

1 **Burnout Syndrome and coping mechanisms among Prison Officers at** 2 **Nsawam Medium Security Prison, Eastern Region, Ghana**

3 ^{1,2}Florence Djoletoe, ²Philip Teg-Nefaah Tabong

4

5 ¹Ghana Prisons Service, P. O. Box 129, Accra, Ghana.

6 ²Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences, School of Public Health, Post Office Box LG 13,
7 College of Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Legon

8 *Corresponding author: ptabong@ug.edu.gh

9

10 **Abstract**

11 Workplace burnout negatively affects employees' productivity, organizational effectiveness, social
12 stability, and personal health and performance. Burnout is a syndrome comprising emotional exhaustion,
13 depersonalization, and loss of personal accomplishment. In Ghana, there are several studies on job-related
14 burnout among health workers but very little on this syndrome in different professional groups like prison
15 officers. Thus, this study assessed burnout syndrome, associated factors, and coping strategies among
16 Prison Officers at Nsawam Medium Security Prison. This was a cross-sectional study involving 266
17 prison officers from the Nsawam Medium Security Prison. A self-administered questionnaire was used to
18 collect data from participants. Data was collected on sociodemographic characteristics, workplace
19 environment, coping strategies, and burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services scale was
20 adopted for this study. The data was analysed using STATA 16. Descriptive Statistical methods were
21 used to summarize socio-demographic characteristics of participants. Bivariable analysis using Pearson's
22 Chi Square was used to determine the association between demographic and work-related factors and
23 burnout. Multivariate logistic regression was used to determine factors associated with burnout at 95%
24 significance level. The prevalence of burnout was 9%. The main causes of burnout perceived by POs
25 were irregular shifts (71.6%), heavy workload (49.0%) and lack of training and opportunities for
26 development (47.7%). Male prison officers had 69% reduction in the odds of burnout compared to their
27 female counterparts (AOR: 0.31; 95% CI= 0.13-0.75, p=0.009). Also, prison officers with
28 diploma/certificate had 89% reduction in odds to burnout compared to those with postgraduate degrees
29 (AOR: 0.11; 95% CI= 0.02-0.69, p=0.019). Talking to colleagues (62.5%), looking forward to off duty
30 (60.1%), talking to family (54.3%), and keeping thoughts and feelings to oneself (42.1%) were the
31 dominant coping strategies. Overall, the prevalence of burnout among prison officers in this study was
32 low. Heavy workloads, erratic shift schedules, and a lack of training and career development chances
33 contribute to prison officers' burnout. Additionally, shift allocations need to be changed to lessen officer
34 burnout.

35

36

37

38

39

40 **Background**

41 Over the last decades, social changes such as increased job deregulation, job insecurity, conflicting
42 conditions, heavy workload, and work-related stress associated with demands of high standards, quality
43 service, and tight competition [1] have caused modifications at the workplace globally. This resulted in
44 workers becoming emotionally and physically worn out, which has led to an uncontrollable buildup of
45 workload and high levels of burnout. Recognized as a global public health issue, and a problem, before
46 the COVID-19 pandemic, burnout is expected to get far worse with the ongoing crisis [2]. Burnout is a
47 state of physical and emotional tiredness brought on by long-term job-related stress or by working in a
48 physically or emotionally demanding position. According to Maslach and Jackson [3], the syndrome has
49 three components: emotional weariness, depersonalization, and loss of sense of accomplishment. Chronic
50 stress is recognized as the key factor resulting in burnout. In addition, adopting negative coping strategies
51 contribute to the maintenance and worsening of burnout symptoms.

52 The World Health Organization (WHO) classified burnout as an “occupational phenomenon” in
53 2019 with a prevalence of 20% in active people [4]. It is reportedly becoming more prevalent
54 among workers worldwide [5]. Geographical regions and professions have been found to have
55 significant differences globally [6]. For instance, it has been found that sub-Saharan African and
56 Asian regions had the greatest prevalence rates of burnout symptoms among healthcare
57 professionals, whereas European and Central Asian regions have the lowest rates [7]. Also, a recent
58 report by Schaufeli, [8] suggests that 10% of the European Union workforce in Europe feels burned
59 out on average. Clearly, the dynamics operating in African prisons are substantially different from
60 those found in Western countries [9]. After almost two decades of ethnographic studies on prisons
61 in East, West, and North Africa, the field has been found to achieve modest advancements in scope
62 and reach as well as relevance and sophistication. Similar to the global picture, there are
63 differences in geographical regions with respect to the inmate population and prison work
64 characteristics resulting in burnout among POs [10,11]. Taken together, under the pressure of
65 overwhelming social, economic, and political challenges observed in most African countries,
66 burnout rates are observed to be high [8].

67 Burnout may have an impact on an individual's quality of life [12] as well as the operations of an
68 organization in terms of physical, psychological, behavioral, and defensive symptoms. Prison officers
69 have been recognized as an underserved and at-risk workforce that, in comparison to persons in other
70 professions, has a higher prevalence of mental and physical illness [13]. They are at risk of burnout due to
71 the general adverse conditions characterized by the nature of their work, which includes a variety of
72 institutional and occupational factors [14]. These working conditions increase their chronic exposure to
73 stress, which is the main cause of exhaustion. Coping, the capacity of persons under stress, and the tools
74 at their disposal for dealing with stress are all closely tied to the level of work-related stress.

75 Currently, burnout is a global public health concern. It was a problem before the COVID-19 pandemic,
76 and because of the current crisis, it is predicted to get far worse [2]. Although as an institution,
77 management of preventive measures would be difficult given the inherent stressors that characterize
78 prison officers' work, such as irregular work hours, and a heavy workload [15], it is acknowledged that
79 burnout among correctional officers needs urgent attention [14]. Evidence suggests that burnout
80 syndrome and subsequent performance are likely to be impacted by the frequency and length of workdays
81 [16].

82 Despite indications of research on job-related stress leading to burnout among Ghanaian workers, most of
83 these studies have focused almost exclusively on health professionals. Providing safe custody and the
84 well-being of convicts is the primary duty of the prison officer [17]. Anecdotal evidence show that job
85 requirement puts pressure and strain on the personnel. For example report available at the prison service
86 show that a total of 102 working days were missed in one month for the year 2021[18]. As a result, the
87 affected officers missed an average of 6 days of work during the thirty-day period [18]. This compels the
88 already understaffed, physically fit officers to continue doing the same amount of work, which hinders the
89 Service's capacity to carry out its mandate. On the other hand, evidence shows that POs experience high
90 levels of burnout because of the distinctive characteristics of their job, far higher than the 46% prevalence
91 rate observed across working populations [19]. About a third (37%) of correctional staff may exhibit
92 burnout related symptoms and this may vary across socio-demographic characteristics and individual
93 coping mechanism [13,16]. In contrast to prisoners in custody, who have several programs to assist them
94 to effectively manage the stress of their living environment, prison officers who spend most of their time
95 in the same space have little resources to help them handle the stress of the prison setting [20]. Moreover,
96 prior research in the Ghanaian prison system mostly ignored the health of the prison officers in favour of
97 the prisoners. This can have negative implications for the Prison Service's efforts to effectively contribute
98 to the reduction in Ghana's crime rate [10]. This study therefore investigated the prevalence of burnout,
99 associated factors and coping strategies adopted by POs to provide evidence that may improve health and
100 wellbeing of service officers.

101

102 **Methods and Materials**

103 **Ethical Consideration**

104 Approval for the study was sought from Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee. Approval was
105 given (GHS-ERC:041/01/23). Ghana Prison Service Administration, Headquarters also gave approval
106 prior to data collection. All participant gave a written consent before data elicitation.

107

108 **Study Area**

109 The study was carried out in the Nsawam Medium Security Prison. This Prison is in the Nsawam-
110 Adoagyire Municipality, in the Eastern Region. This area holds the largest prison establishment in Ghana
111 in terms of inmate population and staff strength (GPS and Ghana Prisons Council, 2014). Records show
112 that this prison has 1350 inmates and an estimated staff strength of 608 [21].

113

114 **Study Design**

115 A quantitative methods approach was adopted for this study. It was a descriptive cross-sectional study.
116 This type of study involves selecting a cross section of Prison Officers working in the Nsawam Medium
117 Security Prison for data elicitation.

118

119 **Study Population**

120 The population for the study comprises Prison Officers of the Ghana Prison Service who perform general
121 duties at the NMSP. Officers actively working at the prison at any point in time may belong to one of
122 these groups; officers in training (Recruit officers or Cadet officers); junior rank (non-commissioned
123 officers) or senior rank (commissioned officers). General duties include escorting, custody, and control of
124 inmates, as well as administrative and supervisory roles (Ghana Prisons Service Ten Year Strategic
125 Development Plan, 2014). POs who have been performing general yard duties for six months or more
126 were recruited.

127 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

128 Prison Officers who perform general duties at the NMSP were included in this study. However, those on
129 annual at the time of data collection were excluded.

130 **Sample Size Determination**

131 Using the Taro Yamane's formula for known population [22] with an assumption of 95% level of
132 confidence, the population of prison officers as given by the Eastern Regional Command of the Ghana
133 Prisons Service was 608. The Yemane formula for cross-sectional study:

$$134 \quad n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

135 Where n = sample size

136 N= Total NSMP officer population

137 e = Margin of error set at 0.05

138 N= 608 (Ghana Prisons Service, 2020)

$$139 \quad n = \frac{608}{1 + (608)(0.05)^2}$$

$$140 \quad = 241.26$$

$$141 \quad = 242$$

142

143 The minimum sample size considering a 10% non-response rate (Nix et al., 2019) was 266.

144 **Sampling Technique**

145 A proportionate stratified random sampling was adopted in recruiting participants for the study. A list of
146 the officers was obtained from the Eastern Regional Command of GPS and divided into two groups based
147 on their corps (commissioned and non-commissioned respectively). A sample size proportionate to each
148 group is selected using simple random sampling and the result combined to make the sample for the study
149 (Table 1).

150 Number of commissioned officers present = 110

151 Number of non-commissioned officers present = 498

152 Total number of officers (n) = 608

153 Sample size (n) = 267
154 Sample fraction = $\frac{n}{N}$ = 266/ 608
155 = 7/16
156
157
158
159

160 Table 1: Number of participants required from each corps for the study

Officer Rank	Number of Officers	$(n \div N) \times$ number of officers	Participants number
Commissioned	110	110 \times 7/16	49
Non-commissioned	498	498 \times 7/16	217
Total			266

161
162 Participants were selected using pieces of paper with the option YES and NO in a bowl from which
163 officers were allowed to pick one. Those who picked yes were given a briefing about the study and
164 participants who consented were recruited for the study. The data collection started on the 5th of February
165 2023 and completed on the 18th May, 2023.

166
167 **Data Collection Tool**

168 Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires assessing burnout among the POs. Both open
169 and closed-ended questions were used to capture information relevant to identifying POs socio-
170 demographics, what they perceive as causes of burnout, and coping mechanisms adopted. The
171 questionnaire was adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS)
172 [23], the Work Environment Scale [24] and the Coping Methods Checklist [25]. These are validated tools
173 and have been used in similar studies with other fields such as health workers in Ghana [26,27].

174
175 The questionnaire comprised four sections. The first section included data on socio-demographic factors:
176 age, sex, educational level, marital status, and work characteristics such as: rank, years of service and
177 supervisory role. The second section gathered information on POs' perception of the workplace using the
178 Work Environment Scale and to identify what officers perceived to be causes of burnout. The Work
179 Environment Scale [24] consists of seventeen statements that measures the social environment of work
180 settings. It assesses employee's perceptions of workplace using the dimensions of relationships, personal
181 growth, and the system maintenance by either agreeing or disagreeing to the statements.

182 Burnout was measured using the MBI-HSS that explores the three dimensions of burnout: emotional
183 exhaustion, depersonalization, and professional accomplishment, in the third section.

184 The adapted 22-item MBI-HSS has each statement rated on a seven-point likert scale that measures how
185 often officers experience a particular feeling from 0 (never) to 6 (everyday). It measures burnout using the
186 three constructs.

187 EE with 9 items

188 DP with 5 items

189 LPA with 8 items

190 The Coping Methods Checklist was adapted in the last section to gather data on the different interventions
191 adopted by POs to reduce burnout. This adapted seventeen (17) statements tool is useful in assessing
192 perceived efficacy of various coping strategies in relation to chronic job-related stress ([28]. Participants
193 indicated from a list coping strategy which was helpful in managing burnout. However, “others” option
194 was available for people to indicate coping strategies that were not part of the list.

195 **Data Collection Technique**

196 After one of the prison facility’s weekly meetings, participants were given an information sheet prior to
197 the administration of the questionnaire. This was a summary of the study in simplified language.
198 Participants were allowed questions for clarification of doubts which were answered appropriately.
199 Consenting participants were made to complete a hardcopy version of the questionnaire.

200 **Data Analysis**

201 Of the 266 participants, 245 questionnaires were returned and after data cleaning, 243 had been filled and
202 used for analysis. Data were exported to STATA version 16 and coded for analysis (StataCorp, 2019).
203 Descriptive statistical measures were used to describe the socio-demographic factors and work
204 characteristics of participants. The scores in each dimension are used to characterize the level of burnout
205 as high, moderate, or low.

206 The MBI-HSS tool, a 7-point Likert scale, was used to measure the three constructs of burnout.

207 0 = Never 4= Once a week

208 1= At least a few times a year 5= Several times a week

209 2= At least once a month 6= Everyday

210 3= Several times a month

211 Scores for each construct were then computed and categorized. For EE, the scale was categorized as Low
212 (≤ 16), Moderate (17-26) and High (≥ 27). Additionally, the DP scale was categorized as Low (≤ 6),
213 Moderate (7-12) and High (≥ 13). Finally, PA was also categorized as Low (< 31), Moderate (32-38) and
214 High (≥ 39) (Table 2).

215 Table 2 Source used for burnout levels assessment

	Low	Moderate	High
Emotional exhaustion	≤ 16	17-26	≥ 27

Depersonalization	≤6	7-12	≥ 13
Personal accomplishment	≥ 37	31-36	≤30

216

217 Scores for EE, DP and PA were summarized as means and standard deviations. Burnout was computed as
 218 a composite variable using scores from participants. The definition of burnout adopted for the study as
 219 provided by Abdo et al., [29] and Dubale et al., [30] was high scores on EE and DP and low scores on
 220 PA. Thus, participants with high EE, high DP and low PA were said to be burned out while those who did
 221 not fall in this categorization were classified as not burned out.

222 Additionally, assessing data on perceived causes of burnout and coping skills adopted by POs using the
 223 Coping Methods Checklist were also presented as frequencies and percentages.

224 Chi-square/Fisher’s Exact where appropriate were used to determine the relationship between socio-
 225 demographic characteristics, EE, DP, PA and Burnout. P-values less than 0.05 were considered
 226 statistically significant. Multivariate logistic regression was used to determine factors associated with
 227 burnout. Based on this, a dichotomous variable was created “0” (no burn out) and “1” (burn out). The
 228 outcome of interest was burnout. Strengths of association between independent variables and burnout
 229 were determined using crude odds ratio. Variables with p-value of <0.05 in unadjusted logistic regression
 230 model (COR) were considered for inclusion into the multivariate logistic regression analyses, adjusted
 231 logistic regression (AOR). Issues relating to cofounders were addressed using multilinear collinearity
 232 using the Variance of Inflation Factor (VIF) command in Stata. To test for goodness of fit of Model II, the
 233 likelihood ratio test was used to examine the likelihood of data under the full model as against the
 234 likelihood of the data under a model with reduced number of independent variables. A p-value for the
 235 overall model obtained was less than 0.05. Thus, it was concluded the model was good. P-values less than
 236 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The results have been presented in tables and graphs.

237 **Results**

238 **Socio-demographic and work characteristics of prison officers**

239 The total number of prison officers recruited for this study was two hundred and sixty-six (266). Of this,
 240 245 questionnaires were returned and two hundred and forty-three (243) used for analysis (Table 3). The
 241 participation rate of this study was 92%.

242 The study revealed that while about half (47.29%) of the respondents were between the ages 20-30 years,
 243 their ages range between eighteen to fifty-eight (18-58) years. The mean age of officers was 32.40 ± 7.55
 244 years. Majority (68.31%) were male. Additionally, more than half were single (57.61%), had attained
 245 senior high school education (54.73%), have been working in prison service for less than five years
 246 (60.90%) and were junior ranked officers (78.19%). Moreover, 19.34% worked as schedule heads. The
 247 predominant shift (59.26%) engaged by officers within the past 6 months was the main shift (8am-4pm).
 248 Less than half (48.15%) indicated they had children and a greater proportion reported not having chronic
 249 conditions (90.95%).

250 Table 3: Sociodemographic characteristics of prison officers

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Mean (SD)= 32.4 (7.5)	
20-30	115	47.29

31-40	102	42.00
40+	26	10.71
Sex		
Female	77	31.69
Male	166	68.31
Marital status		
Single	140	57.61
Married	98	40.33
Divorced/widowed	5	2.05
Education		
SHS	133	54.73
Diploma/certificate	45	18.52
Degree	53	21.81
Postgraduate	12	4.94
Work experience		
<5 years	148	60.90
5-10 years	39	16.00
10+ years	56	23.10
Rank		
Junior	190	78.19
Senior	53	21.81
Schedule Head		
No	196	80.66
Yes	47	19.34
Shift Allocation		
Early	60	24.69
Late	16	6.58
Main	144	59.26
Night	23	9.47
Have children		
No	126	51.85
Yes	117	48.15
Have chronic condition		
No	221	90.95
Yes	22	9.05

251

252 Prevalence of burnout among prison officers

253 The three dimensions of burnout were measured using the 22-item Maslach Burnout Inventory–Human
 254 Services Survey tool (MBI-HSS). The summary of scores for each construct is summarized in Table 4.
 255 Overall, 25.9% of the officers had low emotional exhaustion (EE), 42.0% had high emotional exhaustion.
 256 Furthermore, the distribution of the three categories of depersonalization (DP) were similar for the
 257 officers: Low (35.4%), Moderate (32.1%) and High (32.5%). Regarding personal accomplishment, the
 258 majority (68.7%) of the participants had low personal accomplishment while only 14% had high personal
 259 accomplishment (Figure 1).

260 Table 4: scores of dimensions of burnout among prison officers

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Emotional Exhaustion	0	54	24.9	12.5
Depersonalization	0	30	10.6	7.4
Personal Accomplishment	0	48	26.3	10.7

261

262

263 Figure 1: Distribution of Dimensions of Burnout among Prison Officers

264

265

266 Burnout was defined as a high EE (≥ 27) or high DP (≥ 10) and low PA (≤ 33). Overall, the prevalence of
267 burnout syndrome among the prison officers was 9% (Figure 2).

268

269

270 Figure 2 Prevalence of Burnout among Prison Officers

271

272 **Perceived causes of burnout among prison officers**

273 Perceived causes of burnout were assessed among POs in this study (Figure 3). The respondents
274 identified various causes they perceived which include irregular shifts (71.6%), heavy workload (49.0%)
275 and lack of training and opportunities for development (47.7%). Others included lack of autonomy
276 (35.8%), no variety and poor social status (28.0%).

277

278 Figure 3 Perceived Causes of Burnout among prison officers.

279

280 **Assessment of prison work environment**

281 Table 5 represents how POs rate the prison work environment. More than half (56.4%) disagreed that
282 there is a positive and supportive culture and emotional climate, agreed they felt like part of a team
283 (59.3%) and felt challenged when assigned tests to stretch their efforts (58.4%). Additionally, 59.7%
284 disagreed that their efforts were recognized and received constructive feedback (55.1%). Furthermore,
285 74.1% agreed they took pride in their work and workplace, felt they were in control of their work (71.2%)
286 and felt accepted and valued by their colleagues (72.0%). On the contrary 50.6% disagreed they trusted
287 their superiors to be there for them, disagreed they felt safe sharing their plans with the officer in charge
288 and disagreed the rewards for success were greater than the penalties (62.1%).

289

290 Table 5 Rating of prison work environment

Statement	Agree N(%)	Disagree N(%)
The culture and emotional climate of the prison is generally positive and supportive ie welfare, health,	106(43.6)	137(56.4)
I feel like I am part of a team (shared vision, goals, efforts)	144(59.3)	99(40.7)
I feel challenged and assigned allocations that inspire, test and stretch my efforts	142(58.4)	101(41.6)
My efforts are recognized in a tangible way e. g. awards	98(40.3)	145(59.7)
I receive constructive feedback in a way that emphasizes positives rather than negatives	109(44.9)	134(55.1)
Innovation is expected of me, and I am encouraged to take initiative	127(52.3)	116(47.7)
I have clear-cut and non-contradictory instructions on my job description	123(50.6)	120(49.4)
I believe in and take pride in my work and my workplace	180(74.1)	63(25.9)
I feel in control of my work and capable of competently carrying out my duty duties	173(71.2)	70(28.8)
I feel accepted and valued by my colleague officers	175(72.0)	68(28.0)
I feel accepted and I'm treated with courtesy, listened to and invited to express my thoughts and feelings by my superiors.	135(55.6)	108(44.4)
The station's administrative team provides an environment in which I feel safe and secure	115(47.7)	128(52.7)
I believe administration considers my needs and preference when making decisions.	99(40.7)	144(59.3)
My professional judgement is respected by my superiors; I have adequate freedom to exercise my judgement and expertise	94(38.7)	149(61.3)
I trust my superiors to be there for me and back me up.	120(49.4)	123(50.6)
I feel safe sharing my plans, programs and policies with my OIC	118(48.8)	124(51.2)
The rewards for success are greater than the penalties for failure	92(37.9)	151(62.1)

291

292

293 **Association between dimensions of burnout and demographic characteristics**

294 The Pearson's chi-square test was used to assess the association between demographic characteristics of
 295 respondents and the three constructs of burnout syndrome (Table 6). Results showed that all other socio-
 296 demographics, aside shift allocation was significantly associated with emotional exhaustion (p=0.010).
 297 The percentage of emotional exhaustion was significantly higher among POs who run main shift (68.0%)
 298 compared to those with early (22.5%), night (17.7%) and late (5.9%) shifts. Furthermore, officer rank was
 299 also significantly associated with depersonalization (p=0.010). The percentage of depersonalization was
 300 significantly higher among junior officers (76.0%) as compared to senior officers (24.0%). No
 301 sociodemographic characteristic had a statistically significant association with personal accomplishment.

Table 6 Association between constructs of burnout and socio-demographic characteristics

	Emotional Exhaustion			p-value	Depersonalization			p-value	Personal Accomplishment			p-value
	Low N(%)	Moderate N(%)	High N(%)		Low N(%)	Moderate N(%)	High N(%)		Low N(%)	Moderate N(%)	High N(%)	
Age												
20-30	30(47.6)	33(42.3)	52(51.0)	0.657	42(48.8)	29(37.2)	44(55.7)	0.154	80(47.9)	19(45.2)	16(47.1)	0.170
31-40	26(41.3)	38(48.7)	38(37.2)		33(38.4)	41(52.6)	28(35.4)		73(43.7)	14(33.3)	15(44.1)	
40+	7(11.1)	7(9.0)	12(11.8)		11(12.8)	8(10.3)	7(8.9)		14(8.4)	9(21.4)	3(8.8)	
Sex												
Female	16(25.4)	22(28.2)	39(38.2)	0.165	27(31.4)	21(26.9)	29(36.7)	0.419	58(34.7)	10(23.8)	9(26.5)	0.309
Male		56(71.9)	63(61.8)		59(68.6)	57(73.1)	50(63.3)		109(65.3)	32(76.2)	25(73.5)	
Marital status												
Single	30(47.6)	1(1.3)	2(2.0)	0.440	46(53.5)	41(52.6)	53(67.1)	0.061	96(57.5)	25(59.5)	19(55.9)	0.989
Married	31(49.2)	29(37.2)	38(37.2)		36(41.9)	37(47.4)	25(31.6)		68(40.7)	16(38.1)	14(41.2)	
Divorced/widowed	2(3.2)	48(61.5)	62(60.8)		4(4.6)	0(0.0)	1(1.3)		3(1.8)	1(2.4)	1(2.9)	
Education												
SHS	32(50.8)	42(53.8)	59(57.8)	0.928	42(48.8)	45(57.7)	46(58.2)	0.265	95(56.9)	21(50.0)	17(50.0)	0.453
Diploma/certificate	12(19.0)	16(20.5)	17(16.7)		14(16.3)	15(19.2)	16(20.5)		31(18.6)	8(19.1)	6(17.7)	
Degree	16(25.4)	15(19.2)	22(21.6)		27(31.4)	14(17.9)	12(15.2)		31(18.6)	13(30.9)	9(26.5)	
Postgraduate	3(4.8)	5(6.4)	4(3.9)		3(3.5)	4(5.1)	5(6.3)					
Work experience												
<5 years	42(66.7)	47(60.3)	59(57.8)	0.196	56(65.1)	42(53.9)	50(63.3)	0.073	103(61.7)	24(57.1)	21(61.8)	0.770
5-10 years	9(14.3)	17(21.8)	13(12.7)		8(9.3)	20(25.6)	11(13.9)		29(17.4)	6(14.3)	4(11.8)	
10+ years	12(19.0)	14(17.9)	30(29.4)		22(25.6)	16(20.5)	18(22.8)		35(20.9)	12(28.6)	9(26.5)	
Rank												
Senior	21(33.3)	20(25.6)	25(24.5)	0.435	33(38.4)	14(17.9)	19(24.0)	0.010*	42(25.1)	14(33.3)	10(29.4)	0.539
Junior	42(66.7)	58(74.4)	77(75.5)		53(61.6)	64(82.1)	60(76.0)		125(74.9)	28(66.7)	24(70.6)	
Schedule Head				0.308				0.085				0.466
No	47(74.6)	63(80.8)	86(84.3)		65(75.6)	61(78.2)	70(88.6)		137(82.0)	31(73.8)	28(82.3)	
Yes	16(25.4)	15(19.2)	16(15.7)		21(24.4)	17(21.8)	9(11.4)		30(18.0)	11(26.2)	6(17.7)	
Shift Allocation												
Early	21(33.3)	16(20.5)	23(22.5)	0.010*	22(25.6)	20(25.6)	18(22.8)	0.220	42(25.2)	12(28.6)	6(17.6)	0.380
Late	4(6.4)	6(7.7)	6(5.9)		5(5.8)	4(5.1)	7(8.9)		13(7.8)	1(2.4)	2(5.9)	
Main	36(57.1)	53(68.0)	55(53.9)		54(62.8)	49(62.8)	41(51.9)		100(59.9)	22(52.4)	22(64.7)	
Night	2(3.2)	3(3.8)	18(17.7)		5(5.8)	5(6.4)	13(16.5)		12(7.2)	7(16.7)	4(11.8)	

Have children												
No	27(42.9)	41(52.6)	58(56.9)	0.214	43(40.0)	35(44.9)	48(60.8)	0.125	89(53.3)	19(45.2)	18(52.9)	0.640
Yes	36(57.1)	47(47.4)	44(43.1)		43(50.0)	43(55.1)	31(39.2)		78(46.7)	23(54.7)	16(47.1)	
Chronic condition												
No	59(93.6)	71(91.0)	91(89.2)	0.628	77(89.5)	73(93.6)	71(89.9)	0.612	155(92.8)	37(88.1)	29(85.3)	0.295
Yes	4(6.4)	7(9.0)	11(10.8)		9(10.5)	5(6.4)	8(10.1)		12(7.2)	5(11.9)	5(14.7)	

*Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

302 **Factors associated with burnout among prison officers**

303 A Pearson chi square test showed sex was significantly associated with burn out (p=0.016). The
 304 percentage of burnout was significantly higher among female officers (54.5%) compared to their male
 305 counterparts (45.5%). A logistic regression model was used to predict socio-demographic factors
 306 associated with burnout (Table 7). The model predicted sex and education to be significant factors
 307 associated with burnout among the prison officers. Male prison officers had 69% reduction in the
 308 odds of burnout compared to their female counterparts (AOR: 0.31; 95% CI= 0.13-0.75, p=0.009).
 309 Also, prison officers with diploma/certificate had 89% reduction in the odds of burnout compared to
 310 those with postgraduate degrees (AOR: 0.11; 95% CI= 0.02-0.69, p=0.019).

311

312 Table 7 Factors associated with burnout among prison officers

Variable	Burn out		p-value	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	No	Yes		OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Age							
20-30	104(47.1)	11(50.0)		1			
31-40	93(42.1)	9(40.9)	0.950	0.91(0.36-2.30)	0.851		
40+	24(10.9)	2(9.1)		0.79(0.16-3.79)	0.766		
Sex							
Female	65(29.4)	12(54.5)	0.016*	1		1	
Male	156(70.6)	10(45.5)		0.35(0.14-0.84)	0.020*	0.31(0.13-0.75)	0.009*
Marital status							
Single	116(57.0)	14(63.6)		1			
Married	90(40.7)	8(36.4)	0.689	0.82(0.33-1.99)	0.660		
Divorced/widowed	5(2.3)	0(0.0)		0.79(0.04-15.09)	0.877		
Education							
SHS	121(54.7)	12(54.6)		0.30(0.07-1.24)	0.098	0.25(0.06-1.02)	0.054
Diploma/certificate	43(19.5)	2(9.1)	0.181	0.14(0.02-0.95)	0.045*	0.11(0.02-0.69)	0.019*
Degree	48(21.7)	5(22.7)		0.32(0.06-1.55)	0.154	0.29(0.06-1.37)	0.117
Postgraduate	9(4.1)	3(13.6)		1		1	
Work experience							
<5 years	134(60.6)	14(63.6)	0.623	1			
5-10 years	37(16.7)	2(9.1)		0.52(0.11-2.38)	0.397		
10+ years	50(22.6)	6(27.3)		1.14(0.42-3.15)	0.788		
Rank							
Senior	58(26.2)	8(36.4)	0.309				
Junior	163(73.8)	14(63.6)		1.60(0.64-4.02)	0.312		
			0.477				
Schedule Head							
No	177(80.1)	19(86.4)		1			
Yes	44(19.9)	3(13.6)		0.63(0.18-2.24)	0.481		
Shift Allocation							
Early	56(25.3)	4(18.2)		1			
Late	14(6.3)	2(9.1)	0.662	2.00(0.33-12.04)	0.449		
Main	129(58.4)	15(68.2)		1.63(0.52-5.12)	0.405		
Night	22(9.9)	19(4.5)		0.64(0.07-6.01)	0.693		
Have children							
No	112(50.7)	14(63.6)	0.246	1			
Yes	109(49.3)	8(36.4)		0.59(0.24-1.45)	0.250		
Chronic condition							
No	201(91.0)	20(90.9)	0.995	1			
Yes	20(9.0)	2(9.1)		1.01(0.22-4.62)	0.995		

313 Statistically significant at p<0.05

314

315 **Coping strategies for dealing with stress among prison officers**

316 Participants in this study outlined various coping mechanisms for dealing with stress (Figure 4). The
317 main coping strategy was talking to colleagues (62.5%). Others reported looking forward to off duty
318 (60.1%), talking to family (54.3%) and keeping thoughts and feelings to oneself (42.1%). Finally,
319 alcohol use (29.2%) was the least coping strategy reported by respondents.

320

321

322

323 Figure 4 Coping Strategies for Dealing with Burnout Among Prison Officers

324

325 **Discussion**

326 **Prevalence of Burnout Among Prison Officers**

327 The overall prevalence of burnout syndrome among prison officers involved in this study was found
328 to be 9%. This is lower than the over 30% prevalence rate reported by some studies [31,32]. It is
329 consistent with findings indicative of low to moderate levels of burnout among POs [12], confirming
330 that all POs will experience burnout in varying proportions [14]. Though conducted among different
331 worker groups, this study findings are similar to one by Odonkor and Frimpong in 2020 [33], among
332 Ghanaian health workers where burnout level was reported to be low. Also, Dodam et al., [27] in the
333 year 2022 found that in comparison to Ghanaian clinicians, non-clinicians experienced burnout
334 syndrome at a lower rate of 15.64%. This generally low burnout prevalence could be partly
335 due to cultural contexts like in Ghana where indirect communication is favored, and emotions are
336 internalized as opposed to people in Western settings where explicit communication is the norm.
337 Respondents may thus limit the expression of emotions and psychological states.

338 Furthermore, although more than half (56.4%) of the participants disagreed that a positive and
339 supportive culture and emotional climate existed at the workplace, a good number of them (59.3%)
340 felt a part of the team and could draw from the social support indirectly to reduce stress leading to
341 burnout hence the low level [34]. Most officers in this study reported low levels of personal
342 accomplishment and depersonalization, but high scores of emotional exhaustions). There is a
343 difference in prison systems between African and Western countries [9] and this disparities in the
344 findings can be attributed to the difference in geographical locations and characteristics of individuals
345 in different locations [11,35]. In addition, prison officers involved in the current study reported some
346 level of satisfaction and pride in their work, hence the low levels of depersonalization identified.

347 Regardless of the evidence to show that in resource-constrained settings such as Ghana and Ghanaian
348 prison setting, POs are likely to show more signs of burnout resulting in lack of motivation and
349 dedication lowering organizational commitment, unproductive attitudes and counterproductive
350 behaviours like encouraging inmates to commit crimes while they are in prison custody which will
351 negatively impact the reformative and rehabilitative process, [10,36], this study found that in addition
352 the low burnout observed among POs, the pride and satisfaction that majority of them reported would
353 result in stronger institutional commitment given the right environment. This implies the need for
354 strengthening self-care issues among professional groups prone to burnout through improvement in
355 the health and the psychosocial environment to prevent negative work outcomes such as illnesses,
356 absenteeism, and mental illnesses in future.

357 **Perceived Causes of Burnout among Prison Officers and Work Characteristics**

358 Among respondents of this study, the majority perceived irregular shifts as the cause of chronic
359 stress/burnout. This was followed by a heavy workload and lack of training and opportunities for
360 development. The least perceptible source of stress was poor social status. These findings were
361 consistent with findings of a review of about 140 published documents that reported that stressors of
362 prison officers include their work demands, low levels of professional skills, and lack of
363 organizational structures in prisons [37]. A study by Misis et al., [38] also indicated that a key source
364 of stress among prison officers included characteristics of inmates, which is related to prison officers'
365 workload. Just as the majority of studies attribute correctional officer burnout to the prison
366 environment as against personal characteristics [39,40], findings from this study showed that
367 institutional sources of stress regarding work schedules and the organizational climate were perceived
368 more than those linked to psycho-social factors and logistical support.

369 In assessing the prison work environment, most prison officers (56.4%) reported negatively to a
370 positive and supportive culture and emotional climate. This was evidenced in the number of officers
371 who indicated that their efforts were not recognized and failed to receive constructive feedback from
372 their superiors. In addition, officers did not trust their superiors to be there for them and did not feel
373 safe sharing their plans with their superiors/officer in charge. Consequently, the responses from prison
374 officers who partook in this study indicated that the penalties meted out far exceeded the rewards
375 given for successful work done. Boateng and Hsieh [41], in their study on burnout among POs in
376 some Ghanaian prisons found that lack of supervisors' support contributes to high-stress levels among
377 officers. The findings of their study are inconsistent with the findings of this study as participants
378 were noted to have responded positively about their supervisors. In another study conducted to
379 evaluate the impact of the work environment on prison staff, the role of supervisors was emphasized
380 as being a cardinal factor to increase or decrease stress among correctional officers [34]. These can be
381 attributed to the fact that supervisors encourage the officers not to give up in line of duty.

382 It is recognized that the inherent stressful nature of prisons coupled with resource constraint make it
383 difficult for GPS administration to manage burnout preventive measures. However, the differences in
384 how POs perceive conditions within the prison, as a result of difference in shifts assigned, duty points
385 and objective assessment of conditions experienced [42,43] call for improvement in working
386 conditions, modification of workloads among others [44].

387 In addition to supervisory influence, peer influence also affects stress and burnout experienced by
388 correctional officers. Prison officers in this research agreed to the feeling of being part of a team.
389 Consequently, majority reported taking pride in their work and their workplace, felt accepted and
390 valued by their colleagues, and felt in control of their work. In a study to explore the relationship
391 between social support and job burnout among correctional staff, family and friends' support was
392 found to significantly reduce burnout among correctional staff [34]. These findings can be attributed
393 to the fact that social support provides a sense of belonging and a feeling of being cared for by one's
394 social circle. This is also confirmed by the commonest coping style adopted by officers in this study.
395 These findings suggest the importance of designing and implementing programs focused on
396 identification of specific aspects of work schedules, work environment and strategies to address them.

397 **Influence of Socio-demographic factors on Burnout**

398 Depersonalization among prison officers was found to be significantly associated with officers' rank.
399 According to the findings, junior officers were more likely to experience depersonalization compared
400 to senior officers. This finding can be attributed to the fact that junior officers are just getting started
401 on the job and may experience some form of repulsion from the inmates. On the MBI-HSS,
402 depersonalization describes being emotionally detached from clients as a means of dealing with
403 emotional stressors [45], which is a strategy junior officers are likely to employ at the workplace.
404 Furthermore, supervisory roles are usually held by senior officers and corroborate findings that show
405 that supervisors perceive less job-related stress and more job satisfaction than their colleagues who

406 were not in authority [34]. Also, consistent with the findings of this study, Morgan et al., [46] reported
407 that depersonalization among prison officers decreases with increasing age.

408 **Burnout Coping Mechanism**

409 Evidence suggests that although organizational and individual-based tools are available for
410 correctional officers to manage stress, Maricuțoiu et al., [47] revealed that 96% of the interventions
411 adopted were individualized for each worker, using cognitive-behavioral interventions, interpersonal
412 skills interventions, relaxation interventions, and other strategies. The commonest coping strategy
413 prison officers utilized in dealing with stress in this study was found to be talking to colleagues.
414 Possible reasons for this are that POs' shift system characterized by long hours allow them to engage
415 with colleagues and prisoners frequently, and the fact that the majority of respondents in this study did
416 not find social interactions in the yard stressful corroborates this. Evidence shows that burnout is more
417 likely to occur when interpersonal relationships are poor [48] and the contrary low burnout rate found
418 in this study could be attributed to the good interpersonal relations between officers and officers and
419 inmates.

420 Other notable coping strategies included looking talking to relatives, looking forward to days off and
421 taking advantage of employee assistance programs. Most researchers report that prison officers cope
422 well with stress through support from relatives, friends, and colleagues. This line of discussion is
423 confirmed by the results of this study which is reflected in the top three coping strategies adopted by
424 participants. It can be explained by the fact that although the mechanism of coping adopted by the PO
425 is influenced by purely personal factors, it may also be favored by the work context [49]. In addition,
426 some forms of social support have been found to be advantageous to certain constructs of burnout
427 syndrome [34]. All these individualized approaches; cognitive-behavioral interventions and
428 interpersonal skills interventions.

429 The organizational strategies employed by respondents include engaging in sporting activities, off-
430 duties and employee assistance programs. Alcohol use was identified as the least coping strategy
431 utilized by prison officers

432 **Socio-demographic Factors and Burnout**

433 In determining factors associated with burnout among prison officers, sex was found to have a
434 significant association in this study. Female officers were more likely to experience burnout compared
435 to their male counterparts. In this regard, this study showed similar trend with a study among
436 correctional officers in Spain [12] and United States [50]. Results from the current study showed that
437 majority of the respondents were males. It is expected that in a male prison like NSMP where the
438 proportion of male officers is higher than female officers and a significant proportion of the workload
439 and prison duties is shouldered by them [18], they are more likely to experience burnout. However,
440 this inconsistent finding could be attributed to the fact that men in Africa have reportedly been shown
441 to be more prone to mental health issues because of internalizing masculine ideals. They engage in
442 constrictive emotionality through defensive strategies by downplaying their mental health issues and
443 status because of ingrained and institutionalized views [51]. Perhaps this may have reflected in their
444 responses in this study. This phenomenon is also characterized in their health seeking behaviours [52].
445 Furthermore, research mentions how female officers may find the prison environment more stressful
446 given the hazardous and risky nature of prison environment [53]. In their study, Ghaziri et al., [50]
447 found that female correctional nurses reported higher levels of verbal abuse and sexual harassment by
448 prisoners than male nurses in the same prison.

449 Of particular interest is how female officers at NSMP who are assigned duty points that do not put
450 them in direct contact with inmates for long relative to their male counterparts such as escorting
451 inmates and block duties and are restricted to the office-space (administrative duties) and workshops

452 are more burned out [21]. An explanation for this observation is that those assigned duty points at the
453 offices and workshops run the main shift (8am -4pm) which could be associated with higher
454 workload; they have deal with the poor logistical support of administration and are more prone to the
455 perceived influence from administrative supervisors [8] unlike their male colleagues. Also, just like
456 female prisoners who constitute a minority among inmate population whose needs may be neglected,
457 there is the likelihood that these female officers may have unmet needs predisposing them to burnout.

458 **Conclusions**

459 The study underscores the need to pay attention to irregular shift, heavy workload, and regular
460 training and opportunities for development to reduce burnout syndrome among POs. The study further
461 concludes POs experience high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and low levels
462 of personal accomplishment. In addition, emotional exhaustion was common among Officers running
463 night shifts whilst Junior Officers experienced more depersonalization. POs adopted positive coping
464 mechanisms.

465

466 **Competing Interests**

467 The authors declare that no conflict of interest exist.

468 **Authors' Contributions**

469 FD conceived the idea, wrote the proposal, participated data collection and analysis. PT-NT provided
470 technical support on the methodology, data analysis and wrote the draft manuscript. All authors read
471 and approved the final version of the manuscript.

472 **Acknowledgements**

473 We acknowledge the support of Prison Service for allowing us to conduct this study.

474

475

476 **References**

- 477 1. WHO. Raising Awareness of Stress at Work in Developing Countries: A modern hazard in a
478 traditional working environment. Geneva; 2007.
- 479 2. Chetlen AL, Chan TL, Ballard DH, Frigini LA, Hildebrand A, Kim S, et al. Addressing
480 Burnout in Radiologists. *Acad Radiol*. 2019;26: 526–533. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2018.07.001
- 481 3. Maslach C, Jackson SE. The measurement of experienced burnou. *J Occup Behav*. 1981;2:
482 99–113.
- 483 4. Lu Y, Liu Q, Yan H, Gao S, Liu T. Job burnout and its impact on work ability in biosafety
484 laboratory staff during the COVID-19 epidemic in Xinjiang. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2021;21: 1–13.
485 doi:10.1186/s12888-021-03555-x
- 486 5. Veldhuis GA, Sluijs T, van Zwieten MHJ, Bouwman J, Wiezer NM, Wortelboer HM. A proof-
487 of-concept system dynamics simulation model of the development of burnout and recovery
488 using retrospective case data. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17: 1–28.
489 doi:10.3390/ijerph17165964
- 490 6. Woo T, Ho R, Tang A, Tam W. Global prevalence of burnout symptoms among nurses: A
491 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2020;123: 9–20.
492 doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2019.12.015

- 493 7. Low ZX, Yeo KA, Sharma VK, Leung GK, McIntyre RS. Low: Prevalence of burnout in
494 medical and surgical... - Google Scholar. *Environ Res Public Heal*. 2019;16: 1–22. Available:
495 [https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Prevalence of burnout in medical and surgical](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Prevalence of burnout in medical and surgical residents%3A a meta-analysis&author=Z.X. Low&publication_year=2019)
496 [residents%3A a meta-analysis&author=Z.X. Low&publication_year=2019](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Prevalence of burnout in medical and surgical residents%3A a meta-analysis&author=Z.X. Low&publication_year=2019)
- 497 8. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB. Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout
498 and engagement: A multi-sample study. *J Organ Behav*. 2004;25: 293–315.
499 doi:10.1002/job.248
- 500 9. Sarkin J. Prisons in Africa. *Int J Hum Rights*. 2008.
- 501 10. Forouzanfar MH, Alexander L, Bachman VF, Biryukov S, Brauer M, Casey D, et al. Global,
502 regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and
503 occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks in 188 countries, 1990-2013: A
504 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet*. 2015;386: 2287–
505 2323. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00128-2
- 506 11. Martin TM, Jefferson AM. *Prison Ethnography in Africa: Reflections on a Maturing Field*.
507 *Polit africaine*. 2019.
- 508 12. Da Silva Venâncio L, Coutinho BD, Mont’Alverne DGB, Andrade RF. Burnout and quality of
509 life among correctional officers in a women’s correctional facility. *Rev Bras Med do Trab*.
510 2020;18: 312–321. doi:10.47626/1679-4435-2020-561
- 511 13. Useche SA, Montoro L V., Ruiz JI, Vanegas C, Sanmartin J, Alfaro E. Workplace burnout and
512 health issues among Colombian correctional officers. *PLoS One*. 2019.
- 513 14. Clements AJ, Kinman G. Job demands, organizational justice, and emotional exhaustion in
514 prison officers. *Crim Justice Stud*. 2021;34.
- 515 15. Finney C, Stergiopoulos E, Hensel J, Bonato S, Dewa CS. Organizational stressors associated
516 with job stress and burnout in correctional officers: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*.
517 2013;13: 82. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-82
- 518 16. Jun Bo S, Alkadash TM, Beshar B, Almaamari Q, Saif Mohsen Al-Absy M, Alkadash M, et al.
519 Conceptual Framework on Job Burnout of the Employees and Its Correlative Factors in China
520 During Coivd-19. *Int J Manag*. 2020;11: 200–215. doi:10.34218/IJM.11.10.2020.020
- 521 17. Republic of Ghana. Prisons Service (General Administration) Regulations. 2016.
- 522 18. Ghana Prison Service. Human Resource management Report. 2022.
- 523 19. Jackson SE, Maslach C. *After-Effects of Job-Related Stress : Families as Victims* Author. *J*
524 *Organ Behav*. 1982;3: 63–77.
- 525 20. Morgan RD, Pearson CA. Correctional Officer Burnout: Further Analyses. *Crim Justice*
526 *Behav*. 2002;29: 144–160.
- 527 21. Service GP. Human Resource Report. Accra; 2020.
- 528 22. Yamane T. *An Introductory Analysis*. Michigan: Harper & Row; 1967.
- 529 23. Maslach C, Jackson SE, Leiter MP. *Maslach Burnout Inventory*. Berkeley: University of
530 California; 1997.
- 531 24. Schaefer JA, Moos RH. Effects of Work Stressors and Work Climate on Long-Term Care
532 Staff’s Job Morale and Functioning. *Res Nurs Heal*. 1996;19: 63–73. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-
533 240X(199602)19:1<63::AID-NUR7>3.0.CO;2-J
- 534 25. Alexander DA, Wells A. Reactions of police officers to body-handling after a major disaster.
535 A before-and-after comparison. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1991;159: 547–555.

- 536 doi:10.1192/bjp.159.4.547
- 537 26. Ayisi-Boateng NK, Bankah EM, Ofori-Amankwah GK, Egblewogbe DA, Ati E, Opoku DA, et
538 al. A cross-sectional self-assessment of burnout amongst a sample of doctors in Ghana.
539 African J Prim Heal Care Fam Med. 2020;12: 1–6. doi:10.4102/PHCFM.V12I1.2336
- 540 27. Konlan KD, Asampong E, Dako-Gyeke P, Glozah FN. Burnout syndrome among healthcare
541 workers during COVID-19 Pandemic in Accra, Ghana. PLoS One. 2022;17: 1–21.
542 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0268404
- 543 28. Almutairi MN, Azza AA. Burnout and coping methods among emergency medical services
544 professionals. J Multidiscip Healthc. 2020;13: 271–279. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S244303
- 545 29. Abdo SAM, El-Sallamy RM, El-Sherbiny AAM, Kabbash IA. Burnout among physicians and
546 nursing staff working in the emergency hospital of Tanta university, Egypt. East Mediterr Heal
547 J. 2015;21: 906–915.
- 548 30. Dubale BW, Friedman LE, Chemali Z, Denninger JW, Mehta DH, Alem A, et al. Systematic
549 review of burnout among healthcare providers in sub-Saharan Africa. BMC Public Health.
550 2019;19.
- 551 31. Stanislava N Harizanova THT. Professional burnout syndrome among correctional facility
552 officers. Folia Med. 2013;55: 73–9.
- 553 32. Whitehead JT, Lindquist CA. Correctional Officer Job Burnout: A Path Model. J Res Crime
554 Delinq. 2016.
- 555 33. Odonkor ST. Burnout among Healthcare Professionals in Ghana : A Critical Assessment.
556 Biomed Res Int. 2020;2020. doi:10.1155/2020/1614968
- 557 34. Lambert EG, Altheimer I, Hogan NL. Exploring the relationship between social support and
558 job burnout among correctional staff. Crim Justice Behav. 2010;37: 1217–1236.
- 559 35. Alexander J. The political imaginaries and social lives of political prisoners in post-2000
560 Zimbabwe. J South Afr Stud. 2010;36: 483–503.
- 561 36. Hashim D, Boffetta P. Occupational and Environmental Exposures and Cancers in Developing
562 Countries. Ann Glob Heal. 2014;80: 393–411. doi:10.1016/j.aogh.2014.10.002
- 563 37. Idárraga SMF. What has been written about burnout syndrome in prison officers? Revista
564 Espanola de Sanidad Penitenciaria. 2022. pp. 87–93. doi:10.18176/resp.00056
- 565 38. Misis M, Kim B, Cheeseman K, Hogan NL, Lambert EG. The impact of correctional officer
566 perceptions of inmates on job stress. SAGE Open. 2013;3: 1–13.
567 doi:10.1177/2158244013489695
- 568 39. Oliveira R, Schneider V, Bonafé F, Maroco J, Campos J. Occupational characteristics and
569 Burnout Syndrome in Brazilian correctional staff. Work. 2016;55: 215–223.
- 570 40. Rowe JW, Kahn RL. Human Aging: Usual and Successful. Sci New Ser. 1987;237: 143–149.
- 571 41. Boateng FD, Hsieh M. Explaining Job Satisfaction and Commitment Among Prison Officers :
572 The Role of Organizational Justice. Prison J. 2019;9: 172–193.
573 doi:10.1177/0032885519825491
- 574 42. Bierie DM. The impact of prison conditions on staff well-being. Int J Offender Ther Comp
575 Criminol. 2012;56: 81–95. doi:10.1177/0306624X10388383
- 576 43. Galanek JD. Correctional Officers and the Incarcerated Mentally Ill: Responses to Psychiatric
577 Illness in Prison. Med Anthropol Q. 2015;2.
- 578 44. Lindwall M, Ljung T, Hadžibajramović, E. Jonsdottir IH. Self-reported physical activity and

- 579 aerobic fitness are differently related to mental health. *Ment Health Phys Act.* 2012;5.
- 580 45. Thomson P, Jaque S V. Depersonalization, adversity, emotionality, and coping with stressful
581 situations. *J Trauma Dissociation.* 2018;19: 143–161.
- 582 46. Morgan RD, Van Haveren RA, Pearson CA. Correctional officer burnout: Further analyses.
583 *Crim Justice Behav.* 2002;29: 144–160.
- 584 47. Maricuțoiu LP, Sava FA, Butta O. The effectiveness of controlled interventions on employees’
585 burnout: A meta-analysis. *J Occup Organ Psychol.* 2016;89: 1–27. doi:10.1111/joop.12099
- 586 48. Gao J, Du X, Gao Q. Analysis of burnout and its influencing factors among prison police.
587 *Front Public Heal.* 2022;10. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.891745
- 588 49. Maresca G, Corallo F, Catanese G, Formica C, Lo Buono V. Coping Strategies of Healthcare
589 Professionals with Burnout Syndrome: A Systematic Review. *Med.* 2022;58.
590 doi:10.3390/medicina58020327
- 591 50. Ghaziri M El, Dugan AG, Zhang Y, Gore R, Castro ME. Sex and gender role differences in
592 occupational exposures and work outcomes among registered nurses in correctional settings.
593 *Ann Work Expo Heal.* 2019;63: 568–582. doi:10.1093/annweh/wxz018
- 594 51. Ezeugwu CR, Ojedokun O. Masculine norms and mental health of African men: what can
595 psychology do? *Heliyon.* 2020;6: e05650. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05650
- 596 52. Teh JKL, Tey NP, Ng ST. Ethnic and gender differentials in non-communicable diseases and
597 self-rated health in Malaysia. *PLoS One.* 2014;9: 1–8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091328
- 598 53. Soh M, Zarola A, Palaiou K, Furnham A. Work-related well-being. *Heal Psychol Open.*
599 2016;3. doi:10.1177/2055102916628380
- 600




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4