ISSN: 2690-0688

Research Article

Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences

Burnout Risk in Social Work Fields: A Cross-Field Cross-Sectional Study with a Six-Month Follow-Up on Resignations (Germany, 2024/25)

Sora Pazer*

IU International University of Applied Science

***Corresponding Author**
Sora Pazer, IU International University of Applied Science

Submitted: 2025, Sep 04; **Accepted:** 2025, Oct 01; **Published:** 2025, Oct 13

Citation: Pazer, S. (2025). Burnout Risk in Social Work Fields: A Cross-Field Cross-Sectional Study with a Six-Month Follow-Up on Resignations (Germany, 2024/25). *J Huma Soci Scie, 8*(10), 01-08.

Abstract

Burnout is a structural health and quality risk in social work. The present study examines field-specific burnout profiles, work-related determinants and consequences for employee retention. In a quantitative cross-sectional design (October–December 2024), n = 97 professionals from 13 fields of work were surveyed using a standardized online questionnaire; a six-month follow-up (n = 89 achievable) recorded actual terminations. Burnout was operationalized as an average of four sub-dimensions (emotional exhaustion, feeling of permanent burnout, emotional distancing, difficulty recovering). The predictors were work volume/time pressure, emotional burden, resources/support, leadership/fairness, pay/security, meaning/effectiveness and work-life balance. The results show pronounced field gradients: highest burnout values in inpatient youth welfare (MV = 4.1), followed by homeless assistance and general social services; lowest values in school social work (MV = 2.4), integration assistance and clinical social work. At the overall sample level, burnout is strongly correlated with emotional distress (r = .72) and negatively with resources/support (r = −.67) and most strongly with work-life balance (r = −.74). Multiple regressions confirm the central role of work-life balance as the strongest independent predictor. Gender differences were evident in the follow-up: men were more likely to report intentions to quit (52.2% vs. 38.1%) and were more likely to actually quit (17.4% vs. 6.8%). The findings underline the need for field-specific prevention with a focus on recoverability (border management, duty roster quality, right to disconnect), reliable psychological support and fair leadership to reduce burnout and strengthen staff retention.

Keywords: Burnout, Social Work, Work-Life Balance, Resources and Support, Inpatient youth Welfare, Staff Turnover, Intent to Terminate

1. Introduction

For decades, burnout has been considered a central occupational psychological risk in helping and social professions. The classic works of Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) already define burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced professional effectiveness [1]. With inclusion in the ICD-11, burnout is now officially recognized as a *work-related phenomenon* and clearly distinguished from clinical disorders, especially depressive disorders [2]. This classification underlines the need to understand burnout not as an individual deficit, but as the result of structural working conditions. In times of growing demands in social services – from increasing case complexity to resource scarcity and a shortage of skilled workers – dealing with this phenomenon is becoming particularly topical.

Research shows that social work workers have an above-average risk of burnout [3, 4]. The causes are, on the one hand, the high emotional burden in direct client contact, for example through confrontation with poverty, violence or traumatisation, and on the other hand, organisational factors such as unclear role expectations, high time pressure and a lack of support [5,6]. At the same time, there is considerable heterogeneity within the field: While certain areas of activity are characterized by a high frequency of crises and constant availability, others are characterized by clearer structures and regulated working hours. Previous studies have indicated these differences, but rarely systematically examined them

in comparison [7].

Especially in social work, however, it is of particular importance to analyze field-specific risk constellations. Inpatient youth welfare facilities, work with the homeless or the general social service in the youth welfare office are potentially exposed to different stress profiles than, for example, school social work or clinic-related social work. This raises the question of whether certain fields are structurally more predisposed to burnout and which factors play a decisive role in this. At the same time, it must be taken into account that burnout is not only an individual health risk, but also has organizational and systemic consequences: It increases the willingness to fluctuate, jeopardizes the continuity of support and can reduce the quality of social services [8,9].

Against this background, the present study pursues three central concerns. First, the differences in burnout risk between different fields of social work are to be precisely recorded. Secondly, it analyzes which working conditions – especially work-life balance, resource availability and emotional stress – are significantly related to burnout. Thirdly, the extent to which burnout is associated with intentions to quit and actual resignations is examined and whether gender-specific differences are evident. The aim is to draw a differentiated picture of field-specific stress profiles and to identify starting points for prevention and staff retention in social work.

The article is structured as follows: After a presentation of the theoretical framework (chapter 2), methodology and research design are described (chapter 3). This is followed by the results of the quantitative analyses (Chapter 4), which are critically discussed in Chapter 5 and placed in the context of international research. Finally, Chapter 6 bundles the central conclusions and formulates implications for practice and research.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Conceptual Location of Burnout

In occupational psychology research, burnout is understood as a specifically work-related syndrome that usually manifests itself through three core facets: emotional exhaustion, mental distancing or cynicism, and reduced professional effectiveness [1]. This triad refers to a creeping erosion of energetic, cognitive and motivational resources, which is not to be interpreted as an individual weakness, but as a reaction pattern to persistent, uncompensated workload. With the introduction of ICD-11, burnout is explicitly classified as a phenomenon in the context of work and nosologically distinguished from clinical disorders, namely depressive episodes [2]. This definitional framework obliges research and practice to analyse the causes and processes primarily at the level of work design, organisational structures and professional roles. This is important for social work insofar as emotionally demanding client contacts, morally charged decision-making dilemmas and limited resources often coincide here [3,4].

2.2. Load-Resource Models: JD-R and COR as Analytical Lenses

The Job Demands Resources (JD-R) model provides an integrative framework for understanding burnout as the result of an imbalance between work demands and resources. It postulates a health impairment process in which high demands – such as time pressure, case complexity, emotional dissonance or role conflicts – lead to exhaustion, as well as a motivational process in which resources – social support, autonomy, equitable leadership and purpose – support commitment and dampen burnout [10]. Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) complements this approach with a dynamic perspective on resource flows: people strive to acquire, protect, and increase resources; Loss psychologically weighs more heavily than gain; under chronic demands, there is a risk of *spirals of loss* in which resilience mechanisms successively erode [11]. Both models are broadly empirically underpinned and particularly compatible with personal services because they link structural conditions (organization, leadership, staffing) with individual coping processes [5,12].

2.3. Emotional Work, Secondary Traumatization and Professional Protective Factors

Social work is highly characterised by emotional work. Professionals are required to regulate affective reactions, show empathy and at the same time maintain professional distance. This dual task creates an increased risk of exhaustion and cynicism if there is insufficient opportunity to regenerate. In fields with high exposure to trauma, violence or existential distress – such as inpatient youth welfare, homeless assistance, addiction support or social psychiatric services – the risk of secondary traumatisation and *compassion fatigue* is added [13,14]. Regular, high-quality supervision, reflexive team practices (collegial case counseling, debriefings), trauma-sensitive organizational culture, and reliable access to psychological support are considered effective protective factors. Meta-analyses report that such resources substantially reduce the risk of burnout while increasing perceived effectiveness [5,6]. In the logic of JD-R and COR, these precautions act as *resource anchors* that interrupt spirals of loss and promote the restoration of professional agency.

2.4. Limits of Work: Work-Life Balance, Psychological Detachment Processes, and Organizational Justice

A central cross-cutting issue is the ability to distinguish between work and private life. Research on work-life balance and psychological *detachment* consistently shows that interruptions in recovery – for example due to constant availability, on-call duty or informal availability norms – are associated with increased emotional exhaustion; conversely, clear time and role boundaries have a protective effect [12,15]. From an organizational perspective, the focus is on structures and leadership practices that *enable border management*: plannable duty rosters, reliable replacement, "right-to-disconnect" regulations, realistic case number caps and transparent prioritization in crises. In addition, organizational research emphasizes the role of perceived justice: Procedural, distributional, and interaction justice reduce stress responses and prevent cynicism because they strengthen control beliefs and coherence of meaning (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). For social services, these mechanisms are not ancillary, but constitutive, as they cushion the coupling of high emotional work

and limited access to resources politically and administratively.

2.5. Meaning, Effectiveness and Professional Embedding

In addition to stress and recovery, the perception of meaning and effectiveness is an independent determinant of burnout. Theories of *meaning in work* and *job crafting* argue that subjectively experienced meaningfulness, autonomy, and competence strengthen motivational pathways in JD-R and counteract depersonalization [10]. In social work, a high level of meaningfulness can paradoxically be both a buffer and a risk: while it promotes commitment and perseverance, it can – if structurally underequipped – tip over into *overcommitment* and moral stress. Research on *job embeddedness* also shows that attachments to the team, carrier culture and local community reduce turnover; in the absence of these embeddedness, even moderate stress reinforces termination intentions (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski & Erez, 2001). In practice, this means that staff retention is not only ensured through monetary incentives, but also through fit, development paths and participation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design and Objective

The study was designed as a quantitative-analytical cross-sectional study with a short longitudinal element. The focus was on the cross-field determination of the risk of burnout in different fields of social work and the examination of its connections with work-related conditions as well as with termination intentions and actual terminations. The design combines a baseline survey with standardized scales (October to December 2024) and a follow-up after about six months to record realized terminations. This setup makes it possible to empirically address the theoretically postulated pathways of the Job-Demands–Resources Model (JD–R) and the Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) without overstretching causal conclusions [10,11]. The burnout score acted as a central criterion in the cross-section; Termination intention and behavior served as downstream outcomes.

3.2. Sample, Inclusion Criteria, and Recruitment

The baseline evaluation included 97 fully evaluable cases. Recruitment was carried out via relevant thematic online forums aimed at social work professionals employed in Germany. Inclusion criteria were the age of majority, current activity in one of the relevant fields of work and the electronic declaration of consent. Participation was voluntary and anonymous; no personal identifiers were collected, no incentives were awarded, and no IP addresses were stored. The follow-up was carried out six months after the baseline survey; 89 people could be reached again. The distribution over 13 fields of work reflects the breadth of the occupational field and allows comparisons between inpatient, outpatient, clinic-related and administration-oriented contexts. At the same time, unequal cell sizes in individual segments lead to limited precision in field-specific estimates, which was addressed in the evaluation by robust methods and sensitivity analyses [16].

3.3. Survey Instruments and Operationalizations

The survey was conducted online using a standardized questionnaire with five-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Burnout was recorded in four content-defined dimensions: emotional exhaustion, the subjective experience of permanent burnout, emotional distancing from the clientele and recovery difficulties after work. The aggregated burnout score was formed as an arithmetic mean of these subscales, whereby higher values indicate higher burnout characteristics. This approach is based on the multidimensional conceptualization according to Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001), without using a brand-specific inventory [1]. To map work-related conditions, seven constructs were surveyed, which are theoretically anchored in the JD–R and COR frameworks: amount of work and time pressure, emotional burden, resources and support in the team and through the organization, leadership and perceived fairness, pay and job security, meaning and effectiveness of one's own work, and work-life balance. All constructs were recorded across multiple items; higher scale values represent higher characteristics of the respective characteristics. Intention to quit was raised with an item to a twelve-month horizon and dichotomized for model-based analyses by combining high agreement (characteristics 4 and 5) compared to lower characteristics. The actual termination behavior was recorded in binary in the follow-up. Gender has been documented as a categorical variable.

3.4. Data Collection, Data Management and Dealing with Missing Values

Before the start of the survey, the participants were informed about the objective, voluntariness, anonymity, data storage and their right of withdrawal; participation required digital consent. After completion of the fieldwork, a careful data check was carried out with regard to completeness and plausibility. Individual missing item values were treated scale-by-scale according to a minimally invasive rule: If at most one item per scale is missing, the instrument was imputed on a person-average-based basis; if more items were missing, the scale was considered missing. For inferential statistical models, a case path exclusion strategy was used; the robustness of the findings was missed in sensitivity analyses against alternative handling [17]. All processing steps were documented on a script-based basis to ensure traceability and reproducibility (Munafò et al., 2017).

3.5. Measurement Quality and Test Theory

Reliability indicators were determined for all multi-item scales. Target values were in the range of $\alpha \geq .70$ for research purposes; in addition, McDonald's ω was reported, where appropriate, to counter potential tau-equivalence-critical biases (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Construct validity was assessed in terms of convergent and discriminatory evidence by examining the expected relationships between burnout and the JD–R-relevant constructs. Criterion validity resulted from the correlations with the intention to terminate and termination behaviour. The objectivity of the measurement was ensured by standardized instructions, identical online administration and uniform evaluation routines.

3.6. Statistical Evaluation Procedure

The analysis strategy followed a phased approach. First, descriptive ratios were reported for all key variables, including the

mean and standard deviations of the burnout score within the 13 fields of work. Differences between fields of work were examined using single-factor analyses of variance. Since the homogeneity of variance is vulnerable in groups of unequal size, the Welch-ANOVA was switched to when indications of heteroscedasticity were indicated; Pair comparisons were made with Games–Howell under control of the family error level. Effect sizes have been reported over η^2 and ω^2 respectively for complete models and Cohen's d for contrasts [18,19].

To estimate the strength of bivariate associations between burnout and work-related conditions, Pearson correlations with two-sided tests were used. To test relative predictor contributions, a multiple linear regression model was specified in which the burnout score was used as a criterion and all seven work-related constructs were introduced simultaneously as predictors [20]. Multicollinearity was tested using variance inflation factors, with a conservative guideline of VIF < 5.

The role of burnout as a mediating mechanism between work-related conditions and the intention to quit was investigated in a mediation analysis. Here, burnout acted as a mediator between emotional stress or resources/support and the dichotomized intention to quit. Indirect effects were estimated using bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals; Covariates were gender and field of work [21]. Logistic regression models were used for the binary outcomes intent to terminate in cross-section and termination in follow-up; odds ratios with 95 % confidence intervals and the Nagelkerke R^2 as a pseudo-explanatory measure have been reported [22]. Relevant model assumptions and influence diagnostics (residual pattern, Cook's distance) were examined.

3.7. Assumption Testing, Robustness and Sensitivity

To test model assumptions, residual visualizations (Q–Q plots, scatter plots of standardized residuals) and variance equality tests were used. In the case of injuries, robust procedures such as the above-mentioned Welch-ANOVA and HC3 estimators were used. Sensitivity tests included analyses with the exclusion of very small field cells, alternative specifications without potentially redundant predictors, and variation of the dichotomization threshold in the termination intention. In addition, a ridge regularization was calculated exploratively to test the stability of the coefficients with high predictor correlation; these results have been interpreted purely in a supportive way (Hastie, Tibshirani & Friedman, 2009).

The implementation was based on the Declaration of Helsinki and the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation. Participants were comprehensively informed about goals, risks, data processing and rights; informed consent was obtained electronically. Due to the anonymous, non-interventional design, a formal ethics vote was not mandatory. Nevertheless, the standards of empirical social research were observed, including transparency of the survey and evaluation steps as well as the clear communication of limitations (AAPOR, 2016).

4. Results

4.1. Differences between the Fields of Work

There are clear differences in the risk of burnout between the fields of social work. Specialists in inpatient youth welfare are the most burdened, followed by homeless assistance and the general social service in the youth welfare office. The lowest values are found in school social work, integration assistance and clinical social work.

Field of work	Average burnout score
Youth welfare inpatient	4,1
Homeless assistance / street social work	3,9
General Social Service (Youth Welfare Office)	3,8
Clinical Social Work	2,9
Integration assistance	2,7
School Social Work	2,4

Table 1: Average burnout score in selected fields of work

Inpatient youth welfare thus has almost twice as high stress values as school social work. This spread makes it clear that burnout in social work is not evenly distributed, but depends heavily on the respective working conditions.

4.2. Load Dimensions in Comparison

A closer look at the extreme fields shows how burnout is composed. In inpatient youth welfare, emotional exhaustion is particularly pronounced, while in school social work the values remain low in all dimensions.

Dimension	Youth welfare inpatient	School Social Work
Emotional exhaustion	4,3	2,6
Feeling of being permanently burned out	4,0	2,1
Emotional distancing	4,2	2,5
Difficulties in recovery	3,9	2,4

Table 2: Burnout dimensions in two extreme fields

These results make it clear that burnout in highly stressed fields is not only visible in a single facet, but is reflected on several levels.

4.3. Relationship between Working Conditions and Burnout

The analyses show that burnout is closely linked to three factors: the emotional stress experienced, the perceived support in everyday work and, in particular, the work-life balance.

Working condition	Connection with burnout
Emotional distress	Strong positive
Support from resources	Strong negative
Work-Life-Balance	very strongly negative

Table 3. Relationship between working conditions and burnout (correlations)

The greater the emotional burden, the higher the risk of burnout. At the same time, good support and a good work-life balance reduce the likelihood of burning out. The work-life balance in particular proves to be a decisive factor: Those who have difficulty separating work and private life report the highest burnout values.

4.4. Intentions to Terminate and Actual Terminations

Burnout also has direct consequences for the retention of professionals to their organizations. In our survey, 38 percent of women and 52 percent of men said they wanted to quit within the next twelve months. The six-month follow-up showed that 7 percent of women and 17 percent of men had actually implemented their announcement.

Sex	Intent to terminate in 12 months	Actual terminations (after 6 months)
Women	38 %	7 %
Men	52 %	17 %

Table 4. Intentions to quit and actual terminations by gender

These findings make it clear that burnout is not only a health risk, but also has a significant impact on staff turnover in social work. Male professionals in particular are proving to be at risk of emigration.

5. Discussion

5.1. Field-Specific Differences in Burnout Risk

The results of this study show that the risk of burnout is by no means evenly distributed within social work, but depends on the respective structural, organizational and content-related conditions of the fields of work. This is particularly evident in the comparison between inpatient youth welfare and school social work, which represent the two extreme poles of our sample.

Inpatient youth welfare had the highest burnout rates, which manifested itself in all dimensions of the syndrome – from emotional exhaustion to the feeling of permanent burnout to emotional distancing. This finding is consistent with international studies that regularly identify inpatient settings as high-risk contexts [23,24]. A central explanation for this lies in the dissolution of the *boundaries of work*. Professionals in inpatient residential groups are confronted with the problems of the children and adolescents in their care not only during their shifts, but practically around the clock. Crises, outbreaks of violence and acute emergencies often make a clear separation between work and private life impossible [25]. This finding ties in with theoretical concepts such as the *stressor detachment model* , which emphasizes how central switching off from work is for mental health [15]. Where this possibility is systematically undermined, the risk of chronic fatigue increases considerably.

In addition, there is the specific clientele: children and adolescents with severe traumatization, broken ties and massive behavioral problems. The professionals are not only emotionally involved, but also bear a high level of legal and moral responsibility. Studies on the phenomenon of secondary traumatization show that permanent contact with traumatized people can lead to symptoms similar to primary experiences [14]. In inpatient facilities, this risk is exacerbated by the fact that the professionals have to act to a large extent *on their own responsibility* in acute situations and the relief provided by supervision or psychological support is often insufficient. The fact that only a small proportion of inpatients in our survey were able to make use of regular psychological support points to a structural deficit that has also been highlighted in other studies [6].

School social work, on the other hand, represents the countermodel. Here, the burnout values were significantly lower, which can be explained by the specific work organization. School social work takes place in clearly structured framework conditions: fixed working hours, holiday periods, a high degree of predictability and integration into school teams. This structure makes it easier to separate work and private life and allows for regular rest [12]. This does not mean that school social work is free of burdens – here, too, professionals are confronted with family crises, conflicts in the classroom or endangering the well-being of children. But the framework conditions prevent permanent overload. International studies show that a clear working time structure is one of the

most important protective factors against burnout [26]. The lower values compared to inpatient youth welfare are therefore less an expression of lower emotional demands than an indication of the importance of structural framework conditions.

Between these two extreme poles there are other fields with specific risk profiles. For example, homeless assistance and the General Social Service have particularly high burnout rates. In homeless assistance, confrontation with multiple problems, contact with mentally ill and addicted clients, and safety risks in everyday work play a major role [27]. The General Social Service is characterized by extremely high case numbers and legal responsibility, which is regularly associated with overload and fluctuation in German and international studies [28,29]. Clinical social work, on the other hand, which had comparatively low burnout rates in our study, benefits from more interdisciplinary teams, clearer hierarchies and often better availability of psychological support.

The field-specific differences make it clear that burnout is not an inevitable fate of helping professions, but is significantly shaped by work organization, resources and structural conditions. Prevention must therefore not be uniform, but field-specific.

5.2. The Role of Work-Life Balance and Organizational Resources

One of the most consistent findings of this study is the prominent role of work-life balance. It proved to be the strongest predictor of burnout in the analyses – even ahead of perceived support and emotional distress. This result corresponds with international meta-analyses that highlight work-life balance as a crucial factor in the mental health of professionals [12,30].

The theoretical explanation is obvious: work-life balance is the central mechanism that enables recovery and regeneration. If employees can leave work behind at the end of the day, buffer zones are created that restore physical and psychological resources. The *stressor detachment model* shows that it is precisely the ability to switch off that is crucial to ensure that high demands do not lead to chronic exhaustion [15]. In fields such as inpatient youth welfare or homeless assistance, however, this balance is severely limited, as unforeseeable crises, on-call duty and psychological reverberations of work cause a continuous penetration of private life.

Resources such as supervision, collegial support or fair leadership are closely linked to this balance. The Conservation of Resources theory emphasizes that resource losses outweigh gains and that it is precisely the combination of high demands and a simultaneous lack of resources that leads to burnout [11]. Our results support this assumption: Where resources such as psychological support or fair leadership are lacking, the work-life balance is limited and burnout is high.

In practice, this means that prevention must not rely solely on individual coping strategies. Resilience training or mindfulness courses can make a contribution, but they remain superficial if structural deficits exist. Organisational measures are crucial: mandatory rest periods, regulated duty rosters, transparent case number limits and the institutionalised availability of psychological support. Such measures have shown the greatest effectiveness in studies on staff retention and burnout prevention [6,31].

5.3. Burnout and Staff Turnover

The third key finding concerns the connection between burnout and staff turnover. Our data shows not only a strong link between burnout and quit intentions, but also a real correlation with actual quits in the follow-up. This finding confirms international studies that identify burnout as one of the strongest predictors of turnover in the social and health sector [8,9].

The gender differences are particularly striking: Men not only stated intentions to quit more often, but also more often translated them into actual terminations. This pattern has also been described in a similar way in nursing research, where men in a female-dominated occupational field have above-average migration rates [32]. Explanations for this range from different career expectations to economic factors to less professional embeddedness in organizations that are strongly female.

The consequences for securing skilled workers are considerable. Burnout not only leads to individual exhaustion and health problems, but also weakens the continuity of support systems, destabilizes teams and increases the costs of recruitment and training. Against the background of the already existing shortage of skilled workers in social work, burnout is therefore not only an occupational psychology problem, but also a socio-political problem. Prevention and retention measures must therefore not only protect the health of professionals, but must also be understood as a strategic investment in the future viability of social services.

6. Conclusion

The present study shows that burnout in social work is not a homogeneous phenomenon, but the result of field-specific problems of fit between high demands and variable resources. Inpatient and crisis-oriented settings – especially inpatient youth welfare – combine a constellation of permanent availability, high crisis density and limited psychological relief, which leads to an increased risk of emotional exhaustion, distancing and difficult recovery. In contrast, more structured contexts such as school social work benefit from regulated time regimes, plannable processes and closer team integration. This difference is to be expected in the light of resource-oriented stress models: The job-demands-resources model and the conservation-of-resources theory explain why unfavorable demand-resource balances promote burnout and why resource losses without compensation lead to loss spirals [10,11].

The findings focus on work-life balance as the strongest protective factor. It acts as a hinge between structural framework conditions and individual regeneration: Where there are clear time limits, reliable replacement and plannable duty rosters, the probability that high demands will turn into chronic exhaustion decreases. In settings with on-call duty and ad hoc interventions, this boundary

is systematically undermined; here emotional demands and limited recoverability accumulate. The fact that resources such as supervision, team support and fair leadership have an additional buffering effect confirms the assumption that burnout must be addressed primarily organizationally, not primarily at the level of individual resilience [5,6].

In practice, a clear order of priorities is derived from this. Firstly, providers in high-risk areas should establish binding rules for accessibility and recovery: clear duty windows, documented handovers, limited on-call duty with compensation, the right to be unavailable and plannable, sufficiently long rest periods. Secondly, resource anchors must be strengthened: regular, quality-assured supervision; low-threshold psychological counselling; workload-adaptive staffing ratios; Team debriefings after critical events. Third, leadership practices are needed that ensure fairness, predictability and participation, such as transparent caseload caps and prioritized case management in times of crisis. Fourth, retention strategies should be gender-sensitive, as men are more likely to quit in this study: Offers on career paths, working time fits and mentoring can increase professional embeddedness here. Taken together, these measures address precisely those pathways through which requirements escalate to burnout and build the bridge from individual health to organizational stability.

References

1. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397-422.
2. World Health Organization. (2019). International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics (11th revision).
3. Lloyd, C., King, R., & Chenoweth, L. (2002). Social work, stress and burnout: A review. *Journal of Mental Health, 11*(3), 255-265.
4. Kim, H., & Stoner, M. (2008). Burnout and turnover intention among social workers: Effects of role stress, job autonomy and social support. *Administration in Social Work, 32*(3), 5-25.
5. Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1134-1145.
6. Mor Barak, M. E., Travis, D. J., Pyun, H., & Xie, B. (2009). The impact of supervision on worker outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Social Service Review, 83*(1), 3-32.
7. Lee, H., Kim, M. S., & Kim, H. (2019). Burnout and work-related stress among hospital nurses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(15), 2931.
8. Rudman, A., Gustavsson, P., & Hultell, D. (2014). A prospective study of nurses' intentions to leave the profession during their first five years of practice in Sweden. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 51*(4), 612-624.
9. Scanlan, J. N., & Still, M. (2019). Job satisfaction, burnout and turnover intention in occupational therapists working in mental health. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 66*(5), 571-578.
10. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273-285.
11. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology, 50*(3), 337-421.
12. Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2019). Work–family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 6*, 99-121.
13. Huffhines, L., Noser, A., & Hoxhaj, S. (2023). Secondary traumatic stress in helping professionals: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 99*, 102224.
14. Kim, H. (2021). Secondary traumatic stress and burnout among social service workers: A systematic review. *Traumatology, 27*(1), 1-12.
15. Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(S1), S72-S103.
16. Maxwell, S. E., Kelley, K., & Rausch, J. R. (2008). Sample size planning for statistical power and accuracy in parameter estimation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 537–563.
17. Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied missing data analysis*. Guilford.
18. Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
19. Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(6), 859–869.
20. Hayes, A. F., & Cai, L. (2007). Using heteroskedasticity-consistent standard error estimators in OLS regression: An introduction and software implementation. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(4), 709-722.
21. Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford.
22. Menard, S. (2000). Coefficients of determination for multiple logistic regression analysis. *The American Statistician, 54*(1), 17-24.
23. Dai, Y., Li, L., & Sun, J. (2024). Burnout among child welfare residential care workers: A meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review, 151*, 106982.
24. Carder, S., Geiger, J. M., & Caringi, J. (2025). Burnout, compassion fatigue, and compassion satisfaction among residential care workers: A longitudinal study. *Child & Youth Services Review, 153*, 107284.
25. Voß, G. G., & Pongratz, H. J. (2003). *The labour-power entrepreneur: A new basic form of the commodity labour-power*. 3rd edition. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
26. Medina, F. J., Munduate, L., Martínez, I., & Guerra, J. M. (2021). Work–family conflict, role salience, and employee well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 128*, 103586.
27. Kerman, N., Sylvestre, J., Aubry, T., & Distasio, J. (2022). Work stress and mental health among workers serving homeless individuals. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 30*(2), e319-e328.
28. Seckinger, M. (2020). Workload in the Youth Welfare Office: An Empirical Analysis. *Social Passages, 12*(1), 55-73.

29. DJI – German Youth Institute. (2024). *Working conditions in the ASD: Results of a nationwide survey*. Munich: DJI.
30. Maglalang, D. D., Sorensen, G., Hopcia, K., Hashimoto, D. M., & Dennerlein, J. T. (2021). The role of work-life balance in occupational health: A systematic review. *Occupational Health Science, 5*(1), 1-28.
31. Tummers, L. G., Bekkers, V., Vink, E., & Musheno, M. (2021). Coping during public service delivery: A conceptualization and systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 31*(2), 378-393.
32. Győri, Á., Kállai, J., & Németh, J. (2024). Gender differences in turnover intentions among social care workers: A cross-sectional study. *European Journal of Social Work, 27*(2), 305-321.