



HAL
open science

The opinion of prison-service professionals in Andalusia regarding "Respect Departments"

Francisco Fernández Millán, Purificación Pérez-García

► To cite this version:

Francisco Fernández Millán, Purificación Pérez-García. The opinion of prison-service professionals in Andalusia regarding "Respect Departments". *Pedagogia Social Revista Interuniversitaria*, 2018, 31, pp.169-182. 10.7179/PSRI_2018.31.13 . halshs-01694717

HAL Id: halshs-01694717

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01694717>

Submitted on 28 Jan 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

THE OPINION OF PRISON-SERVICE PROFESSIONALS IN ANDALUCIA REGARDING “RESPECT DEPARTMENTS”

LA OPINIÓN DE LOS PROFESIONALES DE LOS CENTROS PENITENCIARIOS DE ANDALUCÍA SOBRE LOS MÓDULOS DE RESPETO

A OPINIÃO DOS PROFISSIONAIS DOS ESTABELECIMENTOS PRISIONAIS DA ANDALUZIA SOBRE OS MÓDULOS DE RESPEITO

Francisco FERNÁNDEZ MILLÁN* & Purificación PÉREZ-GARCÍA**

* Centro Penitenciario de Albolote (Granada, España), **Universidad de Granada

Received date: 25.IV.2017

Reviewed date: 6.VI.2017

Accepted date: 10.VII.2017

<p>KEY WORDS: prison officer technical team managerial team prison penitentiary treatment</p>	<p>ABSTRACT: Relatively few studies have focused on the group of professionals who work in the Respect Departments, which are internal units within the prison. Our aim was to understand the opinion of prison professionals in relation to these modules, and, in particular, to identify if there was any relationship between these opinions and the professional group to which they belonged, including prison officers, professionals such as psychologists, psychiatrists, educators, and other members of the technical and management teams. This study used the descriptive method, developing our own questionnaire titled “Questionnaire for Professionals on the Respect Departments”, which was tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha (.766) whilst validity of its main components was analyzed, which explained 61.102% of the variance. A sample of 315 subjects from the eight Andalusian provinces of the three sectors participated in the study. Contingency analysis was applied and the results revealed that the Respect Departments were viewed differently both as an educative tool and in general, depending on the group to which the prison staff belonged.</p>
<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: funcionario de prisiones equipo técnico mando directivo prisión tratamiento penitenciario</p>	<p>RESUMEN: El grupo de profesionales que trabajan en los Módulos de Respeto está poco estudiado. Son un sistema de organización interna de la prisión. Nuestro objetivo era conocer su posicionamiento sobre estos módulos; y de forma específica, averiguar si había alguna relación entre el concepto de estos y el grupo profesional al que se pertenecía: funcionario, equipo técnico y mando directivo. Nos apoyamos en el método descriptivo y aplicamos un cuestionario de elaboración propia “Cuestionario para Profesionales sobre los Módulos de Respeto”, al que sometimos al alpha de Cronbach para la fiabilidad (.766) y al análisis de componentes principales para su validez de contenido que explicó el 61.102% de la varianza. Participó una muestra de 315 sujetos de las ocho provincias andaluzas de los tres sectores.</p>

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR’S ADDRESS: Purificación PÉREZ-GARCÍA. Campus Universitario de Cartuja. Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación s/n 18071 Granada. mpperez@ugr.es

	Se aplicó el análisis de contingencias y los resultados mostraron que los Módulos de Respeto, como herramienta formativa y lo que se entendía por este concepto, se relacionaban de forma distinta en función del sector profesional.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: funcionário de prisões equipa técnica coordenação diretiva risão tratamento prisional	RESUMO: O grupo de profissionais que trabalham nos Módulos de Respeito encontra-se pouco estudado. São um sistema de organização interna da prisão. O nosso objetivo era conhecer o seu posicionamento sobre estes módulos; e de forma específica, averiguar se existia alguma relação entre o conceito destes eo grupo profissional ao qual pertenciam: funcionário, equipa técnico ecoordenaçãodiretiva. Apoiámo-nosno método descritivo e aplicámos um questionário de elaboração própria “Questionário para Profissionais sobre os Módulos de Respeito”, ao qual submetemos o alpha de Cronbach para a fiabilidade (.766) ea análise das componentes principais para a sua validade de conteúdo, que explicou os 61.102% da variação. A participação contou com uma amostra de 315 sujeitos das oito províncias andaluzas, dos três sectores. Foi aplicada a análise das contingências e os resultados demonstraram que os Módulos de Respeito, como ferramenta formativa eo que se entendia por este conceito, se relacionavam de forma distinta na função do sector profissional.

1. Introduction

The penitentiary world has been widely studied in our country from a number of different perspectives (psychological, sociological, criminological, and educational) of which Martín, Vila and De Oña (2013) have conducted a comprehensive review, describing the state of the art in terms of educational research in this environment.

The studies have primarily focused on the prison population, including the effects of imprisonment, drugs, gender, age, and mental problems (Añaños, 2017; García-Legaz & Crespo, 2014; Martín, 2008), with very few being carried out on the Respect Departments (RDs), and even fewer have focused on the professionals working in these modules, namely, surveillance officers and technical teams.

The research presented here is the first study of its type to be conducted in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia, and is concerned with exploring the opinions held by prison professionals regarding RDs, given that their maximum involvement is needed for the success of these modules.

At a national level, there has been a lack of research on the professionals who work in these modules. Within the area of penitentiary research we have found number 22 of 2016 of the “Journal of Social Education. (BEEF)”; the 2013 monograph of the “Journal of Education”; number 22 of 2013 of the Journal of “Social Pedagogy, the Journal Interuniversitaria” and number 59 of 2014 of the “Galega Magazine of Education”. The only specific references to professionals are in terms of prisons in general - but not RDs - as in the studies by Anton (1998) and Valderrama (2010).

In the international arena, there are no references to RDs, since this is a construct that is unique to the Spanish prison system (Belinchón,

2009), and was created in 2001 and has since been exported to some European countries such as France and England. Although since the seventies there have been experiences that share the socializing purpose of the RDs, they do not follow either its structure or organization. In the last decade, some of these practices have been characterized by mentoring programs (Cook, McClure, Koutsenok & Lord, 2008, Marlow, Grajeda, Lee, Young, Williams & Hill, 2015), social therapy programs (Suhling & Guéridon, 2016), social reintegration through work (Novo-Corti & Barreiro-Gen, 2015), or the commitment to a sociological application (Guy, 2011).

2. Respect departments: professionals and purpose

Case law advocates reinsertion, but what about re-education? At present, the Basic Law that constitutes all regulations in penitentiary matters is the Organic Law 1/1979, of 26 of September, General Penitentiary (here after OLGP) (BOE nº392, of 5th of October). It establishes - as a fundamental purpose of custodial sentences - the re-education and social reintegration of the convicted.

This is also reflected in Article 25.2 of the Spanish Constitution, which states that security measures should be directed towards re-education and social reintegration (Añaños, Fernández-Sánchez & Llopis, 2013, Cervelló, 2016). Of these two concepts,

the former is more frequently shunned because it implies the internalization of values, which means that the latter has more acceptance as a social reincorporation far removed from the crime, understanding it not as direct actions toward the subject, but as a way creating the social conditions necessary to produce a lower rate of crime. (Cervelló, 2016, p. 41).

The solutions adopted, in any case, will be “methodologically plural and open to pedagogic activities” (Caride & Gradaille, 2013, p.36). Such solutions are specifically operational in prison procedures. They can be medical, psychiatric, psychological, pedagogical, work-related, or social. Although not systematized by OLGP, they refer to group psychotherapy, pedagogical counseling and behavior therapy, with activities such as work, sports, education, culture, or leisure.

In our view, the RDs represent the first step toward the development of an approach that uses programs to reeducate and re-socialize, surpassing therapeutic and clinical techniques (Añaños & Yagüe, 2013). This new approach must be directed toward an educational and moral sense of performance (Gil, 2010, 2016). This implies commitment to the inmates on the part of all professionals. That is to say, they have to be understood, both without judgment and with the mere objective of improving those who wish to live according to the law. Therefore, the RDs is a methodology that offers a future within the penitentiary.

The RD has been defined as “an intervention program with defined and systematized instruments, dynamics, structures and guidelines for action and evaluation” (Belinchón & García, 2014, p. 162). According to Valderrama (2016, p. 31), these are internal organizational structures that “on the basis of voluntariness and commitment to participation, both in activities and in the operation of the module itself, are designed to generate flexible spaces, coexistence, and facilitators of intervention programs”.

The re-socializing and re-educating experiences in the Spanish prison system are scarce, but varied. Del Pozo and Añaños (2013) have committed to programs of coexistence (social and personal skills, autonomy, and leadership), interculturality, and values. Valderrama (2016) leads a project based on a dialogical-communicative approach, generating mechanisms of shared management. Lorenzo, Aroca, and Alba (2013) advocate the Prosocial Thinking Program, which, in the Spanish context, has been applied to various populations. The experience of the Good Lives Program (Gil, 2013) is another possible way of re-education whose foundation is rooted in a legislative, ethical, and anthropological framework of human rights. In other words, it is a question of thinking about the potential of human rights from a juridical point of view, favoring penitentiary legislative reforms and prison management along with the educational possibilities of human rights and the right to education in prisons.

For re-socialization and re-education for work, the prison administration is needed. This is

organized around unipersonal organizations and collegiate bodies with fully specified functions. The former are composed of the director, deputy director, administrator, and head of service; whilst the latter consists of the board of directors, the board of administration, the technical team, the disciplinary commission, and the economic-administrative board. As professionals not classified within any of these bodies, the surveillance officers carry out their work within the prison center.

In our study, we are interested in understanding the work of the different professionals in order to interpret their roles within the prison system. The director is the highest figure, whose functions consist of directing, coordinating, and supervising the guidelines of prison life, such as procedures, regimes, health, personnel, economic-administrative management, representation, and disciplinary order (Cervelló, 2016).

The technical team takes care of the inmate's life in prison. This is achieved by implementing treatment programs or individual intervention models. The team may consist of a lawyer, a psychologist, a pedagogue, a sociologist, a physician, a medical technician / university graduate in nursing, a teacher or workshop manager, an educator, a social worker, a sociocultural or sports supervisor and a department manager. However, as Valderrama (2016, p. 34) puts it, “the professional profiles that currently form the body of correctional technicians are basically those of lawyers and psychologists, there being a general absence of pedagogues.” The figure of the social educator whose actions surpass therapeutic, legalistic, and criminological approaches “is focused on designing demanding occupational activities that favor personal and social change, both in attitudes and values.” (Gil, 2016, p. 61)

The Directorate General of Penitentiary Institutions (DGPI, 2007) indicates that in the RD, the functions of the technical team are: a) to conduct weekly meetings in informal sessions; b) to evaluate inmates and the progress of the program; and (c) to establish standard setting and organization, and advise on coordination between the team, officials, and inmates. In addition, these teams also have the task of encouraging, motivating, and locating the prisoner inside the module, based on the individualized profile of each prisoner (Cendón, Belinchón & García, 2011).

In-house or security officers ensure that security and order are maintained within the prison. The DGPI (2007) understands that they must be volunteers and trained in the dynamics of operation of the RDs. Their roles are: a) to take responsibility for coordinating the activities of the inmates, b) to be familiar with the program, c) to evaluate

each inmate on a daily basis, and d) to participate in the weekly meetings with the technical team.

However, the DGPI itself expresses a certain fear, since, despite the functions of the RDs being stipulated in terms of generating fewer conflicts, playing a more positive role and changing the type of interpersonal relations, – because here it is no longer the enemy of the prisoner “who limits the freedom that is allowed?” (Galán, 2015, p. 366), but instead it presupposes an approach – and to augment its function, it is possible to find resistance or at least not entirely unconditional support for the RDs. This originates from confusion with respect to the role that they have to play and from mistaken ideas about the concept of the RDs.

For their part, prison centers must therefore transmit, to those professionals developing their work in the RDs, the philosophy of the system and its advantages, both from the point of view of the aims of the Prison center, as well as for their professional satisfaction, and the important role that they play as professionals in its functioning (Cendón, Belinchón & García, 2011).

The professionals most directly involved in the RDs – namely educators and surveillance officials – will focus on two issues: first, they will focus on the situation as a collective social problem rather than on the subject as a problem in itself (Valderama, 2013), or as people with the internal potential to change their values and attitudes (Gil, 2016, 2010); and second, on training (Añaños & Yagüe, 2013). We argue that both types of professional must have knowledge of the instruments and techniques that are needed to develop their work properly, but above all, must be “committed.”

We also recognize that training in the processes of diagnosis, execution, and evaluation that are required for re-education and re-socialization are not clearly assigned to different professionals (Valderrama, 2016). Such specialized intervention would allow for coherence and effectiveness of these processes and is the best approach to adopt (Del Pozo, 2013).

In any case, if the managers, technical teams, and surveillance officers are to be noted for “the responsibility of understanding to intervene better” (Scarfó, Breglia & López, 2016, p.85), then regardless of the professional knowledge they possess, the significance of their performance ultimately “will depend on their ethics, values, and principles” (Expósito & Llopis, 2016, p. 81) in their daily work within the RDs.

In this regard, our research objective was to explore the opinion of the various professionals working within the prison (surveillance officers, technical team, and managers) in relation to the RDs.

3. Methodology

For inclusion in the study, participants needed to belong to the civil service sector, including internal or surveillance officers, technical teams (lawyers, psychologists, pedagogues, educators, and social workers) or managers (directors, assistant directors, and chiefs of service). According to the data included in the Workplace list of the penitentiary centers of Andalusia, this population was composed of 2327 subjects.

Our sample, which was representative with a confidence level of 95%, comprised 315 professionals from the Andalusian penitentiary centers. This was obtained by applying the simple random sampling technique, considering the finite population, following Tagliacarne (1968).

9,5% of the total of the sample was from Almería, 11,1% from Cadiz, 8,3% from Cordoba, 11,7% from Granada, 18,1% from Huelva, 11,4% from Jaén, 19,7% from Malaga, and 10,2% from Seville. 76,2% were men and 23,8% were women. With regard to sector, 66,6% were surveillance officers, 31,2% were technical staff, and 2,2% were managers. In terms of professional experience, 35,5% had more than 25 years of service, 27,1% between 15 and 25 years and only 3,2% had less than 5 years of service. Regarding the number of years of working in the RD, 52,4% had given between 1 and 3 years service, 25,4% between 3 and 5 years and 13,3% over 5 years. 54,9% preferred RDs compared with 31,7% who preferred the ordinary modules.

In our research we employed the self-designed questionnaire method (Cohen & Manion, 1990) and for data collection, being consistent with the method, a questionnaire was used (McMillan and Schumacher, 2005) known as “Questionnaire for Professionals on Respect Departments”. This was structured in three parts. The first refers to identification data: sex, professional group, section in which the participant was working, experience as a prison professional and in RDs, as well as where they preferred to carry out their daily work. The second part comprised the bulk of the questionnaire and was divided into four blocks with a Likert-type response scale consisting of categories 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5: (a) general position regarding RDs (items 1, 2, 8); b) training tool (items 3 to 7); c) utility of the RDs (items 9 to 12); and d) feasibility (items 13 to 16). The third part was composed of a group of six open-ended questions, as follows: What is the best aspect of the RDs in comparison with the other departments of the Center? What is the worst aspect of the RDs in relation to the other departments of the Center? What would you change from the current RDs? What would

you eliminate from the current RDs? and the last two questions: add any proposal for improvement in relation to the RDs that you think important and necessary; and add any proposal for improvement in relation to the Penitentiary Institution that you believe to be important and necessary.

The self-made questionnaire was constructed following a review of the literature – both academic and legislative – on the RDs. The procedure followed for the collection of the information was the questionnaire delivered by hand to the professionals, since we had the permission of the Ministry of the Interior. The General Subdirectorate of Institutional Relations and Territorial Coordination opened the way with a circular addressed to the directors of the penitentiary centers in Andalusia. Following ethical criteria, the participants also gave informed consent.

To determine the validity of the questionnaire, we used principal component analysis, which confirmed the validity of the content. Through this analysis, we identified how the items were interrelated (Rodríguez, Olos & Martínez, 2012) with a cut-off of .04 (Cea, 2001) to locate the items in a factor. The KMO value for sampling adequacy was .830 and Barlett sphericity was significant at $p = .000$, with the sample having an adequate distribution. We obtained 4 factors that explained 61.102% of the variance, which indicated the degree of homogeneity of the data (Quispe, 2014) in each one of the factors, which were practically in line with the structure of the questionnaire presented. Thus, the “general position” factor held two of the three variables (2, 8); “training tool” was reproduced in full with items 3 to 7; the “utility” factor constituted all the items and added two more (1, 15); and the “viability” factor collected three of the four items.

To calculate reliability, following Bisquerra (1987), we applied the α of Cronbach. We obtained a coefficient of .766, indicating moderate reliability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2005) and an acceptable degree of internal consistency, above .600, in accord with Thorndike (1997).

4. Results

We approached our objective by exploring the possible significant associations, through contingency analysis, using the statistical package SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). For the open-ended data, we conducted content analysis (Kelchtermans, 1993), which yielded six categories:

the best aspects of RDs compared to other modules, the worst or more negative aspects of RDs compared with other modules, aspects to modify (points that would have to be changed within the RDs), aspects to eliminate (aspects to suppress), aspects to improve (aspects that could be kept but improved) and aspects for development (suggestions for rethinking the philosophy of the RDs).

For the statistical data (Table 1), we found significant relationships between the sector to which the participants belonged with both their position regarding the *concept of RDs* and with their opinion of the RDs as a *training tool*. However, no associations emerged with the utility of the modules or their viability.

With regard to the *concept of RDs*, both the surveillance officers and the technical teams showed a positive appreciation of the inclusion and development of the RDs in the prison; similarly, the managers (57.1%) greatly valued the inclusion and development of the RDs. The same pattern was found regarding the question of how detrimental the creation of RDs could be for the remaining modules, where both officers (58%) and the technical team (45.3%) felt that it did not harm anything. However, among the management teams there was disagreement, since only 28.6% did not think it would harm anything.

As a *training tool*, we found that the officials believed that the formal education or training activities that were taking place inside the RDs were sufficient (30.5%). In contrast, for technical teams these were regarded as abundant (34.7%). On the other hand, there was no unanimous criterion among the managers, since their opinions were distributed with the same percentage giving the responses of “lacking” and “abundant”.

Surveillance officers (40%) thought that productive workshops, regulated by Royal Decree 782/2001, in which the inmates were insured with Social Security and received a monthly payment, were not considered inside the RDs. In this regard, technical teams (28.5%) and managers (42%) recognized that they existed, but maintained that they were scarce.

The sports activities programmed in the RDs were regarded as sufficient by officials (32.9%), technical teams (38.9%), and management (42.8%). The belief that training or job placement courses were sufficiently developed within the RDs was shared by officials (24.7%) and technical teams (28.5%); in contrast, the management pointed out that these were lacking (42.9%).

Table 1. Associations by sector

1. Do you positively value the inclusion and development of the RD within the prison center?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	29,753	.040
Sector	Surveillance officer	9	5,3	19	32,9	33,8	100		
	Technical team	5,3	8,4	15,6	36,9	33,8	100		
	Management	0	0	0	57,1	42,9	100		
3. Are education activities or formal academic training developed within the RD?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	36,603	.006
Sector	Surveillance officer	14,8	9	30,5	26,7	19	100		
	Technical team	6,3	7,4	20	31,6	34,7	100		
	Management	14,3	28,6	14,3	28,6	14,2	100		
4. Within the RD are productive workshops held that are regulated by RD 782/2001 (With Social Security and monthly payments for inmates)?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	43,689	.000
Sector	Surveillance officer	40	17,5	14,8	17,1	10,6	100		
	Technical team	17,9	28,5	17,9	16,8	18,9	100		
	Management	28,6	42	0	28,6	0	100		
6. Are sporting activities developed within the RD?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	42,564	.001
Sector	Surveillance officer	2,9	13,2	31	32,9	20	100		
	Technical team	2,1	9,5	15,8	38,9	33,7	100		
	Management	0	28,6	14,3	42,8	14,3	100		

7. Are training courses or work placements developed within the RD?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	34,693	.009
Sector	Surveillance officer	17,2	21	24,7	23,8	13,3	100		
	Technical team	7,4	14,7	28,5	27,4	22	100		
	Management	14,3	42,9	14,3	28,5	0	100		
8. Does the creation of the RD have a detrimental effect on the other modules?									
		%						χ^2	<i>p</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	32,469	.006
Sector	Surveillance officer	58	11	9,5	10,5	11	100		
	Technical team	45,3	22,1	10,5	7,4	14,7	100		
	Management	28,6	28,6	14,2	28,6	0	100		
Response Key: 1 none, 2 a little, 3 sufficient, 4 high, 5 very high									

The information obtained through the open questions is presented as a function of the 6 categories extracted.

In relation to the first category, the three sectors pointed out that *the best aspects* of the RDs were cleanliness; no conflicts; respect for authority by the inmates; an improvement in their behavior; a quiet and peaceful environment; more occupations and activities; a life that was more reminiscent of freedom; an environment in which order, discipline, respect, and education prevailed; and the module was drug-free with increased participation, autonomy, and sanitation.

For the second category i.e. *the worst aspects* of the RDs, in the opinion of the three groups of professionals these were: increased bureaucracy, relaxed security, promotion of delation, lack of command of the officials and a reduction in their powers when dealing with greater authority of the technical team, not all profiles of prisoners were included, the program was not fulfilled as it was thought, it looked like a “facelift of prisons”, prisoners were believed to have more rights and fewer obligations, even an inmate could punish another partner, the system of selection of inmates, use of the RDs as a “dump” to separate incompatible prisoners in other modules. It was a “pantomime and a theater” for society, norms were not adapted to the realities of society, and hypocrisy and artificiality were evident because the behaviors were simulated.

In the third category, the points to be modified were: the selection of the prisoners and their classification, as well as access and exit from the module. They also valued the power relations between the officials, the board of administration, and the board of directors. Officials wanted more weight and technical teams wanted more power in front of the board. It was requested to increase the number of RDs, with more resources, personnel and intellectual activities with fewer sports, questioning the over-authority of the inmates and internal organization.

The fourth category, referring to what they would eliminate, elicited the following: they stated that the meaning of the RDs were “pure facade”, and they would dispense with the confidantes, the uninvolved inmates, the stupid rules, the inmates point scoring between them and, in sports, body-building and boxing.

Suggested improvements primarily centered on everyone having the same opportunity to be involved; the inclusion of complicated inmates and any officials who wanted to participate in the program (not only those that had been “given a way in”); more staff and resources; more vocational training and education and more productive work; commitment to training and work; more productive workshops; more courses; more recognition of the work of the officials; greater collaboration between the technical team and officials; more follow-up of the inmates and their attitude and aptitude; removal of power from the inmates;

less paternalism; a more exhaustive selection procedure; more planned outings; and greater control of NGOs.

Finally, the development of the RDs was another key aspect. The view of the three sectors was that these modules should be redirected towards vocational training, training in values, along with a regulated study environment and productive work. In addition, they mentioned the consolidation of work habits, education, training and overcoming conflict with mutual respect. It was also suggested to not limit the RDs to patterns of coexistence, but move towards reinsertion and reintegration - in the words of the professionals - there is a "necessary evolution, because currently only the rules of urbanity matter." They suggested the need for coordination, because the RDs had become "behavior simulation factories". It was also deemed necessary to raise the prisoner's awareness of the problem that led him to prison.

5. Discussion & conclusions

The aim of this study was to explore the views of the various professionals working in prison (surveillance officers, technical team, and managers) on the RDs.

Following analysis of the numerical data, we observed significant relationships between the opinion of the RDs as a *training tool* and *its concept*, but not between its utility or viability.

In our view these latter two results are unsurprising, since the usefulness - collected after the qualitative analysis of the information using open questions - is not in doubt, since the RDs (see annex) adopts a

"less punitive conception of prison and places more emphasis on education, based on the voluntary commitment of inmates to comply with norms and patterns of behavior that are appropriate for coexistence, not so much in the sense of discipline but rather in terms of social relations with other inmates and personal hygiene habits or non-use of drugs" (Cervelló, 2016, p. 271),

care for the environment and interpersonal relationships (Casado, 2013). The "proper functioning of the RDs favors social reintegration" (Galán, 2015, p. 325). The viability of the RDs is not questioned, and the placement of 257 modules distributed in 68 centers at national level has not been in vain, placing 19289 inmates (SGIP, 2016).

In contrast, the *concept of RDs* is highly valued by officials and technical teams. The fact that these professional figures create the RDs is fundamental to its development and success. As suggested by Lerman and Page (2016), the prospects of prison officials affect their behavior in the

workplace, which has consequences for staff-prisoner relationships, policy implementation, and routine prison operations. Galán (2015, p. 321) argues that

the professionals who are part of a RDs are an indispensable part of the program, since they are in charge of supervising the correct functioning of the module. In addition, a greater degree of involvement on the part of this group is necessary for making the RDs a viable alternative for those inmates who want to live together under more adequate conditions within prison.

Belinchón (2009) expressly states in his RDs handbook that it is essential to have the direct and permanent involvement of the Director of the center as a promoter of the project, along with the Technical Team responsible for day-to-day management.

As a *training tool*, it is the officials and the technical team who see these as sufficient and abundant, respectively, whilst in terms of the opinion regarding academic activities, the management do not clarify if these are sufficient or lacking. This result is consistent with the idea that the RDs must be redirected away from (but not abandoning) academic emphasis in favor of a more professional stance, designing occupational workshops and more productive work, as well as working toward the formation of values (Del Pozo & Añaños, 2013; Gil, 2010). It would be a matter of "designing demanding occupational activities that favor personal and social change, both in attitudes and values" (Gil, 2016, p. 61)

The idea that there are few or no productive workshops in which the inmates are registered for Social Security and are remunerated is a point on which all agree. Indeed, all three sectors justify their implementation in terms of the implied benefits for the inmate. Such benefits include socio-economic advantages, since it will imply economic remuneration (Viedma & Frutos, 2012); the penitentiary will also benefit in that it will allow him to "dignify himself as a person, prepare for his future release, avoid unemployment and, above all, channel the degree of anxiety and stress generated by confinement, coming to regard the employment relationship as an essential element in their daily life"; whilst another benefit is the educational and therapeutic function that these workshops presuppose (Esteban, Alós, Jódar & Miguélez, 2014). According to these authors, the benefits are manifold, since "inmates internalize attitudes associated with work" (p. 192) such as punctuality, responsibility, or duty and because it mitigates the prison culture. The educational function of work is an idea associated with the need to promote general, professional, and occupational

training through the process of socialization through education, and this is particularly important given that prison work is the first consistent employment experience for some prisoners (Alós, Martín, Miguélez, & Gibert, 2009). However, it appears that there is a lack of proper management when organizing these workshops, as pointed out by Salamanca (2016), who showed that there are 12500 working prisoners, but there are facilities for 20000, that is, there are equipped workshops that are empty because there are no companies that carry out their work there.

For the three sectors, the sports activities that are programmed within the RDs are regarded as sufficient, and they are undoubtedly considered to be beneficial. This fact is confirmed by studies on sport in prisons, the results of which show the benefits of coexistence and self-control in inmates (Castillo, 2005). Although these studies do not differentiate between sports, the officials prefer to dispense with the bodybuilding and boxing rooms and instead try different types of activities that do not involve bodybuilding.

The development of training courses or labor insertion are recognized as sufficient by officials and technical teams, but are regarded as lacking by the management. As argued by Del Pozo y Añaños (2013), education is a challenge, a right and a deontological principle. Martín (2008, p. 23) is in favor of “pedagogical interventions that lead to re-education”, i.e., according to his words, the educational component should preside over the actions that take place within prisons.

Do we disagree with our quantitative results? Absolutely not. Our findings show the Andalusian reality as viewed by the people working in the various professional sectors in prisons. But it is also worth discussing the perspective obtained from the categories defined from the open questions.

The strongest attribute of the RDs is that it achieves each and every one of the objectives for which it was created, and the following are recognized by all three sectors: participation, autonomy, health, respect, and a drug-free environment. These are the axes on which these modules are embedded and are thus recognized (Belinchón, 2009; Belinchón & García, 2014; Cendón, Belinchón & García, 2011).

The worst aspect, in the opinion of the officials and technical teams, is the simulation of the conduct of the inmates. Therefore, the reward system should be reviewed along with the professionals who manage the rewards that the inmates are given (Valderrama, 2016). Officials question whether rewards can be sanctioned among the inmates themselves, and consider that this power should be withdrawn and their over-authority reviewed.

They also believe that they have to *change* the system of access to the module, because they understand that, in reality, not all inmate profiles are included in the program. This idea is very important. If those who work within the module have reservations about the type of access, it would be necessary to think about this issue, since, as Galán (2015, p. 365) points out, the people outside these modules, officials and inmates, coexist with the premise that the “program houses sneakers, rapists and inmates in prison” and this will be a variable that disrupts their development.

What they would change are the power relations between officials and technical teams. It recognizes the lack of awareness of the prison staff and the lack of coordination at the different levels (Añaños & Yagüe, 2013). Specific training and the clear definition of roles and responsibilities would be helpful in this regard. Galán (2015) argues that both officials and technical staff must ensure that the RDs works, and must also evaluate the behavior of the inmate and make the relevant decisions. According to Valderrama (2016) the field of action of each professional is well defined, because, at the three established levels, the first is occupied by the surveillance officer who completes a daily record sheet on the progress of the inmate; The second is done by the person responsible for the specific daily activity; and the third is a weekly assessment by the Technical Team in which the surveillance officers participate.

What they *would improve*, particularly the technical teams, would be the programmed outings and the greater control of the NGOs. And we share the idea that it is difficult to undertake reintegration processes, segregating the population into which they are reinserted and isolating them from contact with society (Martín, 2008). On the other hand, there is a need to address the educational deprofessionalization in the prison sector (Gil, 2010), which could account for the fact that many of the activities within prisons are carried out by NGOs. Our claim is, therefore, that it is necessary to professionalize the actions carried out in prison.

Finally, we would like to stress the unanimity of the three sectors when considering that the RDs *should evolve* in other directions. We must overcome the idea of “learning rules of urbanity” (which has already been achieved, and which works very well in terms of the absence of conflicts) because what fundamentally underlies this is a “factory of behavior simulation.” It is really a question of approaching a new RDs concept based on moral and ethical values (Martín, 2008). The aim is to reorient the modules towards a new “ethics of accountability” (Martín, Vila & De Oña,

2013, p.29). That is to say, it would imply an educational methodology that shifted from blaming to taking responsibility and working with each person towards being responsible for their actions and experiences and living in a “more committed” way within society. In the same vein, Caride and Gradaille (2013, p. 44) pronounce “a special emphasis on the ethical commitments of and to those who are in prisons”. It is a question of overcoming an exemplary moral machination, and as Savater (2012, p. 16) rightly points out, “ten or fifteen commandments, or one or two codes of good conduct, are not to be learned. Ethics is the practice of reflecting on what we are going to do and the reasons why we are going to do it”. Undoubtedly the whole design of future formative-educational-professional-occupational actions should consider this new purpose “the why”.

The general view of the RDs is favorable. We conclude, in the light of our results, that there are no significant associations between being a surveillance officer, belonging to the technical team or being part of the management with regard to their viewpoint on the viability and usefulness of the RDs. Thus, the opinion on feasibility and utility is not related to belonging to one sector or another. It is, however, relevant when understanding the RDs as a training tool in which academic activities, productive workshops, sports activities, and training courses are held, since the opinions of all three sectors differ. There is also a significant difference of opinion with regard to the general concept - both its inclusion and creation - where it is recognized that there is no unanimity among the sectors.

The major contribution of this research is that it analyzes, at a regional level, the RDs from the perspective of the agents involved in its development, which include the management, technical team, and surveillance officers. But above all, an

important feature of the present work is that it picks up on the suggestions made by the studied sectors with respect to the RDs and the need for them to develop. It is necessary to reformulate the modules with a greater educational and productive dimension, with an emphasis on commitment to society and a focus on working on the “attitude” of prisoners and professionals towards wanting to change. The RDs cannot be social containers of good behavior, but instead must be the place that prepares the inmates for society in terms of a sense of ethics and social co-responsibility. This leads us irremediably to rethink both the meaning of the RDs and the profile of the professionals involved in its operation, and be sensitive to the necessary educational and social rethinking of the prison sector.

We must highlight some limitations of the present study. Despite having the approval of the General Sub-directorate of Institutional Relations and Territorial Coordination, the participation of the managers has not been as in-depth as we would have liked. Another possible limitation is that this investigation is confined solely to the autonomous community of Andalusia, and in addition, it has not taken into account the specific idiosyncrasies of the different penitentiary centers in the different provinces. In this regard, we have been cautious in discussing the results and conclusions in light of the restrictions discussed. Our work opens up the possibility of expanding this line of enquiry by gathering the voice of the inmates and adopting a biographical-narrative research approach in order to understand the RDs from the viewpoint of all sectors.

A further step in this work will be to communicate the findings to the Sub-directorate of Penitentiary Institutions with the aim of “listening to the voice of opinion” of the different sectors, which we have been able to collect and analyze in both a quantitative and qualitative manner.

References

- Alós, R., Martín, A., Miguélez, F., & Gibert, F. (2009). ¿Sirve el trabajo penitenciario para la reinserción?: un estudio a partir de las opiniones de los presos de las cárceles de Cataluña. *Reis: Revista española de investigaciones sociológicas*, 127, 11-32.
- Antón, P. (1998). *Actitudes del personal de prisiones hacia su trabajo y hacia los reclusos*. (Tesis doctoral). Universidad de Deusto.
- Añaños, F. (2017). *En Prisión. Realidades e intervención socioeducativa y drogodependencias en mujeres*. Madrid: Narcea.
- Añaños, F., Fernández, P., & Llopis, J. (2013). Aproximación a los contextos en prisión: una perspectiva socioeducativa. *Pedagogía social: revista interuniversitaria*, 22, 13-28. doi: 10.7179/PSRI
- Añaños, F., & Yagüe, C. (2013). Educación social en prisiones: planteamientos iniciales y políticas encaminadas hacia la reinserción desde la perspectiva de género. *Pedagogía social: revista interuniversitaria*, 22, 7-12. doi: 10.7179/PSRI
- Belinchón, E. (2009). *Módulos de Respeto. Manual*. Madrid: Secretaría General de Instituciones Penitenciarias. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/cvs2x3>
- Belinchón, E., & García, H. (2014). Módulos de respeto. Fundamentos metodológicos. Definición y objetivos. En A. De Juanas (Coord.), *Educación social en los centros penitenciarios* (153-176). Madrid: UNED.
- Bisquerra, R. (1987). *Introducción a la estadística aplicada a la investigación educativa. Un enfoque informático con los paquetes BMDP y SPSS*. Barcelona: PPU.
- Caride, J., & Gradañlle, R. (2013). Educar en las cárceles: nuevos desafíos para la educación social en las instituciones penitenciarias. *Revista de educación*, 360, 36-47. doi: 10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE
- Casado, J. (2013). Visión del sistema penitenciario español. *Intervención psicoeducativa en la desadaptación social: IPSE-ds*, 6, 41-54.
- Castillo, J. (2005). Deporte y reeducación de conductas antisociales en prisión: principales experiencias. En J. Aquesolo (Eds.), *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Historia del Deporte*. Sevilla: Aquesolo Vegas. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/EyK6sZ>
- Cea, A. (2004). *Métodos de encuesta. Teoría y práctica, errores y mejora*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Cendón, J., Belinchón, E., & García, H. (2011). *Módulos de Respeto. Manual de aplicación*. Madrid: Ministerio del Interior. Secretaría General Técnica. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/qj6Uwz>
- Cervelló, V. (2016). *Derecho Penitenciario*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1990). *Métodos de investigación educativa*. Madrid: La Muralla.
- Constitución Española. Boletín Oficial del Estado 311, 29 de diciembre de 1978.
- Cook, J., McClure, S., Koutsenok, I., & Lord, S. (2008). The Implementation of Inmate Mentor Programs in the Correctional Treatment System as an Innovative Approach. *Journal of Teaching in the Addictions*, 7(2), 123-32. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332700802418758>
- Del Pozo, F. (2013). Las políticas públicas para las prisiones: una aproximación a la acción social desde el modelo socioeducativo. *Revista de humanidades*, 20, 63-82. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/rdh.20.2013>
- Del Pozo, F., & Añaños, F. (2013). La Educación Social Penitenciaria: ¿De dónde venimos y hacia dónde vamos? *Revista complutense de educación*, 24(1), 47-68.
- Dirección General de Instituciones Penitenciarias (2007). *Módulos de Respeto. Módulos penitenciarios para la mejora de la convivencia*. Madrid: Ministerio del Interior. Secretaría General Técnica. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/jQMqnR>
- Esteban, F., Alós, R., Jódar, P., & Miguélez, F. (2014). La inserción laboral de ex reclusos. Una aproximación cualitativa. *Reis: Revista española de investigaciones sociológicas*, 145, 181-204. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5477/cis/reis.145.181>
- Expósito, E., & Llopis, N. (2016). El tránsito del educador social en prisiones: entre el control y la transgresión. *RES: Revista de Educación Social*, 22, 69-84.
- Galán, D. (2015). *Los Módulos de Respeto: una alternativa al tratamiento penitenciario*. (Tesis doctoral). Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/NWYGSD>
- García-Legaz, M., & Crespo, Álvaro (2014). *Cuestionario calidad de vida en los centros penitenciarios*. Madrid: Comisión de Calidad de Vida del Consejo Social Penitenciarios. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/J8CVNv>
- Gil, F. (2010). La acción pedagógica en las prisiones: posibilidades y límites. *Revista española de pedagogía*, 245, 49-66.
- Gil, F. (2013). Derechos humanos y reeducación en las prisiones. El derecho a la educación en el modelo good lives. *Revista de educación*, 360, 48-68. doi: 10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE
- Gil, F. (2016). Decálogo pedagógico de la educación social en prisión. *RES. Revista de Educación Social*, 50-69.
- Guy, R. (2011). Applied sociology and prisoner reentry a primer for more successful reintegration. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 5 (2), 40-52. doi: 0.1177/193672441100500204

- Kelchtermans, G. (1993). Getting the story, understanding the lives: From career stories to teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(5), 443-56. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(93\)90029-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(93)90029-G)
- Lerman, A., & Page, J. (2016). Does the Front Line Reflect the Party Line? The Politicization of Punishment and Prison Officers' Perspectives Towards Incarceration. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 56(3), 578-601. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv061>
- Ley Orgánica 1/1979, de 26 de septiembre, General Penitenciaria. Boletín Oficial de Estado 239, 5 de octubre de 1979.
- Lorenzo, M., Aroca, C., & Alba, J. (2013). La pedagogía penitenciaria en España: Luces y sombras. *Revista de educación*, 360, 119-39. doi: [10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE](https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE)
- Marlow, E., Grajeda, W., Lee, Y., Young, E., Williams, M., & Hill, K. (2015). Peer Mentoring for Male Parolees: A CBPR Pilot Study. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 9(1), 91-100. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2015.0013>
- Martín, V. (2008). Estudio socioeducativo de los jóvenes internados en las prisiones andaluzas. *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica: REIC*, 6, 1-25.
- Martín, V., Vila, E., & De Oña, J. (2013). La investigación educativa en el ámbito de las instituciones penitenciarias: panorámica, desafíos y propuestas. *Revista de educación*, 360, 16-35. doi: [10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE](https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE)
- Mcmillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2005). *Investigación educativa*. Madrid: Pearson.
- Novo-Corti, I., & Barreiro-Gen, M. (2015). Walking From Imprisonment Towards True Social Integration: Getting a Job as a Key Factor. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54 (6), 445-464. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1055036>
- Quispe, A. (2014). Procesamiento, análisis e interpretación de datos sociales. En A. Díaz, & A. Luna (eds.), *Metodología de la investigación educativa: Aproximaciones para comprender sus estrategias* (141-158). México: Díaz de Santos.
- Rodríguez, M., Olmos, S., & Martínez, F. (2012). Propiedades métricas y estructura dimensional de la adaptación española de una escala de evaluación de competencia informacional autopercibida. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 30 (2), 347-366. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/rie.30.2.120231>
- Salamanca, L. (2016). Intervención educativa en prisión: memoria y deseo. *RES, Revista de Educación Social*, 22, 159-73.
- Savater, F. (2012). *Ética de urgencia*. Madrid: Ariel.
- Scarfó, F., Breglia, F., & López, C. (2016). El aporte de la Pedagogía Social en la formación de los/as funcionarios/as penitenciarios. *RES, Revista de Educación Social*, 22, 85-98.
- SGIP (2016). *Informe General 2015*. Madrid: Ministerio del Interior. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/ugoaYf>
- Suhling, S. & Guéridon, M. (2016). Comparisons between social therapeutic institutions. *Forens Psychiatr Psychol Kriminol*, 10 (32). doi: [10.1007/s11757-015-0355-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11757-015-0355-y)
- Tagliacarne, G. (1968). *Técnica y práctica de la investigación de mercado*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Thorndike, R. (1997). *Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Valderrama, P. (2010). *Cárcel: poder, conflicto y ciudadanía. La micropolítica de la función reeducadora: La micropolítica de la función reeducadora*. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga.
- Valderrama, P. (2013). La micropolítica de la función reeducadora en prisión. *Revista de educación*, 360, 69-90. doi: [10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE](https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-0034-8082-RE)
- Valderrama, P. (2016). Los módulos de respeto en las cárceles, una revisión desde la Educación Social. *RES, Revista de Educación Social*, 22, 29-49.
- Viedma, A., & Frutos, D. (2012). El trabajo en prisiones: Observando las desigualdades de género. En C. Del Val, & A. Viedma (Coords.), *Condenadas a la desigualdad: sistema de indicadores de discriminación penitenciaria* (87-108). Barcelona: Icaria.

Anexo

Módulo de respeto, cultura, educación y deporte. Centro Penitenciario de Albolote (Granada)

Normas de convivencia en el módulo 13

- 1ª Debes cuidar tu aspecto utilizando el vestuario adecuado para cada ocasión, siendo obligatorio la ducha diaria y el cambio de ropa interior.
- 2ª Queda terminantemente prohibido el consumo de toda clase de drogas.
- 3ª Sólo se permite fumar en las dependencias autorizadas (patio y celda).
- 4ª La celda estará en perfecto estado de limpieza y ordenada, teniendo el vestuario debidamente colocado en su lugar habilitado.
Diariamente se pasará revista a la celda. En caso de incumplimiento de la normativa, los internos que se alojen en la misma obtendrán una valoración negativa que se reflejará en la "hoja de valoración" y se tendrá en cuenta para la evaluación semanal.
- 5ª Queda prohibido cualquier almacenamiento de alimentos en las celdas con la excepción de dos piezas de fruta y dos botella de agua por interno.
Se autoriza a lavar la ropa en la celda.
- 6ª No arrojar nada al suelo, ni escupir, utilizando las papeleras y ceniceros. Quedando terminantemente prohibido arrojar basura y objetos por la ventana de la celda.
- 7ª No se permite el acceso a la celda de otro interno sin estar el titular de la misma presente.
- 8ª Al toque de diana se levantará el interno, se aseará y pondrá en orden su celda. Durante los recuentos, el interno estará de forma respetuosa.
- 9ª La asistencia y puntualidad a todo tipo de actividades, asambleas o reuniones es muy importante.
- 10ª El interno respetará los turnos establecidos (comida, teléfono, economato, consultorios, etc.). En el comedor no hay sitio propiedad del nadie, no se puede entrar con ropa deportiva ni chanclas de goma, tampoco con camiseta de tirantes o cortadas.
- 11ª En horario de actividades, no se puede subir a las celdas sin autorización de los funcionarios y por algún motivo serio.
- 12ª El interno tendrá muy presente el espíritu de fomentar el objetivo del módulo, basado en el RESPETO, LA CULTURA Y EL DEPORTE.

El incumplimiento de las presentes normas de convivencia será motivo de estudio por los miembros del EQUIPO TÉCNICO, y en su caso, la expulsión.

En Albolote, a ___ de _____ de 20__

Fdo. El interno: _____

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Fernández, F., Pérez-García, P. (2018). La opinión de los profesionales de los centros penitenciarios de Andalucía sobre los Módulos de Respeto. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 31, 136-176. DOI: 10.7179/PSRI_2018.31.13

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Francisco Fernández Millán. C/ Fátima 22. Las Gabias 18110 (Granada. España). - Email: francisco-fmillan@hotmail.com

Purificación Pérez-García. Campus Universitario de Cartuja. Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación s/n 18071 Granada mpperez@ugr.es

ACADEMIC PROFILE

Francisco Fernández Millán. Doctor en Ciencias de la Educación y Licenciado en Derecho, ambas titulaciones por la Universidad de Granada. Título de Máster Universitario en Dirección de Centros Penitenciarios por la UNED. Funcionario de Prisiones desde el año 1989, actualmente desempeña el puesto de Educador.

Purificación Pérez-García. Profesora Titular de Universidad desde 2007 en la Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación de la Universidad de Granada (España). Sus intereses de investigación están relacionados con la formación del docente, formación inicial, practicum, enseñanza universitaria y ética profesional. Ha publicado libros y artículos sobre estas líneas temáticas.