



# Job Burnout among Prison Staff in the United States and Croatia: A Preliminary Comparative Study<sup>1</sup>

Sudipto Roy<sup>2</sup>

Indiana State University, USA

Tihana Novak<sup>3</sup>

Ljiljana Miksaj-Todorovic<sup>4</sup>

University of Zagreb, Croatia

## Abstract

*Managing prisons is one of the tough tasks for the criminal justice professionals. Especially, prison management takes the toll of time and energy of many of the prison staff. There may be a tough routine, difficult prisoners, unsupportive higher-ups, critical governments etc, which may cause physical and mental exhaustion of the prison staff. This exhaustion leads to burn out which is though common to any other type of employees working in other organizations, but in a different magnitude and dimension. The issue of job burnout among prison staff is intensely studied by various researchers in several countries around the world. There were many correlative studies on job burnout. However, there are no comparative studies on this issue. There is a need to fill the gap in the literature on the comparative aspect of job burnout among prison staff and this paper tries to compare job burnout between American and Croatian prison staff. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was used to collect data from 480 respondents in the U.S., and 442 respondents in Croatia. Results indicate severe job burnout among prison staff in both the countries.*

Key Words: Job burnout; Prison staff; United States; Croatia; Maslach Burnout Inventory.

## Introduction

Penological literature has traditionally focused on ideological, theoretical, and practical aspects of enforcing criminal sanctions, and for the most part, the concentration has been on the criminal offender. However, over the past three decades, researchers across the

<sup>1</sup> A part of this article forms a part of the project entitled "Emotional well – being and job burnout among prison staff in Republic of Croatia", financed by the Ministry of Science, Republic of Croatia.

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Indiana State University, Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, 240 Holmstedt Hall, Terre Haute, IN 47809. Email: sroy@indstate.edu

<sup>3</sup> Professor, Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveucilista u Zagrebu, Znanstveno ucilisni kampus Boronga, Borongajska cesta 83f, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia. Email: tnovak@email.htnet.hr

<sup>4</sup> Professor, Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveucilista u Zagrebu, Znanstveno ucilisni kampus Boronga, Borongajska cesta 83f, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia. Email: miksj@gmail.com

world have been increasingly focusing on the varied correctional staff having duty to enforce those sanctions, with emphasis on prison staff. Lambert, Hogan, and Barton (2002) refer to prison staff as professionals who utilize their skills in prison environment. The definition of prison staff provided by the various authors is broad. In general, the term prison staff involves several categories, depending on the organizational structure in various countries viz. administrative staff in prison system or in specific penal institutions, custodial staff, treatment staff, health-care staff, staff involved in vocational, educational training, and occupational activities.

Some researchers have focused solely on custodial staff (Castle, 2008; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Morgan, Van Haveren, & Pearson, 2002), while others studied prison staff in general (Garland & McCarty, 2009; Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Hogan, 2009; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006; Lambert & Paoline, 2005; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). In addition, some authors focused on prison staff that provides other types of care for the health and well-being of inmates and involves education, work, health-care, leisure time activities etc (Lambert, Hogan, Jiang, Elechi, Benjamin, Morris, Laux, & Dupuy, 2009). Regardless of their focus on different types of prison staff, all the previous researchers reported that prison environment affects emotional well-being of the prison staff, which in turn brings about increased stress among them, affects their job satisfaction, and ultimately culminates in to job burnout among many prison staff.

Büssing and Glaser (2000) maintained that idealistic, highly motivated, and sincere prison employees most frequently reported burnout due to frustrations caused by the discrepancy between expectations and achievements. The manifestation of burnout was more likely to happen when a prison employee experienced loss of purpose and meaning of work. Pucak (2006) reported that causes for burnout of younger people having employment in assisting vocations were increased because of sensitivity and conflict of roles, while older employees burnout because of dissatisfaction with their share in decision making processes, vagueness and confusion of working roles.

One type of insecurity among prison staff is the possibility of job loss and uncertain opportunities for promotion. However, those two risks vary from one country to another (Kommer, 1990; Savicki, Cooley, and Gjesvold, 2003). For example, custodial staff in Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden is protected from the possibility of being laid off or losing their jobs unless they get involved in some type of illegal activities. In exchange for this security, the employees work in poor conditions, especially in state-run institutions. However, in private institutions, the working conditions for the prison staff are better, but their job security is uncertain. Almost one-half of the custodial staff in those countries considers their career advancement impossible (Philliber, 1987; Šarić, 2007). According to the authors, low income, inadequate opportunities for promotion, and insecurity of job are perceived by the custodial staff as significant factors causing professional stress among them leading to their job burnout. Several researchers (e.g. Mejovšek, 2002; Šarić, 2007; Verhagen 1986) reported that absence from work as significant indicators of stress among the prison staff leading to burnout in European countries. These researchers also mentioned that one-third of custodial staff quit their jobs during the first 18 months of their appointments. Psychosomatic reactions to stress were significantly frequent among prison staff in European countries (Härenstam & Palm, 1988) and stress causing negative attitudes like cynicism, skepticism and pessimism were mostly reported by the treatment staff (in prisons) who were somewhere in the middle of their professional career (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Philliber, 1987; Šarić, 2007).

### ***Job burnout***

In 1974, Freudenberger defined employee burnout as a situation when an employee was exhausted psychologically as well as physically due to work place situations. Freudenberger's definition referred to a state of exhaustion, which resulted from failure, fatigue, loss of energy, or unmet demands on an employee's inner resources (Arabaci, 2010). In other words, burnout is a depletion of an employee's physical and mental resources leading to personal and professional difficulties. Maslach and Jackson (1981) defined burnout as "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who work with people" (p. 99). Maslach and Jackson (1981) maintained that factors in the work place were the primal causes for burnout among employees. In simple words, burnout is the emotional as well as physical exhaustion experienced by an employee due to stressful work situations. Burnout is generally deemed as the result of prolonged exposure to stressful work situations (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Alarcon, Eschleman, & Bowling, 2009; Garland & McCarty, 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In Croatian studies, commonly used terms are "burnout", "job-consumed" and "burn through" (Mejovšek, 2002; Ajduković, 1996; Ljubotina and Družić, 1996).

Although the explanations of burnout vary among previous researchers, Maslach (1982) has maintained that three core aspects of burnout are commonly referred in these explanations

- Depersonalization
- Reduced personal accomplishments
- Emotional exhaustion

According to Maslach (1982), depersonalization first takes place as employees become frustrated with their jobs and less concerned about their clients, and culminates in increasingly negative work-related attitudes. The second stage of burnout is a reduction in personal accomplishment, which equates to a job related sense of inadequacy and feelings of failure (Maslach, 1982). Emotional exhaustion is the final stage of burnout and occurs when employees feel overextended by their work (Maslach, 1982), resulting in decreased job productivity (Pearlman & Hartman, 1982). These three factors from the Maslach Burnout Inventory- depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishments, and emotional exhaustion – are the primary focus in this comparative study.

### ***The present study***

The purpose of this study is to compare the prison staff of the two countries in terms of job burnout. In the following sections, we present the preliminary findings on job burnout among prison staff (which included administrative staff, custodial staff, treatment staff, health-care staff, and the staff involved in vocational, educational training, and occupational activities) in Croatia, and compare the findings with their counterparts in three state prisons in Indiana, USA.

### **Review of related literature**

Over the last thirty years, a number of researchers focused on the issue of job burnout among prison staff in various ways. For instance, some researchers focused on the relationship between personality variables and burnout (Alarcon, Eschleman, & Bowling,

2009), gender difference in stress and burnout (Carlson, Anson, & Thomas, 2003) and the relationship between job related well-being and burnout (Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000). Other researchers worked on burnout among prison caseworkers and correctional officers (Carlson & Thomas, 2006), impact of correctional officer job stress and burnout (Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, & Hogan, 2007), impact of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on burnout (Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Clarke, 2005), impact of depersonalization and cynicism on burnout (Salanova, Llorens, Renedo, Burrell, Bresó, & Schaufeli, 2005), etc.

It is evident from previous research that many prison employees suffer from burnout (e.g. Garland, 2004; Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Holmes & Norton, 2003; Hurst & Hurst, 1997; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lambert, Hogan, Jiang, Elechi, Benjamin, Morris, Laux, & DePuy, 2010; Lambert, Paoline, Hogan, & Baker, 2007; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Morgan, van Haveren, & Pearson, 2002). Some studies conducted in the United States and other countries; provide approximate percentages of burnout among prison staff. For example, previous research in three states in the U.S. reported that 64% of custodial staff in Kentucky institutions, 33% of prison staff (in general) in Alabama, and 17% of educational instructors in Illinois prisons (Garland, 2004) suffered from burnout. In addition, Garland and McCarty's (2009) study in Missouri revealed that 22% of prison health care staff reported job burnout. Furthermore, Keinan and Malach-Pines's (2007) study on burnout among prison personnel in Israel reported burnout of 38% of correctional officers.

Research focusing on possible origins and consequences of stress leading to burnout among prison staff has revealed several issues. Most frequently reported predictors of burnout among prison staff are, personality variables (Alarcon, Eschleman, & Bowling, 2009), stress (Carlson, Anson, & Thomas, 2003; Carlson and Thomas, 2006; Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, and Hogan, 2007; Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Clarke, 2005), role ambiguity (Dignam, Barrera, & West, 1986; Morgan et al., 2002; Salanova, Llorens, Renedo, Burrell, Bresó, & Schaufeli, 2005;), role conflict (Castle, 2008; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986), work load (Dignam et al., 1986; Lambert et al., 2010; Long & Vogues, 1987; Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996) etc. Other variables include, understaffing (Lambert, Hogan, and Barton, 2002; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Rutter & Fielding, 1988), lack of environmental control (Rutter and Fielding, 1988), lack of participation in decision-making (Lasky, Gordon, & Srebalus, 1986; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986), inmate contact (Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Saylor & Wright, 1992), and confrontations with inmates and job danger (Garland & McCarty, 2009; Triplett et al., 1996). In addition, several previous researchers have reported that physical conditions of prisons were significant in predicting burnout (Lambert et al., 2009; Launay & Fielding, 1989; Gerstein, Topp, & Correll, 1987; Harenstam & Palm, 1988; O'Donnell & Stephens, 2001). Job burnout has negative consequences on individual accomplishments at work and results into frequent absence from work, changes of vocational orientation, low efficiency, reduced satisfaction with and reduced dedication to work (Angerer, 2003).

Despite, the varied focus of previous studies on job burnout among prison staff, there has been a dearth of studies comparing two or more countries. The fact is that the comparative study on job burnout among prison staff in the United States and Croatia had not been conducted prior to this study. To date, in the Republic of Croatia no research on prison staff burnout had been conducted prior to the present study. Only a few studies on prison staff had been conducted focusing on personal and demographic characteristics

and social values (Budjanovac and Jandric, 2007; Novak and Culig, 2007; Novak, Culig, Miksaj Todorovic, and Budjanovac, 2007; Novak, Miksaj-Todorovic, and Josipovic, 2007; Uzelac, et al., 1990; Mejovsek et al., 1990), the motivation for their choice of jobs in prisons (Budjanovac, 1991), and the extent in which female custodial staff (police) employed within prison system face problems in daily work (Saric, 2007). The present study will fill the gap in the literature of comparative analysis of prison staff burn out studies.

## **METHODS**

### ***Data and Subjects***

For this study, in the United States, the data were gathered from prison staff in general (i.e. administrative staff, custodial staff, treatment staff, health care staff, and the staff involved in vocational, educational training, and occupational activities) working at three state prisons (Plainfield, Putnamville, and Wabash Valley) in the state of Indiana. The data on the prison staff in Indiana was considered as a sample of the prison staff across the United States. In addition, data was collected in nine prisons in Croatia (Zagreb, Turopolje, Lipovica, Lepoglava, Sisak, Osijek, Pula, Gospic, and Zadar) between January 2008 and January 2010. Participation in this study was voluntary for all the respondents/subjects in both countries. Confidentiality of all the respondents was maintained during all stages of this study by using a study identification number for each individual. Since the primary purpose of this study was to compare job burnout between the two samples, Maslach Burnout Inventory was used to collect data from all the respondents. In addition, demographic data were collected in terms of age and gender.

The Croatian sample included 442 respondents. The age range was from 18 to 65 years, with a mean age of 41.7 years. Among the respondents in Croatia, 289 individuals (65.4%) were men, and the remaining 153 individuals (34.6%) were women. As for the U.S. sample, 480 individuals completed the Inventory. The ages of these 480 respondents ranged from 18 to 68 years, with a mean age of 44.2 years. In the U.S. sample, 322 individuals (67.1%) were men, and 157 individuals (32.7%) were women.

### ***The Instrument***

Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) is the most frequently used scale for measuring job-burnout of people employed in providing assistance, support, therapy, etc. Job burnout is a three-dimensional factor. (1) emotional exhaustion (feeling of emotional worn-out working with others) – 9 items (numbers 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, 20), (2) depersonalization (negative feelings, cynical attitudes towards prisoners) – 5 items (numbers 5, 10, 11, 15, 22), and (3) reduced personal accomplishments (negative evaluation of one's own work) – 7 items (numbers 4, 7, 9, 12, 17, 18, 21).

The Inventory consisted of twenty-two items in form of statements related to one's own feelings and behavior at work. The subjects were asked about the frequency of experiences of feelings of exhaustion, frustration, emotionless towards others at work. The response choices were, never (0), few times in year (1), once a month or less (2), few times in a month (3), once a week (4), and few times a week (5).

### ***The goals and the hypothesis for the study***

There were two goals in the present study. As the Maslach Burnout Inventory presumes a three factorial structure, the first goal was to check such structure in the U.S.

and Croatian samples. If, in both samples the three-factorial structure was confirmed, the second goal was to examine whether there were differences between the two samples on those factors. Hence, the null hypothesis used in this study was that there would be no significant difference between the two samples in terms of job burnout.

### Results

First, to verify the factor structure of the instrument, factor analysis was computed on both samples. Second, for the purpose of comparison (to test the hypothesis), a discriminant analysis was computed to determine whether there was any statistically significant difference between the two samples in terms of job burnout.

#### **Factor Structure and Validation/Reliability Testing of Maslach Burnout Inventory**

As the first step of data analyses, the factor structures of Maslach Burnout Inventory for both samples were verified. In addition, validation/reliability testing was computed for both samples (correlation matrix, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and reliability measure - Cronbach  $\alpha$ ).

Table 1: Factor Structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory of the Croatian sample (N = 442, with given number of factors)

			Factors		
	No	Variables	1	2	3
1. Emotional exhaustion	2	I feel used up at the end of the day.	.838		
	1	I feel emotionally drained from work.	.828		
	8	I feel burned out from my work.	.822		
	3	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.	.771		
	13	I feel frustrated by my job.	.760		
	20	I feel like I am at the end of my rope.	.689		
	14	I feel I'm working too hard on my job.	.655		
	6	Working with inmates all day is really a strain for me.	.568		
	11	I've become more callous toward people.	.532		
	16	Working with inmates directly puts too much strain on me.	.529		
2. Personal accomplishment	19	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.		.737	
	9	I feel I' positively influencing inmates' lives through my work.		.710	
	17	I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with inmates.		.705	
	7	I deal very effectively with the problems of inmates.		.655	
	21	In my work, I deal with emotional		.571	

		problems very calmly.			
	18	I feel exhilarated after working closely with inmates.		.507	
	12	I feel very energetic.		.466	
	4	I can easily understand how inmates feel about things.		.319	
3. Depersonalization	15	I don't really care what happens to some inmates.			.748
	5	I feel I treat some inmates as if they were impersonal objects.			.688
	10	I've become more callous toward people.			.668
	22	I feel that inmates blame me for some of their problems.			.319

The factor structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory of the Croatian sample is presented in Table 1. This factor analysis of the Maslach Burnout Inventory revealed consistency statistically. This analysis also revealed three given factors and reproduced the model of the original factor structure according to Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996). The results confirmed adequacy in using original three factors in further data analyses.

*Table 2: Reliability Measure on the Maslach Burnout Inventory Factors on the Croatian Sample*

Factors	Number of variables	% Variance	Cronbach $\alpha$
1. Emotional exhaustion	10	30.60	.87
2. Personal accomplishment	8	13.46	.73
3. Depersonalization	4	6.74	.69

As for reliability testing, the correlation matrix supported computing factor analysis for the Croatian sample. The findings are presented in Table 2. The KMO test score of .894 indicated that sufficient items were predicted by each factor. In addition, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ( $\chi^2=3848.20$ ,  $df=231$   $p<.001$ ). This test demonstrated that the variables were correlated highly enough to provide a reasonable basis for factor analysis.

The factor structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory of the US sample is presented in Table 3. Like the factor analysis of the Maslach Burnout Inventory of the Croatian sample, this analysis of the US sample revealed consistency statistically. It also revealed three given factors and reproduced the model of the original factor structure according to Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996). The findings from this analysis confirmed adequacy in using the original three factors in further data analyses.

Table 3: Factor Structure of Maslach Burnout Inventory of the US Sample (N = 480, with given number of factors)

			Factors		
	No.	Variables	1	2	3
1. Emotional exhaustion	1	I feel emotionally drained from work.	.871		
	2	I feel used up at the end of the day.	.841		
	3	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.	.823		
	8	I feel burned out from my work.	.633		
	13	I feel frustrated by my job.	.698	.311	
	14	I feel I'm working too hard on my job.	.666		
	20	I feel like I am at the end of my rope.	.529		
2. Depersonalization	5	I feel I treat some inmates as if they were impersonal objects.		.726	
	6	Working with inmates all day is really a strain for me.	.351	.501	
	10	I've become more callous toward people.	.308	.658	
	11	I've become more callous toward people.	.432	.637	
	15	I don't really care what happens to some inmates.		.687	
	16	Working with inmates directly puts too much strain on me.	.384	.582	
	22	I feel that inmates blame me for some of their problems.		.407	
3. Personal accomplishment	4	I can easily understand how inmates feel about things.			.428
	7	I deal very effectively with the problems of inmates.			.438
	9	I feel I'm positively influencing inmates' lives through my work.			.670
	12	I feel very energetic.			.571
	17	I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with inmates.			.668

	18	I feel exhilarated after working closely with inmates.			.569
	19	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.			.655
	21	In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.			.574

Table 4: Reliability Measure on the Maslach Burnout Inventory Factors on the US Sample

Factors	Number of variables	% Variance	Cronbach $\alpha$
1. Emotional exhaustion	7	28.05	.88
2. Lack of Personal accomplishment	8	12.60	.78
3. Depersonalization	7	48.14	.70

Regarding reliability testing, the correlation matrix supported computing factor analysis for the US sample. The findings are presented in Table 4. The KMO test score of .865 indicated that sufficient items were predicted by each factor. In addition, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ( $\chi^2=3597.72$ ,  $df=210$   $p<.001$ ). This test demonstrated that the variables were correlated highly enough to provide a reasonable basis for factor analysis.

#### ***Difference in Job Burnout between the American and Croatian Prison Staff***

To test the hypothesis of this study, a discriminant analysis was computed. The purpose of this analysis was to find out whether the three factors (depersonalization, personal accomplishment, and emotional exhaustion) of the Maslach Burnout Inventory predicted any statistically significant difference between the Croatian and US samples. The significant findings (Eigenvalue, canonical correlation, Wilks' Lambda, chi-square value, degrees of freedom, and significance) from the analysis are presented in Table 5. One function was generated and was significant (Wilks' Lambda .877, Chi-square=116.22,  $p<.001$ ) indicating that the function of the three predicting factors significantly differentiated between the US and Croatian samples. Hence, the null hypothesis (there would be no significant difference between the two samples) was rejected.

Table 5: Discriminant Function Significance

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Wilks' lambda	$\chi^2$	Df	p
1	.140	.351	.877	116.220	3	<.001

Table 6: Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients (K) and correlations between Discriminating Variables and Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function (S)

Scale	K	S
Depersonalization	.741	.785
Personal accomplishment	-.621	-.665
Emotional Exhaustion	.011	.529

Table 7: Group Centroids

	Function 1
CROATIA	-.403
USA	.347

The results of the discriminant analysis show the existence of significant differences on factors of burnout inventory in prison staff in Croatia and the United States. Evidently, the discriminant function was significant (Table 5). Additionally, the values of the standardized coefficients and correlations between factors and the canonical discriminant function (Table 6), and group centroids (Table 7) demonstrate that the Croatian and American prison staff differs on all three factors of Burnout Inventory. The American prison staff experienced significantly more depersonalization, while the Croatian prison staff more often perceived lack of personal achievement at work, and emotional exhaustion, compared to the American prison staff. Finally, Table 8 presents the results of correct classification of subjects on factors with respect to the two samples. The results showed 64.6% correct classification.

Table 8: Classification Results

			Predicted Group		Total
			Membership		
			CROATIA	USA	
Original	Country	CROATIA	270	146	416
		USA	172	309	481
	%	CROATIA	64.5	35.5	100
		USA	35.4	64.6	100

64.6 % original grouped cases were correctly classified

### Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to compare job burnout between American and Croatian prison staff. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was used to collect data from 480 respondents in the U.S., and 442 respondents in Croatia. As Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) define job burnout in terms of three factors (depersonalization, lack of personal

accomplishments, and exhaustion), they were utilized in this study. There were two objectives in this study. As the Maslach Burnout Inventory surmises a three factorial structure, the first goal was to investigate that structure in the two samples. If, in both samples the three factorial structures were confirmed, the second objective was to examine whether there were statistically significant difference(s) between the two samples in terms of those three factors.

Regarding the first objective, the data analyses demonstrated the presence of all three factors in both samples. Once this was verified, validation or reliability testing was computed for both samples (correlation matrix, Bartlett's test of Sphericity, and reliability measure - Cronbach's Alpha). The findings presented in Table 2 and Table 4 manifested the validation. As for the second objective, a discriminant analysis was computed. The findings from this analysis established statistically significant difference between the two samples, in terms of the three factors, depersonalization, lack of personal accomplishments, and emotional exhaustion. Among these three factors, depersonalization demonstrated the most difference between the two samples.

### Limitations

One needs to remember that the data for the American sample were collected from three prisons in the State of Indiana, while the data on the Croatian prison staff were collected from nine prisons across the country. Given that context, the findings from this preliminary study cannot be generalized for the two countries. Data need to be collected from other states across the U.S. and compared with the Croatian data before any generalization could be made about job burnout among prison staff working in the two countries. Although only preliminary findings from the comparative study have been presented in this article, the findings from the present study make additional contribution to the existing literature on job burnout among prison staff. Furthermore, the findings from this preliminary study raise the question, why one of the three factors, depersonalization, was found to be more prevalent among the American prison staff compared to their Croatian cohorts. Answering that question is beyond the scope of the present article. Future studies comparing the prison staff of the two countries should investigate the reason(s).

### REFERENCES

- Ajduković, M., & Ajduković, D. (1996). Pomoć i samopomoć u skrbi za mentalno zdravlje pomagača. Društvo za psihološku pomoć, Zagreb.
- Alarcon, G., Eschleman, K. J., & Bowling, N. A. (2009). Relationship between personality variables and burnout: A meta-analysis. *Work & Stress*, 23(3), 244–263.
- Angerer, J. M. (2003). Job Burnout. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 40(3), 98 – 106.
- Arabaci, B. (2010). The effects of depersonalization and organizational cynicism levels on the job satisfaction of educational inspectors. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(13), 2802–2811.
- Budjanovac, A., & Jandric, A. (2007). Evaluacija Testa Stresa Zivotnog Stila U Hrvatskom Penalnom Sustavu. *Kriminologija i Socijalna Integracija*, 14(2), 39–44.
- Budjanovac, A. (1991). Socijalne vrijednosti, motivacija i konativne dimenzije osoblja KP ustanove zatvorenog tipa. Magistarski rad. Fakultet za defektologiju Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb.

- Büssing, A., & Glaser, J. (2000). Four-stage Process Model of Core Factors of Burnout: the Role of Work Stressors and Work-related Resources. *Work and Stress*, 14(4), 329-346.
- Castle, T. L. (2008). Satisfied in the Jail: Exploring the Predictors of Job satisfaction Among Jail Officers. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33(1), 48-63.
- Carlson, J. R., Anson, R. H., & Thomas, G. (2003). Correctional Officers Burnout and Stress: Does Gender Matter? *The Prison Journal*, 83(3), 277-288.
- Carlson, J. R., & Thomas, G. (2006). Burnout among prison caseworkers and corrections officers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43(3), 19-34.
- Dignam, J. T., Barrera M., & West, S. G. (1986). Occupational Stress, Social Support, and Burnout among Correctional Officers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(2), 177-193.
- Garland, B. (2004). *The Impact of Administrative Support on Prison Treatment Staff Burnout: An Explanatory Study*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Garland, B. E., & McCarty, W. P. (2009). Job Satisfaction Behind Walls and Fences: A Study of Prison Health care Staff. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20(2), 188-208.
- Gerstein, L.H., Topp, C. G., & Correl, G. (1987). The Role of the Environment and Person When Predicting Burnout Among Correctional Personnel. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14(3), 352-369.
- Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 239-255.
- Härenstam, A., & Palm, U. B. (1988), Stress, Health and the Working Environment of Swedish Prison Staff, *Work and Stress*, 2(4), 281-290.
- Holmes, A., & Norton, E. (2003). *Women in Prison: Sexual Misconduct by Correctional Staff*. United States General Accounting Office Report.
- Hurst, T. E., & Hurst, M. M. (1997). Gender differences in mediation of severe occupational stress among correctional officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(1), 121-137.
- Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 219-230.
- Keinan, G., & Malach-Pines, A. (2007). Stress and burnout among prison personnel: Sources, outcomes, and intervention strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(3), 380-398.
- Kommer, M. M. (1990). *Working with People: A Study on the Working Environment and the Functioning of Correctional Officers*. Ministry of Justice, Hague.
- Lambert, E. G. & Hogan, N. L. (2009). The Importance of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Shaping Turnover Intent: A Test of a Causal Model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96-118.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Allen, R. (2006). Correlates of Correctional Officers Job Stress: The Impact of Organizational Structure, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 227-246.
- Lambert, E. G., Cluse-Tolar, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2007). This job is killing me: The impact of characteristics on correctional staff job stress. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 3(2), 117-142.

- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A. & Baker, D. (2007). The Good Life: The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Occupational Stressors on Correctional Staff Life satisfaction: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 28(2), 1-26.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A., & Clarke, A. (2005). The impact of role stressors on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among private prison staff. *Security Journal*, 18(4), 33-50.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Barton, S. M. (2002). Satisfied Correctional Staff: A Review of the Literature on the Correlates of Correctional Staff Job Satisfaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(2), 115-143.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Jiang, S., Elechi, O., Benjamin, B., Morris, A., Laux, J. M., & Dupuy, P. (2010). The Relationship Among distributive and Procedural justice and Correctional Life Satisfaction, Burnout, and turnover Intent: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 7-16.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2005). The Impact of Jail Medical Issues on the Job Stress and Job Satisfaction of Jail Staff: An Exploratory Study. *Punishment and Society: International Journal of Penology*, 7(3), 259-275.
- Lambert, E. G., Paoline, E. A., & Hogan, N. L. (2003). The Impact of Centralisation and Formalisation on Correctional Staff Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment: An Exploratory Study. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19(1), 23-44.
- Lasky, G. L., Gordon, B. C. & Srebalus, D. J. (1986). Occupational Stressors Among Federal Correctional Officers Working in Different Security Levels. *Criminal Justice and Review*, 13(3), 313-327.
- Launay, G., & Feilding P. J. (1989). Stress among Prison Officers: Some Empirical Evidence Based on Self-Report. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(2), 138-141.
- Lindquist, C. A., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Burnout, job stress and job satisfaction among Southern correctional officers. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation*, 10(4), 5-26.
- Ljubotina, D., & i Družić, O. (1996). Sindrom izgaranja na poslu kod pomagača i čimbenici koji utječu na stupanj izgaranja. *Ljetopis studijskog centra socijalnog rada*, 3, 51-56.
- Long, N. R., & Vogues, K. F. (1987). *Can Wives Perceive the Source of Their Husbands' Occupational Stress?*. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60(3), 235-242.
- Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The Cost of Caring*. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Mejovšek, M. (2002). Uvod u penološku psihologiju. Naklada Slap, Jasterbarsko i Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb.
- Mejovšek, M., Mikšaj-Todorović, Lj., Uzelac, S., & Žakman-Ban, V. (1990). Relacije stavova i konativnih karakteristika radnika kazneno-popravne ustanove zatvorenog tipa. *Penološke teme*, 5(1-2), 91-98.
- Morgan, R. D., van Haveren, R. A. & Pearson, C. A. (2002). Correctional Officer Burnout: Further Analyses. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(2), 144-160.

- Novak T., & Čulig, B. (2007), Emotional well-being and job related stress among prison staff – research blueprint, 3rd-6<sup>th</sup> September, 2007, str.151 (abstract book), 8th Annual Conference of the European Sociological Association – Conflict, Citizenship and Civil Society, Glasgow.
- Novak, T., Čulig, B., Mikšaj-Todorovic, Lj., & Buđanovac, A. (2007). Overview of the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) June 2007, p.14-16, str.174 (abstract book), 7th International Scientific Conference-Research in Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, Zagreb.
- Novak, Mikšaj-Todorović, & Josipović. (2007). Upitnik o socijalno-demografskim obilježjima i nekim karakteristikama posla, interni material, dostupan kod autorica.
- O'Donnell, C., & Stephens C. (2001). The Impact of Organizational, Social, Environmental and Job Content Stressors on the Works Related Strains of Probation Officers. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 34(2), 193-202.
- Perlman, B., & Hartman, H. (1982). Burnout: Summary and Future Research, *Human Relations*, 35(4), 283-305.
- Philliber, S. (1987). Thy Brothers Keeper: A Review of the Literature on Correctional Officers. *Justice Quarterly*, 4(1), 9-37.
- Pucak, T. (2006). Sagorijevanje u osoblja kaznenih ustanova. Diplomski rad, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet.
- Rutter, D. R., & Fielding, P. J. (1988). Sources of Occupational Stress: An Examination of British Prison Officers, *Work and Stress*, 2(4), 291-299.
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Renedo, M. G., Burriel, R., Bresó, E., & Shaufeli, W. B. (2005). Towards a Four-Dimensional Model of Burnout: A Multigroup Factor-Analytic Study including Depersonalization and Cynicism. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(5), 807-819.
- Šarić, J. (2007): Kakav je moj sadašnji posao, organizacija posla, uvjeti rada i moja zapažanja i razmišljanja o poslu. Središnji ured Uprave za zatvorski sustav Ministarstva unutarnjih poslova. Zagreb (interni materijal dostupan kod autora).
- Savicki, V., Cooley E., & Gjesvold J. (2003). Harassment as a Predictor of Job Burnout in Correctional Officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(5), 602-619.
- Saylor, W. G., & Wright, K. N. (1992). Status, Longevity, and Perceptions of the Work Environment Among Federal Prison employees. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 17(3-4), 133-160.
- Uzelac, S., Žakman-Ban, V., Mikšaj – Todorović, Lj., & Mejovšek, M. (1990). Relacije Socijalnih Vrijednosti i Stavova Radnika Kazneno-popravne Ustanove Zatvorenog Tipa. *Penološke teme*, 5(1-2), 83-90.
- Verhagen, J. (1986). Stress in De Werksituatie van Bewaarders (Job stress among correctional staff), *Balans*, 9(3-5), 20-22.