of clergy resilience and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 49(4), 308-323. [Doi.org/10.1177/0091647120968136](https://doi.org/10.1177/0091647120968136)
69. Simpson, G. W. (2022). Burn On, Don't Burn Out: Factors That Promote Longevity in Ministry. <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>
70. Suleman Q, Hussain I, Shehzad S, Syed MA, Raja SA (2018) Relationship between perceived occupational stress and psychological well-being among secondary school heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,

- Pakistan. *Plos One* 13(12).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208143>
71. Verrastro, V., Ritella, G., Saladino, V., Pistella, J., Baiocco, R., & Fontanesi, L. (2020). Personal and family correlates to happiness amongst Italian children and pre-adolescents. *International Journal of Emotional Education*, 12(1), 48-64.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1251781>
72. Wajanathawornchai, W., & Blauw, J. N. (2018). The impact of spiritual well-being, calling, and religious coping on burnout, mediated by job stressors, among Thai protestant pastors. *Scholar: Human Sciences*, 10(1), 128-128. Retrieved from <http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/Scholar/article/view/3319>
73. Webb, B. L., & Chase, K. (2019). Occupational distress and health among a sample of Christian clergy. *Pastoral Psychology*, 68, 331-343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-018-0844-y>
74. Woods, S. B. & Priest, J. B. (2020). Family versus intimate partners: Estimating who matters more for health in a 20-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34(2), 247-256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000600>
75. Young, D. S., & Casey, E. A. (2019). An examination of the sufficiency of small qualitative samples. *Social Work Research*, 43(1), 53-58. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svy026>
76. Zeng, Y., Ye Baojuan, Zhang, Y., & Yang, Q. (2021). Family Cohesion and Stress Consequences Among Chinese College Students During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Frontiers in Public Health*, 9. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2021.703899>