



## Evaluación de los riesgos psicosociales en agentes de seguridad penitenciaria: centro de rehabilitación social Turi

*Evaluation of psychosocial risks in prison security agents: Turi social rehabilitation center*

- <sup>1</sup> Claudia Magali Tapia Urgilez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0351-0543>  
University Catholic of Cuenca, Basin, Ecuador.  
[cmtapiu35@est.ucacue.edu.ec](mailto:cmtapiu35@est.ucacue.edu.ec)
- <sup>2</sup> José Luis Solano Peláez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8388-0338>  
Catholic University of Cuenca, Cuenca, Ecuador.  
[jsolano@ucacue.edu.ec](mailto:jsolano@ucacue.edu.ec)



Article of scientific and technological research

Sent: 10/14/2023

Reviewed: 11/09/2023

Accepted: 12/05/2023

Published: 01/05/2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33262/cienciadigital.v8i1.2835>

Quote:

Tapia Urgilez, CM, & Solano Peláez, JL (2024). Evaluation of psychosocial risks in prison security agents: Turi social rehabilitation center. Digital Science, 8(1), 55-74. <https://doi.org/10.33262/cienciadigital.v8i1.2835>



*DIGITAL SCIENCE*, and It is a multidisciplinary, quarterly magazine that will be published electronically. Its mission is to contribute to the training of competent professionals with a humanistic and critical vision who are capable of presenting their research and scientific results to the same extent that positive changes are promoted through their intervention, in society. <https://sciencedigital.org>

The magazine is published by the Ciencia Digital Publishing House (prestigious publisher registered in the Ecuadorian Chamber of Books with Affiliation No. 663) [www.celibro.org.ec](http://www.celibro.org.ec)



This magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. Copy of license: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.es>

**Palabras claves:**

agentes penitenciarios, centros penitenciarios, bienestar psicológico, riesgos psicosociales, salud mental y emocional.

**Keywords:**

penitentiary agents, penitentiary centers, psychological well-being, psychosocial risks, mental and emotional health.

**Resumen**

**Introducción:** En el artículo se presenta un análisis de los riesgos psicosociales en los agentes penitenciarios, siendo un aspecto de vital importancia en la gestión de los centros penitenciarios, ya que estos profesionales se enfrentan a desafíos únicos que pueden tener un impacto significativo en su bienestar psicológico y emocional. Este tema adquiere una importancia particular en un contexto en el que la atención a la salud mental y emocional de los trabajadores se reconoce como un factor esencial para garantizar un ambiente de trabajo saludable y para promover la rehabilitación efectiva de los reclusos. **Objetivo:** Analizar los riesgos psicosociales en los agentes penitenciarios del Centro de Rehabilitación Social Turi, mediante la aplicación del cuestionario de CoPsoQ istas21, con el fin de conocer el impacto que estos tienen en la salud, el bienestar y el rendimiento de los funcionarios que laboran en este Centro. **Metodología:** No experimental de corte transversal, de tipo cuantitativo y nivel descriptivo. Muestra: 310 agentes. Instrumentos: cuestionario CoPsoQ Ista 21. **Resultados:** Los resultados mostraron que la mayoría de los agentes penitenciarios del Centro de Rehabilitación Social Turi, han tenido afecciones en su salud emocional, bienestar mental y su rendimiento, derivado de las largas jornadas laborales, la presión que representa laborar en la penitenciaría y la inseguridad a la que deben enfrentar diariamente. **Conclusión:** La evaluación permitió identificar los factores de riesgo psicosocial a los que están expuestos los agentes de seguridad en su entorno laboral. Estos factores evidencian un bajo nivel de exposición a situaciones de conflicto, violencia, estrés crónico y condiciones de trabajo adversas. **Área de estudio general:** Salud Ocupacional. **Área de estudio específica:** Salud y Seguridad Ocupacional.

**Abstract**

**Introduction:** The article presents an analysis of psychosocial risks in penitentiary agents, being an aspect of vital importance in the management of penitentiary centers, since these professionals face unique challenges that can have a significant impact on their psychological well-being and emotional. This issue takes on particular importance in a context where attention to the mental and emotional health of workers is recognized as an essential factor to ensure a healthy work environment and to promote the effective rehabilitation of prisoners. **Objective:** Analyze the psychosocial risks

---

in the penitentiary agents of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center, through the application of the CoPsoQ istas21 questionnaire, to know the impact that these have on the health, well-being and performance of the officials who work in this Center. **Methodology:** Non-experimental cross-sectional, quantitative, and descriptive level. Sample: 310 agents. Instruments: CoPsoQ Ista 21 questionnaire. **Results:** The results showed that most of the penitentiary agents of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center have had problems in their emotional health, mental well-being, and their performance, derived from the long working hours, the pressure that work represents in the penitentiary and the insecurity at work. which they must face daily. **Conclusion:** The evaluation made it possible to identify the psychosocial risk factors to which security agents are exposed in their work environment. These factors show a low level of exposure to situations of conflict, violence, chronic stress, and adverse working conditions.

---

## Introduction

Work-related mental health problems, such as stress, anxiety and depression, represent a significant burden on public health worldwide (World Health Organization [WHO], 2022). It frames factors in the work environment that can affect the mental health and well-being of workers (Cabrera et al., 2022). These risks are related to the interaction between working conditions, the skills and abilities of employees, and the needs, expectations and values of workers. (Patlan, 2019). These risks are a growing concern in the international community due to their detrimental effects on the mental health and well-being of employees, as well as productivity and the economy in general. (Uribe, 2020).

Furthermore, in the case of prison security agents, who currently face a series of psychosocial risks due to the challenging and often stressful nature of their work, mainly in Latin American Penitentiary Centers (Cesia & Sanhueza, 2023); where, these risks can have a significant impact on the mental and emotional health of agents, as well as their general well-being; They often work in high-stress environments, dealing with potentially dangerous situations, such as riots, inmate confrontations, escape attempts, and more. (Quezada, 2021).

Intrapenitentiary security agents are people who are evidently exposed in the work areas to a hostile, stressful environment and with rotating schedules, which are distributed

according to activities such as being transferred to external health homes, hearings, mobilization to educational areas, workshops, orchards, intra-penitentiary health areas, all these activities are carried out on a rotating work day with an eight-day schedule and four days of rest.(Heredia, 2020)

It must be considered that psychosocial risks are all actions that have a high possibility of causing harm during the work day and generate negative impacts on the physical, psychological and social health of workers in a short, medium or long-term period ( National Institute of Safety and Health at Work [INSST], 2018)

When reviewing the literature, the research carried out by Quintana stands out(2018), who, referring to the stress suffered by internal and surveillance personnel who work in this type of centers, indicates that it is considered a set of emotional, cognitive, physiological and behavioral responses to harmful or adverse elements related to work tasks, the structure organizational and work environment.

A study applied in the Colombian context in relation to Medline bibliographic references determines that factors such as organizational structure, participation in decision making, hostile work environment, satisfaction, commitment to work and overwork are dominant psychological factors. A systematic review method was applied with a sample size of 92 articles where they determined that it is necessary to implement changes in organizations that help strengthen the personal, professional, occupational and also psychological skills of penitentiary officials.(Franco, 2022).

The results of the research carried out by Morales et al.(2018), show that there are work situations that affect the development of the proceedings, since they require greater effort from the official to be able to adapt to work and cope with their functions such as responsibilities, emotions, work hours, physical work environment, being in contact with people deprived of liberty, thus generating emotions, feelings and mistreatment for these people during the exercise of their duties.

In an investigation on psychosocial risk factors in Penitentiary Agents in the Women's Deprivation of Liberty Center in the city of Quito, Estrella et al.(2023), that several of the work conditions indirectly harm the satisfaction and well-being of prison security agents, influencing the development of daily activities, which is why, since there are risk factors inherent to prison, they lead to producing accidents or occupational illnesses generating poor work performance.

Under this context, the present study was born due to the high incidence of psychosocial risks to which prison security agents are exposed during work hours, due to an increase in the wave of violence experienced in Ecuador's prisons; which generates stress for

workers, becoming one of the triggers for psychological alterations, as indicated by previous studies (Andrade et al., 2022).

Based on the background described, the research objective is to analyze the psychosocial risks in the prison officers of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center, through the application of the CoPsoQ Ista21 questionnaire, in order to know the impact they have on health, the well-being and performance of the officials who work in this Center.

### **Methodology**

The design of this research is non-experimental, cross-sectional; since it is an approach used in the social sciences to collect data at a specific time, without intervening or manipulating any variable (Padilla et al., 2020). In this type of research, data are collected from a group of individuals or study elements at a single point in time (Castellano et al., 2020). The type of research is quantitative; given that it focuses on numerical and measurable data, which allows a high degree of objectivity and precision in data collection and analysis; In addition, it facilitates the generalization of the findings (Ñaupás et al., 2019).

The level of research is descriptive, since, once the data is collected, an analysis is carried out to summarize, organize and present the information in a clear and understandable way (Barbosa et al., 2020). In this way, the psychosocial risks in the penitentiary agents of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center are analyzed, in order to describe the working conditions that influence the mental health of the agents.

The research modality is field and bibliographic. It is field-based, because it is carried out directly in the environment where the events occur or the population of interest is located (Rebollo & Ábalos, 2022); Accordingly, information is collected at the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center. It is bibliographic, because it is based on the collection, analysis and synthesis of information and knowledge previously published in books, academic journals, reports, documents and other printed or electronic materials (Polgar & Shane, 2021), which have valuable theoretical information that supports the study.

The method used is deductive, this is based on a logical reasoning approach that is based on general premises to reach specific conclusions (Latorre et al., 2021). On the other hand, the technique used to collect information is the CoPsoQ Ista 21 questionnaire, which is a psychosocial risk assessment tool at work developed by the Trade Union Institute of Work, Environment and Health (ISTAS) in collaboration with the International Association of Social Security (AISS). This questionnaire is used to measure various psychosocial factors in the work environment that can affect the mental health and well-being of workers (Chartzman et al., 2022).

The questionnaire contains 33 questions, which have several response options, evaluates multiple dimensions of psychosocial risks, including, among others:

- Psychological demands: The amount of work, time pressure and complexity of tasks.
- Control over work: Autonomy and the ability to make decisions at work.
- Social support: Support and collaboration between colleagues and supervisors.
- Quality of leadership: The quality of leadership and the relationship with supervisors.
- Job insecurity: The perception of job security and job stability.

The procedure carried out for the collection, processing, analysis and interpretation of the information is as follows:

Step 1: Collection of information. - application of the CoPsoQ Ista 21 questionnaire to penitentiary agents, which will be provided through a form in Google forms.

Step 2: Processing. – Once the questionnaire has been applied, the results generated will be refined in a matrix in Microsoft Excel, subsequently, the data will be tabulated using the SPSS 25 Statistical Software, in which statistical tables and figures will also be generated.

Step 3: Analysis and interpretation of the information. – In this step the results obtained will be described, based on the tables and figures generated in the previous step. In addition, the results obtained will be contrasted with the literature.

The population that is part of this study is made up of 130 Penitentiary Security Agents from the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center. Since it is a finite population, the information collection instrument will be applied to 100% of the agents. It is important to mention that there is informed consent from the Director of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center to apply the questionnaire to the agents.

## Results

The results show the Psychosocial Risks to which the Penitentiary Security Agents of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center are exposed:

**Table 1***Sociodemographic variables*

	Frequency	%
<b>Sex</b>		
1. Man	100	76.92%
2 women	30	23.08%
<b>Age</b>		
1. Less than 31 years old	76	58.46%
2. Between 31 and 45 years old	43	33.08%
3. More than 45 years	eleven	8.46%
<b>Department or section</b>		
1. Inspector General	1	0.77%
2. Sub-inspector	2	1.54%
3. Agent 1	9	6.92%
4. Agent 2	26	20.00%
5. Agent 3	82	63.08%
6. GEA Group	10	7.69%
<b>Job</b>		
1. Information	3	2.31%
2. Hearings	fifteen	11.54%
2. Polyclinic	10	7.69%
4. Hospitals	8	6.15%
5. Pavilions	32	24.62%
6. Family and intimate visits	6	4.62%
7. Locutorio	7	5.38%
8. Tour	8	6.15%
9. Administrative	6	4.62%
10. Educational	6	4.62%
11. Translated	12	9.23%
12. CAI	8	6.15%
13. Fragrance of the Judicial Unit	9	6.92%

**Note:** CoPsoQ Iestas 21 questionnaire for correctional officers

Table 1 describes the sociodemographic characteristics of 130 Penitentiary Security Agents from the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center, of which the majority are men (76.92%) and a minority are women (23.08%). The age of the majority of the participants is less than 31 years (58.46%). The highest proportion works as agent 3 (63.08%) and

agent 2 (20%); while a smaller number works in the GEA group, sub-inspector and general inspector. It is worth mentioning that penitentiary agents carry out activities of medium complexity that involve planning, organizing and executing surveillance, custody and security services for criminals in prisons, and they also carry out programs and actions to support criminal treatment for their rehabilitation (Jaskowiak & Fontana , 2015).

**Table 2**
*Results of multiple dimensions (part 1)*

Dimensions	Always +many times	Sometimes	Only sometimes + Never
<b>Emotional demands</b>			
Do there occur emotionally draining moments or situations in your work?	53.85%	29.23%	16.92%
In your job do you have to deal with other people's personal problems?	26.15%	19.23%	54.62%
<b>Double presence</b>			
Do you think about domestic and family tasks when you are in the company?	26.15%	23.85%	50.00%
Are there times when you would need to be at work and at home at the same time?	31.54%	29.23%	39.23%
Do you feel that work in the company consumes so much of your energy that it affects your domestic and family tasks?	36.15%	23.85%	40.00%
Do you feel that work in the company takes up so much of your time that it affects your domestic and family tasks?	26.15%	23.85%	50.00%
<b>Quantitative requirements</b>			
Is the distribution of tasks irregular and causing your work to pile up?	27.69%	15.38%	56.92%
Do you find it impossible to finish your work tasks?	26.15%	15.38%	58.46%
Are you late in delivering your work?	15.38%	20.77%	63.85%
Do you have enough time to do your work?	73.85%	13.85%	12.31%
<b>Pace of work</b>			
Do you have to work very fast?	53.85%	29.23%	16.92%
<b>Demands to hide emotions</b>			
Does your job require you to treat everyone the same, even if you don't feel like it?	56.92%	13.85%	29.23%
Does your job require you to keep your opinion to yourself?	37.69%	16.92%	45.38%
<b>Group feeling</b>			
Do you have a good atmosphere with your coworkers?	77.69%	15.38%	6.92%
Do you feel in your work that you are part of a group?	72.31%	19.23%	8.46%



**Table 2***Results of multiple dimensions (part 1) (continued)*

Dimensions	Only sometimes +		
	Always +many times	Sometimes	Never
Do you help each other at work among colleagues?	79.23%	13.85%	6.92%
<b>Social support from peers</b>			
Do you receive help and support from your colleagues in carrying out your work?	68.46%	24.62%	6.92%
Are your colleagues willing to listen to your work problems?	63.85%	23.85%	12.31%
Do your colleagues talk to you about how you do your job?	63.85%	19.23%	16.92%
<b>Social support from superiors</b>			
Is your immediate boss willing to listen to your work problems?	72.31%	13.85%	13.85%
Do you receive help and support from your immediate boss in carrying out your work?	72.31%	13.85%	13.85%
Does your immediate boss talk to you about how you do your job?	72.31%	10.00%	17.69%
<b>Influence</b>			
Do you have influence over the pace at which you work?	53.85%	15.38%	30.77%
Do you have a lot of influence over decisions that affect your work?	36.15%	19.23%	44.62%
Do you have influence over how you do your work?	51.54%	13.85%	34.62%
Do you have influence over what you do at work?	50.00%	16.92%	33.08%

**Note:**CoPsoQ Iestas 21 questionnaire for correctional officers

In relation to emotional demands, the results show that in their work, most of the time, the Penitentiary Security Agents of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center have to face moments that exhaust them emotionally (53.85%), On the other hand, in The majority (54.62%) do not deal with the personal problems of their colleagues.

Regarding the double presence, it is evident that 50% of the agents never and only ever think about domestic and family tasks when they are in the Social Rehabilitation Center; Likewise, their work takes up so much time that it harms their domestic and family tasks, which could be due to the fact that their work consumes their energy, causing many agents to feel at times the need to be in the center and at home at the same time. .

Quantitative requirements, the majority of agents affirm that they have enough time to do their work (73.85%); In this way, they are only or sometimes late in delivering their work (63.85%), since it is not impossible for them to complete their tasks (58.46%), this is due to the fact that the distribution of tasks is never or sometimes they cause work to accumulate (56.92%); However, the majority of agents consider that they always (53.85%) have to work very quickly.

Regarding the demands of hiding emotions (table 1), the majority of agents feel that they must treat everyone equally, even if they do not want to (56.92%); Furthermore, they mention that their position requires them to keep their opinion silent (37, 69%). On the other hand, the majority of agents indicate that to a large extent (Table 2) their work requires them to hide their emotions (56.92%) and that it also requires them to be kind to all people (41.54% ).

Regarding group feeling, the majority of agents have a good atmosphere with their co-workers (77.69%), because they feel that they are part of a group (72.31%) and they help each other (79.23%); also showing that there is social support from their colleagues, because the majority report receiving support in carrying out their work (68.46%); Furthermore, they are always (72.31%) willing to listen to work problems, talking about how to do their job (63.85%). Similarly, the majority (72.31%) of the agents affirm that their immediate boss is willing to listen to work problems and receive support to carry them out.

Regarding influence, the results show that agents have influence on the pace of work (53.85%), how they do it (51.54%) and what they do in their work (50.00%); while, the majority of agents do not have much influence over the decisions that affect their work (44.62%). These results show the autonomy with which the majority of the prison officials who are part of this study work.

**Table 3**

*Results of multiple dimensions (part 2)*

Dimensions	To a large extent +To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent +To no extent
<b>Emotional demands</b>			
Does your work affect you emotionally?	43.08%	26.15%	30.77%
Is your work, in general, emotionally draining?	55.38%	16.92%	27.69%
<b>Pace of work</b>			
Is it necessary to maintain a high work rate?	83.85%	8.46%	7.69%
Is the work pace high throughout the day?	77.69%	12.31%	10.00%
<b>Role conflict</b>			
Do you do things at work that are accepted by some people and not by others?	50.00%	22.31%	27.69%
Are contradictory things required of you at work?	56.92%	10.77%	32.31%

**Table 3**
*Results of multiple dimensions (part 2) (continued)*

Dimensions	To a large extent +To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent +To no extent
Do you have to do tasks that you think should be done differently?	60.00%	19.23%	20.77%
Do you have to perform tasks that seem unnecessary to you?	43.08%	19.23%	37.69%
<b>Insecurity about working conditions</b>			
If you are transferred to another workplace, unit, department or section against your will?	50.00%	23.85%	26.15%
Are you worried about... [b] if your schedule (shift, days of the week, entry and exit times...) is changed against your will?	50.00%	23.85%	26.15%
if they change your tasks against your will?	44.62%	23.85%	31.54%
If they vary your salary (that they don't update it, that they lower it, that they introduce variable salary, that they pay you in kind...)?	51.54%	16.92%	31.54%
<b>Demands to hide emotions</b>			
Are you required at work to be nice to everyone regardless of how they treat you?	41.54%	13.85%	19.23%
Does your job require you to hide your emotions?	56.92%	20.77%	22.31%
<b>Job insecurity</b>			
If they fire you or don't renew your contract?	50.00%	12.31%	37.69%
How difficult would it be to find another job if you were unemployed?	60.00%	12.31%	27.69%
<b>Role clarity</b>			
Does your work have clear objectives?	67.69%	19.23%	13.08%
Do you know exactly what tasks are your responsibility?	80.77%	8.46%	10.77%
Do you know exactly what is expected of you at work?	75.38%	12.31%	12.31%
Do you know exactly what margin of autonomy you have in your work?	72.31%	15.38%	12.31%
<b>Predictability</b>			
In your company, are you informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions, changes and future projects?	54.62%	13.85%	31.54%
Do you receive all the information you need to do your job well?	68.46%	13.85%	17.69%
<b>Meaning of work</b>			
Do your tasks make sense?	83.08%	12.31%	4.62%
Do the tasks you do seem important to you?	88.46%	5.38%	6.15%
Do you feel committed to your profession?	87.69%	5.38%	6.92%

**Table 3**
*Results of multiple dimensions (part 2) (continued)*

Dimensions	To a large extent +To a large extent	To some extent	To some extent +To no extent
<b>Leadership quality</b>			
Does your current immediate boss ensure that each employee has good opportunities for professional development?	63.85%	16.92%	19.23%
Does your current immediate boss plan work well?	69.23%	16.92%	13.85%
Does your current immediate boss distribute work well?	75.38%	12.31%	13.08%
Does your current immediate boss resolve conflicts well?	77.69%	12.31%	10.00%
<b>Development possibilities</b>			
Does your job require you to have initiative?	83.08%	10.00%	6.92%
Does your job allow you to learn new things?	79.23%	8.46%	12.31%
Does your job give you the opportunity to improve your knowledge and skills?	82.31%	6.92%	10.77%
Does your job allow you to apply your skills and knowledge?	74.62%	15.38%	10.00%
<b>Recognition</b>			
Is your work valued by management?	39.23%	34.62%	26.15%
Does management respect you in your work?	53.08%	23.85%	23.08%
Do you receive fair treatment at your job?	48.46%	33.08%	18.46%
<b>Vertical trust</b>			
Does management trust workers to do a good job?	55.38%	19.23%	25.38%
Can you trust the information coming from the management?	53.85%	22.31%	23.85%
<b>Justice</b>			
Are conflicts resolved fairly?	47.69%	26.15%	26.15%
Is one recognized for a job well done?	51.54%	16.92%	31.54%
Does management consider proposals from all workers with the same seriousness?	55.38%	20.77%	23.85%
Are tasks distributed fairly?	51.54%	27.69%	20.77%

**Note:** CoPsoQ Iestas 21 questionnaire for correctional officers

Regarding emotional demands, it can be seen that for the majority of agents their work is exhausting (55.38%), emotionally affecting 43.08% of them. In fact, into a large and good extent (83.85%), agents must maintain a high work pace, maintaining it throughout the entire working day (77.69%).

Regarding role conflict, it appears that it does exist, since the majority of agents indicate that to a large extent there are contradictory things in their work (56.92%); Likewise, they consider that these tasks can be done in another way (60.00%); Furthermore, there are tasks that seem unnecessary (43.08%).

Regarding insecurity regarding working conditions, the agents indicate that, to a large extent, against their will they are transferred to another work center, unit, department or

section (50%), and their schedule has also been changed (50%). and tasks (44.62%); in addition to varying their salary (51.54%).

In relation to the extent to which they are concerned about possible changes in their working conditions, 50% of the agents state that, to a large or great extent, they fear being fired or having their contract not renewed; while 60% are concerned about how difficult it would be to find another job, this derives from the serious socioeconomic crisis that Ecuador is currently going through, rooted in insecurity that has led to the closure of many sources of employment in various industries.

Regarding role clarity, the majority of agents indicate that their work has clear objectives (67.69%), they know exactly the tasks that are their responsibility (80.77%), they know what is expected of them. them in their work (75.38%) and know the level of autonomy they have in it, which ensures that institutional objectives are met (Bracco et al., 2019); Furthermore, it is observed that to a large extent in the Social Rehabilitation Center they are informed in advance of decisions, changes and future projects (54.62%), receiving the information they need to do their work well (68.46%). Regarding the meaning of work, the majority of agent's assert that to a large extent their tasks have meaning (83.08%), they are important (88.46%), which makes them feel committed to their profession (87.69%).

When evaluating the quality of leadership, it is inferred that it is very good, taking into account that the majority of agents indicate that to a large extent their immediate boss ensures that workers have the opportunity for professional development (63.85%), plans the work well (69.23%), distributes it well (75.38%) and resolves conflicts well (77.69%). Likewise, there is possibility of development, since, to a large extent, the work requires that agents have initiative (83.08%), that they learn new things (79.23%), giving them the opportunity to improve their knowledge and skills (82.31%) and apply them (74.62%).

In relation to recognition, the agents indicated that to a large extent their work is valued by the management of the Social Rehabilitation Center (39.23%), their work being respected (53.08%), in addition, that for the most part receive fair treatment (48.46%).

The vertical trust that exists in the Social Rehabilitation Center is good, considering that the majority of agents affirm that to a large extent the management trusts that the workers do a good job (55.38%), on the other hand, indicate that they can trust the information coming from the management (53.85%), which makes evident the existence of a good relationship between the center management and prison officials, contributing to the promotion of a healthy work environment.

Regarding justice, the results show that to a large extent conflicts are resolved fairly (47.69%); In the same way, they indicate that the work done is recognized (51.54%), and

the proposals made by all workers are considered with the same seriousness (55.38%). It is also worth mentioning that most agents perceive that tasks are distributed fairly.

### Discussion

Through the use of the CoPsoQ istas21 questionnaire, it was identified that the risks of the prison officers of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center are emotional, because they face moments in which they become emotionally exhausted, because when carrying out their work, they are in a state of permanent alert (Cesia & Sanhueza, 2023), since they are in frequent contact with the criminal behavior of the prison population (Estrella et al., 2023), having to be locked up on some occasions for more than 10 consecutive hours, and without being able to find a way to rest. (Quezada, 2021), which leads them to present manifestations of feelings of anxiety, depression or depressive symptoms, apathy, among others (Fernández & Pereira, 2016).

When they are working hours, around 50% of agents consider that their work takes up so much time that it harms their domestic and family tasks, which could be because their work consumes their energy, causing many agents to feel at times the need to be in the center and at home at the same time, as mentioned by Álvarez et al. (2020), who point out that the prison work environment is demanding and exhausting due to the simultaneous attention to several fronts of potential conflict such as the relationship with the higher hierarchy and with the family.

Regarding the quantitative requirements, the results show that the agents They have enough time to carry out their work, therefore, they rarely delay in completing the assigned tasks, managing to complete them in a timely manner, considering that the custody of inmates is under their responsibility. In addition, they must provide security to their colleagues and staff. civilians working in the prison environment (Nolivos, 2021), which affects their work performance (Useche et al., 2019).

On the other hand, the results show a good atmosphere with coworkers, as they indicate feeling that they are part of a group that helps and supports each other in the execution of their work; Furthermore, they indicate that they are willing to listen to the labor problems that arise, to which Álvarez et al. (2020) points out that expressing their emotions and seeking social support and solutions to their problems is part of the current reality experienced in detention centers.

Regarding the insecurity regarding working conditions, the agents, against their will, are transferred to another work center, unit, department or section, their schedule and tasks are also changed, in addition to their salary varying, which, according to Velázquez et al. (2015) makes it difficult for there to be room for recognition of professional performance.

Regarding role clarity, the majority of agents indicate that their work has clear objectives, they know exactly the tasks that are their responsibility, they know what is expected of them in their work and they know the level of autonomy they have in it, which ensures that institutional objectives are met (Bracco et al., 2019). In relation to the quality of leadership, the majority of agents affirm that your immediate boss ensures that workers have the opportunity for professional development, plans and distributes their work well; In addition, he resolves conflicts well. These good management practices are associated with the cordiality and quality of managers, being favorable for the development and perception of healthier psychosocial environments (Fernández & Pereira, 2016).

### Conclusions

- The results showed that the majority of penitentiary agents at the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center have had problems in their emotional health, mental well-being and performance, derived from the long working hours, the pressure of working in the penitentiary and the insecurity at work. which they must face daily. However, the prevalence of a collaborative work environment is observed between officials and immediate superiors, serving as support to fulfill the tasks that are the responsibility of each agent.
- The degree of psychosocial risk to which prison security agents are exposed is high; Taking into account that these environments are usually volatile, unpredictable and potentially dangerous, which generates high levels of stress and anxiety. Furthermore, they are exposed to violent situations, physical attacks or threats by inmates. This has a significant impact on your agents' mental and emotional health.
- The working conditions of the prison officers at the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center that influence their performance emanate from frequent transfers to other work centers, as well as the changing schedule. In relation to the extent to which they are concerned about possible changes in their working conditions, the agents state that they fear being fired or having their contract not renewed, since they are also concerned about how difficult it would be to find another job.
- The evaluation of Psychosocial Risks in penitentiary agents creates a basis that exposes how these risks affect the officials of the Turi Social Rehabilitation Center, which helps prevent mental health problems, such as stress, anxiety, depression and depression. of burnout, by detecting early signs of psychological distress. This can lead to timely intervention to prevent problems from worsening. Besides, addressing the factors that have a significant impact on emotional health and mental well-being can contribute to improving the work environment and promoting a healthier work environment.

### Conflict of interests

Authors must declare whether or not there is a conflict of interest in relation to the article presented.

### *Bibliographic references*

- Álvarez, P., Chacón, F., & Sánchez, E. (2020). Burnout Syndrome in Prison Officials. *Psyche*, 29(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7764/psykhe.29.1.1292>
- Andrade, X., Narváez, Y., & Arévalo, C. (2022). Analysis of compliance with the powers of the technical body in charge of the social rehabilitation system in the “Turi” CRS, during 2021. *MQRInvestigar*, 6(4), 205-248. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364288964\\_Analisis\\_de\\_las\\_atribuciones\\_establecida\\_en\\_el\\_COIP\\_del\\_organismo\\_tecnico\\_encargado\\_del\\_sistema\\_de\\_rehabilitacion\\_social\\_en\\_el\\_CPL\\_Turi\\_durante\\_el\\_2021](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364288964_Analisis_de_las_atribuciones_establecida_en_el_COIP_del_organismo_tecnico_encargado_del_sistema_de_rehabilitacion_social_en_el_CPL_Turi_durante_el_2021)
- Barbosa, A., Mar, C., & Molar, J. (2020). Investigation methodology. Methods and techniques. Mexico: Homeland Education.
- Bracco, L., Váldez, R., Wakeham, A., & Velázquez, T. (2019). Professional Burnout Syndrome and Peruvian Prison Workers. A Qualitative Look at Institutional and Social Factors. *Colombian Journal of Psychology*, 28(1), 13-28. <https://doi.org/10.15446/rcp.v28n1.66056>
- Cabrera, R., Ortiz, M., Yáñez, K., & Orozco, D. (2022). Influence of workers' mental health on the quality of the service offered. *Domains of Science*, 8(3), 377-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23857/dc.v8i3>
- Castellano, M., Granados, O., Castellano, N., & Silva, H. (2020). Entering the world of research: basic guidelines. Santa Marta: Unimagdalena Editorial.
- Cesia, M., & Sanhueza, G. (2023). Prison officials in Latin America: quality of life, working conditions and main problems. *Rev Esp Sanid Penit.*, 25(1), 21-31. [https://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/sanipe/v25n1/es\\_2013-6463-sanipe-25-01-20.pdf](https://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/sanipe/v25n1/es_2013-6463-sanipe-25-01-20.pdf)
- Chartzman, A., Raffaghelli, L., Abajo, F., Capón, R., Tosto, G., Livellara, L., & Spreafico, S. (2022). Stress in the workplace Causes, health consequences and compensation. Autonomous City of Buenos Aires: elDial.com.
- Estrella, S., Rodríguez, A., Suasnavas, P., & Vilaret, A. (2023). Psychosocial risk factors and Burnout Syndrome in Penitentiary Security Agents at the CPL Mujeres Quito. *Investigation*, 1(20). <https://doi.org/10.31095/investigatio.2023.20.2>



- Fernández, C., & Pereira, A. (2016). Exposure to psychosocial risk factors in the context of work: a systematic review. *Rev. Public Health*, 50(24), 1-14.  
<https://www.scielosp.org/article/rsp/2016.v50/24/>
- Franco, S. (Sep-Dec 2022). What has been written about burnout syndrome in prison officers? *Rev Esp Sanid Penit*, 23(4), 87–93. doi:10.18176/resp.00056
- Heredia, D. (2020). *Psychosocial Problems in Prison Guards*. Scribd.  
<https://es.scribd.com/document/476456867/Problematicas-psicosociales-en-guardianes-penitenciarios-pdf#>
- National Institute of Safety and Health at Work [INSST]. (2018). The effect on health of psychosocial risks at work: an overview. Madrid: INSST n.  
<https://www.insst.es/documents/94886/538970/EI+effecto+sobre+la+salud+de+los+risks+psicosociales+en+el+trabajo+una+visi%C3%B3n+general.pdf/7b79def3-88be-4653-8b0e-7518ef66f518>
- Jaskowiak, C., & Fontana, R. (2015). Work in prison: reflections on the health of prison officials. *PESQUISA, Rev Bras Enferm*, 68(2).  
<https://www.scielo.br/j/reben/a/HkVgkzm3m3W3LSxhxYrTrVy/?lang=en>
- Latorre, A., Rincón, D., & Arnal, J. (2021). *Methodological bases of educational research*. Barcelona: Experience Editions.
- Morales, M., Díaz, I., & Díaz, S. (2018). Review of stress in the work performance of employees of the National Penitentiary Institution "INPEC" in 2018. Bogotá DC: Corporación Universitaria UNITEC.
- Nolivos, L. (2021). "Prevalence of burnout syndrome in prison security agents at the Pichincha No 1 male provisional detention center 2020 – 2021." SEK International University, 1-8.  
<https://repositorio.uisek.edu.ec/bitstream/123456789/4176/1/Moreta%20Colcha%20Byron%20Fabi%c3%a1n.pdf>
- Ñaupmas, H., Valdivia, M., Palacios, J., & Romero, H. (2019). *Quantitative-qualitative research methodology and writing of the thesis*. Bogotá: Editions of the U.
- World Health Organization [WHO]. (September 28, 2022). Mental health at work. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/es/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work>
- Padilla, D., Trigueros, R., Aguilar, J., & López, R. (2020). *Research in Health and Development*. University of Almería Editorial.

[https://www.google.com.ec/books/edition/Investigaci%C3%B3n\\_en\\_Salud\\_y\\_Developmento/IYThDwAAQBAJ?hl=es-419&gbpv=1](https://www.google.com.ec/books/edition/Investigaci%C3%B3n_en_Salud_y_Developmento/IYThDwAAQBAJ?hl=es-419&gbpv=1)

Patlan, J. (2019). What is work stress and how to measure it? *Salud Uninorte Magazine*, 35(1), 156-184. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/817/81762945010/html/>

Polgar, S., & Shane, T. (2021). *Introduction to research in health sciences*. Barcelona: Elsevier Health Sciences.

Quezada, J. (2021). Incidental behavioral factors of prison security agents in the context of their work. *Criticism and Law: Legal Review*, 2(2), 43-49. <https://revistadigital.uce.edu.ec/index.php/criticayderecho/article/view/2789/3738>

Quintana, L. (2018). *Prevention of occupational risks in the penitentiary administration: special reference to interior and security personnel*. University of León: Spain.

Rebollo, P., & Ábalos, E. (2022). *Research/Compilation Methodology*. Autonomous City of Buenos Aires: Editorial Authors of Argentina.

Uribe, J. (2020). Psychosocial risks, burnout and psychosomatic factors in public servants. *Administrative research*, 49(125). <https://doi.org/10.35426/iav49n125.03>

Useche, S., Montoro, L., Ruiz, J., Vanegas, C., Sanmartín, J., & Alfaro, E. (2019). Workplace burnout and health problems among Colombian prison officials. *PLOS ONE* 14(2). <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0211447>

Velázquez, T., Bracco, L., Hildenbrand, A., Wakeham, A., Váldez, R., Florentini, M., & Oviedo, V. (2015). Professional burnout syndrome in treatment workers of two establishments. *Psychology Notes*, 33(2), 57-65. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334362633\\_Sindrome\\_de\\_agotamiento\\_profesional\\_en\\_trabajadores\\_de\\_tratamiento\\_de\\_dos\\_establecimientos\\_penitenciarios\\_de\\_Lima](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334362633_Sindrome_de_agotamiento_profesional_en_trabajadores_de_tratamiento_de_dos_establecimientos_penitenciarios_de_Lima)

The article that is published is the exclusive responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the thoughts of the Revista Ciencia Digital.



The article remains the property of the magazine and, therefore, its partial and/or total publication in another medium must be authorized by the director of the Revista Ciencia Digital.



#### Indexaciones

