

## Prison and its action in reintegration. Socio-educational and Gender Study in Spain

### La prisión y su acción re-insertiva. Estudio socioeducativo y de género en España

Elisabet Moles-López  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6586-2654>

*Universidad de Granada, España, elisabethmoles@ugr.es*

Rubén J. Burgos-Jiménez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1156-6483>

*Universidad de Granada, España, rubenbj@ugr.es*

Original article  
lenguaje: spanish

Fanny T. Añaños\*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7515-1987>

*Universidad de Granada, España, fanntab@ugr.es*

Translated by  
Caridad Rodríguez  
Hernández

\*Corresponding  
author: Fanny  
T. Añaños,  
fanntab@ugr.es

**Abstract:** Prison intervention/treatment actions are aimed at addressing the in/reintegration of convicted persons. However, there are few references and results of these actions. This paper aims to analyze the intervention programs in Spain and their relationship with the processes of female in/reinsertion and recidivism. A descriptive univariate and bivariate analysis was performed on a sample of 310 female inmates surveyed in open regime. The results indicate that employment education programs are most in demand, followed by life skills and gender-based violence programs. There is greater participation in the ordinary regime (between 50% and 60%), with repeat offenders standing out (75.3%), which questions the adequacy of their needs in professional actions. The findings show the importance of updating the penitentiary intervention-action from a socio-educational and gender perspective, adapted to the characteristics of women for their in/reinsertion.

**Key words:** gender, prison, social reintegration, prison education, intervention programs.

**Resumen:** Las acciones de intervención/tratamiento penitenciario están orientadas a abordar la in/reinserción de las personas penadas; sin embargo, se tienen escasos referentes y resultados de dichas acciones. El objeto de este trabajo es analizar los programas de intervención en España y su relación con los procesos de in/reinserción y reincidencia femenina. Se realizó un análisis descriptivo univariante y bivariado sobre una muestra de 310 mujeres reclusas encuestadas en régimen abierto. Los resultados indican que los programas de educación para el empleo son los más requeridos, le siguen los de

Reception:  
May 19th, 2023

Approval:  
August 8th, 2023



habilidades para la vida diaria y los de violencia de género. Existe mayor participación en régimen ordinario (entre 50 y 60%), destacando las reincidentes (75.3%), lo cual cuestiona la adecuación de sus necesidades en las acciones profesionales. Los hallazgos muestran la importancia de actualizar la intervención acción penitenciaria desde una perspectiva socioeducativa y de género, adaptada a las características de las mujeres para su in/reinserción.

**Palabras clave:** género, prisión, reinserción social, educación penitenciaria, programas de intervención.

## Introduction

The complications of prison life, the process of coping with it and subsequent social reintegration after serving a sentence are imbued with multiple factors that have an impact on a non-problematic or “normalized” reintegration process, as opposed to other processes of “failure” or recidivism (Moles and Añaños, 2021; Añaños *et al.*, 2022).

The reinsertion function of custodial sentences is constantly questioned, as is the true function of this type of sentence. However, it is worth noting the principles in which the present work is framed. On the one hand, from the legal-political vision that legitimizes the Spanish government. On the other hand, a disciplinary vision from which the research is nourished. Thus, Article 25.2 of the Spanish Constitution (1978) indicates that “sentences deprived of liberty and security measures will be oriented towards re-education and social reintegration”. A perspective that goes beyond the fulfillment of the sentence or merely punitive action, placing the importance of the reinsertive purpose.

In this regard, from the educational field, specifically from Pedagogy and Social Education, where “prison social education” is situated, the principles are paradoxically, emancipating, transforming, generating improvements in the conditions/quality of life of individuals and groups and so on. (Caride and Gradaille, 2012). Therefore, from the socio-educational approach, the prison environment can be interpreted as a place and time for education, culture and all its integrity for the preparation of inmates towards their freedom, through the realization of activities and learning that develop their capacities, attitudes, skills, strategies, knowledge, values, socio-labor relations, among others, through the contact and treatment of professionals and available resources (Añaños *et al.*, 2020; Añaños, 2022; Añaños *et al.*, 2022).

Hence, educational action is introduced as a vital tool for re-education and reintegration, developing community preventive functions and generating new proposals, through elements of socialization and prevention of recidivism (Fernández, 2014; López, 2012; Moles-López and Añaños, 2021; Montero, 2019).

In this regard, the importance of prison intervention programs stands out. However, the analysis of these actions presents great difficulties due to the diversity of existing typologies. By focusing on socio-educational and educational programs for employment and labor in/reinsertion, they can be classified, according to Burgos-Jiménez *et al.* (2020 and 2023), into:

- Socio-labor insertion programs.
- Programs for the promotion of daily living skills and personal autonomy.
- Gender-specific socio-educational programs.
- Other programs (sociocultural, artistic, family, health and so on).

It is worth mentioning that these programs have certain limitations in the case of women, since in many cases they are not adapted to their characteristics and demands due to their low population presence (Almeda, 2017; Juliano, 2009), showing a limited gender perspective. As a result, female reintegration processes are weakened in the face of a masculinized structure (Añaños, 2013; Yagüe, 2007), which conditions the prevention of recidivism.

Despite this, research on recidivism is increasingly used by official institutions and researchers, as it is very useful to evaluate and reorient management strategies and penal execution policies; to support decision-making on prison policies; to provide knowledge on risk and protective factors associated with the recidivism process; and, more frequently, to evaluate the effectiveness of prison treatment programs (Brewster *et al.*, 2014; Capdevila, 2015; Caudy *et al.*, 2013; Nakamura and Bucklen, 2014).

In this sense, recidivism can be understood as the reiteration of criminal behavior, being determined by the possible interaction of different criminal risk factors and the consideration of the socio-personal and vulnerability characteristics of the convicted person in their transits to life in freedom (Moles-López and Añaños, 2021; Nguyen *et al.*, 2011). The percentage of recidivism in Spain has increased from 31.6% in 2018 to 34.05% in 2022, according to the General Secretariat of Penitentiary Institutions (SGIP, 2022 and 2018), with the percentage of female recidivists being 24.8% (Moles and Añaños, 2021). These data reflect a failure in treatment processes for reintegration.

Once this background has been explained, the aim of this paper is to analyse the three main blocks of programs: social skills, education for employment and labor market reinsertion and gender, in order to learn how they influence the female processes of reinsertion and criminal recidivism.

## **Method**

This research is based on a descriptive and interpretative quantitative approach, based on the methodological design of the R+D+i REINAC Project (Ref.EDU2016-79322-R), developed at the national level in Spain, endorsed by SGIP and the Ministry of Justice of the Generalitat de Catalunya, approved by the respective ethical committees and governed in accordance with the ethical principles of human research of the University of Granada.

### *Proof*

The proof is made up of women sentenced to open or semi-liberty in Spain. It should be noted that the population of women in this type of sentence in the entire Spanish territory was 1,062. For the stratification process, the allocation was proportional to the size of the female prison population and according to geographical areas. The fieldwork was carried out between June 2018 and March 2019, obtaining 310 participants surveyed within the Spanish territory (sample margin of error  $\pm 4.5$  points), which represents 30.1% of said population.

### *Tools*

The tools were mixed questionnaires developed *ad hoc*, which were administered voluntarily and anonymously, after coordination with the 31 investigated centers in 13 Spanish autonomous communities, and after obtaining informed consent. Each questionnaire consisted of a total of 115 multiple-choice and open-ended questions (Añaños *et al.*, 2022), from which the questions related to the aim of this manuscript were extracted.

### *Analysis of the results*

A univariate and bivariate descriptive statistical analysis was performed. The univariate analysis generated important descriptive data; the bivariate analysis, by obtaining Pearson's Chi-square made it possible to observe the relationship existing (or not) between various variables of interest, in order to accept or refute the hypotheses put forward.

Variables examined were:

- Programs analysis: participation, usefulness, recommendation, and necessity.
- Relationship analysis between program participation and reintegration processes: participation in programs, current employment, perception of normalized life on the outside, assessment and preparation for freedom, coping with life in freedom and expectations for the future.
- Relationship analysis between recidivism profile and participation or not in programs: participation in programs and recidivism profile (two or more convictions).

### **Results**

Table 1<sup>1</sup> describes the participation in activities on daily living skills, education for employment and labor in/reinsertion programs, and socio-educational or gender programs at the general level and for the ordinary (prison) and open (semi-release) regimes. In the case of life skills programs, there are 160 women participants (51.6%): 151 do so in prison (48.7%) and 42, in semi-freedom (13.5%). For the programs on education for employment and in/reinsertion into the labor market, there is 63.2% participation: 59.2% in prison and 21.4% in semi-liberty. Finally, there is 49.2% participation in socio-educational or gender programs: 46.3% in prison and 12% in semi-liberty.

Table 2 presents the attendance and usefulness of life skills activities, both in prison and in semi-freedom. In prison, there was greater participation in the following programs: self-esteem (26.5%), conflict resolution (18.7%), social skills (17.7%) and preparation for life at liberty (15.2%). Regarding the usefulness of these actions, the percentages range from 81.8% to 100%. In semi-freedom, attendance is notably lower; the

---

1 All tables can be found in the Annex at the end of this article (Editor's note).

programs with the highest participation are those of self-esteem (5.2%) and support and accompaniment (4.2%). In this modality, the percentages associated with usefulness range from 60% to 100%.

Table 3 shows the attendance and usefulness of training and job search courses in both regimes. Within prison, it is observed that the greatest participation in these courses is in food handling (25.2%), computers (17.8%), cooking (15.5%), job search and job orientation (15.2%) and sewing (14.9%). As for the usefulness of the programs carried out, most of the women who participate in them consider them to be beneficial. Participation in semi-liberty is also notably lower; the courses in job search and job orientation (6.1%), computers (5.8%) and food handling (5.2%) stand out. Most of the women who take these courses believe that they are useful, except for the computer course, which one of the women indicated that it is not.

Table 4 shows the attendance and usefulness of socio-educational and gender programs. Within prison, there is greater participation in the following courses: "Being a woman is" (25.9%), "gender violence" (23.9%) and socio-cultural programs (20.1%). Most of the women think that the programs carried out are useful. Participation, as in the previous cases, is lower in semi-liberty; sociocultural programs (5.5%) stand out mainly, being valued by all of them as useful.

Furthermore, Table 5 asks which of these programs they would recommend to their female peers. Of those on life skills, the women suggest carrying out those on social skills (30.4%) and self-esteem (25.6%). In the case of job and vocational training programs, 24.2% recommend cooking and hospitality, and 12.1%, job search and orientation. Regarding socio-educational and gender programs, more than half of the women suggest those on gender violence and "Being a woman is" (56.3%).

Table 6 shows the programs that the women consider they need to carry out for better reintegration. First, the percentages for daily living skills are very even: 18.7% would require self-esteem, 15.4%, social skills, and 17.1%, others. In the work programs, 19.1% would need cooking and hotel management, and 28.6%, others. Regarding socio-educational and gender programs, 17% indicated gender violence and "Being a woman is", and 13.7%, family programs, care for the elderly and other skills. Likewise, a high percentage of women indicate that they do not need any program: 37.4%, 24.6% and 50.3%, respectively, for each of the blocks of programs.

Table 7 presents the relationship between the variables corresponding to the reinsertion processes and the completion or not of programs. The

completion of courses in general obtained a relationship in semi-freedom in the following variables with respect to coping with life in freedom: “I feel insecure making decisions” ( $p^2 = 0.001$ ) “I need help and reinforcement from another person to make decisions” ( $p = 0.008$ ) and “I find it difficult to plan for the future because I do not know what is going to happen” ( $p = 0.09$ ).

In the variable “I feel insecure making decisions”, 52% of the women who had taken programs in general indicated that they did not feel insecure and 48% that they did. Regarding the variable “I need help from another person to make decisions”, of the women who did take part in programs, 47.1% said they needed help and 52.9% said they did not. Regarding the variable “I solve day-to-day problems and it is difficult for me to plan for the future”, 64.4% of the women who had taken programs indicated that it was difficult for them to plan for a future and 35.6% that it was not. Of those who did not take programs, 48.4% said they did and 51.6% said they did not.

Concerning the daily living skills programs, the variable “I have difficulties in carrying out basic activities of daily living” was related during the sentence, in general ( $p = 0.019$ ) and in prison ( $p = 0.014$ ). In semi-release, the relationship was found in the variables “I feel insecure making decisions” ( $p = 0.031$ ), “I need help from another person to make decisions” ( $p = 0.041$ ) and “I solve day-to-day problems and find it difficult to plan for the future” ( $p = 0.03$ ).

In the variable “I have difficulties in carrying out basic activities of daily living”, with respect to taking courses in general, 95.3% of the women indicated that they do not have difficulties and 4.7% that they do. Likewise, similar percentages were obtained within prison: 95.7% indicated that they did not and 4.3% that they did. On the other hand, the variable “I feel insecure making decisions” in semi-liberty stands out among women who had attended programs in general, 50% indicated that they felt insecure. Among those who had not completed programs, 32.8% said they felt insecure. Following a distribution of percentages like the previous one, in the variable “I need help and reinforcement from another person to make decisions”, 51.2% of the women who had taken programs indicated that they needed help and 48.8% did not.

In the variable “I solve day-to-day problems and it is difficult for me to plan for the future”, 75.6% of the women who had taken the programs

---

2 The  $p$  value corresponds to Pearson's Chi-square test, whose values range in this sense:  $\alpha < 0.01$  highly significant,  $\alpha < 0.05$  significant and  $\alpha > 0.05$  not significant.

indicated that it was difficult for them to plan for the future and 24.4% that it was not. Of those who did not take the programs, 50.6% said they did and 49.6% said they did not.

For the work programs, both at the general level and in prison, significance was obtained in the variables: “I am afraid of what I will find outside when I get out for definitive release” ( $p = 0.024$  and  $0.023$ , respectively) and “when I am in definitive release everything will go well for me” ( $p = 0.008$  and  $0.011$ , respectively). In semi-freedom, significance was found in the variables: “I feel insecure making decisions” ( $p = 0.051$ ) and “I need help and reinforcement from another person to make decisions” ( $p = 0.036$ ).

In the variable “I am afraid of what I will find outside when I get out”, at the general level, 59.4% of the women who attended programs indicated that they were not afraid and 40.6% that they were. For inside prison, the percentages were: 58.9% no and 41.1% yes. Regarding the variable “when I am finally released everything will go well for me”, of the women who had completed programs, 94.5% expressed positive expectations and 5.5% negative expectations. Within prison, similar percentages were recorded: 94.7% expressed positive expectations and 5.3% negative expectations.

In semi-liberty, in the variable “I feel insecure making decisions”, for women who had completed programs in general, 54.1% indicated that they did not feel insecure and 45.9% that they did. Among those who had not taken part in programs, 67.6% did not feel insecure and 32.4% did. Regarding the variable “I need help and reinforcement from another person to make decisions”, 51.6% of the women who did take part in programs said they needed help and 48.4% said they did not.

The socio-educational and gender programs, both at the general level and in prison, obtained significance in the variable “it is difficult for me to adapt to work routines” ( $p = 0.004$  and  $0.012$ , respectively), with a similar distribution of percentages at both times. Of the women who had taken these programs, 94.2% overall and 93.8% in prison indicated that they had no problems adapting to work routines. Among those who had not taken these programs, 83.2% overall and 84.2% in prison reported no problems in adapting to work.

It should be noted that there were 77 women convicted and recidivists, which represents 24.8% of the proof. When analysing the relationship between the recidivism profile and program participation, we found a significant relationship between participation in employment education and labor market reintegration programs, both in general ( $p = 0.012$ ) and



in prison ( $p = 0.025$ ). At the general level, 75.3% of women recidivists participate in such programs ( $p = 0.0012$ ). On the other hand, in prison, 70.1% of recidivist women participated in these courses ( $p = 0.025$ ).

## Discussion

The penitentiary environment, beyond its punishment and sanctioning function, from a socio-educational point of view can be configured or pretend to be a re-educational, formative and cultural space (Añaños, 2013 and 2022; Fernández, 2014), where a wide variety of socio-educational interventions are carried out to improve reintegration (Montero, 2019), taking into account the multitude of factors and situations of risk and violence (Añaños, 2012). Likewise, the historical invisibility and lack of recognition of convicted women in socio-educational action and prison treatment should be noted (Almeda, 2017; Juliano, 2009), being necessary to emphasize their own processes of socio-educational intervention and re-education for in/reinsertion.

First, it is noticed that the participation of women in programs is reduced in semi-liberty, decreasing from 50-60% in ordinary regime to 10-20% in open regime, due to the personal circumstances and socio-family responsibilities involved in returning to their social context in this regime (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2020; Loinaz and Andrés-Pueyo, 2017).

This situation is also expressed by Burgos-Jiménez *et al.* (2023), which is due, according to Montero (2019), to the voluntariness to participate in prison socio-educational interventions, especially in semi-freedom spaces (Martí, 2019), and to a lack of regulation in prison policies to carry out professional accompaniment processes after imprisonment. However, in this modality, education programs for employment and labor in/reinsertion are the ones that collect more participation, followed by activities on “life skills” and socio-educational and gender programs, showing the female needs in this phase, which prioritize the re/incorporation into the labor market (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2020; Yagüe, 2007).

Regarding the programs aimed at activities on daily living skills, both in prison (26.5%) and in semi-freedom (5.2%), the one with the highest participation is self-esteem, being also the one they indicate as the most useful in the social reintegration process, confirming what is supported by Burgos-Jiménez *et al.* (2023). In this sense, there is literature that supports

the relationship between the female criminal profile associated with risk factors, such as histories of abuse and/or gender violence suffered (Añaños, 2013; Jones *et al.*, 2018; Yagüe, 2007) and low self-esteem (Loinaz, 2016).

In terms of education for employment and labor market insertion/reinsertion programs, participation in food handling, information technology, job orientation, cooking and sewing programs stands out at both times. Likewise, 24.2% would recommend the cooking program to their peers, while 19.1% indicated a need for this program. It can be deduced that traditional gender roles continue to be reproduced, insisting on the role of the domestic woman who participates in activities related to the family and service context (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2020; Yagüe, 2007).

Following this line of socio-educational and gender programs, the highest percentages of participation are focused on the “Ser mujeres” program (25.9%) and the “gender violence” program (23.9%), followed by socio-cultural programs, especially in semi-freedom (5.5%). All the programs have their purpose and re-educational importance, but the former are of great socio-personal utility and for female empowerment. In fact, the women themselves reiterate that they would recommend them to other women (56.3%). These data also highlight the vulnerability of women to gender-based violence, considering that, according to Loinaz and Andrés-Pueyo (2017), 28.4% of women convicted in Spain have suffered this type of aggression, with such initiatives being strategies for support and comprehensive care in accordance with the needs and fragilities involved in this situation (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2020; SGIP, 2019).

It is also worth mentioning the high percentage of women who indicate that they do not need any program (37.4%, 24.6% and 50.3%, respectively, for each of the blocks of programs mentioned above). This may be associated with the unrealistic self-perception and high expectations of insertion of the prison population, as well as the low medium and/or long-term projection of life organization (Valverde, 1991).

Regarding the analysis of the association of the variable “taking courses in general” with the variables related to social reintegration, it was observed that there is a relationship, in the semi-liberty regime, in the variables corresponding to coping with life in freedom and expectations for the future. In this regard, the variable “I solve day-to-day problems and it is difficult for me to plan for the future because I do not know what will happen” ( $p = 0.03$ ) stands out, with 75.6% of the women who had

carried out programs and 50.6% who indicated that they had no problems when planning for the future. Therefore, as stated by Sarmiento *et al.* (2015), imprisonment can generate adaptive disorders that make it difficult to return to life in freedom, with this emotional impact being greater in women (Yagüe, 2007); which requires specialized professional support and accompaniment (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2023).

Furthermore, with respect to the variable “I feel insecure making decisions”, for those who had completed programs at the general level ( $p = 0.001$ ), there are 48% of insecure women compared to 28.2% of those who had not completed such programs. In semi-liberty, this distribution decreases for women who had attended programs: 45.9% feel insecure; meanwhile, in those who had not attended programs, it increases to 32.4%. The emotional dependence in decision making of the female prison population is reinforced, as well as a limitation in the capacity for self-management of daily life (Añaños *et al.*, 2020); therefore, treatment and socio-educational intervention are a tool for independence, empowerment and promotion of socio-personal skills and competencies (Montero, 2019).

In the daily living skills programs, the variable “I have difficulties in performing basic activities of daily living” shows a relationship with taking courses in general during the sentence ( $p = 0.019$ ). Specifically, 95.3% of the women who participated in such programs expressed having no difficulties. Moreover, a relationship was also established with taking this type of course in the ordinary regime ( $p = 0.014$ ): 95.7% indicated that they had no difficulties in carrying out basic activities of daily living. Therefore, the importance of participating in the offer of programs and intervention actions for the development of basic skills and abilities in adaptation and daily performance among the prison population is re-emphasized (Brewster *et al.*, 2014; Caudy *et al.*, 2013; Nakamura and Bucklen, 2014).

The work programs, both at the general level and in prison, were significant in the variable “I am afraid of what I will find outside when I get out for good” ( $p = 0.024$  and  $0.023$ , respectively). 40.6% of the women who had completed these programs at the general level expressed difficulties in facing their life at liberty, increasing in the ordinary regime to 41.1%. The fear of the uncertainty of what will happen when they are released reflects the disconnection experienced in the process of deprivation of liberty (Sarmiento *et al.*, 2015), further increasing the feelings of fragility and vulnerability in convicted women. The variable “when I am in definitive freedom everything will go well for me” also

obtains significance at the general level and in prison ( $p = 0.008$  and  $0.011$ , respectively). Of the women who had participated in programs, 94.5% indicated positive expectations at the general level, followed by 94.7% in prison. Participating in training and orientation initiatives for labor insertion generates optimistic projections in convicted women. However, this largely responds to the idealization of freedom, often disconnected from reality, being an effect of imprisonment (Sarmiento *et al.*, 2015; Valverde, 1991).

In the socio-educational and gender programs, both at the general level and in prison, significance was obtained in the variable “it is difficult for me to adapt to work routines” ( $p = 0.004$  and  $0.012$ , respectively), with a similar percentage distribution at both times. Of the women who had participated in this type of program, 94.2% overall and 93.8% in prison indicated that they had no problems adapting to work routines. It is evident that participation in socio-educational and gender-specific interventions benefits the development of labor competencies (Burgos-Jiménez *et al.*, 2020 and 2023).

Finally, the analysis of the relationship between the recidivism profile and the completion or not of programs only obtained statistical significance with participation in education for employment and in/reinsertion into the labor market, both in general ( $p = 0.012$ ) and in prison ( $p = 0.025$ ). The 75.3% at the general level and 70.1% inside prison of women recidivists participate in courses of this type, showing that the reiteration of the stay in prison generates more possibilities of participating in programs for their progression and penitentiary evaluation; but it also evidences a lack of specific treatment for the prevention of recidivism and improvement of the re/insertion processes (Añaños, 2022; Moles-López and Añaños, 2021).

## Conclusions

Despite the many limitations and difficulties, the penitentiary environment is a space that aims to be oriented, as it is contemplated as a legal objective in Spain, to the socio-educational intervention for the accompaniment and reintegration of the prison population (Añaños, 2022). Women experience a period of deprivation of liberty that is different from that of men, whose needs and characteristics determine their reintegration processes. In this sense, the results

obtained highlight the importance and need for participation in socio-educational prison intervention programs with a gender perspective, since they favor the better development and response of women prisoners in their social reintegration processes. Despite this, the participation of recidivist women stands out, evidencing the lack of actions to prevent recidivism, as well as a greater deepening in the self-recognition of the crime and the hurt and its responsible projection of committing it again.

Prison professionals should be aware of the demands and needs of the female population in order to adapt their actions and offer adapted interventions that facilitate their transition to life in freedom. For this reason, it is recommended that the penitentiary institution offer training and professional awareness strategies that enable and update the development of their interventions for the better reintegration of women in prison.

## Referencias

- Almeda, Elisabet (2017), “Criminologías feministas, investigación y cárceles de mujeres en España”, en *Papers: Revista de Sociología*, vol. 102, núm. 2, España: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.
- Añaños, Fanny T. (2012), “Violencias y exclusiones en el medio penitenciario. Enfoque socioeducativo y de la paz”, en *Convergencia, Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 59, México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Añaños, Fanny T. (2013), “Formación educativa previa ante las discriminaciones: las mujeres reclusas en España”, en *Revista de Educación*, núm. 360, España: Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional.
- Añaños, Fanny T., et al. (2022), *Tránsitos y retos de la inserción-reinserción social con mujeres en semilibertad. Propuestas socioeducativas (Premio Nacional Victoria Kent 2021)*, España: Ministerio del Interior.
- Añaños, Fanny T., et al. (2020), “Dropout, Autonomy and Reintegration in Spain: A Study of the Life of Young Women on Temporary Release”, en *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 11, Bélgica: Universidad Libre de Bruselas.
- Añaños, Fanny T. (2022), “Hacia modelos socioeducativos y de desarrollo humano. Claves para la inserción-reinserción social penitenciaria”, en Añaños, Fanny, García-Vita, María del Mar y Amaro, Ana [coords.], *Justicia social, género e intervención socioeducativa. Medio penitenciario y contextos delictivos*, vol. I, España: Ediciones Pirámide.
- Brewster, Kelsey et al. (2014), “Beyond the Big House: Making the Transition to Life After Prison”, en *VA Engage Journal*, vol. 3, núm. 1, Estados Unidos: Universidad de Virginia.
- Burgos-Jiménez, Rubén Jorge et al. (2023), “Procesos de acompañamiento socioeducativo y adaptación a la vida en libertad en mujeres penadas”, en *Pedagogía social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, núm. 42, España: Sociedad Iberoamericana de Pedagogía Social.

- Burgos-Jiménez, Rubén Jorge *et al.* (2020), “El enfoque de género en la intervención socioeducativa con mujeres: un estudio en el medio penitenciario español”, en *Psychology, Society & Education*, vol. 13, núm. 1, España: Universidad de Córdoba.
- Capdevila, Manel (2015), *Tasa de reincidencia penitenciaria 2014*, España: Centre d’Estudis Jurídics i Formació Especialitzada.
- Caride, José Antonio y Gradaille, Rita (2012), “Educar en las cárceles: nuevos desafíos para la educación social en las instituciones penitenciarias”, en *Revista de Educación*, núm. 360, España: Secretaría General Técnica, Centro de Publicaciones y Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- Caudy, Michael *et al.* (2013), “How well do dynamic needs predict recidivism? Implications for risk assessment and risk reduction”, en *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 41, núm. 6, Estados Unidos: Universidad de Iowa.
- Constitución Española (1978), publicada en Madrid el 29 de diciembre, en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, núm. 311, España: Legislación Consolidada.
- Fernández, Daniel (2014), *Individualización científica y tratamiento en prisión. Premios Victoria Kent*, España: Ministerio del Interior.
- Jones, Melissa *et al.* (2018) “Bruised inside out: The adverse and abusive life histories of incarcerated women as pathways to PTSD and illicit drug use”, en *Justice Quarterly*, vol. 35, Estados Unidos: Universidad de Florida.
- Juliano, Dolores (2009), “Delito y pecado. La transgresión en femenino”, en *Política y sociedad*, vol. 46, núm. 1, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Loinaz, Ismael (2016), “Cuando ‘el’ delincuente es ‘ella’: Intervención con mujeres violentas”, en *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, vol. 26, núm. 1, España: Colegio Oficial de la Psicología de Madrid.
- Loinaz, Ismael y Andrés-Pueyo, Antonio (2017), “Victimización en la pareja como factor de riesgo en mujeres en prisión”, en *Revista Criminalidad*, vol. 59, núm. 3, Colombia: Dirección de Investigación Criminal.
- López, Montserrat (2012), “Aplicación de la pena privativa de libertad como principio resocializador: la reeducación y la reinserción social de los reclusos”, en *Anuario de derecho penal y ciencias penales*, vol. 65, núm. 1, España: Ministerio de Justicia.
- Martí, Marta (2019), “Prisiones abiertas: la supervisión de la pena de prisión en semilibertad”, en *Revista Electrónica de Ciencia Penal y Criminología*, núm. 21, España: Universidad de Granada.
- Moles-López, Elisabet y Añaños, Fanny T. (2021), “Factors of Prison Recidivism in Women: A Socioeducational and Sustainable Development Analysis”, en *Sustainability*, vol. 13, núm. 11, Suiza: Universidad de Basilea.
- Montero, Esther (2019), “La reeducación y la reinserción social en prisión: el tratamiento en el medio penitenciario español”, en *Revista de Estudios Socioeducativos. ReSed*, núm. 7, España: Universidad de Cádiz.
- Nakamura, Kiminori y Bucklen, Kristofer (2014), “Recidivism, Redemption, and Desistance: Understanding Continuity and Change in Criminal Offending and Implications for Interventions”, en *Sociology Compass*, vol. 8, núm. 4, Estados Unidos: Universidad de Pensilvania.
- Nguyen, Thuy *et al.* (2011), “Factores de riesgo de la reincidencia violenta en población penitenciaria”, en *Revista de derecho penal y criminología*, núm. 6, España: Universidad de Educación a Distancia.

- Sarmiento, Jhon *et al.* (2015), “Los efectos de Prisionalización y su relación con el Trastorno Adaptativo”, en *Enfoques*, vol. 1, núm. 2, Colombia: Universidad de Boyacá.
- Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias (2022), *Estudio de reincidencia penitenciaria 2009-2019*, España: Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias.
- Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias (2018), *Reincidencia delictiva 2018*, España: Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias.
- Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias (2019), *Evaluación de la eficacia de un programa de tratamiento para el empoderamiento de mujeres en prisión. Programa SerMujer.es*. Disponible en: [http://www.interior.gob.es/documents/642317/1201664/Evaluacion\\_de\\_la\\_eficacia\\_de\\_un\\_programa\\_tratamiento\\_empoderamiento\\_mujer\\_prision\\_SerMujer\\_126190502\\_web\\_vf.pdf/3b6ff1cd-c773-4f86-8fa6-0988fce67057](http://www.interior.gob.es/documents/642317/1201664/Evaluacion_de_la_eficacia_de_un_programa_tratamiento_empoderamiento_mujer_prision_SerMujer_126190502_web_vf.pdf/3b6ff1cd-c773-4f86-8fa6-0988fce67057) [08 de diciembre de 2022].
- Yagüe, Concepción (2007), “Mujeres en prisión. Intervención basada en sus características, necesidades y demandas”, en *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica*, vol. 5, España: Sociedad Española de Investigación Criminológica.
- Valverde, Jesús (1991), *La cárcel y sus consecuencias*, España: Editorial Popular.

## Acknowledgements

This article comes from the R+D+I Project entitled “Processes of socio-educational reintegration and accompaniment to female inmates in semi-freedom” (REINAC), Reference: EDU2016-79322-R, within the framework of the 2016 Call, State Program for Research, Development and Innovation Oriented to the Challenges of Society, being the Principal Investigator Dr. Fanny T. Añaños. This project has been developed in Spain and funded by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, General Directorate of Scientific and Technical Research, Research Projects Sub-Directorate.

**Annex**

Table 1

**Participation in programs**

	PARTICIPATION	GENERAL	ORDINARY REGIME	SEMI- LIBERTY
Life skills activities	Yes	160 (51.6%)	151 (48.7%)	42 (13.5%)
	No	150 (48.4%)	159 (51.3%)	268 (86.5%)
Education for employment and labor market integration programs	Yes	196 (63.4%)	183 (59.2%)	66 (21.4%)
	No	113 (36.6%)	126 (40.8%)	243 (78.6%)
Socio-educational or gender programs	Yes	152 (49.2%)	143 (46.3%)	37 (12%)
	No	157 (50.8%)	166 (53.7%)	272 (88%)

Source: Author's elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref.EDU2016-79322-R.



Table 2

**Attendance and usefulness of “life skills” programs**

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI-LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Interculturality (Spanish for foreigners)	Yes	10 (3.2%)	7 (87.5%)	3 (1%)	3 (100%)
	No	300 (96.8%)	1 (12.5%)	307 (99%)	0 (0%)
Driver education/ Driving license	Yes	16 (5.2%)	14 (100%)	13 (4.2%)	11 (91.7%)
	No	294 (94.8%)	0 (0%)	297 (95.8%)	1 (8.3%)
Conflict resolution	Yes	58 (18.7%)	54 (96.4%)	9 (2.9%)	7 (87.5%)
	No	252 (81.3%)	2 (3.6%)	301 (97.1%)	1 (12.5%)
Social skills	Yes	55 (17.7%)	47 (97.9%)	12 (3.9%)	12 (100%)
	No	255 (82.3%)	1 (2.1%)	298 (96.1%)	0 (0%)
Preparation for life at liberty	Yes	47 (15.2%)	37 (86%)	10 (3.2%)	8 (80%)
	No	263 (84.8%)	6 (14%)	300 (96.8%)	2 (20%)
Self - esteem	Yes	82 (26.5%)	68 (94.4%)	16 (5.2%)	13 (92.9%)
	No	228 (73.5%)	4 (5.6%)	294 (94.8%)	1 (7.1%)
Sex education	Yes	46 (14.8%)	41 (93.2%)	9 (2.9%)	7 (77.8%)
	No	264 (85.2%)	3 (6.8%)	301 (97.1%)	2 (22.2%)
Healthy eating	Yes	24 (7.7%)	18 (81.8%)	5 (1.6%)	3 (60%)
	No	286 (92.3%)	4 (18.2%)	305 (98.4%)	2 (40%)

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI-LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Deinstitutionalization programs	Yes	13 (4.2%)	11 (91.7%)	3 (1%)	2 (66.7%)
	No	297 (95.8%)	1 (8.3%)	307 (99%)	1 (33.3%)
Support and accompaniment	Yes	44 (14.2%)	42 (97.7%)	13 (4.2%)	11 (91.7%)
	No	266 (85.8%)	1 (2.3%)	297 (95.8%)	1 (8.3%)
Others	Yes	7 (2.3%)	6 (100%)	4 (1.3%)	3 (100%)
	No	303 (97.7%)	0 (0%)	306 (98.7%)	0 (0%)

Source: Author's elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R.

Table 3

**Attendance and participation in employment programs or  
 “Courses or vocational training aimed at finding a job”**

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI-LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Computing	Yes	55 (17.8%)	51 (100%)	18 (5.8%)	16 (94.1%)
	No	254 (82.2%)	0 (0%)	291 (94.2%)	1 (5.9%)
Electricity	Yes	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	No	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)	309 (100%)	0 (0%)
Hairdressing	Yes	45 (14.6%)	39 (97.5%)	6 (1.9%)	6 (100%)
	No	264 (85.4%)	1 (2.5%)	303 (98.1%)	0 (0%)
Plumbing	Yes	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
	No	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)
Gardening	Yes	15 (4.9%)	13 (86.7%)	3 (1%)	3 (100%)
	No	294 (95.1%)	2 (13.3%)	306 (99%)	0 (0%)
Dressmaking	Yes	46 (14.9%)	40 (97.6%)	6 (1.9%)	6 (100%)
	No	263 (85.1%)	1 (2.4%)	303 (98.1%)	0 (0%)
Cooking	Yes	48 (15.5%)	44 (97.8%)	15 (4.9%)	14 (100%)
	No	261 (84.5%)	1 (2.2%)	294 (95.1%)	0 (0%)

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI-LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Cleaning	Yes	41 (13.3%)	36 (97.3%)	14 (4.5%)	13 (100%)
	No	268 (96.7%)	1 (2.7%)	295 (95.5%)	0 (0%)
Esthetics	Yes	10 (3.2%)	9 (100%)	2 (0.6%)	2 (100%)
	No	299 (96.8%)	0 (0%)	307 (99.4%)	0 (0%)
Hospitality	Yes	13 (4.2%)	13 (100%)	4 (1.3%)	4 (100%)
	No	296 (95.8%)	0 (0%)	305 (98.7%)	0 (0%)
Social and health care	Yes	12 (3.9%)	10 (90.9%)	4 (1.3%)	4 (100%)
	No	297 (96.1%)	1 (9.1%)	305 (98.7%)	0 (0%)
Food handling	Yes	78 (25.2%)	70 (97.2%)	16 (5.2%)	16 (100%)
	No	231 (74.8%)	2 (2.8%)	293 (94.8%)	0 (0%)
Paint (“broad brush”)	Yes	12 (3.9%)	11 (100%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)
	No	297 (96.1%)	0 (0%)	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)
Building	Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	No	309 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (100%)	0 (0%)
Lifeguarding	Yes	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	No	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)	309 (100%)	0 (0%)
Laundry and ironing	Yes	27 (8.7%)	23 (100%)	5 (1.6%)	5 (100%)
	No	282 (91.3%)	0 (0%)	304 (98.4%)	0 (0%)

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI-LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Training in agricultural activities	Yes	3 (1%)	3 (100%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)
	No	306 (99%)	0 (0%)	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)
Entrepreneurship strategies	Yes	10 (3.2%)	9 (100%)	3 (1%)	3 (100%)
	No	299 (96.8%)	0 (0%)	306 (99%)	0 (0%)
Job search and orientation courses	Yes	47 (15.2%)	43 (95.6%)	19 (6.1%)	18 (94.7%)
	No	262 (84.8%)	2 (4.4%)	290 (93.9%)	1 (5.3%)
Multiprofessional course	Yes	8 (2.6%)	8 (100%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)
	No	301 (97.4%)	0 (0%)	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)
Others	Yes	30 (9.7%)	30 (100%)	12 (3.9%)	12 (100%)
	No	279 (90.3%)	0 (0%)	297 (96.1%)	0 (0%)

Source: Author's elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R.

Table 4

**Attendance at socio-educational and gender programs, and their usefulness**

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI - LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
“Being woman is” Program	Yes	80 (25.9%)	70 (92.1%)	6 (1.9%)	6 (100%)
	No	229 (74.1%)	6 (7.9%)	303 (98.1%)	0 (0%)
“Gender Violence” Program	Yes	74 (23.9%)	63 (95.5%)	9 (2.9%)	9 (100%)
	No	235 (76.1%)	3 (4.5%)	300 (97.1%)	0 (0%)
Socio-cultural programs: art, painting, etc.	Yes	62 (20.1%)	56 (100%)	17 (5.5%)	15 (100%)
	No	247 (79.9%)	0 (0%)	292 (94.5%)	0 (0%)
Sport Program	Yes	39 (12.6%)	33 (100%)	7 (2.3%)	5 (100%)
	No	270 (87.4%)	0 (0%)	302 (97.7%)	0 (0%)
Leisure management programs	Yes	9 (2.9%)	8 (100%)	2 (0.6%)	2 (100%)
	No	300 (97.1%)	0 (0%)	307 (99.4%)	0 (0%)
Drug treatment and relapse prevention programs	Yes	31 (10%)	27 (96.4%)	9 (2.9%)	9 (100%)
	No	278 (90%)	1 (3.6%)	300 (97.1%)	0 (0%)
Prevention of recidivism	Yes	8 (2.6%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (100%)
	No	301 (97.4%)	1 (16.7%)	308 (99.7%)	0 (0%)

		ORDINARY REGIME		SEMI - LIBERTY	
		ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS	ATTENDANCE	USEFULNESS
Family intervention or participation programs	Yes	11 (3.6%)	10 (100%)	4 (1.3%)	4 (100%)
	No	298 (96.4%)	0 (0%)	305 (98.7%)	0 (0%)
Senior citizen programs	Yes	3 (1%)	3 (100%)	4 (1.3%)	4 (100%)
	No	306 (99%)	0 (0%)	305 (98.7%)	0 (0%)
Programs for people with disabilities	Yes	2 (0.6%)	2 (100%)	3 (1%)	3 (100%)
	No	307 (99.4%)	0 (0%)	306 (99%)	0 (0%)
Mental health care program	Yes	9 (2.9%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	No	300 (97.1%)	0 (0%)	309 (100%)	0 (0%)
Others	Yes	8 (2.6%)	7 (100%)	7 (2.3%)	5 (83.3%)
	No	301 (97.4%)	0 (0%)	302 (97.7%)	1 (16.7%)

Source: Author's elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R.

Table 5

**Programs that they would recommend to their peers**

	N	%
Programs “activities on daily living skills”		
Self-esteem	32	25.6
Support and accompaniment	13	10.4
Driver education	5	4
Social skills	38	30.4
Preparation for life at liberty	13	10.4
Others	24	19.2
Employment programs “Courses or vocational training aimed at finding a job”		
Cooking and Hospitality	38	24.2
Computing	17	10.8
Food Handling	8	5.1
Cleaning and laundry	13	8.3
Dressmaking	12	7.6
Esthetics and hairdressing	15	9.6
Job search and orientation courses	19	12.1
Others	35	22.3
Socio-educational and gender programs		
Gender Violence Programs and “Being woman is”	67	56.3
Sports and Leisure Programs	9	7.6
Drug Addiction Prevention Programs	12	10.1
Family programs, care for the elderly and other capacities	4	3.4
Others		

Source: Author’s elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R.



Table 6

**Programs that would need to be performed**

	N	%
Programs “activities on daily living skills”		
Self-esteem and conflict resolution	23	18.7
Driver education	14	11.4
Social skills	19	15.4
Others	21	17.1
None required	46	37.4
Employment programs “Courses or vocational training aimed at finding a job”		
Cooking and Hospitality	38	19.1
Computing	15	7.5
Language	6	3
Esthetics and hairdressing	18	9
Job search and orientation courses	16	8
Others	57	28.6
None required	49	24.6
Socio-educational and gender programs		
Gender Violence Programs and “Being woman is”	26	17
Sports and Leisure Programs	7	4.6
Drug Addiction Prevention Programs	4	2.6
Family programs, care for the elderly and other capacities	21	13.7
Others	18	11.8
None required	77	50.3

Source: Author’s elaboration based on the questionnaire of convicted women from Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R

Table 7  
Variable relationship between reinsertion processes and whether or not programs are carried out

	GENERAL COURSES			COURSE REALIZATION SKILLS			COMPLETION OF LABOR COURSES			GENDER COURSES		
	G	DP	S	G	DP	S	G	DP	S	G	DP	S
Currently employed.	0.316	0.366	0.731	0.457	0.39	0.65	0.164	0.257	0.807	0.994	0.916	0.636
Normalized life abroad.	0.145	0.255	0.537	0.933	0.933	0.922	0.438	0.607	0.527	0.497	0.609	0.971
Assessment of readiness for liberty.	0.595	0.739	0.173	0.623	0.803	0.334	0.897	0.818	0.238	0.243	0.16	0.82
I am afraid of what I will find outside when I leave for good.	0.304	0.467	0.401	0.266	0.192	0.292	0.024**	0.023**	0.973	0.29	0.313	0.35
I find it difficult to manage administrative matters (requesting medical appointments, social services, employment services, etc.).	0.445	0.304	0.558	0.233	0.204	0.835	0.267	0.187	0.651	0.918	0.981	0.165
I feel insecure about going out and finding new things.	0.124	0.115	0.773	0.361	0.554	0.668	0.319	0.116	0.474	0.257	0.237	0.49
I feel insecure making decisions.	0.513	0.503	0.001***	0.567	0.438	0.031**	0.291	0.177	0.051**	0.334	0.445	0.537
I need help and reinforcement from another person to make decisions.	0.87	0.811	0.008***	0.492	0.395	0.041**	0.847	0.718	0.036**	0.564	0.803	0.444
I have accepted that my family/others make decisions for me.	0.356	0.619	0.496	0.299	0.413	0.46	0.61	0.469	0.692	0.155	0.342	0.661
I have difficulty performing basic activities of daily living (cooking, hygiene, adequate rest).	0.701	0.936	0.133	0.019**	0.014***	0.351	0.327	0.63	0.247	0.914	0.995	0.068

	GENERAL COURSES		COURSE REALIZATION SKILLS		COMPLETION OF LABOR COURSES		GENDERCOURSES					
I am not able to carry out my tasks (professionals or other people continue to do it).	0.207	0.236	0.564	0.81	0.236	0.688	0.725	0.818	0.328	0.677	0.717	0.17
I solve day-to-day problems and find it difficult to plan for the future because I do not know what will happen.	0.512	0.88	0.009***	0.513	0.247	0.003***	0.981	0.8	0.413	0.656	0.341	0.345
I find it difficult to adapt to work routines.	0.889	0.732	0.32	0.273	0.479	0.867	0.385	0.743	0.37	0.004***	0.012***	1
When I am finally free everything will be fine for me.	0.136	0.351	0.993	0.588	0.834	0.407	0.008***	0.011***	0.08	0.506	0.451	0.959

\*\*\* Significant at 99%, \*\* significant at 95%, \* significant at 90%.  
 Source: Author's own elaboration (Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R).

Table 8

**Relationship between recidivism profile and program performance**

	GENERAL	ORDINARY REGIME	SEMI- LIBERTY
Some type of program (general)	0.142	0.699	0.764
Daily Living skills program	0.845	0.356	0.547
Job orientation and training programs	0.012***	0.025***	0.859
Socio-educational and gender programs	0.411	0.375	0.752

\*\*\* Significant at 99%, \*\* significant at 95%, \* significant at 90%.

Source: Author's own elaboration (Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R).

Table 9

**Relationship between the recidivism profile and the completion or non-completion of work programs (with significance).**

Education programs for employment and labor in/reinsertion: GENERAL	Recidivist	Non- recidivist	TOTAL
Yes	58 (75.3%)	138 (59.5%)	196 (63.4%)
No	19 (24.7%)	94 (40.5%)	113 (36.6%)
TOTAL	77 (100%)	232 (100%)	309 (100%)
Education for employment and in/ reinsertion into the labor market: ORDINARY REGIME	Recidivist	Non- recidivist	TOTAL
Yes	54 (70.1%)	129 (55.6%)	183 (59.2%)
No	23 (29.9%)	103 (44.4%)	126 (40.8%)
TOTAL	77 (100%)	232 (100%)	309 (100%)

Source: Author's own elaboration (Project Ref. EDU2016-79322-R).

**Elisabet Moles-López.** PhD in Education and Graduate in Sociology from the University of Granada. Current teaching staff researcher in the Department of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Education Sciences, University of Granada. Lines of research: gender, addictions, vulnerable contexts, prison, recidivism, criminality, education, socio-educational intervention, crime prevention, restorative justice, gender in justice, alternative to incarceration, migration, poverty, and social inequality. Recent publications: 1) Moles-López, Elisabet and Añaños, Fanny (2021), “Factors of Prison Recidivism in Women: A Socioeducational and Sustainable Development Analysis,” in *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 11, Switzerland: University of Basel. 2) Moles-López, Elisabet and Añaños, Fanny (2021), “Prison recidivism in Spain: gender, associated factors and prevention,” in *Psychology, Society & Education*, vol. 13, no. 2, Spain: University of Cordoba. 3) Moles-López, Elisabet (2022), “Criminal recidivism and its socio-educational prevention from a gender perspective”, in Añaños, Fanny, García-Vita, María del Mar and Amaro, Ana [coords.], *Social justice, gender and socio-educational intervention. Prison environment and criminal contexts*, vol. I, Spain: Pirámide Editions.

**Rubén J. Burgos-Jiménez.** PhD in Pedagogy. He was a beneficiary of the University Staff Training Program (FPU) and he is currently doing postdoctoral research at the University of Granada in the Department of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Education Sciences. Lines of research: addictions, gender, vulnerable contexts, sexuality, socio-educational intervention, prison, youth, and socio-educational action. Recent publications: 1) Burgos-Jiménez, Rubén, Amaro Agudo, Ana and Añaños, Fanny (2023), “Processes of socio-educational accompaniment and adaptation to life in freedom in convicted women”, in *Social Pedagogy. Interuniversity Journal*, No. 42, Spain: Iberoamerican Society of Social Pedagogy. 2) Burgos-Jiménez, Rubén, Moles-López Elisabet and Añaños, Fanny (2023), “Reintegration factors in the treatment of drug addiction in women prisoners in Spain”, in *Spanish Journal of Criminological Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, Spain: Spanish Society of Criminological Research (SEIC). 3) Burgos-Jiménez, Rubén, García Tardón, Bruno, Martín-Solbes, Víctor Manuel and Pozuelo Rubio, Florencia (2020), “The gender approach in socio-educational intervention with women: a study in the Spanish penitentiary environment”, in *Psychology, Society & Education*, vol. 13, no. 1, Spain: University of Cordoba.

**Fanny T. Añaños.** PhD in Pedagogy from the University of Granada. Professor of the Department of Pedagogy, researcher at the University Institute for Peace and Conflict Research (IPAZ). Lines of research: Pedagogy/Social Education and its different fields (addictions, gender, prison social education, vulnerable contexts, methodology of socio-educational intervention/action, migrations, among others). Recent publications: 1) Añaños, Fanny *et al.* (2022), *Transits and challenges of social insertion-reinsertion with women in semi-liberty. Socio-educational proposals (National Victoria Kent Award 2021)*, Spain: Ministry of the Interior. 2) Añaños, Fanny, García-Vita, María del Mar, Galán Casado, Diego and Raya-Miranda, Rocío (2020), “Dropout, Autonomy and Reintegration in Spain: A Study of the Life of Young Women on Temporary Release,” in *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 11, Belgium: Free University of Brussels. 3) Añaños, Fanny (2022), “Towards socio-educational and human development models. Keys to prison social insertion-reinsertion”, in Añaños, Fanny, García-Vita, María del Mar and Amaro, Ana [coords.], *Social justice, gender and socioeducational intervention. Prison environment and criminal contexts*, vol. I, Spain: Pirámide Editions.