

PARADOXICALITY OF THE ACTIVITY OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: PRINCIPLES AND OPPORTUNITIES

*Adolfas Juodraitis, Odeta Šapelytė,
Šiauliai University, Lithuania*

Abstract

The article presents the problem of paradoxicality of the activity of juvenile institutional education (i.e., socialisation centres operating in Lithuania). Several important variables have not been considered in the interaction of the activities of the socialisation centre, simultaneously of pedagogical and other staff and learners, their families/foster parents, and this resulted in inconsistency of the implementation of the complex resocialisation process. The article calls for the scientific discussion, actualising essential principles of resocialisation observed in socialisation centres, grounded on empirical data of children's subjective experience (N= 97) and assessment of specialists of the child socialisation centre (N=94).

Key words: *institutional education, child socialisation centre, juvenile resocialisation, principles and possibilities of activity*

Introduction

Juvenile delinquency is to be treated as a very big social problem both in Lithuania and other countries. Statistical data of different countries demonstrate that proportionally persons in their late adolescence years and early youth (up to 25 years) make up the biggest share of delinquent persons and later this proportion is reducing (e.g., in Lithuania, in 1990-2009, young people aged 14-24 years committed 41,6 per cent - 48,3 per cent of criminal acts of the total number of crimes) (Žukauskaitė, 2012). According to the data of the Department of Statistics of Lithuania, from 2009 to 2013, the number of juvenile delinquency and crimes was reducing² (from 4 023 down to 3126). It is important to note that the reducing number does not mean that the scope of the problem is reducing. It should be worth considering such social demographic variables as the decrease of birth rate, emigration, and others. Therefore, juvenile delinquency, inappropriate/deviant behaviour and these juveniles' institutional education/resocialisation remain a burning and worrying socio-economical problem in our society.

Institutional education is perceived as a constituent of social systems orientated towards the solution of personally and socially important problems. Problems that have been insufficiently considered or incompetently solved by corresponding social systems (family, the closest social setting, school, systems organising leisure, etc.), determining tendencies of the manifestation of socially irresponsible behaviour and the deficit of success of socialisation, are delegated for correction to the specific social education institution – the child socialisation centre (further referred to as the CSC). According to the Law on Minimal and Average Care of the Child (2010) of the Republic of Lithuania, the CSC is defined as state general education school implementing the measure of the child's average supervision. The socialisation centre is obliged to perform a number of functions (educational, developmental, the function of

² <http://db1.stat.gov.lt/statbank/selectvarval/saveselections.asp?MainTable=M3170202&PLanguage=0&TableStyle=&Buttons=&PXSId=12906&IQY=&TC=&ST=ST&rvar0=&rvar1=&rvar2=&rvar3=&rvar4=&rvar5=&rvar6=&rvar7=&rvar8=&rvar9=&rvar10=&rvar11=&rvar12=&rvar13=&rvar14=>

emotional stabilisation and change of conduct, of teaching social skills and socially significant activity, etc.), which directly affect the possibilities of ensuring the juvenile's successful adaptation and social processes. The purpose of the CSC is to *ensure suitable education of the child accommodated in the CSC, qualified educational support provided for him/her and other services, which would help to seek positive changes in the child's conduct, develop value approaches and social skills helping to become an honest, independent and responsible person and which would prepare him/her for independent life in the society* (The Law on Minimal and Average Care of the Child³ (2010).

Managing the quality shift of adaptation and socialisation processes, several important variables have not been considered in the purposefully organised interaction of the pedagogical and other staff of the socialisation centre and learners, resulting in inconsistency of implementing tasks of the complex resocialisation process.

- By its quantity and quality parameters the socialisation process is a constant and continuous process, which is implemented synergetically, when social environment and the juvenile functioning in it purposefully seek personally and socially significant goals. It is obvious that in the process (stages can differ insignificantly but basically these were critical stages of development) of psychosocial development (on the other hand, cognitive development too) the bigger share of learners of the socialisation centre encountered a number of problems and the socialisation process or its separate structural segments were transformed. Studies have proved that such changes result in stating about the violation of integration of *the Self* system of the personality, which is related to uneven development or considerable deviations of 1) images of personal features and attributes, 2) self-esteem, 3) perception of self-efficacy, 4) meta-cognitive awareness the self-control strategy and 5) personal conduct evaluation standards.
- The said unevenness of juvenile psychosocial development transforms the development of the social competency, first of all bearing in mind social conduct, which consists of the complex system of social mastering, social motives, social skills and abilities, habits and knowledge. It is stated that the social competency is a constituent of learned and inherited social conduct (Zcolnai, 2002), it is closely related to the dynamics of the formation of social relationships and their quality. It is obvious that scientists naturally focus on the peculiarities of the relationships with peers as a determinant of social competency development, considering the importance of this formation and its links with self-efficacy, self-respect and other personality components, which together with other factors determine the specificity of adaptation and socialisation processes. This way it is noted that the person's ability to form interpersonal relationships is treated as an important factor for holistic personality development and successful psychosocial adaptation (Ullrich & De Muynck, 1998; Hinsch & Pfingsten, 1988).

It is stated that the quality and stability of peer relationships affect adaptation at school (Berndt & Hawkins, 1999), peer acceptance is closely related to their social and academic competency (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Hartup, 1983). It is also noted that disordered relationships in the peer group determine the emergence of various forms of social dysadaptation (Valickas, 1997; Wentzel, 1991; Žukauskienė, 2012 et al.). Assessing the influence of the peer group on the adolescent's social competency development, it was noticed that the more time is spent with peers and friends, the more there are possibilities to try out various social roles and master appropriate social conduct models (Fine, 1981, qtd. in Vyšniauskytė-Rimkienė, 2006).

3 LR Vaiko minimalios ir vidutinės priežiūros įstatymas (2010). *Valstybės žinios, 2010-12-31, Nr. 157-7969.*

The problem is that the development of social relationships of the learner in the socialisation centre and possibilities of mastering socially significant roles are restricted by numerous disruptive factors, first distinguishing early age of the majority of them when they get into the care institution and specificity of development of relationships, which are based on vertical principles (staff of the institution – senior foster-children – learner). It is understandable that a similar scheme also operates in the system of family relationships (parents – senior children – child) but, irrespective of family disposition peculiarities, in the family there are significantly more elements of horizontal interacting (cooperation, attachment, support, etc.) like more possibilities to master different social roles. Not denying competition in the family, it is necessary to consider the fact that experience of institutional education determines lesser possibility of choosing roles (learner) and bigger manifestation of competition (staff – learners, senior and junior learners, peers), when friends' acknowledgment and status in the group are particularly important. Seeking acknowledgement, suitability or unsuitability of conduct model in a concrete social field is kind of checked; on the other hand, this is the way how juveniles master certain rules related to conduct regulation, including conduct norms created by the very juveniles, which first of all mean their independence from adults (Zsolnai, 2002). The totality of interacting factors (observance of rules and norms, social roles, communication abilities, value scale peculiarities, social conduct, etc.) correspondingly determines the status of the juvenile in the group (peer respect and functioning of self-efficacy) and the perspective of his/her adaptation and socialisation. Data of various studies confirm the existing positive link between the acquired status and psychosocial adaptation (Rosenblum & Olson, 1997; Luthar, 1995 et al.). The problem is that, as stated in the analyses of conduct changes of those who do not receive effective peer support (e.g., due to academic or sport achievements, personality features, etc.), such juveniles are caught in a closed circle, when, seeking acknowledgement, attention and respect, they often choose negative conduct manifestation ways (in principal, this is regular, considering the influence of the closest setting) and this way interpersonal relationships in the group and possibilities of reaching the wished status are still more complicated (Combs & Slaby, 1977).

Scientific and practical relevance of the research presupposes the following **problem questions**: *How can the mission of child socialisation centres in the process of implementing juvenile resocialisation be described? What are possible contradictions in the context of aims raised by institutionalised resocialisation and actually implemented principles?* **Research subject**: paradoxicality of activities of socialisation centres, implementing institutional education. The research aimed to **disclose principles and tendencies of organisation of juvenile resocialisation processes in socialisation centres (in the context of paradoxicality) (from the standpoint of specialists of the CSC (N=94) and children (N =97).**

To achieve the research aim, qualitative and quantitative research approaches were chosen, seeking to reveal the specificity of activities of the CSCs in the context of paradoxicality of implemented functions and resocialisation processes as broadly as possible. In order to implement this, it is sought to integrate different methods of research data collection and processing (i.e., written questionnaire, narrative method and content analysis method), involving different participants of the resocialisation process (specialists of the CSC (N=94) (educators, administration) and learners (N = 97). Processing quantitative research data, **descriptive analysis** was applied, and, seeking to disclose the assessments of different participants of the resocialisation process, **non-parametric methods** (Kruskal-Wallis method) were employed.

Paradoxicality of Institutional Education: Interpretation of Research Data and Discussion

Institutional education in Lithuania is implemented ensuring the performance of the average supervision measure in six socialisation centres. The order of imposing the child's

average supervision measure is regulated by: the Law on Minimal and Average Care of the Child (2011), also the Description of the Operational Model of the Children's Socialisation Centre⁴ (2011) and the Description of the Order of Selecting the Children's Socialisation Centre⁵ (2011). Work of socialisation centres operating in Lithuania with delinquent conduct juveniles, implementing the average supervision measure, is very complicated both due to specificity, type of the educational activity and due to responsibility, falling on the whole staff, and expectations of the society, (Bakutytė, Geležinienė, Gumuliauskienė, Juodraitis, Jurevičienė, & Šapelytė, 2013), which are to be related to successful resocialisation of the juvenile. However, it is noticed that traditional juvenile rehabilitation methods are ineffective, what is more, on the contrary, the latter methods can even more affect the personality and increase delinquency (Tarolla, Wagner, Rabinowitz, & Tubman, 2002). Therefore, recently many efforts were focused on the actualisation and implementation of successful principles of juvenile resocialisation. It is noticed that in today's context considerable attention is being paid to such strategies applied in the juvenile resocialisation process as development of social-cognitive, parenthood skills, cognitive-behavioural therapy, systemic family therapy, individual/ group consulting, probation programmes, creation of therapeutic communities, mentoring programmes, etc., seeking to isolate the adolescent from the society as little as possible, instead focusing on his/her resocialisation in the context of his/her closest social setting. Morrison & Ramsay (2010) distinguish the following principles to be pursued in the resocialisation process:

- Implementation of validated risk assessment system,
- The principle of actualisation of needs (support goals are related to clients' needs),
- The principle of responsibility (cognitive therapy methods are perceived as methods encouraging choice if they are focused on the client's intellectual and emotional abilities),
- Involvement of management (i.e. management must take interest and know about relationships of staff and what structural abilities they have),
- Maintaining of relationships and structural abilities using usual mechanisms,
- Implementation of supportive type of management system,
- Implementation of maximal occupation,
- Formation of positive relationships between staff and juveniles (staff-juvenile relationships must be based on interpersonal sensibility and constructivism so that it will be possible to improve internal motivation, mindedness to change the existing conduct), etc.

However, suitable juvenile resocialisation processes can be ensured relating it to critical analysis of the existing situation, seeking to identify advantages, drawbacks of the system and contradictions of the implemented activity.

Analysing empirical research data, the assessment palette, submitted by both staff of the CSC and children, enabled to actualise several essential controversies of the principles of implementing institutional education and resocialisation processes, ranging from preventive-warning/intervention-penal principle to integration-socialisation/isolation-resocialisation principle.

Preventive-Warning / Intervention-Penal Principle. The problem question is to be related to *the degree to which the juvenile is involved in the system of warning-preventive impact due to possible stricter sanctions; i.e., application of intervention-penal measures and all possible consequences of applying these measures?*

Even subjectively assessing a number of cases of learners' getting into (being directed to) the average supervision institution, there are certain doubts regarding the scope of work and

4 Vaikų socializacijos centro veiklos modelio aprašas (2011)

5 Vaikų socializacijos centro parinkimo tvarkos aprašas (2011)

responsibility for performance of necessary functions of responsible services because juveniles' versions of "life stories" reveal obvious similarities. This way preconditions are formulated that in separate cases 1) children were not familiarised with all circumstances of directing them to children's care homes and, feeling being deceived, they start revenging on subjects of social setting; 2) pedagogical staff and corresponding services choose a "comfortable" way of solving the problem, modelling the fate of children raising in risk families, most often as usual replacing preventive measures with intervention. Acknowledging that such facts are quite rare and thinking about principal changes in the child's life quality, it is also necessary to consider his/her psychological readiness (in principle, doubtful possibilities) to be separated from the family and emotional and behavioural reactions, which can be provoked by such situation. This is confirmed by several learners' described stories: *"the social worker says: "Let's go to children's care home only for several days, until mother sobers... it is painful to see my mother drinking, this is how I got into the children's home... after one year I started longing for my mother; fleeing from children's home and at the same time truanting... I met "good" friends, started stealing, drinking, smoking and, what is the worst, sniffing gas, petrol..."*. Nearly identical story of another learner: *"... when I was 10, child rights saw my mother drunk, then they offered me temporary children's home and said that I would stay there not for long. I agreed, then I started disliking the place and I started fleeing from there, after that I met those who taught me to steal..."*. Also the case of another learner: *"... I lived with the family for 10 years and then I got into the children's care home and I felt that I wasn't necessary for anyone ... and I started smoking, drinking in the care home and fleeing from the care home ...every day I ran home to my mother..."*

The survey results of the staff of the CSC (N=94) demonstrate that formally defined (in legal acts clearly regulated) psychosocial factors of implementing the child's average supervision measure (e.g., the child's familiarisation with internal conduct rules, with physical environment, observation of the child's situation after he/she leaves, etc.) have evidently become an integral part of organisational culture of socialisation centres. However, it is worth mentioning that indefinite and less measurable psychosocial factors in normative acts, which are more to be related to the very process of resocialisation and to support for learners, are less developed (this is reflected in respondents' assessments, when they only partially agree that *the average supervision measure is effective for many children* in the statement *the possibility that children will change during the allocated time in the socialisation centre is very small*). According to respondents' assessment, the said areas require changes most (see Table 1).

Table 1. Psychosocial and Educational Factors of Implementation of the Child's Average Supervision Measure: *Specialists' Assessment of the Current Situation and the Need for Changes* (scale from 1 to 5)⁶ (N=94)

Variables	Assessment of the existing situation		Manifestation of the need for changes	
	M	SD	M	SD
The child is familiarised with the implementation of the average supervision measure in the socialisation centre	4,24	0,68	3,10	1,12
Children most often get into the socialisation centre reasonably	4,05	0,66	3,33	0,99

⁶ Scale from 1 to 5 when: 1 – fully disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – partially agree, 4 – agree, 5 – fully agree

Variables	Assessment of the existing situation		Manifestation of the need for changes	
	M	SD	M	SD
Specialists of the socialisation centre prepare recommendations for schools about children leaving the centre	3,99	0,86	3,36	1,13
Information about children who have left the centre is collected in the socialisation centre	3,92	0,93	3,42	1,1
Children are well informed and know that they can be taken to socialisation centres due to inappropriate conduct	3,58	0,9	3,61	1,01
The imposed average supervision measure is effective for many children	3,44	0,8	3,66	0,86
The possibility that children will change during the allocated time in the socialisation centre is very small	3,00	0,87	3,60	0,86
There are children in the socialisation centre, to whom a milder measure had to be imposed	2,92	0,95	3,43	0,98

During the interview the majority of informants underlined that the resocialisation process in socialisation centres was successful only for a very small share of children. In principal, intervention practice, resulting in the application of the penal model, when the juvenile, often a preteen, is separated from the family and directed to institutional care (supervision), having considered only conduct deviations and ignoring personal features of the individual, naturally determines further transformations of conduct and emotions. According to frequent learner's assessment, the problem is that they treat directing to the institutional care (children's care homes, children's socialisation centres) as an endeavour to get rid of them, violate their rights, as unwillingness and inability to help them to cope with problems. Therefore, the statement "...while staying here I went crazy, behaviour with other people changed, it became still more aggressive, bold, reserved... mostly I was angry on adults such as child rights, director of the home, educators and other... staying here isn't any good because behaviour changes not to the good side but to the bad..." confirms certain inconsistency of the applied model of conduct modification. This is to be related to another principle highlighting the controversies of the activity of the CSC; i.e., **the principle of conduct modification (changing of conduct) vs conduct transformation** (where the essential question is *To what degree does the learner, being purposefully affected by favourable psychosocial environment, modify his/her conduct in a motivated way, this way mastering the essential skills of social conduct and disassociating himself/herself from certain and at least episodically manifesting elements of subculture, which determine conduct transformation, adapting to changed requirements of institutional education?*) as well as to **the principle of integration-socialisation vs isolation-resocialisation** (*To what degree does the learner perceive the final goal of integration-socialisation processes, implemented in the CSC, and treat it as corresponding support, optimising the continuity of his/her psychosocial development, considering temporary manifestation of isolation-resocialisation processes?*)

This is evidently witnessed by the data given in Table 2, having analysed learners' subjective experiences in the aspect of isolation and conduct transformation (see Table 2).

Table 2. Experience of Institutional Education: Learners' Subjective Experiences (N=97).

Categories	Examples of confirming statements	N (frequency)	
		Girls	Boys
Education in children's care home	"Children's home spoiled my childhood for me"; "I got into the care home and felt unnecessary for anyone, I started smoking, drinking, stealing and fled home to my mother..."; "I've grown in the care home since early years..."; "... I lived in the care home for long with my three brothers and sisters..."; "I live in the care home"; "during that time my mother refused of me, I lived in the temporary care home..."; etc.	14	18
Education in the children's socialisation centre	"I got into that centre already for the second time..."; "the centre is the second in my life..."; "I spent 3 years in X centre..."; "time matured and I left and after two months I came back again..."; "I served in X CSC 8 months, then I was taken to Z CSC, I've stayed here already for 3 months..."; etc.	4	12
Experience of special educational (care) institution	"I was learning for three years in Švėkšna, there were many bad children there..."; "again I fled, after a month they found, brought me, I stayed for a month, again fled... then they took me to the lunatic asylum"; "I was in the mental institution for bad conduct 33 times...".	1	2

Given data reveal a complicated "story" of learners' life. The child's getting into the care institution is related to certain contradictory tendencies: on the one hand, the institution ensures the child's care, supervision and education, eliminating the negative impact of the environment, particularly family, and correcting the consequences of such education, but on the other hand, there are significant changes in very important psychological development segments, firstly regimen requirements, which in the institution regulate personality's autonomy and unconditional observance of corresponding norms, a larger number of staff members regulating life rhythm, and the necessity of constructing new relationships with other learners and anchoring in the group (Juodraitis, 2013). Many studies confirm that institutional setting provides the adolescent's and child's development with additional specific features (Samašonok & Žukauskienė, 2004; Samašonok, Juodraitis, & Gudonis, 2010; et al.) and is often a reason of social immaturity.

Analysing another controversy, which is to be related to **the principle of social fairness/ social responsibility vs social isolation and freedom deprivation**, it is important to answer the following question: *To what degree is the juvenile informed and how much does he/she perceive the meanings of the principle of fairness and responsibility and of his/her directing to the CSC for a corresponding period and does not treat this as social isolation and freedom restriction sentence?*

The research revealed that often learners do not even know why and what kind of measure is imposed on them. There are cases of obvious intimidation with socialisation centres at schools. This is witnessed by one educator's statement: *"...Children come to the socialisation centre being very intimidated. The very social educators intimidate with the socialisation centre. They come to the centre like to the concentration camp. Others don't say that they will take them to the socialisation centre, sit them in the car and say that they will go to "Akropolis" or to do some shopping but they take them to the socialisation centre. The child is terribly shocked. There should be no intimidation or lying. Just to state that for some time he/she will have to live here..."; "Not always. Or they find out while going..."*

Subjective experiences of learners (N=97) of the CSC, including (self-)assessment of current stay in the institution, range from positive assessment, which is more to be related to ensuring continuity of learning, to negative assessment, ruining the personality and restricting freedom (see Table 3).

Table 3. Subjective experiences of learners (N=97) of the CSC: (self-)assessment of current stay in the institution

Categories	Examples of confirming statements	N (frequency)	
		Girls	Boys
General positive assessment of staying in the CSC and its purpose	“I am happy that I’ll finish school here...”; “It’s good that I got here because I’ll be able at least to finish 10 classes”; “It’s very easy to learn here, very easy to get used to...”; “I started to do well and I’m happy that I started changing to the positive side...”; “I started believing in myself, doing homework, thinking about the future...”; “... I think that centres help because I personally changed my thinking...”; etc.	26	27
Naming of separate unsatisfactory components (attaching personal significance to them)	“I would like to be able to use the telephone”; “... they could allow us to have mobiles, to speak with friends, close family...”; “Security guard X should be changed because he “is doing” all of us with a banana (is using a rubber baton against all of us); “...It’s bad that it’s far from home”; “... once you come to this centre you become cruel but not better...”; “there could be girls in this centre too, there would be less problems...”; “...I don’t like that we can’t smoke because the majority of those who are here have dependence...”; etc.	19	18
Assessment of the care home as a place of freedom restriction (deprivation)	“I’m already imprisoned here...”; “I wonder why these centres are opened at all because, in my opinion, girls and boys won’t change, they will leave being still worse...”; “I didn’t believe they will put me into the colony...”; “I’ve been imprisoned for more than half a year...” “they imposed a punishment of one year for me...”; “the court directed to the CSC, we have to stay here for one year”; “the sentence of the court was 2 years...”; etc.	4	13
Time counting tendencies as a factor of freedom restriction	“I’ve stayed here for 3 months, 9 months remaining”; “I’ve been here for about one year, I’ll leave on January 3”; “I’ve been here long, for half a year, 2 more years and 6 months remaining...”; “only one month is left and I’ll leave this cocks’ place...” “I’ve been here for almost 10 months...”; “I’ve been sitting here for 5 months and 16 days”; “ by December 23, I’ll have spent 2 months...”; etc.	23	31

It should be stated that in principle the resocialisation processes of a certain share of learners (found more in boys’ subjective assessments) can be disturbed by perception peculiarities of the purpose of the CSC, direction of the court to these centres and freedom restriction. This is evidently witnessed by 2 categories related to treating the CSC as a place of freedom deprivation (*assessment of the centre as of the place of freedom restriction (deprivation); tendencies of counting time spent in the CSC (or of time that remains) as a factor of freedom restriction*), where a considerable share of learners treat their getting into the CSC as a punishment, imprisonment or restriction, deprivation of privileges (telephones, cigarettes, the possibility to meet friends, girls, etc.).

However, it is important to note that almost a half of learners also express satisfaction with being in the CSC. The centre is partially understood as a possibility to change but most importantly it is perceived as a possibility to continue learning because in general education schools these learners occupy the position of “the inconvenient learner” when due to unsuitable conduct during the lesson, large learning gaps, truancy, often due to special educational needs he/she becomes unwanted, unacceptable at school. Many educators of the CSC confirm the fact that the majority of incoming children have large learning gaps.

The obtained results enable to formulate one more principle: **educational-developmental/ social education vs supporting the educational developmental principle**; i.e., *To what degree is the learner of the CSC involved in the educational-developmental process corresponding to his/her intellectual powers and aptitude level, in which all preconditions promoting success motivation are created and supportive tendencies of education-development are minimised?*

The written questionnaire was aimed at finding out how specialists of the CSC assessed the child’s preparation for active activities, social education and his/her own involvement/ participation. The majority of respondents noticed that it was sought to look for measures promoting children’s activeness in socialisation centres; i.e., attention is focused on the disclosure of the child’s inclinations and abilities for a corresponding professional activity (M=3,86), the endeavour to get involved in pre-vocational training activities (M=3,83) (Šapelytė, 2013). The analysis of empirical data revealed that formal, external drawbacks of social education and of the system of learners’ preparation for active activities (concretely emphasis of poor learning resources) were more underlined. This is witnessed in different specialists’ assessments (see Table 4).

Table 4. The System of the Learners’ Preparation for Active Activities: *Assessments of Different Specialists* (scale from 1 to 5)⁷ (N=94)⁸

Variables	Form tutors M	Educators M	Administration M	p ⁹
Organisation of active activities of learners of the CSC is the problem of the initiative of staff	2,86	3,10	2,33	0,033
Problems of involving children of the CSC in various active activities are the consequence of financial provision	3,98	3,53	3,92	0,045
No unanimous system and resources for development of children’s activeness in various activities are created	3,40	3,03	2,58	0,039
To be improved: the CSC does not have resources necessary for the child’s preparation to take part in professional working activities	4,37	3,95	3,78	0,027
To be improved: no unanimous system and resources are created for development of children’s activeness in various activities	4,19	3,47	3,57	0,005

⁷ Scale from 1 to 5, when: 1 – fully disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – partially agree, 4 – agree, 5 – fully agree

⁸ Kruskal-Wallis test is applied

⁹ P = 0,05

Assessments of class tutors compared with the assessments of educators and in certain cases of administration, put more emphasis on the situation of inappropriate material resources and express a bigger need to enhance these resources. However, it is important to point out that there should be a focus on the development of internal resources (e.g., usage of existing competencies of the staff of the CSC, their development, promotion to take up search for new ideas and integration in the processes of learners' social education, preparation for life, in general, resocialisation, which would promote their involvement in interesting activities, expanding children's view and meeting learners' socio-educational needs).

Analysing children's subjective experiences, both positive tendencies, to be related to the child's education, development, and unfavourable assessments, creating a possibility to name the CSC as a regimen institution of supporting type, are observed (see Table 5).

Table 5. Self-assessment of (Self-)education Situation in the CSC

Categories	Examples of confirming statements	(N) frequency	
		Girls	Boys
Positive assessment of the educational institution	"In this centre I succeed very well"; "I'm doing well here"; "I feel well"; "I find it very good here to settle my behaviour..."; "class tutors and other staff support me and listen to me when it is difficult..."; "...in this centre you can learn more of everything than in the family..."; etc.	17	15
Positive assessment of occupation and leisure	"I go to different clubs..."; "it's good in the centre, there is a lot to do here..."; "mostly I like events, trips..."; "we are happy that we have more occupation"; "I really like how I'm occupied ..."; "... you learn to work, go to excursions, competitions..."; etc.	13	12
Negative assessment of the educational system	"I don't like to be because of very restricted life, nothing is allowed, they give a lot of work, never listen to ..."; "I don't like being here because really you won't become any better having left this place..."; "poor teaching because teachers don't know how to interest the child"; "I still haven't got used to because it's boring here, there is little activity..."; "people who want to change the child and not to harm him/her should work..."; "I hate this school and this centre.."; "... here I would like to change almost everything, leisure, classes because we are very restricted here..."; etc.	10	6
Critical assessment of occupation and leisure	"there could be more interesting occupations, floristics, what is related to beauty..."; "so that they at least let us go to the sports hall every day..."; "no workouts take place here, there could be some sports club"; "this centre lacks excursions..."; "we really lack the sports hall..."; "I like drawing but I don't have a possibility to (self-)develop..."; etc.	4	8
Satisfaction with welfare in the CSC	"Food is very good here"; "I don't complain about eating"; "I also think that we don't lack anything here..."; "food is delicious but they give too little for breakfast and supper"; etc.	3	4
Critical assessment of welfare in the CSC	"I'd like to change food in the canteen"; "it's necessary to eat more and tastier because every evening I have an upset stomach"; "we lack new kitchenette"; "... I don't like that we lack food, I'm often hungry.."; "they could change toilets, give bigger portions..."; etc.	6	15

Categories	Examples of confirming statements	(N) frequency	
		Girls	Boys
Positive assessment of regime requirements, incentives and sanctions	“I like the day regimen”; “You can go to work, get pluses for work...”; “If I hadn’t got there, I would have further continued to mischief...”; “I’d like to stay here longer because having left I’ll again start drinking again”; “social worker helped to change...”; “I have occupations, I don’t run in the streets...”; “...here I understood that stealing, running and doing nonsense, you won’t reach anything...”, etc.	2	8
Critical assessment of regime requirements, incentives and sanctions	“I’d like them not to take away my telephone because almost all have but I don’t...”; “I’d like to change almost everything because here we are very restricted”; “If one child does something then everybody suffers...”; “I wish there were no minuses because they write minuses for every bad thing”; “... they don’t let us go to clubs in the city”; etc.	7	8
Vocational training, development of social skills	“It would be better if there was vocational training in the centre”; “there could be a possibility to work and earn money for oneself and learn to spend it normally...”; “there could be some work to do, earn money and get it. At least there would be little benefit...”; etc.	0	6

It is likely that the inconsistency that has showed up is to be related to such facts as: different age of respondents in one institution; time of staying in the institution and level of adaptation; exact circumstances of getting into the institution and the level of self-evaluation of one’s fault; experience of institutional education and duration of care in the institution; gender aspects, etc.

Conclusions. Discussion

Paradoxicality of resocialisation processes in the context of five principles actualised in the article are related to the aim to highlight tendencies of observed good practice, objectives and to state evident drawbacks in the activity of child socialisation centres, which are tried to be concealed.

It is evident that controversies that have showed up are to be related both to the fact that it is attempted to view the situation from different standpoints of situation perception and assessment (of children, staff of the CSC), and to the fact that the very juvenile delinquency and their resocialisation is a huge challenge to the whole society, policy strategists, scientists and specialists working with such juveniles. The problem is related to the fact that there is no very clear, purified vision of juvenile resocialisation.

Search for strategies of juvenile resocialisation, constant discussions between practitioners, scientists, politicians’ communities should create more definite visions of analysed centres, clearly regulating how children get into these centres, the system of their adaptation, education, staff selection and the system of its motivation to perform its functions with high level of responsibility. It is also important to point out that all responsibility for juvenile resocialisation should not be imposed on child socialisation centres. Very clear tendencies of the child’s “pushing out from the society” and isolation are observed. This is evident in children’s narratives, in which CSCs are also treated as institutions of isolation and freedom deprivation (very clear tendencies of calculating time spent in the institution and the remaining time are observed). “Pushing out” of the juvenile is to be related to delegation of all responsibility for his/her upbringing, education to closed type institutions (in this case child socialisation centres). These centres oddly start performing the role of a “scapegoat” in the

society when it falls on them to accept all fault and accusation for non-readiness of children who returned from the CSC to behave appropriately, for their repeated criminal acts and for “unsuccessfully” implemented resocialisation. However, there arises a question what roles and commitments are taken by others: municipalities, the school, child right institutions, assisting institutions. What responsibilities were taken by others so that the child who has returned could appropriately behave in the society: Was anything done in the child’s social context, his/her closest setting? It is evident that the juvenile returns to the setting that has not changed. Naturally, the question arises: What result can be expected if work is performed only with one segment of the system; i.e., the child, and the remaining system is left out of the way of intervention? In this case the juvenile is treated as the subject of the resocialisation process. It is a typical example of the clinical approach, when the “guilty” person is identified and it is sought to change him/her.

The principles highlighted in the article presuppose the idea that anyway it is important to establish CSCs according to the geographical principle so that learners have a possibility to maintain closer links with the closest social setting. This would create preconditions for the involvement of the subjects of the closest setting in juvenile resocialisation processes, seeking positive shifts in the juvenile’s conduct, and for affecting uneven functioning of separate social systems as well as for successful implementation of socialisation processes in a broader context (Bakutyte et al., 2013).

References:

1. Asher, S.R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children’s social competence in peer relations: sociometric and behavioral assessment. In J.D. Wine, M.D. Smye (Eds.), *Social competence* (pp.122-157). New York: Guilford.
2. Bakutyte, R., Geležinienė, R., Gumuliauskienė, A., Juodraitis, A., Jurevičienė, M., & Šapelytė, O. (2013). *Socializacijos centro veiklos modeliavimas: ugdytinių resocializacijos povesų valdymas ir metodika*. Vilnius. BMK leidykla.
3. Berndt, T.J., & Hankins, J. A. (1999). Influences of friends and friendship on adjustment to junior high school. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45 (1), 13-41.
4. Combs, M.L., & Slaby, D.A. (1977). Social skills training with children. In B.B. Lahey & A.E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology* (pp.161-201). New York: Plenum.
5. Hartup, W. W. (1983). The peer system. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Carmichael’s manual of child psychology*, 4th ed., Vol. 4, (pp. 103-196). New York: Wiley Hirsch, Pfingsten.
6. Hirsch, R., & Pfingsten, U. (1988). *Gruppentraining sozialer kompetenzen* (3 aufl.). Weinheim Belz.
7. Juodraitis, A. (2013). Vaikų socializacijos centrų ugdytinių refleksijų tyrimas. Naratyvų analizė ir perspektyvos vertinimas. In R. Bakutyte, R., Geležinienė, A., Gumuliauskienė, A., Juodraitis, M., Jurevičienė, O., Šapelytė, O. (2013). *Socializacijos centro veiklos modeliavimas: ugdytinių resocializacijos povesų valdymas ir metodika* (pp.122-160). Vilnius. BMK leidykla.
8. LR Vaiko minimalios ir vidutinės priežiūros įstatymas (2010). *Valstybės žinios*, 2010-12-31, Nr. 157-7969.
9. Luthar, S.S. (1995). Social competences in the school settings: perspective cross-domain associations among inner-city teens. *Child development*, 66, 416-429.
10. Morrison, C.R., & Ramsay, N.A. (Eds.) (2010). *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice : Causes, Intervention and Treatment Programs*. NOVA. Nova Science Publishers, Inc. New York
11. Rosenblum, K.L., & Olson, S.L. (1997). Assessment of peer neglect in the preschool years: A short - term longitudinal study. *Journal of clinical child psychology*, 26 (4), 424-432.
12. Samašonok, K., Juodraitis, A., & Gudonis, V. (2010). Globos namuose ir pilnose šiemose gyvenančių paauglių asmenybės bruožų ir elgesio bei emocinių sunkumų ypatumai. *Ugdymo psichologija*, 21, 23-34.
13. Samašonok, K., & Žukauskienė, R. (2004). Globos namų auklėtinių ir vaikų, gyvenančių su abiem tėvais, mokyklinės adaptacijos ir kompetencijos ypatumai. *Socialinis darbas*, 3 (2), 119-129.

14. Šapelytė, O. (2013). Socialinio ugdymo ir švietimo pagalbos organizavimas. In R. Bakutytė, R., Geležinienė, A., Gumuliauskienė, A., Juodraitis, M., Jurevičienė, O., Šapelytė, O. (2013). *Socializacijos centro veiklos modeliavimas: ugdytinių resocializacijos pocesų valdymas ir metodika* (pp.110-122). Vilnius. BMK leidykla.
15. Tarolla, S.M., Wagner, E.F., Rabinowitz, J., & Tubman, J.G. (2002). Understanding and treating juvenile offenders: A review of current knowledge and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7, 2*, 125-143.
16. Ullrich, R., & De Mynck, R. (1998). *ATP1: Einübung von Selbstvertrauen- Bedingungen und Formen sozialer Schwierigkeiten*. München: J. Pfeiffer Verlag.
17. Vaikų socializacijos centro parinkimo tvarkos aprašas (2011). *Valstybės žinios, 2011-05-10, Nr. 55-2674*.
18. Vaikų socializacijos centro veiklos modelio aprašas (2011). *Valstybės žinios, 2011-05-24, Nr. 62-2946*.
19. Valickas, G. (1997). *Psichologinės asocialaus elgesio ištakos*. Vilnius: LTA.
20. Vyšniauskytė-Rimkienė, J. (2006). Paauglių socialinės kompetencijos bendrojo lavinimo mokykloje plėtojimas taikant socialinių gebėjimų lavinimo modelį. (PhD thesis, Lithuanian Academy of Physical Education).
21. Zcolnai, A. (2002). Relationship between children's social competencies, learning motivation and school achievement. *Educational psychology, 22 (3)*, 317 – 330.
22. Žukauskaitė, J. (2012). Nepilnamečių nusikalstamas elgesys: psichologiniai mediacijos taikymo aspektai. *Teisės problemos, 2 (76)*, 96-110.
23. Žukauskienė, R. (2012). *Raidos psichologija: integruotas požiūris*. Vilnius: Margi raštai.
24. Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Relations between social competencies and academic achievement in early adolescents. *Child development, 62*, 1066-1078.

PARADOXICALITY OF THE ACTIVITY OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: PRINCIPLES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Summary

*Adolfas Juodraitis, Odeta Šapelytė,
Siauliai University, Lithuania*

The article presents the problem of paradoxicality of the activity of juvenile institutional education (i.e., socialisation centres operating in Lithuania). Several important variables have not been considered in the interaction of the activities of the socialisation centre, simultaneously of pedagogical and other staff and learners, their families/foster parents, and this resulted in inconsistency of the implementation of the complex resocialisation process. The article calls for the scientific discussion, actualising the essential principles of resocialisation observed in socialisation centres, grounded on empirical data of children's subjective experience (N= 97) and assessment of specialists of the child socialisation centre (N=94).

Scientific and practical relevance of the research presupposes the following **problem questions**: *How can the mission of child socialisation centres in the process of implementing juvenile resocialisation be described? What are possible contradictions in the context of aims raised by institutionalised resocialisation and actually implemented principles?*

Research subject: paradoxicality of activities of socialisation centres, implementing institutional education. The research aimed to **disclose principles and tendencies of organisation of juvenile resocialisation processes in socialisation centres (in the context of paradoxicality)**.

Analysing empirical research data, the assessment palette, submitted by both staff of the CSC and children, enabled to actualise several essential controversies of the principles of implementing institutional education and resocialisation processes, ranging from *preventive-warning/intervention-penal principle* to *integration-socialisation/isolation-resocialisation principle*. Also in the article, the principles of *conduct modification (changing of conduct) vs conduct transformation, of integration-socialisation vs isolation-resocialisation and social fairness/social responsibility vs social isolation and freedom deprivation* were discussed based on the empirical data.

Paradoxicality of resocialisation processes in the context of five principles actualised in the article are related to the aim to highlight tendencies of observed good practice, objectives and to state evident drawbacks in the activity of child socialisation centres, which are tried to be concealed.

It is evident that controversies that have showed up are to be related both to the fact that it is attempted to view the situation from different standpoints of situation perception and assessment (of children, staff of the CSC), and to the fact that the very juvenile delinquency and their resocialisation is a huge challenge to the whole society, policy strategists, scientists and specialists working with such juveniles. The problem is related to the fact that there is no very clear, purified vision of juvenile resocialisation. Search for strategies of juvenile resocialisation, constant discussions between practitioners, scientists, politicians' communities should create more definite visions of analysed centres, clearly regulating how children get into these centres, the system of their adaptation, education, staff selection and the system of its motivation to perform its functions with high level of responsibility.

The principles highlighted in the article presuppose the idea that anyway it is important to establish CSCs according to the geographical principle so that learners have a possibility to maintain closer links with the closest social setting. This would create preconditions for the involvement of the subjects of the closest setting in juvenile resocialisation processes, seeking positive shifts in the juvenile's conduct, and for affecting uneven functioning of separate social systems as well as for successful implementation of socialisation processes in a broader context (Bakutyte et al., 2013).