

PROSOCIAL PERSONALITY AS A PREDICTOR OF BURNOUT IN SPANISH SOCIAL WORKERS

Summary

The aim of this study is to establish the link between burnout and prosocial personality and discover how prosocial personality influences burnout. A single-group ex post facto prospective descriptive design questionnaire was created incorporating socio-demographic data, the Maslach Burnout Inventory and Penner's Prosocial Personality Battery. The study involved 442 members of professional social workers' associations in Spain, 91.1% of them women and 8.9% men, with ages ranging from 24 to 63. The results showed that social responsibility is significantly lower and personal distress is higher in emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation, while the personal accomplishment variable correlates positively with the positive variables of prosociality and negatively with personal distress. Social responsibility, perspective-taking, self-reported altruism, prosociality factor 1 (other-oriented empathy) and prosociality factor 2 (helpfulness) were found to be significantly higher among professionals without burnout, while personal distress predominates in professionals with burnout. The study also found that personal distress and mutual concerns moral reasoning are risk factors for burnout, while perspective-taking is a protective factor. It was concluded that prosociality acts as a protective factor against burnout: a novel idea of great importance when developing prevention programmes to alleviate this problem among professionals.

Key words: burnout, prosociality, risk and protective factors, social work practitioners.

Teaser text

This study tries to discover how prosocial personality influences Burnout in a sample of 442 members of professional social workers' associations in Spain, with ages ranging from 24 to 63, mostly women. From its results, it is concluded that prosociality acts as a protective factor against burnout, because the positive variables of prosociality (social responsibility, empathic concern, perspective taking, other-oriented moral reasoning, mutual concerns moral reasoning, self-reported altruism, prosociality factor 1 other-oriented empathy and prosociality factor 2 helping) correlate positively with the personal accomplishment of burnout and are higher in professionals without burnout, while personal distress is associated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, predominates in professionals with burnout. The study of the relationship between both variables is original in the field of social work and it is useful to prevent burnout among professionals.

Introduction

Social Work is understood as a profession aimed at improving the quality of life of citizens, meeting their needs, providing social support, and leveraging the most suitable resources to increase their well-being.

The best resource with which to achieve this objective is social workers themselves, their personality, attitudes and interpersonal communication skills (Schaufeli, 1998; Maslach et al., 2001). Social workers must be empathetic, calm, able to take an objective point of view and ready to help and support (Lazaro, 2004). They will also undoubtedly need to resort to other means, i.e., materials, to carry out their work. However, the continuous cutbacks in social services experienced in Spain in recent years have led to a decrease in the material and human resources available to these professionals, subjecting them to greater pressure and increasing the risk of psychological reactions such as burnout (Lazaro, 2004). The concept of burnout was originally defined by Freudenberger in 1974 as the exhaustion stemming from a high number of responses to a large number of demands. This situation is experienced daily by social workers, who struggle to balance their large workloads with the insufficient resources, both material and sometimes personal, with which they have to address situations of extreme necessity and meet the complex care requirements of users (Center for Workforce Studies, 2006; Winstanley and Hales, 2014; Crowder and Sears, 2017; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007).

The burnout phenomenon has been extensively associated with social work professionals in international scientific literature, with researchers generally agreeing that this is a high-risk profession for burnout (Acker, 1999; Gilbar, 1998; Lloyd et al., 2002; Egan, 1993; Sze and Ivker, 1986; Gibson et al. 1989; Lazaro, 2004; Um and Harrison, 1998; Abu-Bader, 2000; Arches, 1991; Haj-Yahia et al., 2000) and that it is necessary to act and provide social support for workers to alleviate this situation of work dissatisfaction (Esteban-Ramiro and Fernandez-Montaño, 2017; Cosano et al., 2014). In addition to all this work pressure, social workers often experience increased levels of anxiety as a result of their self-perceived defencelessness when attending the most vulnerable groups in society, sometimes being verbally and or even physically attacked by those people. (Lazaro, 2004). Besides, studies indicate that there is a high level of burnout among professionals in the Public Social Services System, assuming that working in community social services carries a greater risk than working in specialized social services (De la Fuente and Sanchez, 2012; Gómez-García et al., 2019).

In this situation of helplessness brought about by the lack of material and staffing resources, the types of situations addressed, and the population groups attended, there is a need for research work to determine what variables protect social workers from burnout. And of all the aspects considered, personal variables seem to be particularly important when analysing the relationship between burnout and social work.

As already mentioned, social work is fundamentally characterised by its focus on citizen welfare and the provision of assistance for people in need. In this regard, one personality characteristic especially relevant to social work professionals is the prosocial construct (Roig-Vila, 2019).

Prosocial personality is understood as the set of behaviours that focus on satisfying the physical and emotional support needs of other people (Benson et al., 2006; Catalano et al., 2004). Associated with volunteering, it is considered a form of socialization (Eisenberg et al., 2006), a vital personal resource construct (Martorell et al., 1995). In the scientific literature, and due to the presence of altruistic behaviour in all instances of social action, the prosocial personality has been linked to social work ever since the emergence of that profession, as an element indispensable to its development (Miranda

Aranda, 2003). It has been observed, however, that burnout is often an obstacle to the execution of prosocial and/or altruistic behaviour. In this regard, Bang and Reio Jr. (2017) stated in their study that, under stressful working conditions, with high demands and lack of resources, the exhaustion experienced by professionals from the university environment reduces their desire to engage in prosocial behaviour. The same affirmation is made by Van Emmerick et al. (2005), who found that the feeling of emotional and mental exhaustion experienced by employees in banks, city councils and universities prevented them from making an extra effort or dedicating personal time to activities that exceeded the requirements of the job. Different studies have also shown that resource exhaustion decreases the probability of engaging in prosocial behaviour (DeWall et al., 2008; Xu et al., 2012) and that, in work situations with chronic and oppressive demands, the feeling of resource exhaustion and lack of energy increases when suffering from burnout (Bakker et al., 2004; Leiter, 1993).

To perform their work, therefore, social workers need to overcome both insufficient material resources and the tense working conditions in which they carry out their activities: two circumstances which contribute to the appearance of burnout. To do this, they need to exploit their own personal resources, possibly (in our opinion) by developing a prosocial personality that will help them improve their attention to users and resist the emotional and mental exhaustion to which they are exposed as professionals, and thus act as a protective factor against burnout (Maslach et al., 2001).

In the current literature, there are no studies with Spanish populations which relate the prosocial personality of social workers with the risk of burnout. In the present work it was considered interesting to look at the prosocial personality of Spanish social workers (Bekkers, 2006) as a set of positive acts that are performed voluntarily and that could improve their working environment, consequently reducing the risk of burnout. As mentioned earlier, burnout has a high impact in this profession and is generated by working conditions lacking in resources with which to meet growing demand (Xu et al. 2012).

The aim of this study is to observe the current reality of burnout among social workers in the Spanish context and discover how the prosocial personality influences its presence. We considered it useful to identify the protection or risk factors for burnout present in the professionals who constitute this fourth pillar of citizen welfare, identifying the differences between groups with and without burnout according to prosocial personality and determining whether prosocial personality is a protective factor against burnout in this field of activity.

Method

Design and procedure

Using a single-group ex post facto prospective descriptive design, data were collected from a sample of social workers registered in different professional social workers' associations in Spain. To collect the data, each association was invited to distribute a questionnaire among their members. We explained to them the reason we were carrying out the research and the importance of their collaboration, informing them of the purpose and the data processing that would be carried out. Each social work professional was informed individually that participation in the survey was completely voluntary, and that there would be no problem if they preferred not to collaborate in the study. If they did decide to take part, they were assured that they could drop out at any time with no repercussions. They were also assured that the survey was anonymous and in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki and (Spanish) Organic Law 3/2018, of December the

1
2
3 5th, regulating personal data protection and the guarantee of digital rights. This study had
4 been approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of XXXXX and that all
5 participants have provided either verbal or written consent. Finally, they were given the
6 assignment and contact details of the people running the project, in case they had any
7 queries.
8
9

10 Participants

11
12 The study, carried out in 2019, involved 442 social workers in total, of which there
13 were a maximum of 5 missing cases in variables that had not been answered. Of the total
14 sample, 91.1 per cent were women (n= 401) and 8.9 per cent were men (n=39). The ages
15 of the participants ranged from 24 to 63 years, with a mean age of 42.02 years (SD=
16 9.192). Participants belonged to 29 professional social workers 'associations, from 36
17 professional associations existing in Spain. Professional associations are organized
18 territorially on a provincial, autonomous or multiprovincial level. All of them make up
19 the General Council of Social Work, which is the representative, coordinating and
20 executive body of the 36 professional associations (Almeria, Cadiz, Huelva, Jaen,
21 Cordoba, Granada, Malaga, Seville, Alicante, Valencia, Castellon, Araba, Biscay,
22 Gipuzkoa, Avila, Badajoz, Caceres, Burgos, Leon, Palencia, Soria, Galicia, Aragon,
23 Asturias, Madrid, Castille La Mancha, Catalonia, Cantabria, La Rioja, Murcia, Navarre,
24 Balearic, Las Palmas, Santa Cruz, Valladolid - Segovia, Salamanca - Zamora). These
25 Professional Associations are recognized as public law corporations by the Spanish
26 Constitution and created by public authorities to carry out an independent and impartial
27 control of the professional activity that enable citizens to exercise their rights with total
28 guarantees. The territorial distribution of the sample can be seen in Table 1.
29

30
31 Taking as a reference the scores measured by the *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (MBI),
32 the sample showed a high level of generalised burnout (90.85). In terms of the three
33 dimensions of burnout, it showed high levels of emotional exhaustion (30.26) and
34 depersonalisation (12.38) and a medium level of personal accomplishment (38.27).
35

36
37 However, although the MBI distinguishes between sufferers and non-sufferers of
38 burnout, it was found when analysing the frequencies of the burnout dimensions in our
39 sample that those without burnout also presented high levels of EE (28.89) and DP
40 (11.61). It was therefore considered appropriate to distinguish three groups of
41 professionals according to the following characteristics: without burnout: with low or
42 medium scores in EE and DP, regardless of PA; with burnout: with high scores in EE and
43 DP and low scores in PA; and at risk of burnout: with high scores in EE and DP and high
44 or medium scores in PA.
45

46
47 After dividing the sample into groups according to the burnout variable, it was found
48 that 55.2 per cent (n=244) of the participants had no burnout, 10.6 per cent had burnout
49 (n=47) and 33 per cent (n=146) were at risk of burnout (with high emotional exhaustion
50 and high depersonalisation).
51

52 Instruments

53
54 An *ad hoc* questionnaire was developed which included the following instruments:
55

- 56 • *Socio-demographic questionnaire*

57
58 This questionnaire was designed *ad hoc* specifically for our study. The variables included
59 were gender, age, territorial distribution of professional social workers' associations and
60 areas of intervention.

1
2
3
4 • *Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)*

5 Burnout was assessed with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1986).
6 The MBI is a twenty-two-item scale including three dimensions: emotional exhaustion
7 (EE; the wearing down of emotional resources when feeling unable to cope with the
8 situation), made up of items 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 16 and 20; depersonalisation (DP; the
9 development of negative, distant and cold attitudes, thoughts and feelings towards users
10 and co-workers), made up of items 5, 10, 11, 15 and 22; and personal accomplishment at
11 work (PA; the negative evaluation of one's own work and results, considering them to be
12 a failure), defined by items 4, 7, 9, 12, 17, 18 and 21. To specify the cut-off points, the
13 Spanish version developed by Seisdedos (1997) was used, dividing up the scores into
14 three categories for each dimension, as follows: low EE (less than 18 points), medium EE
15 (from 19 to 26 points) and high EE (more than 27 points); low DP (less than 5 points),
16 medium DP (from 6 to 9 points) and high DP (more than 10 points); low PA (less than
17 33 points), medium PA (from 34 to 39 points) and high PA (more than 40 points). In
18 general, scores higher than 21 in EE and 5 in DP and lower than 36 in PA determined the
19 presence of burnout. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from .71 to .90.
20
21
22
23

24 • *Prosocial Personality Battery (PSB)*

25 The *Prosocial Personality Battery* was developed by Penner et al. (1995). It comprises
26 56 items, grouped into two factors: other-oriented empathy (the tendency to experience
27 empathy and to feel responsibility and concern for the well-being of others) and
28 helpfulness (self-perceived involvement in helping activities). To configure these factors,
29 the following variables were taken into account: social responsibility, empathic concern,
30 perspective taking, personal distress, other-oriented moral reasoning, mutual concerns
31 moral reasoning, and self-reported altruism. All these variables have a positive
32 connotation except personal distress, which is the tendency to experience feelings of
33 unease and tension in interpersonal situations (Gracia et al., 2009). Both subscales have
34 internal consistency greater than 0.80, with test-retest reliabilities of 0.77 for other-
35 oriented empathy and 0.85 for helpfulness. For this study, the alpha values were 0.79 for
36 other-oriented empathy and 0.77 for helpfulness.
37
38
39

40 **Data analysis**

41
42 Once the data had been collected, it was analyzed using SPSS statistical software. More
43 specifically, a correlation analysis was carried out relating the factors assessed in the
44 prosocial personality construct to the variables included in the MBI. An Analysis of
45 Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine the differences between the burnout
46 groups with regard to the prosocial personality variable. Finally, a linear regression
47 analysis was conducted to identify which dimensions of prosocial personality/behaviour
48 predicted the appearance of burnout in social workers.
49
50

51 **Results**

52
53 Firstly, to study the context of current reality of burnout among social workers in
54 Spain, in Table 2 it can be seen an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with the areas of
55 intervention of social worker which are compared according to Burnout. In this analysis,
56 significant differences were found between the areas of intervention of the social worker
57 and the dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion [$F(1,345) = 2.095; p = 0.011$],
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

depersonalisation [$F(1.984) = 2.516$; $p=0.002$], personal accomplishment [$F(0.686) = 1.783$; $p=0.039$] and total Burnout [$F(0.820) = 1.967$; $p=0.019$].

According to the post-hoc analysis of multiple comparisons (S-N-K) for emotional exhaustion, the differences were not statistically significant. On the other hand, the differences for personal fulfilment seem to be slightly significant specifically in the intervention areas: women, primary care of social services, addictions, elderly, health, education, dependents, refugees and immigrants, children, family and minors, social exclusion, prisons, disability, unaccompanied foreign minor and free exercise. The statistically significant difference in depersonalisation was found in the area of prison intervention, although the statistical data indicate that these differences are not very strong. Finally, the differences for total Burnout were found in the areas of social exclusion, free exercise, primary social services care, dependency and prisons, being equally weak. These results are due to the fact that the number of groups to be compared in the post hoc analysis was too large and the sample size in each group was too small. To explore the relationship between burnout and prosocial personality, a correlational analysis was carried out between the two variables (see Table 3).

The most significant results ($p \leq 0.05$) showed that the greater the emotional exhaustion, the higher the scores for mutual concerns moral reasoning, personal distress, and empathic concern and the lower the scores for social responsibility; the greater the depersonalisation, the higher the scores for personal distress and the lower the scores for prosociality factor 2, prosociality factor 1, perspective taking and social responsibility; the greater the personal accomplishment, the higher the scores for prosociality factor 2, prosociality factor 1, self-reported altruism, mutual concerns moral reasoning, other-oriented moral reasoning, perspective taking, empathic concern and social responsibility and the lower the scores for personal distress.

To determine the differences between the different groups in terms of prosocial personality, and taking into account the subsequent sampling distribution based on the presence or absence of burnout (professionals with burnout, without burnout or at risk of burnout), the variables included in the Prosocial Personality Battery (social responsibility, empathic concern, perspective taking, personal distress, other-oriented moral reasoning, mutual concerns moral reasoning, self-reported altruism, prosociality factor 1 and prosociality factor 2) were compared. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also performed to compare the groups of social workers with and without burnout according to prosocial personality. The results are shown in Table 4.

In Table 4 it can be seen that social responsibility was significantly higher ($F_{(0.477)} = 4.552$; $p < 0.05$) in professionals without burnout than in those with or at risk of burnout. Empathic concern was also higher in professionals without burnout than in those with or at risk of burnout, although in this case the differences were not found to be statistically significant. On the other hand, perspective taking was also higher in professionals without burnout than in those with or at risk of burnout, the differences here being statistically significant ($F_{(2.394)} = 8.869$; $p < 0.05$). Personal distress was found to be higher in professionals with burnout than in those with or at risk of burnout, these differences again being statistically significant ($F_{(2.607)} = 14.319$; $p < 0.05$). Other-oriented moral reasoning was found to be higher in professionals who are at risk of burnout than in those who have or do not have burnout, but the differences here were not statistically significant. Mutual concerns moral reasoning was also higher in professionals who are at risk of burnout than in those who have or do not have burnout, although, again, the differences found were not statistically significant. Self-reported altruism was shown to be significantly higher ($F_{(3.329)} = 3.435$; $p < 0.05$) in professionals without burnout than in those with or at risk

of burnout. Finally, prosociality factor 1 (other-oriented empathy) and prosociality factor 2 (helpfulness) were both found to be significantly higher ($F_{(1,633)} = 5.538$; $p < 0.05$) and ($F_{(1,502)} = 8.137$; $p < 0.05$, respectively) in professionals without burnout than in those with or at risk of burnout.

To fulfil the third objective and determine whether prosocial personality was a protective factor for burnout in this sample, a linear regression analysis was carried out in which the dependent variable was the level of burnout and the independent variables were the dimensions of the prosocial personality (social responsibility, empathic concern, perspective taking, personal distress, other-oriented moral reasoning, mutual concerns moral reasoning, self-reported altruism, prosociality factor 1, and prosociality factor 2). The results are shown in Table 5, where it can be seen that the variables that predict and are therefore risk factors for burnout are high scores in personal distress and mutual concerns moral reasoning. On the other hand, perspective taking was seen to be a protective factor for burnout ($R^2 = 0.72$; $F = 11.167$; $p < 0.001$).

Discussion

The aims of this study were to know the context of current reality of burnout among social workers in Spain, relate prosocial personality with the burnout syndrome present in a group of Spanish social workers and to determine whether prosocial personality was a protective factor for burnout in this sample. These objectives can be said to have been accomplished.

About the context, besides the description of the sample, the study found significant differences between areas of intervention of social workers and the dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment, and total Burnout). These differences were not only in primary social services care / community social services as indicated by most of the studies (De la Fuente and Sanchez, 2012; Gómez-García et al., 2019), but significant differences were found mainly in the prison area according to the study of Caravaca Sánchez et al (2018).

Considering the data collected from the sample, the initial situation could be described as one of generalised burnout (90.85). With regard to the three dimensions of burnout, the sample presented high levels of emotional exhaustion (30.26) and depersonalisation (12.38) and a medium level of personal accomplishment (38.27). In this respect, our study coincided with other studies with Spanish social workers such as that carried out by Sanchez et. al (2019), who found a high degree of burnout with an overall prevalence of 37.6% and prevalences of 41.4% for emotional exhaustion, 58.2% for depersonalisation and 19.6% for low personal accomplishment in the analysed dimensions.

In terms of the relationship between prosocial personality and the level of burnout in the sample, it can be said firstly that social responsibility was significantly lower and personal distress was higher in emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation, while personal accomplishment correlated positively with the positive variables of prosociality (prosociality factor 2, prosociality factor 1, self-reported altruism, mutual concerns moral reasoning, other-oriented moral reasoning, perspective-taking, empathic concern, social responsibility and total prosociality) and negatively with personal distress. In general, therefore, it can be understood that prosocial personality is negatively related to burnout: that is to say, people with a prosocial personality are less likely to experience burnout (Benito and Rivera Rivera, 2019; Maslach, et al. 2001). In contrast, personal distress correlates positively with burnout: that is to say, the greater the personal distress, the higher the probability of presenting a high score for burnout (Gleichgerricht and Decety,

1
2
3 2013; Lazaro, 2004; De Toscano, 2007; Singer and Lamm, 2009; Decety and Jackson,
4 2004; Romero, 2019).

5 These results were confirmed when the groups were compared according to the level
6 of burnout (without burnout, with burnout, at risk of burnout) and similar results were
7 obtained. Scores for the positive variables of prosociality (social responsibility, empathic
8 concern, perspective taking, other-oriented moral reasoning, mutual concerns moral
9 reasoning, self-reported altruism, prosociality factor 1 and prosociality factor 2) were
10 found to be higher in those professionals without burnout than in those with burnout, the
11 only exception being the personal distress variable, which is higher in professionals with
12 burnout.
13

14 Finally, from the linear regression carried out to confirm whether these results could
15 be considered risk or protective factors for the burnout syndrome, it was observed that
16 perspective-taking acts as a protective factor for burnout (Ceron Carrera et al, 2019;
17 Lamothe et al., 2014; Gleichgerrcht and Decety, 2013; Galán et al., 2014; Thomas, 2010;
18 Krasner et al., 2009), whereas personal distress and mutual concerns moral reasoning
19 both act as risk factors (Gil-Monte, 2006). This may be because perspective taking
20 involves understanding other people better, being empathetic to them and adopting
21 another point of view. It is then that the exercise of this form of prosocial behaviour
22 reduces burnout. On the other hand, personal distress prevents the development of
23 prosocial behaviour: a distressed person is in a situation of desperation, and this increases
24 the likelihood of burnout, as does mutual concerns moral reasoning, perhaps because
25 when people strive to keep in mind the interests of all parties when making a moral
26 decision, consideration of their own interests generates a conflictive moral dilemma.
27

28 With respect to the limitations of the study, some shortcomings are inherent to its
29 design. For example, the online collection of data through professional social workers'
30 associations at national level had a selection bias and the results may appear
31 underestimated because the study only took into account professionals registered in very
32 different parts of Spain and the only ones who answered were those who were personally
33 keen to participate in the survey. On the other hand, and despite guaranteeing the
34 participants' anonymity, we must acknowledge the social desirability bias inherent in
35 self-report questionnaires.
36

37 In future research, it would be useful to continue analysing the risk and protective
38 factors that influence the prevalence of the burnout syndrome among Spanish social
39 workers; to look more closely at the relationship between prosociality and burnout in
40 different, more specific contexts; and to study the attitudes and behaviours that social
41 workers display in their daily work depending on whether or not they suffer from burnout,
42 to find out how they use their personal resources to deal with the situations facing them.
43

44 In conclusion, and according to the prevalences shown in this study, it can be said that
45 prosocial personality factors, such as perspective taking, act as a protective factor for
46 burnout in a sample of Spanish social workers. In contrast, if personal distress responses
47 are generated this acts as a risk factor. This study into the issue is highly relevant and
48 original given the lack of any other studies relating prosocial personality with burnout
49 among Spanish social workers. Further research is required to learn more about the risk
50 and protective factors that influence burnout in this population. Such studies would
51 undoubtedly aid the design and planning of burnout prevention programmes and help
52 improve psycho-social working conditions in Spain, in punished areas such as prisons.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abu Bader, S. H. (2000). Work satisfaction, burnout, and turnover among social workers in Israel: A causal diagram. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 9(3), 191-200. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2397.00128>
- Acker, G. M. (1999). The impact of clients' mental illness on social workers' job satisfaction and burnout. *Health & Social Work*, 24(2), 112-119. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/hsw/24.2.112>
- Arches, J. (1991). Social structure, burnout, and job satisfaction. *Social work*, 36(3), 202-206. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/36.3.202>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands–resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83–104. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A. (84). B. and Demerouti, E.(2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: Satte of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 309-328. Available online at: [//doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115](https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115)
- Bang, H. and Reio Jr, T. G. (2017). Examining the role of cynicism in the relationships between burnout and employee behavior. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 33(3), 217-227. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2017.07.002>
- Benito, E. and Rivera Rivera, P. (2019). El cultivo de la autoconciencia y el bienestar emocional en los profesionales que trabajan con el sufrimiento. *Revista de Investigación y Educación en Ciencias de la Salud (RIECS)*, 4(S1), 77-93. Available online at: [//doi.org/10.37536/RIECS.2019.4.S1.115](https://doi.org/10.37536/RIECS.2019.4.S1.115)
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F. and Sesma Jr, A. (2007). Positive youth development: Theory, research, and applications. *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development*, 894–941.
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and health-related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social psychology quarterly*, 69(4), 349-366. Available online at: [//doi.org/10.1177/019027250606900404](https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250606900404)
- Caravaca Sánchez, F., Carrión Tudela, J. and Pastor Seller, E. (2018). Síndrome de burnout y satisfacción laboral en profesionales del trabajo social en prisiones de España. *Revista Española de Sanidad Penitenciaria*, 20(2), 40-46.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A., Lonczak, H. S. and Hawkins, J. D. (2004). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 591(1), 98-124. Available online at: [//doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260102](https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260102)
- Center for Workforce Studies, NASW. (2006). Licensed Social Workers in the U.S., 2004. Available online at: <http://workforce.socialworkers.org/studies/intro.pdf>.
- Cerón Carrera, K. V. and Mediavilla Simbaña, D. P. (2019). Años de experiencia, fantasía y toma de perspectiva en psicólogos.
- Crowder, R. and Sears, A. (2017). Building resilience in social workers: An exploratory study on the impacts of a mindfulness-based intervention. *Australian Social Work*, 70(1), 17-29. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2016.1203965>
- Cosano-Rivas, F. and Hombrados-Mendieta, I. (2014). Un modelo explicativo de la influencia del apoyo social en el burnout y la satisfacción laboral en el Trabajo Social. *El trabajo social ante el reto de la crisis y la educación superior*, 927-934. Available online at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10630/7795>

- 1
2
3 De la Fuente, I. and Sánchez, E. (2012). Trabajo social, síndrome de estar quemado por
4 el trabajo y malestar psíquico: un estudio empírico en una muestra de trabajadores
5 sociales de la comunidad de Madrid. *Portularia*, 12(extra), 121-130. Analizable
6 online at: <https://doi.org/10.30827/tsg-gsw.v10i19.15342>
7
- 8 De Toscano, G. T. (2007). El Trabajo Social y el síndrome de quemarse por el
9 trabajo. *Revista Trabajo Social*, (5), 55-68. Avaliable online at:
10 <https://revistas.udea.edu.co/index.php/revistraso/article/view/20435>
11
- 12 Decety, J. and Jackson, P. L. (2004). The functional architecture of human
13 empathy. *Behavioral and cognitive neuroscience reviews*, 3(2), 71-100. Avaliable
14 online at: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1534582304267187>
15
- 16 DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., Gailliot, M. T. and Maner, J. K. (2008). Depletion
17 makes the heart grow less helpful: Helping as a function of self-regulatory energy
18 and genetic relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 1653–
19 1662. Avaliable online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167208323981>
20
- 21 Egan, M. (1993). Resilience at the front lines: Hospital social work with AIDS patients
22 and burnout. *Social Work in Health Care*, 18(2), 109-125. Avaliable online at:
23 https://doi.org/10.1300/J010v18n02_07
24
- 25 Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A. and Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. En W.
26 Damon and N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*, Vol. 3: Social,
27 emotional and personality de- velopment (pp. 646-718). Nueva York: John Wiley
28 y Sons.
29
- 30 Esteban-Ramiro, B. and Fernández-Montaña, P. (2017). Las competencias para el
31 desempeño profesional en Trabajo Social dentro de la formación: del burnout al
32 engagement a través del manejo de las emociones. *Trabajo social global-Global*
33 *Social Work: Revista de investigaciones en intervención social*, 7(13), 142-168.
34
- 35 Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of social issues*, 30(1), 159-165.
36
- 37 Galán, J., Romero, R., Morillo, M. and Alarcón, J. (2014). Descenso de empatía en
38 estudiantes de enfermería y análisis de posibles factores implicados. *Psicología*
39 *Educativa*, 20(1), pp. 53-60. Avaliable online at:
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pse.2014.05.007>
41
- 42 Gibson, F., McGrath, A. and Reid, N. (1989). Occupational stress in social work. *The*
43 *British Journal of Social Work*, 19(1), 1-18. Avaliable online at:
44 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjsw.a055517>
45
- 46 Gil-Monte, P. R. (2006). El síndrome de quemarse por El trabajo (burnout): factores
47 antecedentes y consecuentes. In J. L. Aragón, P. R. Gil-Monte, P. R. M. Salanova,
48 and W. B. Shaufeli (Orgs.), *Jornada el síndrome de quemarse por el trabajo en*
49 *servicios sociales*. Valencia: Edita Diputació de Valencia
50
- 51 Gil-Monte, P. and PEIRÓ, J. M. 2000. “Un estudio comparativo sobre criterios
52 normativos y diferenciales para el diagnóstico del Síndrome de Quemarse por el
53 Trabajo (Burnout) según el MBI en España”. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y*
54 *de las Organizaciones*, 16(2), 135-151.
55
- 56 Gilbar, O. (1998). Relationship between burnout and sense of coherence in health social
57 workers. *Social Work in Health Care*, 26(3), 39-49. Avaliable online at:
58 https://doi.org/10.1300/J010v26n03_03
59
- 60 Gleichgerrcht, E. and Decety, J. (2013). Empathy in clinical practice: how individual
dispositions, gender, and experience moderate empathic concern, burnout, and
emotional distress in physicians. *PloS one*, 8(4), e61526. Avaliable online at:
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061526>

- 1
2
3 Gómez-García, R., Alonso-Sangregorio, M. and Llamazares - Sánchez, M. (2019).
4 Burnout in social workers and socio-demographic factors. *Journal of Social Work*,
5 20 (4), 1-20. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1468017319837886>
6
7 Gracia, E., Lila, M. and García, F. (2009). La intervención policial en casos de violencia
8 contra la mujer en relaciones de pareja: actitudes hacia la intervención y otras
9 variables psicosociales. *Boletín criminológico*, 15. Available online at:
10 <https://doi.org/10.24310/Boletin-criminologico.2009.v15i0.8742>
11
12 Haj-Yahia, M. M., Bargal, D. and Guterman, N. B. (2000). Perception of job satisfaction,
13 service effectiveness and burnout among Arab social workers in Israel.
14 *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 9(3), 201-210. Available online at:
15 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2397.00129>
16
17 Krasner, M. S., Epstein, R. M., Beckman, H., Suchman, A. L., Chapman, B., Mooney, C.
18 J. and Quill, T. E. (2009). Association of an educational program in mindful
19 communication with burnout, empathy, and attitudes among primary care
20 physicians. *Jama*, 302(12), 1284-1293. Available online at:
21 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1384>
22
23 Lamothe, M., Boujut, E., Zenasni, F. and Sultan, S. (2014). To be or not to be empathic:
24 the combined role of empathic concern and perspective taking in understanding
25 burnout in general practice. *BMC family practice*, 15(1), 1-7. Available online at:
26 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-15-15>
27
28 Leiter, M. P. (1993). Burnout as a developmental process: Consideration of models. In
29 W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent*
30 *developments in theory and research* (pp. 237-250). London: Taylor & Francis
31
32 Lloyd, C., King, R. and Chenoweth, L. (2002). Social work, stress and burnout: A review.
33 *Journal of Mental Health*, 11(3), 255-265. Available online at:
34 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638230020023642>
35
36 Martorell, M. C., González, R., Aloy, M. and Ferris, M. C. (1995). Socialización y
37 conducta prosocial. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación*
38 *Psicológica*, 1(1), 73-102.
39
40 Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B. and Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of*
41 *psychology*, 52(1), 397-422. Available online at:
42 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
43
44 Miranda Aranda, M. (2003). *Pragmatismo, Interaccionismo simbólico y Trabajo Social.*
45 *De cómo la caridad y la filantropía se hicieron científicas [Tesis doctoral*
46 *inédita]*. Universitat Rovira i Virgili: Tarragona.. Available online at:
47 <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/8406>
48
49 Roig-Vila, R. (2019). *Investigación e innovación en la Enseñanza Superior. Nuevos*
50 *contextos, nuevas ideas*. Barcelona: OCTAEDRO, S.L.
51
52 Romero, K. (2019). Empatía y síndrome de desgaste profesional (burnout) en docentes
53 de educación básica regular de Lima Metropolitana. *Avances En Psicología*,
54 27(2), 237-254. Available online at: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12833/1919>
55
56 Sánchez, F. C., Barrera-Algarín, E., Seller, E. P. and Sarasola, J. L. (2019). Prevalencia
57 y factores de riesgo asociados al síndrome de burnout entre los profesionales del
58 trabajo social en servicios sociales municipales en España. *Trabajo social global-*
59 *Global Social Work: Revista de investigaciones en intervención social*, 9(17), 89-
109. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.30827/tsg-gsw.v9i17.8284>
60
61 Santa Fernández, L. (2004). El desgaste profesional (síndrome de burnout) en los
trabajadores sociales. *Portularia*, 4, 499-506.
62
63 Schaufeli, W. and Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A*
critical analysis. CRC press. London: Taylor and Francis.

- 1
2
3 Singer, T. and Lamm, C. (2009). The social neuroscience of empathy. *Annals of the New*
4 *York Academy of Sciences*, 1156(1), 81-96. Available online at:
5 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04418.x>
6
7 Sze, W. C. and Ivker, B. (1986). Stress in social workers: The impact of setting and role.
8 *Social Casework*, 67(3), 141-148. Available online at:
9 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F104438948606700303>
10
11 Thomas, J. T. and Otis, M. D. (2010). Intrapsychic correlates of professional quality of
12 life: Mindfulness, empathy, and emotional separation. *Journal of the Society for*
13 *Social Work and Research*, 1(2), 83-98. Available online at:
14 <https://doi.org/10.5243/jsswr.2010.7>
15
16 Um, M. Y. and Harrison, D. F. (1998). Role stressors, burnout, mediators, and job
17 satisfaction: A stress-strain-outcome model and an empirical test. *Social Work*
18 *Research*, 22(2), 100-115. Available online at:
19 <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/22.2.100>
20
21 Van Emmerick, H., Jawahar, I. M. and Stone, T. H. (2005). Associations among altruism,
22 burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Work & Stress*, 19,
23 93–100. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678370500046283>
24
25 Winstanley, S. and Hales, L. (2015). A preliminary study of burnout in residential social
26 workers experiencing workplace aggression: Might it be cyclical?. *British Journal*
27 *of Social Work*, 45(1), 24-33. Available online at:
28 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcu036>
29
30 Xu, H., Bègue, L. and Bushman, D. (2012). Too fatigued to care: Ego depletion, guilt,
31 and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1183–
32 1186. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.03.007>
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Territorial distribution of the sample

Territories	Frequency	Valid percentage
Alicante	21	4,8
Almeria	20	4,5
Araba	1	0,2
Asturias	12	2,7
Badajoz	3	0,7
Bizkaia	34	7,7
Caceres	12	2,7
Cadiz	12	2,7
Cantabria	6	1,4
Castille La Mancha	24	5,4
Catalonia	3	0,7
Cordoba	53	12,0
Galicia	21	4,8
Gipuzkoa	14	3,2
Granada	18	4,1
Huelva	13	2,9
La Rioja	21	4,8
Las Palmas	11	2,5
Leon	12	2,7
Madrid	34	7,7
Malaga	5	1,1
Murcia	5	1,1
Navarre	36	8,1
Palencia	1	0,2
Salamanca - Zamora	12	2,7

1			
2			
3			
4	Seville	5	1,1
5	Soria	7	1,6
6			
7	Valencia	1	0,2
8			
9	Valladolid	25	5,7
10	Segovia	-	
11			
12	Total	442	100,0
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

Manuscript for Review

Table 2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between areas of intervention of social workers and the dimensions of Burnout

BURNOUT VARIABLES	AREA OF INTERVENTION	M	F	<i>p</i>	S-N-K
Emotional exhaustion	1	30,57			
	2	27,69			
	3	24,33			
	4	31,89			
	5	33,07			
	6	26,18			
	7	29,02			
	8	28,48	2,095	0,011*	0,071
	9	33,74			
	10	26,73			
	11	30,89			
	12	27,19			
	13	29,43			
	14	36,43			
	15	31,55			
Depersonalisation	1	11,35			
	2	11,13			
	3	9,73			
	4	10,89			
	5	13,22			
	6	12,09	2,516	0,002*	0,530
	7	11,60			
	8	11,67			
	9	14,26			
	10	11,68			
	11	11,89			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	12	12,56			
	13	12,86			
	14	20,14			
	15	10,91			
Personal accomplishment	1	37,86			
	2	40,11			
	3	38,40			
	4	41,44			
	5	38,63			
	6	37,73			
	7	37,96			
	8	39,19			
	9	36,93			
	10	38,82			
	11	39,32	1,783	0,039*	0,101
	12	41,13			
	13	36,93			
	14	39,57			
	15	33,82			
Total Burnout	1	89,67			
	2	89,71			
	3	81,93			
	4	94,22			
	5	95,41			
	6	85,27	1,967	0,019*	0383
	7	88,09			
	8	89,12			
	9	94,93			
	10	87,36			

11	91,89
12	90,13
13	88,71
14	105,86
15	86,18

Notes:

1 Old age; 2 Disability; 3 Education; 4 Free exercise; 5 Dependent; 6 Addictions; 7 Health; 8 Childhood, family and underage; 9 Primary social services care; 10 Refugees and e immigrants; 11 Social exclusión; 12 Unaccompanied foreign minor; 13 Women; 14 Prisons; 15 Others.

*p<0,05

Table 3 Correlations between the variables in the Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Penner Prosocial Personality Battery.

	EE	DP	PA	FACTOR2	FACTOR1	ALTRUISM	MUTUAL REASONING	OTHER REASONING	DISTRESS	PERSPECTIVE	EMPATHIC	RESPONSIBILITY
EE	1	.541**	-.201**	-.055	.031	.008	.122*	.078	.192**	-.026	.139**	-.094*
DP		1	-.283**	-.144**	-.196**	-.071	-.010	-.042	.253**	-.184**	-.087	-.236**
PA			1	.284**	.363**	.209**	.246**	.202**	-.308**	.350**	.217**	.239**
FACTOR2				1	.546**	.949**	.453**	.387**	-.504**	.496**	.354**	.288**
FACTOR1					1	.491**	.689**	.689**	-.349**	.776**	.648**	.682**
ALTRUISM						1	.451**	.382**	-.206**	.421**	.379**	.201**
MUTUAL REASONING							1	.682**	-.169**	.526**	.430**	.162**

Notes:

- Prosociality factor 2 - helpfulness, Prosociality factor 1 - other-oriented empathy, Self-reported altruism, Mutual concerns moral reasoning, Other-oriented moral reasoning, Personal distress, Perspective taking, Empathic concern and Social responsibility.

+ EE (Emotional Exhaustion), DP (Depersonalisation), PA (Personal Accomplishment).

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Draft Manuscript for Review

Table 4 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between groups with and without burnout and scores on the dimensions of the Penner Prosocial Personality Battery.

PROSOCIALITY VARIABLES	BURNOUT GROUPS	M	F	P
Social responsibility	Without Burnout	45.35	4.552	0.011
	With Burnout	42.64		
	At risk of Burnout	44.42		
Empathic concern	Without Burnout	24.66	0.636	0.530
	With Burnout	23.96		
	At risk of Burnout	24.58		
Perspective taking	Without Burnout	25.72	8.869	0.000
	With Burnout	23.19		
	At risk of Burnout	25.25		
Personal distress	Without Burnout	10.30	14.319	0.000
	With Burnout	13.04		
	At risk of Burnout	10.97		
Other-oriented moral reasoning	Without Burnout	16.11	1.654	0.193
	With Burnout	15.49		
	At risk of Burnout	16.36		
Mutual concerns moral reasoning	Without Burnout	15.80	1.209	0.299
	With Burnout	15.45		
	At risk of Burnout	16.05		
Self-reported altruism	Without Burnout	54.80	3.435	0.033
	With Burnout	51		
	At risk of Burnout	54.14		
Prosociality factor 1 - other-oriented empathy	Without Burnout	127.65	5.538	0.004
	Con Burnout	120.72		
	At risk of Burnout	126.66		
Prosociality factor 2 - helpfulness	Without Burnout	69.50	8.137	0.000
	With Burnout	62.96		
	At risk of Burnout	68.17		

Table 5 Linear Regression where the dependent variable is the burnout score and the independent variables are the dimensions of the Penner Prosocial Personality Battery.

	B	S	Beta	t	p	CI 95%
(Constant)	0.386	0.307		1.26	0.209	-0.216 - 0.989
PERSONAL DISTRESS	0.038	0.01	0.188	3.746	0	0.018 - 0.058
PERSPECTIVE TAKING	-0.029	0.01	-0.162	-2.782	0.006	-0.049 - -0.008
MUTUAL CONCERNS	0.03	0.015	0.108	1.971	0.049	0 - 0.060
MORAL REASONING						

Notes: B= regression coefficient; S= standard error; Beta= standardised coefficient; t= t-statistic value; p= p value; CI= 95% confidence interval.

Manuscript for Review