

The Youth Facility as a Total Institution:

A Focus on Experiences of Mortification

Republic Act (RA) 9344 of the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act (JJWA) of the Philippines promises to champion the cause of youth offenders as it takes into consideration the flaws of the juvenile justice system.¹ The law seeks to deal with youths in a manner that is appropriate to their stage of development, while reinforcing the fundamental importance of restorative justice. As such, RA 9344 veers away from retribution, which was the principle behind the policy of youth incarceration in the Philippines before its passage in 2006. This change in attitude started with the use of the neutral term *children in conflict with the law* (CICL) instead of the term delinquent. This landmark legislation mandates that anyone who is fifteen or younger is exempted from criminal liability, while those older than fifteen but younger than eighteen can only be charged accountable if it can be proven that they acted with discernment.² The 2013 amendment of the law retains the age of fifteen as the minimum age of criminal responsibility, but requires the twelve to fifteen year-old recidivists and serious offenders in a youth facility to be rehabilitated.³

For the CICL to be rehabilitated, RA 9344 provides for the adoption of a diversion system with a two-fold purpose. First, to dispose of the CICL's case without a formal trial and second, to admit them into youth homes where they can receive services and go through programs to rehabilitate them. Diversion is rooted in the notion that youth is a transitional period in life; wayward activities are inevitable among "persons in formation" because their moral sense is still developing but they will eventually "outgrow" criminal behavior.⁴ Diversion clearly steps away from the deterrence argument, which argues that it is only through the certainty, swiftness, and severity of punishment that youth re-offending can be prevented.⁵ Diversion, as an example

of a community-based program, allows offenders to serve all or a part of their sentence in the community and makes use of community resources to complement and support traditional correctional functions.⁶

When the CICL are diverted to a facility, RA 9344 dictates that each child goes through an individualized program that responds to his or her needs, based on the assumption that youth offenders come from different backgrounds and their degree of involvement in delinquency also varies.⁷ The goal is to teach the CICL mechanisms for self-regulation so that when they are released to the community, they will be able to avoid or refuse opportunities to re-offend.⁸ Hence, the crucial role of facilities to reform the CICL cannot be overemphasized, and as such section 53 of RA 9344 directs the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) to establish a facility in each region, while section 17 obliges local government units (LGUs) to establish their own youth homes within five years of the law's implementation.⁹ It is in this context that St. John's Shelter¹⁰ was established in Cavite, Philippines. When RA 9344 passed in 2006, the local Philippine National Police (PNP) and the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP) turned over all incarcerated minors (defined as those younger than eighteen) to St. John's Shelter and hitherto, all minors caught violating the law have to be admitted to shelter.¹¹ As a community-based facility, St. John's Shelter is guided by its mission¹² "to provide utmost care, protection, and guidance of its residents¹³ using the multidisciplinary approach that adequately prepares them for an outright living and be a better person when reunited with their families and reintegrated with their family and community." Since the shelter opened, thirty-five to fifty residents are housed at any given time at this facility.

The hope that community-based facilities can genuinely reform youth offenders is not unfounded. Mark Lipsey's 1995 and 1998 studies concluded that community-based corrections

can effectively rehabilitate delinquents.¹⁴ In his 1995 study, he conducted a meta-analysis of approximately 400 studies on the treatment of juvenile delinquency. Lipsey found that community-based treatment resulted in an approximately 10 percent reduction of recidivism.¹⁵ Likewise, community-based treatment also works with the most serious youth offenders based on the results of nearly 200 experimental or quasi-experimental studies.¹⁶

It is, however, a mistake to conclude that admission to a facility for the intent of rehabilitation is the panacea for youth offending. Significant arguments against the effectiveness of rehabilitation facilities to reform offenders have been put forward, most notably by Andrew Scull in *Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant – a Radical View*. Scull employs the term *decarceration* to refer to the policy of closing down asylums, prisons, and reformatories and the admission of “the mad and the bad” in community-based facilities to be rehabilitated.¹⁷ He dismisses decarceration as a “new humanitarian myth, built on a foundation of sand.”¹⁸ Through historical and comparative methods, he concludes that rehabilitation facilitated in the community has not lowered crime statistics, mainly because communities are ill-equipped to deal with criminals and mentally-ill people, and facilities do not have the deterrence mechanisms of prisons. In the same light, Erving Goffman’s *Asylum: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* contends that a facility that qualifies as a “total institution” will seek to rehabilitate its wards, but cannot achieve this goal because a meaningful “home life” existence is problematic in a “total institution.”¹⁹ For Goffman, asylums and prisons are examples of what a “total institution” is: *a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enforced, formally administered round of life.*²⁰ In a total institution, rehabilitation is achieved by purging out of the inmates (the people admitted inside) their individual identities because only

then can the institution “resocialize” them through its own norms. Hence, a total institution takes over the lives of the inmates, treating them as a homogenous group without the opportunity for individual choice. Even in personal domains such as their daily schedule of activities, it is the management that drafts and enforces it in a military-style that Goffman terms *regimentation*.²¹ The inmates are also subjected to processes of mortification, eliciting experiences of degradations and humiliations, all as part of the scheme to remove any trace of individual identity. This deliberate removal of an inmate’s “civilian” identity is fundamental to the institution because only then can it impose its own social arrangements to produce what they perceive is the “ideal” or “perfect” inmate.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to determine whether St. John’s Shelter qualifies as a total institution. The study will discuss the mortification experiences, if any, of the children in conflict with the law, from admission to confinement in St. John’s Shelter and how they adapt to institutional living.

Methodology

This study uses qualitative research—specifically ethnography—to gather rich, descriptive data about the experiences of children in conflict with the law admitted to St. John’s Shelter. Attempting to understand the culture inside the facility from the point of view of the children themselves (behavior, language, routine, rules etc.) is important to be able to make sense of how the CICL resist or succumb to the difficulties of adjusting to institutional living.

Giving more weight to their views can bring to light their own beliefs about the programs they participate in, and their conviction about the capability of the facility to effect positive changes in them. This is an area where qualitative techniques are most appropriate.²² Moreover, the use of qualitative method can also be personally beneficial to respondents as it allows them to

articulate their subjective experiences. This can be therapeutic because the process of reflecting on their experiences can generate some degree of understanding and enable sense-making.²³

Respondents²⁴

At the time of the study, there were forty residents (thirty-five males and five females) living at St. John's Shelter. Of this number, eight were below fifteen years old, thirty-one were in the fifteen- to-seventeen-year-old range, and one person was over eighteen. In terms of education, one youth had no formal education, twenty-one were in elementary school, three were elementary school graduates, twelve were in high school, and three had graduated from high school. With regards to their violation, the most common was crime against property: eighteen theft cases and six robberies. The second most common offense was crime against persons (two rape cases, four physical injury cases, two child abuse violations and two homicides), and lastly, three drug-related violations. Three child scavengers had no clear offenses when brought by the police. However, because their parents could not be located immediately, the management deemed it important to admit the children for safekeeping and further investigation. It is important to note two pertinent revelations from the CICL. First, some children own up to committing other violations and divulge that they were not caught doing them. Second, most of the CICL had a companion, a *tropa* (peer), when they committed their offense.

Directly supervising the residents are six female houseparents called *Nanay* (the Filipino word for mother). Their ages range from twenty-nine to fifty-three years old. One is single (*Nanay Marie*, thirty-nine), another is a widow (*Nanay Jean*, fifty-three), and the rest are married (*Nanay Mel*, twenty-nine, *Nanay Ann*, forty-four, *Nanay Mae*, forty-three and *Nanay Cecil*, fifty). In regard to education (for which there is no specific job prerequisites), all of them are high school graduates, with one finishing a 2-year secretarial course (*Nanay Mae*) and another, a

college degree (*Nanay Mel*). In terms of religion, five are Catholic and one is a Born-again Christian (*Nanay Marie*). All of them received training in houseparenting, team building, and how to handle the CICL. All have served St. John's Shelter for more than two years. The houseparents are contractual workers receiving compensation ranging from Php278 to Php302 (\$6-7) per day, lawfully fulfilling the minimum wage requirement of Php 255.00-337.00 for the province where the shelter is located.²⁵ They are not entitled to leaves and other benefits.

Results and Discussion

Institutionalization results in the loss of autonomy. The residents label their stay at the shelter as "*pagkakulong*" (imprisonment) and its opposite is "*laya*" (freedom). This does not mean that they view themselves as common prisoners however. According to Jaypee (not his real first name), seventeen, who had been in St. John's Shelter seven times (six times for theft, and once for physical assault), "we have no police record. Even if I have been in St. John's Shelter many times, I am not called an *ex-con*, unlike those in BJMP who have a criminal record when released."

What then typifies the offenders' stay at a mortifying facility? In "The Pains of Imprisonment," Gresham Sykes posits that offenders are subjected to a double loss of freedom—"by confinement to the institution and second, by confinement within the institution."²⁶ The first confinement emanates from forced admission to the facility, while the second one comes from the rules inside that severely restrict movement.

These conditions describe the situation of the residents of St. John's Shelter. The entry of youth offenders to the facility cuts them off from their family, peers, and their former lifestyle. Although visits are allowed, these cannot substitute for the freedom they enjoyed outside the

facility. While inside St. John's Shelter, there are numerous rules which the CICL are compelled to follow. Breaking any of these brings punishment. According to Ron, seventeen, a high school graduate whose case involves possession of drugs, "here, you have to ask permission for everything. Also, there are so many restrictions. All your actions are monitored. It is true that there are those who violate the rules here, but not everyone. Yet, everybody suffers when someone breaks a rule."

Since some residents violate the regulations inside the facility, all residents are indiscriminately censured, resulting in frequent searches for prohibited materials such as pencils, pens, and staple wires. While outsiders may consider these items harmless, the management of St. John's Shelter believes that they can serve as weapons to harm oneself or others. There was one instance when a volunteer teacher taught the residents make *origami*. They were not provided with scissors to cut paper into small pieces. Instead, they were instructed to just tear them. Since some parts of the *origami* had to be firmly attached, the residents were allowed to use a stapler. However, some male residents kept the staple wires to tattoo themselves after the session. As a result, the management immediately confiscated the finished *origami* pieces to the dismay of those who did not make tattoos. The art sessions were cut short. The head of the shelter defends their harsh response, arguing that they will just hurt each other with activities involving the use of pointed or sharp objects. This severely curbs the types of activities available to the residents.

The extensive surveillance by the houseparents, guards, and other staff emanates from their lack of trust on the residents. Believing that the residents would violate rules if left on their own, the guards are instructed to exercise vigilance at all times. Periodic inspections are conducted, even during sleeping time. During visitation periods, guards subject visitors to body-

checks and scrutinize everything they bring, including food. After their visits, the residents are body-checked by the guard before being allowed to enter the inner gate of the shelter.

The residents believe that even when they cannot actually see houseparents nearby, their guards unwavering eyes are scrutinizing all movements, and hence the residents are constantly mindful of their behavior. In effect, the houseparents serve as a panopticon. According to Michel Foucault and Jeremy Bentham, the effectiveness of the panopticon does not lie so much on whether or not people are actually being watched, but on the fact that they think they are under surveillance.²⁷ This allows institutions to exert control over their members as those who feel they are under observation—whether they are or not— are less likely to violate rules.

Loss of identity and individuality

Upon entrance, new residents are issued the official St. John's Shelter shirt which will be their daily uniform until their release. This signals that they can no longer decide on what they will wear. The imposition of a uniform is a form of "trimming" and "programming," whereby the "new arrival allows himself to be shaped and coded into an object that can be fed into the administration machinery of the establishment..."²⁸

In the first few days of confinement, this kind of mortification is evident as the residents are subjected to interrogations and tests designed to gather information regarding their demographic background and offense(s). This is part of the efforts of the St. John's Shelter management to prepare an official record which will be permanently available for use in their database. In the process, the offenders' identities are "trimmed;" i.e., their previous identifications are disregarded when the shelter officials deal with them. It no longer matters whether they were good students, good *ka-tropa* (peer), or a loving son/daughter prior to their

admission. Based on the “programmed” identity, they are merely offenders. All the CICL are homogenously viewed as such, with the only difference between offenders the severity of their cases and the circumstances related to their offense differ. In the first few days of the resident’s detention in St. John’s Shelter, he/she is recognized only for his/her offense. Thus, when a resident or a houseparent is asked who the newcomer is, the standard reply is, “I don’t know what his name is, but his offense is _____.”

As part of identity programming and trimming, the residents’ personal and offense-related backgrounds are formally scrutinized by the management, and informally by their co-residents. Hence, even without the resident opening up about their life and violations, everyone will eventually know. The management prepares a file about each resident, giving particular attention to behavior as this is required by the judge in determining how the case will proceed. In the process, the resident is stripped of privacy. Goffman calls this the violation of one’s “informational preserve.”²⁹

A resident who would be spending his/her days in St. John’s Shelter is oriented towards following the prescriptions and proscriptions that embody the standard of an ideal resident. Dispossession of one’s name, identity, and role ensues as the resident conforms to what the St. John Shelter requires from them, namely, obedience, subservience, respect, and silence. Residents who find it hard to exhibit these earn negative descriptions in the logbooks that the houseparents and guards submit separately to the head of the facility. In these logbooks, only violations are logged, while good deeds are not.

The regulations are painful for the residents. Among the many roles that the residents assumed before being confined to St. John’s Shelter, that of being a gang member is perceived by many as their most important role. Many of them felt that they were happier with their peers

than with their own families, implying that their peers were their most important source of support before their entry into St. John's Shelter. While this separation is painful for them, it is also justifiable considering that their peers are also their partners in juvenile and criminal activities.

Deficiency of Information and Advice on Legal Actions

RA 9344 requires that an individual diversion plan be prepared for each CICL. Nothing of this sort is done at St. John's Shelter. Without any advice on the course of action that can be taken to speed up their child's release, parents conveniently blame the judge for the delay. While there is some truth to this, it is just one of the reasons for the delay. The head of the shelter clarifies that the fastest way to get a release is through amicable settlement. Once a certificate of desistance is signed by the victim, the judge will most likely sign the release papers. She explains that the parents of the CICL may approach the victim's family to ask forgiveness. When the family asks for civil liabilities payment, the parents should accept it, and find ways to pay promptly. Things would speed up after that because there is already desistance.

Unfortunately, most of the residents and their families do not have the necessary information on the rights of their children as CICL. This particularly applies to the release on recognizance and the processes that they need to go through to be released. The residents, on the other hand, also have this prevailing notion that they were placed in St. John's Shelter as punishment for their wrongdoing, and that prolonged detention is just a part of what they need to go through. As Arvin, sixteen, whose case is robbery explained, "this is just the way that it should be. If you commit something wrong, you need to simply accept everything. At least, we're here, not in the BJMP prison." This implies that St. John's Shelter is still seen as a juvenile

detention center and not as a rehabilitation facility. The residents know that if not for their age, they would be imprisoned in the city jail.

For the houseparents, other staff, and even the residents themselves, it is patently clear that the concept that a youth offender has the right to be rehabilitated and not punished is difficult to accept. As Robert Hoge notes, the idea of rehabilitation requires a “reframing” of traditional notions, especially among people who are handling them.³⁰ This reframing should be focused on reinforcing the conviction that offenders are persons who can still be productive citizens and not deviants who must be treated harshly. Thus, the people who are directly in contact with youth offenders have to reframe their notion from retributive justice to restorative; otherwise their beliefs will impede rather than facilitate rehabilitation.

Mortifications from Peers

Goffman also notes that in asylums, mortification can come from other inmates. In St. John’s Shelter, mortification from other residents comes in the form of the “welcome” and the “no squealing” rule.

In describing the asylum, Goffman writes that new entrants undergo a form of initiation called “the welcome,” prepared by the staff and/or the inmates to give them a preview of the kind of life that they would have inside the facility.³¹ Among the residents of St John’s shelter, “the welcome” is an expected event. According to seventeen-year-old Jay, who is charged with robbery, “everyone admitted here receives a “welcome.” In my case, I was “welcomed” twice.” Jay has appointed himself as a giver of “the welcome” to the new entrants. Sixteen year old Jerson, who is accused of raping his stepsister, is the other resident who initiates “the welcome.” A common “welcome” consists of three punches to the stomach. He proudly said that he has

taken it upon himself to give “the welcome.” When asked why he does this, he responded that, “it’s a standard practice to have a ‘welcome.’ I myself experienced being “welcomed.” Jay, on the other hand, “welcomes” new residents through a tight neck grip causing the victim to lose consciousness. The “welcome” usually happens during sleeping time.

Some residents do not experience being “welcomed,” however. These are the residents who are well-built because they might retaliate, and those with disabilities. According to Jay and Jerson, residents who are usually given a “welcome” include those who look arrogant, their personal enemies before their admission to the facility, and the enemies of one’s peer group.

Despite this, no confrontation inside St. John’s Shelter is needed to warrant the “welcome.” According to them, there is an unspoken rule among the residents that if you were “welcomed,” you should not get back at the ones who “welcomed” you. Instead you “welcome” a newcomer. This is how the residents justify and maintain the practice.

No squealing

Ronald, fifteen, and accused of theft, relates that residents honor a tacit understanding amongst themselves in regards to “the welcome.” Whenever you witness a violation or are at the receiving end of the “welcome” you do not report it or they would get back at you. “If you’re beaten, you just endure it because they are not going to kill you. They are just trying to intimidate you.”

The staff members are aware of this unwritten agreement not to squeal but are not alarmed. For example, the medical personnel reported that at one time, a male resident asked her for fever medicine. The onset of fever was sudden so she asked if any part of his body ached to rule out enflamed tonsils, toothache, swollen gums, etc. She could not point out the cause until

she noticed him walking with a slight limp. She called the male guard and asked the resident to strip in the privacy of the therapy room (which also serves as the clinic). That was when they discovered that he has pellets in the fold of his private part and red blotches could be seen around it. His fever remained high a day later so he had to be brought to the nearby hospital. This incident prompted further investigation which revealed that four other residents inserted pellets while another one placed an earring. The residents explained that the putting pellets in the private part can enhance sexual pleasure while the ring is for adornment.

Residents are not allowed rings, earrings, or any sharp instruments. Brian, fifteen, who is charged with theft, shared that he used the handle of a toothbrush to cut the skin after sharpening it. He, and the others, used the rough edges of their beds and the cracks on the floor to sharpen the handle during sleeping time. The pellets were made from broken parts of plastic hangers, which they also sharpened and molded by rubbing until the shape became circular and their sizes, that of corn kernels. Putting a pellet in one's private part cannot be done alone. It requires at least one person to pull the skin while the other simultaneously inserts the pellets. All their dorm mates knew about this activity but no one wanted to report it.

Many similar incidents happen with the knowledge of the residents but no one dares to report them. Even the victims of wrongdoings do not say anything. For example, one new resident was interrogated by the houseparents about being “welcomed” because it was apparent from the crack on his lips that violence occurred. However, despite the grilling and the assurance from the houseparents that they would protect him if he gave out the names of those who “welcomed” him, he did not utter a single word. He would not divulge the perpetrators' identity even to his mother.

The foregoing example illustrates Goffman's notion of "permanent mortification," whereby it is not just the victim who is mortified but the viewers as well. "Permanent mortification" takes place when a person witnesses his peer being physically assaulted by another but is powerless to help the victim or stop the assailant.³² At St. John's Shelter, newcomers receive the "welcome" in view of many residents. They are not apathetic, because many of them have formed close friendships among themselves. For example, Johnny, seventeen, and Arvin, sixteen, (both charged with crime against property) consider themselves best friends. The same is true for Edward, seventeen, and Clark, seventeen, who happen to be cousins. In fact, even those who are not chummy with their peers feel pity for those whom they witness being physically assaulted. As Ronald, sixteen, who is charged with theft said, "they are pitiful, but that's all the reaction you can show. If you meddle, then, you'll be involved. You'll only get beaten. It has happened before." Silence is simply their way of self-preservation because squealers are threatened with more beatings than those who were "welcomed."

The aforementioned incidents resonate with the notion that living with people who committed different violations can be "contaminative."³³ Goffman explains that "contaminative exposure" happens when inmates are forced to form relationships with people they may not like.³⁴ For example, in St. John's Shelter, no resident can openly express his/her dislike for a co-resident because a bad stare, an unintentional bump, or a step on the foot can result in a fistfight. More importantly, contamination can be clearly seen when people with different violations are placed in one setting. This certainly allows them to "compare notes" with one another, so it is possible to learn new tricks of the trade or to learn other violations. Residents may offer information about drugs, weapons, information about the location of robbery targets, and new enemies in rival gangs. Kenneth Dodge, Thomas Dishion and Jennifer Lansford call it "peer

contagion,” a theory that supposes that the decision to offend gets strengthened when offenders are placed in one facility.³⁵ Deviant peer contagion is most likely to occur when youth are provided with unsupervised opportunities to interact with one another in unstructured settings. Peer contagion is also likely when younger ones are placed with slightly older youth who have committed similar crimes.³⁶ This situation is present in St. John’s Shelter.

Conclusion

Goffman’s assertion that to be forcibly detained in a facility is to be mortified applies to the residents of St. John’s Shelter. Mortifications come from the management and co-residents. St. John’s Shelter is a source of mortifications because forced admission is tantamount to losing one’s autonomy right from the start. During their stay in the facility, the structured schedule and close supervision likewise curtail the residents’ freedom. Another loss pertains to the resident’s identity as his/her prior civilian self no longer count. He/She is but another offender who deserves detention for breaking the law. Deprivations of leisure activities and meaningful programs for rehabilitation also mortify the CICLs. Lastly, the management’s lack of proper advice to the CICLs and their parents on how to proceed with the case causes undue delay in the release of the CICL.

Co-residents also serve as sources of mortification. The “welcome” and beatings are carried out when residents are new, and potential victims may be chosen because of their enemies before entry or because they look arrogant. Since a no-squealing rule is observed, most perpetrators are not caught. Although not thoroughly explored in this study, there are manifestations that a code of conduct from the viewpoint of the residents is tacitly understood and even agreed among them.

Are mortifications inherent in facilities? It appears to be so. At the crux is the loss of freedom upon admission to residence. A resident's life is a distant departure from his civilian life and the difference stems largely from the loss of freedom. Without freedom, deprivations follow. On top of these difficulties experienced by the CICLs, the utter lack of activities to occupy their time exacerbates their situation. Again, this is a far cry from a normal adolescent's life whose daily routine is normally marked by a wide array of activities done outside of their home and mostly in the company of peers, as indicated by the youth in this study.

ENDNOTES

¹ Save the Children-UK, *Breaking Rules: Children in Conflict with the Law and the Juvenile Justice Process, the Experience in the Philippines*, (Save the Children UK: Quezon City, Philippines. 2004).

² Congress of the Philippines, Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act of 2006, Republic Act Number 9344. <http://www.dswd.gov.ph/images/articles/RA9344.pdf> . (accessed on Aug. 4, 2012)

³ Alexis Romero, "New Juvenile justice law signed," *The Philippine Star*, October 9, 2013. <http://www.philstar.com/headlines/2013/10/09/1243132/new-juvenile-justice-law-signed> (accessed Oct. 12, 2013)

⁴ Robert M. Regoli, John D. Hewitt, and Matt DeLisi, *Delinquency in Society*, (Jones & Bartlett Publishers, 2012) & John Dean Champion, *The Juvenile Justice System*. 6th ed. (Ohio, USA: Prentice Hall. 2010).

⁵ Richard J. Lundman, *Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency* 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, 1993),150.

⁶ Leanne F. Alarid, and V. Rolando del Carmen, *Community-Based Corrections* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning: 2011), 331.

⁷ Jessica Knowles, *Still Behind Bars: Child Incarceration and Juvenile Justice Policy in the Philippines* (Makati, Phils: Philippine-American Educational Foundation. 2010).

⁸ Maria Virginia G. Aguilar, "Instilling Values to Children in Conflict with the Law in a Youth Facility" *Journal of Human Values* (2016): 0971685816650574.

⁹ Congress of the Philippines. Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act of 2006. Republic Act Number 9344, (<http://www.dswd.gov.ph/images/articles/RA9344.pdf> , (accessed on Aug. 4, 2012).

¹⁰ The name of the study site is changed for confidentiality.

¹¹ Official documents (vision/mission/goals) provided by the management of St. John's Shelter.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ "Residents" refer to the children in conflict with the law who are admitted to a facility. The two terms are used interchangeably in this study.

¹⁴ Mark W. Lipsey, "Can Intervention Rehabilitate Serious Delinquents?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 564, no. 1 (1999): 142-66.

-
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Mark W. Lipsey, David S. Cordray, and Dale E. Berger, "Evaluation of a Juvenile Diversion Program using Multiple Lines of Evidence" *Evaluation Review* 5, no. 3 (1981): 283-306.
- ¹⁷ Andrew T. Scull, *Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Deviant-A Radical View* (Oxford, US: New Polity Press. 1984), 2.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., 1.
- ¹⁹ Erving Goffman, *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (Doubleday, 1961).
- ²⁰ Ibid., 6.
- ²¹ Ibid., 42.
- ²² Laura S. Abrams, "Listening to Juvenile Offenders: Can Residential Treatment Prevent Recidivism?" *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal* 23, no. 1 (2006): 61-85.
- ²³ Adam H. Bourne and Maggie A. Robson, "Participants' Reflections on being Interviewed about Risk and Sexual Behaviour: Implications for Collection of Qualitative Data on Sensitive Topics" *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 18, no. 1 (2015): 105-16.
- ²⁴ All names used in this study to refer to the houseparents and the children in conflict with the law are aliases to protect their identity.
- ²⁵ Department of Labor and Employment – National Wages and Productivity Commission, Summary of Daily Minimum Wage Rates Per Wage Order, By Region, Non-Agriculture (1989-2016), http://www.nwpc.dole.gov.ph/pages/statistics/stat_wage%20rates1989-present-non-agri.html (accessed on December 29, 2016).
- ²⁶ Gresham M. Sykes, 'The Pains of Imprisonment,' in *The Sociology of Punishment and Correction*, eds. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin Wolfgang (New York, US: John Wiley & Sons. 1962), 41.
- ²⁷ Michel Foucault, "Discipline and Punish," in *Contemporary sociological theory* (2nd ed.), eds. Craig Calhoun, Joseph Gerteis, and James Moody, (Victoria: Wiley & Sons. 2007).
- ²⁸ Goffman, *Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*, 16.
- ²⁹ Ibid., 23.
- ³⁰ Robert D. Hoge, Nancy Guerra, and Paul Boxer, eds. *Treating the Juvenile Offender* (Guilford Press, 2008), 102.
- ³¹ Goffman, *Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*, 18.
- ³² Ibid., 11-20.
- ³³ Ibid., 28.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Kenneth A. Dodge, Thomas J. Dishion, and Jennifer E. Lansford. "Deviant Peer Influences in Intervention and Public Policy for Youth. Social Policy Report. Volume 20, Number 1" *Society for Research in Child Development* (2006).
- ³⁶ Ibid., 11.