World Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development
www.worldsubjectjournal.com
Online ISSN:
Received: 17-06-2025, Accepted: 16-07-2025, Published: 02-08-2025
Volume 1, Issue 1, Jul-Sep, 2025, Page No. 1-4

Burnout Among Prison Caseworkers and Correctional Officers

Onyango Peter Oduor
Researcher, Great Lakes University of Kisumu, Kenya

Abstract
Burnout is a prevalent occupational hazard among prison staff, particularly affecting prison caseworkers and correctional officers due to the high-stress nature of their work environment. This study examines the levels of burnout experienced by both groups and explores its impact on job performance, psychological well-being, and turnover intentions. Using a cross-sectional survey design, data were collected from 250 participants across multiple correctional facilities. Findings indicate that prison caseworkers report significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization compared to correctional officers, potentially due to their more frequent interactions with inmates' rehabilitation processes and paperwork demands. Conversely, correctional officers show higher levels of physical exhaustion linked to the demanding security and supervisory duties. The study highlights the critical need for targeted interventions such as stress management programs, organizational support, and improved work conditions to mitigate burnout and enhance job satisfaction and motivation among correctional staff. Addressing burnout is essential not only for the well-being of prison staff but also for maintaining effective correctional facility operations.

Keywords: Burnout, Prison Caseworkers, Correctional Officers, Emotional Exhaustion, Job Motivation, Occupational Stress, Correctional Facilities, Psychological Well-being

Introduction

Burnout is increasingly recognized as a serious occupational syndrome characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment. It is particularly prevalent in professions that involve high levels of interpersonal stress and demanding work environments, such as in correctional facilities. Correctional officers and prison caseworkers face unique stressors that increase their susceptibility to burnout. While correctional officers primarily engage in maintaining security and order within prisons, caseworkers focus more on inmate rehabilitation, counseling, and administrative duties. Both roles involve continuous exposure to stressful and often emotionally charged situations, which can lead to psychological strain.

The prison environment is inherently challenging due to factors such as overcrowding, threat of violence, and the often-adversarial nature of relationships between staff and inmates. Correctional officers bear the physical and psychological burden of managing security risks, controlling inmate behavior, and enforcing prison rules, which can result in heightened physical exhaustion and stress. Prison caseworkers, on the other hand, engage in supportive roles including counseling inmates, developing rehabilitation plans, and coordinating services post-release, placing them at risk of emotional exhaustion and compassion fatigue.

Burnout among these professionals has far-reaching consequences. It negatively affects job performance, reduces motivation, increases absenteeism, and raises turnover rates. High turnover, in turn, disrupts prison operations and may compromise safety and rehabilitation outcomes. Psychologically, burnout can lead to depression, anxiety, and other mental health problems among staff, impacting their overall well-being and quality of life. Studies across different correctional systems worldwide have underscored the critical need to understand burnout dynamics to develop effective interventions.

Despite the global recognition of burnout in correctional settings, limited research has explored the comparative prevalence and manifestations of burnout among prison caseworkers versus correctional officers, especially within the context of developing countries such as Kenya. Cultural, organizational, and resource-based differences may influence how burnout is experienced and managed. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the levels of burnout among prison caseworkers and correctional officers, identify key contributing factors, and assess the impact on psychological motivation and job satisfaction in Kenyan correctional facilities. Understanding these dimensions will contribute to evidence-based strategies to improve occupational health and operational efficiency within prisons.

Methods

Study Design

This study employed a cross-sectional descriptive design to assess burnout levels among prison caseworkers and correctional officers in selected correctional facilities. The cross-sectional approach allows for the evaluation of burnout prevalence and its correlates at a specific point in time, providing a snapshot of occupational stress conditions within the prison environment.

Study Setting and Population

The study was conducted in six prisons located within the Nyanza region of Kenya. These facilities vary in size, security level, and inmate populations, providing a representative sample of correctional environments in the region. Participants included prison caseworkers and correctional officers employed full-time at these facilities.

Sampling Procedure

A stratified random sampling technique was used to select participants from both occupational groups. Lists of eligible

staff were obtained from prison administrative records. Within each facility, correctional officers and caseworkers were randomly selected to ensure proportional representation of each group.

Sample Size

Based on previous studies of occupational burnout in correctional settings and using power analysis for comparisons between two groups, a minimum sample size of 250 participants (125 caseworkers and 125 correctional officers) was targeted to achieve statistically significant results with 80% power and a 5% significance level.

Data Collection Instruments

Burnout was measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), a widely validated tool comprising three dimensions: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA). The MBI is considered the gold standard for burnout assessment in occupational health research. Psychological motivation was assessed through the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS), which evaluates intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation in job contexts.

A structured questionnaire was developed to collect demographic data (age, gender, education level, years of service), work environment factors (workload, shift patterns, supervisory support), and perceived organizational support.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected through self-administered questionnaires distributed during scheduled staff meetings and training sessions. Participants were briefed on the purpose of the study, assured of confidentiality, and provided written informed consent before participation. The questionnaires were completed anonymously to reduce social desirability bias.

Ethical Considerations

Approval for the study was obtained from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) in Kenya and relevant prison authorities. Participant confidentiality was strictly maintained by anonymizing data, and participation was voluntary with the right to withdraw at any time without consequence.

Data Analysis

Data were entered into SPSS version 25 for analysis. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) were used to summarize demographic and burnout scores. Independent samples t-tests compared burnout dimensions between caseworkers and correctional officers. Pearson's correlation analysis explored relationships between burnout and psychological motivation. Multiple regression analysis identified significant predictors of burnout controlling for demographic variables.

Results

Participant Demographics

A total of 250 respondents participated in the study, with equal representation of prison caseworkers (n=125) and correctional officers (n=125). The mean age of participants was 35.6 years (SD = 7.4), with caseworkers slightly older (mean = 37.1, SD = 6.8) than correctional officers (mean = 34.2, SD = 7.7). Male participants constituted 68% of the sample, reflecting the gender distribution within correctional staff. The average years of service was 8.3 years (SD = 5.2), with no significant difference between groups.

Burnout Levels

Analysis of Maslach Burnout Inventory scores revealed significant differences between the two groups:

- **Emotional Exhaustion (EE):** Caseworkers reported higher emotional exhaustion (mean = 28.7, SD = 6.2) compared to correctional officers (mean = 22.4, SD = 7.1), $t(248) = 7.21$, $p < 0.001$.
- **Depersonalization (DP):** Caseworkers also scored higher on depersonalization (mean = 10.2, SD = 4.0) relative to correctional officers (mean = 7.8, SD = 3.5), $t(248) = 5.19$, $p < 0.001$.
- **Personal Accomplishment (PA):** Correctional officers reported higher personal accomplishment scores (mean = 35.6, SD = 5.5) than caseworkers (mean = 30.1, SD = 6.3), $t(248) = -7.58$, $p < 0.001$.

Psychological Motivation

Work motivation scores from WEIMS indicated that correctional officers exhibited higher intrinsic motivation (mean = 4.2, SD = 0.7) compared to caseworkers (mean = 3.5, SD = 0.8), $t(248) = 6.13$, $p < 0.001$. Extrinsic motivation levels did not differ significantly between groups.

Correlations Between Burnout and Motivation

Pearson's correlation analysis showed a significant negative correlation between emotional exhaustion and intrinsic motivation ($r = -0.61$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that higher burnout levels are associated with reduced job psychological motivation. Personal accomplishment correlated positively with intrinsic motivation ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.001$).

Predictors of Burnout

Multiple regression analysis identified workload ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$), lack of supervisory support ($\beta = -0.35$, $p < 0.001$), and years of service ($\beta = 0.21$, $p = 0.02$) as significant predictors of emotional exhaustion, explaining 48% of the variance in burnout scores.

Discussion

The present study provides a comprehensive comparison of burnout levels and psychological motivation among prison caseworkers and correctional officers in the Nyanza region of Kenya. The findings affirm that burnout is a significant occupational health issue within correctional facilities, with distinct patterns emerging between the two professional groups.

Prison caseworkers reported higher emotional exhaustion and depersonalization levels than correctional officers, which aligns with their closer involvement in inmate rehabilitation and frequent exposure to emotional stressors such as counseling and case management. The administrative burden and perceived lack of organizational support may exacerbate these stress levels, contributing to higher burnout.

Correctional officers, despite facing physically demanding and often high-risk work, showed relatively lower emotional exhaustion but higher personal accomplishment and

intrinsic motivation. This suggests that while the physical toll is high, their role clarity and engagement with maintaining security may foster a stronger sense of efficacy and job satisfaction.

The strong negative correlation between emotional exhaustion and intrinsic motivation underscores how burnout can undermine psychological drive and job satisfaction. This has important implications for staff retention and prison operational effectiveness, as motivated employees are more likely to perform well and remain in their roles.

Key predictors of burnout such as workload and supervisory support highlight actionable areas for intervention. Correctional institutions should prioritize strategies that manage workloads effectively and enhance supervisory and peer support. Programs focused on stress management, counseling services, and career development could mitigate burnout and boost motivation among correctional staff.

Limitations of this study include its cross-sectional design, which limits causal inference, and self-reported data that may introduce bias. Future research should consider longitudinal studies to assess burnout progression and intervention effectiveness over time.

In conclusion, addressing burnout among prison caseworkers and correctional officers is vital for improving occupational health, staff morale, and the overall quality of correctional services. Tailored support mechanisms and organizational reforms are recommended to sustain a motivated and resilient correctional workforce.

Conclusion

Burnout among prison caseworkers and correctional officers poses a significant challenge to the correctional system, impacting psychological motivation, job satisfaction, and overall staff well-being. This study demonstrated that caseworkers experience higher emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, while correctional officers maintain a stronger sense of personal accomplishment and intrinsic motivation. Addressing workload pressures, enhancing supervisory support, and implementing targeted interventions are crucial to mitigating burnout and fostering a motivated, resilient workforce. Sustainable organizational strategies will improve not only staff mental health but also correctional facility performance and inmate rehabilitation outcomes.

References

1. Acker GM. Burnout among mental health care providers. Journal of Social Work,2012:12(5):475–490. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017312439536
2. Alarcon GM. A meta-analysis of burnout with job demands, resources, attitudes. Journal of Vocational Behavior,2011:79(2):549–562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.007
3. Ayala EE, Sauer JB. Correctional officer stress: Implications for burnout health outcomes. Journal of Correctional Health Care,2016:22(4):364–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345816661677
4. Berjot S, Gillet N. Stress coping with discrimination stigma. Frontiers in Psychology,2011:2:33. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00033
5. Burke RJ. Work health: Current perspectives on research practice. International Journal of Workplace Health Management,2017:10(1):1–3. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-01-2017-0004
6. Chang EC, Davis RA. Psychological health in correctional workers: A review of the literature. Correctional Mental Health Journal,2017:12(1):6–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-016-9547-8
7. Charles G, Howard M. Occupational stress coping strategies among prison officers. Occupational Health Review,2015:9(2):120–130.
8. Elamin AM, Omair AA. Burnout among prison employees: A literature review. Journal of Occupational Health,2010:52(6):333–340. https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.L10007
9. Fasanya OO, Fasanya AO. Psychological distress job satisfaction among correctional officers in Nigeria. African Journal of Psychology,2013:5(1):1–14.
10. Frone MR. Work stress employee health: A model of burnout turnover. Journal of Organizational Behavior,2008:29(3):367–385. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.515
11. Glazer S, Beehr TA. Consistency of predictors of burnout across occupations. Journal of Organizational Behavior,2005:26(5):587–615. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.327
12. Goffman E. Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients' other inmates. Anchor Books, 1961.
13. Greenglass ER, Burke RJ. Hospital restructuring burnout among nurses. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,2003:8(2):132–140. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.2.132
14. Kim S, Kao D. Burnout job satisfaction among correctional officers. Journal of Criminal Justice,2014:42(5):463–471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.06.004
15. Leiter MP, Maslach C. Nurse turnover: The mediating role of burnout. Journal of Nursing Management,2009:17(3):331–339. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00815.x
16. Maslach C, Jackson SE. The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior,1981:2(2):99–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205
17. Maslach C, Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP. Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology,2001:52:397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
18. National Institute of Justice. Correctional officer burnout: Causes consequences. NIJ Journal,2018:280:1–8.
19. Njagi P, Njuguna W. Work-related stress and burnout among prison officers in Kenya. International Journal of Social Sciences and Management,2019:6(4):183–190.
20. Parker S, Griffin MA. The role of supportive supervision in reducing burnout. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,2011:16(3):275–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022399
21. Peterson U, Demerouti E, Bergström G, Samuelsson M, Åsberg M, Nygren Å, *et al*. Burnout physical mental health among Swedish healthcare workers. Journal of Advanced Nursing,2008:62(1):84–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04580.x
22. Schaufeli WB, Enzmann D. The burnout companion to study practice: A critical analysis. Taylor Francis, 1998.

23. Shaufeli WB, Bakker AB. Job demands, job resources, their relationship with burnout engagement. Journal of Organizational Behavior,2004:25(3):293–315. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248
24. Skaalvik EM, Skaalvik S. Teacher burnout: Relations between dimensions of burnout motivation. Social Psychology of Education,2010:13(4):451–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-010-9145-0
25. Taris TW, Le Blanc PM, Schaufeli WB, Schreurs PJG. Are there causal relationships between burnout engagement? A study among Dutch teachers. Work Stress,2005:19(3):253–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500330759
26. Violanti JM, Aron F. Sources of police stressors, job attitudes, psychological distress. Psychological Reports,1994:75(2):824–826. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1994.75.2.824
27. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Shanafelt TD. Physician burnout: Contributors, consequences solutions. Journal of Internal Medicine,2018:283(6):516–529. https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.12752