For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

DISCIPLINE, EDUCATE AND PUNISH: LAW, DISCOURSE AND PRAXIS IN A PORTUGUESE YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE

Peter Anton Zoettl

Centre for Research in Anthropology (CRIA-UM), Portugal

ABSTRACT

Based on an ethnographic study in a Portuguese Youth Detention Centre (YDC), the article discusses the divergent discourses of law, the judiciary, and detention centres, and the way they are put into practice. While the law gives priority to young offenders' 'education', both the sentencing practices of the judiciary, and the institutional practices of YDCs, adopt and implement primarily a disciplinary stance on youth justice. The article anatomizes how these divergent discourses intermingle, and contrasts the institutional discourses with the inmates' views of, and reactions to, the disciplinary mode of operation of the centres. It is suggested that the regime of confinement and strategies of reward and punishment of the YDCs induce juveniles to adopt only short-lived changes of conduct, ultimately confining the law's precept of education to a praxis of behavioural conditioning.

Keywords: discourse analysis, juvenile justice, Portugal, youth custody, youth offending

Introduction

The diversity and peculiarities of international juvenile justice systems have been extensively researched with reference to a large number of countries (see eg Dünkel 2011; Hazel 2008; Junger-Tas and Decker 2008; Hartjen 2008; Muncie and Goldson 2006). Scholars have also repeatedly discussed the impact of secure custody on young citizens (Franzén and Holmqvist 2014; Neves 2012; Cox 2011; Bickel 2010; Halsey 2007; Gray and Salole 2006; Kivett and

Warren 2002), pointing, for instance, to the 'harm and damage' potentially inflicted on individual juveniles, the counterproductive effects of 'labelling and processing children through formal proceedings' and the 'failings of custodial institutions when measured in terms of crime reduction' (Goldson 2008: 1; 245; 64). While developments in international juvenile justice law and politics in the last decades may have been thoroughly analysed, and the practice of juvenile confinement studied in numerous empirical studies, what is missing is often a closer, localised look at the interplay between law and practice. Changes in juvenile criminal justice generally follow, concomitantly, popular demands for 'more' security and changing rationalities of governance and—being high on the political agenda in most countries—are frequently 'railroaded' through the legislature. However, the institutions responsible for implementing the law (such as juvenile courts, youth justice boards, and youth detention centres), although formally bound by the law 'on the books', necessarily must interpret the law's letter and spirit in light of their own conceptual traditions, and the demands of their everyday practice.

In this article, I will anatomise the intricacies of the interwoven discourses of Portuguese law, the judiciary, and Youth Detention Centres (YDCs), and confront them with the YDCs' institutional praxis as well as the point of view of young offenders held in custody. As Gray and Salole have noted, understanding the 'macro-level' of modern penality does not necessarily 'explain the micro, situated, day-to-day local practices' of youth custody facilities (2006: 675). With this in mind, dissecting Portuguese institutional discourses is intended to render intelligible the way that different rationalities, practices and principles of youth justice intermingle on a local level and to what effect. Accordingly, I am interested in the discourses of law and youth justice institutions, not only in terms of how they constitute, as Fox has named it, 'a constitutive bridge between micropolitical dynamics and organizational structures of social control' (1999: 437), but also in the way these discourses relate to each other and to the empirical reality they produce (that is, a particular YDC's day-to-day practice). Moreover, I will point out how the presumed beneficiaries of youth justice (juvenile offenders) conceptualise their experiences with custody, and contrast their perspective against the ideas and objectives laid down in institutional discourses.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Methods and Limitations

Borrowing from Foucault, the discussion in this article makes use of institutional discourses as 'material for a thorough examination of the way in which a particular kind of knowledge'—namely the law's, the judiciary's and the YDCs' knowledge on youth offending—'is formed and acts in relation to institutions and the roles prescribed in them' (Foucault 1982: xi). Legal discourse sets a framework for certain ways of 'thinking' youth offending which, once adopted by the judiciary or the staff of a YDC, has a strong bearing on how juvenile offenders are dealt with by these institutions in practice. I do not, however, suggest a causal relationship between discourse and practice, but rather consider the various discourses presented throughout this article (laws, judgments, house rules, etc.) as being, at the same time, the expression of—and foundation for—certain notions regarding youth offending. As Foucault emphasised, while discourses establish and represent relations of power, they do not simply translate relations of power and domination. Instead, they are themselves 'the thing for which and by which there is struggle' (1981: 53).

The different Portuguese institutional discourses on youth offending, as I will demonstrate, likewise interact and compete with each other and the institutional practice they participate in producing. Both the individual discourses, as much as the hierarchical body of discourses (from the law down to a YDC's *Pupil's Guide*), are often rather contradictory in themselves, and include competing or even antagonistic ideas. They are, to use Foucault's words, 'discontinuous practices, which cross each other, are sometimes juxtaposed with one another, but can just as well exclude or be unaware of each other' (1981: 67). However, as a consequence of organisational necessities in the everyday practice of youth custody, certain ideas (like that of 'discipline') may gain the upper hand over others (like that of 'education') and dominate the way a corpus of discourses is put into practice.

Just as Foucault pointed out the non-correspondence between 'the orders of discourse, practice and effects' (1981: 247), criminologists have emphasised the need to 'study the pragmatics of programme-implementation and the processes through which rationalities come to be realized (or not) as actual practices' (Garland 1997: 200). While juvenile justice politics follows certain political rationalities, it is nevertheless essential to explore, as Garland notes, 'the real practices and processes in which these programmes and rationalities and technologies are selectively and sometimes unexpectedly used, with all of their compromise formations and unintended effects' (1997: 200). Along these lines, I will make use of the

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

narratives of interned young offenders in order to demonstrate some of the effects of the putting-into-practice of a web of institutional discourses on youth offending.

The considerations in this article are based (apart from statutory texts) principally on evidence collected during fieldwork at a YDC in the city of Lisbon, which I will call Belleterre.[1] At the time of my research—fieldwork was conducted during three periods of five weeks each over the course of one year, with daily attendance and participation in the centre's routine—Belleterre had an inmate population of around thirty male and ten female sentenced youth offenders, aged between thirteen and twenty. I was granted unrestricted and unaccompanied access to all areas and activities of the centre at any time of day, and was permitted to move freely around the centre's premises and to converse privately with inmates and staff *ad libitum*. Furthermore, I was allowed to study the case records (dossiers) of all of the offenders. These dossiers documented the juveniles' entire institutional biographies—including school assessments, police enquiries and opinions of courts—and included numerous psychological reports as well as all of the documents filed by other YDCs in which they had been interned.

While this study is limited to the extent that it was carried out in only one of the six YDCs operating in Portugal at the time of writing (accommodating nearly a quarter of the country's total juvenile inmate population), the documentary evidence filed in the dossiers, together with the personal reports given by the centre's residents and staff regarding other YDCs, were of great help in overcoming this restriction. Apart from the innumerable informal conversations with residents and staff, semi-structured recorded interviews were conducted with twenty-four inmates (six of whom were women) and eleven of the centre's Youth Offending Workers. Another thirty-five inmates' files were studied. With ten of the residents, a second formal interview was conducted approximately one year after the first. Selection for the semi-structured interviews was not based on formal criteria, but rather on mutual empathy and trust. The centre provided a room which allowed interviews to be conducted in a confidential atmosphere (Belleterre's library).

[1] To guarantee the complete anonymity of all data collected, quotations of interviews, records of cases and inmates' files will not include any personal references, and personal pronouns do not necessarily indicate the actual gender of the persons concerned.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Portuguese Youth Justice in an International Context

Portuguese policy on juvenile justice underwent profound reform at the turn of the millennium. In 1999, a new law for young offenders—the Law for Tutelage and Education (LTE)—was enacted, which came into effect in January 2001. The LTE separated the legal treatment of 'children and juveniles at risk' (Lei-147/99) from that of juvenile offenders.[2] The former, from that point onward, could only be subjected to so-called measures of fostering and protection (including institutionalization in child welfare institutions), while the latter faced sanctions ranging from admonition to secure custody in YDCs (called 'Educational Centres'). Notwithstanding the fact that the LTE introduced important guarantees regarding due process of law for juvenile offenders (including the right to a fair hearing, the right to a court-appointed lawyer, and the right to silence), it also expressed a shift in Portuguese juvenile justice policy towards containment and managerialism, in step with developments in other European countries.

Adult rates of imprisonment in Portugal are within the European average.[3] Rates of imprisonment of juvenile offenders, however, according to UN data, seem to be comparatively high for an EU country (although it is difficult to make straightforward comparisons due to different definitions and ages of criminal responsibility).[4] Young offenders aged sixteen and older (at the time of the crime) are tried in adult courts and, for the most part, may only benefit in terms of a reduction in penalty (CP 1995: Art. 9). Offenders aged twelve to fifteen are tried within family courts (called 'juvenile courts' hereafter) and, in the case of a custodial sentence, may be detained until they turn twenty-one. While a number of European countries (such as Italy, Finland, Norway and Sweden) in the 1990s were pursuing policies designed to reduce juvenile incarceration, Portugal, by contrast, thus formed part of the 'half of Europe' which witnessed 'some form of youth repenalisation' during this same period (Muncie and Goldson 2006: 205).

[2] All terms and quotes originally in Portuguese have been translated by the author. In the case of interviews, the translation sought to keep as close to the Portuguese original as possible, even where this resulted in rather awkward English versions.

[3] Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics: Prison populations (SPACE I, Survey 2013).

[4] The UNODC database "Juveniles Held in Prisons, Penal Institutions or Correctional Institutions" quotes a rate of 12.7 per 100,000 for juveniles aged 17 or under for Portugal, compared to, for example, 1.0 for Denmark, 5.2 for France, 7.1 for England and Wales, and 23.2 for Greece (2013 data). Data given for Portugal was cross-checked with local sources and seems to be plausible.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

The reasons for this shift in Portuguese policy on juvenile offending are manifold and related to a widespread view that previous legislation, with its markedly protectionist approach, was no longer adequate to deal 'efficaciously' either with children at risk or with juvenile offenders (Martins 2012: 155). While it is beyond the scope of this article to assess these claims, it is clear that the transition to the LTE was mainly driven by a political rationale which demanded that juvenile offenders be contained in a more secure institutional setting, in order to confront supposedly increasing rates of juvenile delinquency.[5] Accordingly, the draft LTE bill, in its 'explanation of motives', emphasises, on the one hand, the 'recrudescence of forms of juvenile violence' and the 'existence of gangs, particularly in metropolitan and suburban areas' (PL-266: preamble, paras. 3, 19). On the other hand, it notes the state's duty 'to protect social peace and a community's essential juridical goods' and it highlights the 'proven inadequacy' of the 'protectionist model […] in a time in which the welfare state and its means and priorities are being questioned' (para. 6, 2).

Even if the changes introduced by the LTE accompany (albeit with some delay, which is probably due to Portugal's late return to democracy in 1974) the tailing off of rhetorics of child protection which dominated most Western systems of juvenile justice until at least the 1970s (Muncie and Goldson 2006: 197), they do not follow a single rationality of crime governance. While exhibiting 'managerialist' tendencies—in the sense of putting emphasis on 'effectiveness in the use of criminal justice resources' (Garland 1996: 455; see also Neves 2012)—the LTE does not renounce the idea of 'transforming' young offenders. In fact, youth justice authorities and workers continue to be concerned about recidivism in a more than superficial manner.[6] The alteration of Portugal's youth justice policy thus cannot simply be subsumed under those European and US American developments which have been termed the 'new penology' (Feeley and Simon 1992) or new 'techniques and rationalities of control' (Rose 2000: 321), which prioritise risk management over individual reform.

It also would be simplistic to characterise the enactment of the LTE as a symptom of a new European 'penal common sense' which emulates, according to Wacquant, American

[5] While overall crime rates in Portugal in fact have been increasing in the years preceding the LTE, those of the capital city of Lisbon, for instance, have actually decreased. The Sistema de Informação das Estatísticas da Justiça (http://www.siej.dgpj.mj.pt, accessed 18 February 2016) indicates an increase of 18% for continental Portugal and a decrease of 9% for the district of Lisbon, respectively, from 1993 to 1999. Specific data on juvenile offending is not available.

[6] Recently, the Portuguese Prison authorities (DGRSP) launched a longitudinal research project on causes and frequency of recidivism of former YDC inmates ("Projeto Reincidências").

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

developments "aiming to criminalize poverty" (1999: 319). While it is true that the great majority of YDC inmates come from the marginalised strata of Portuguese society, scholars have observed that this is a continuation of practices pursuant to the previous law, in which 'in the great majority of cases, only children coming from the poorest social milieus were subjected to custody sentences […] leaving unpunished young delinquents who belonged to the middle and upper classes' (Martins 2012: 155-56). Then again, Portugal, as a country with quite modest crime rates overall,[7] is far from being an example of the 'new criminologies of everyday life', described by Garland as one of the consequences of the 'limits of the sovereign state', within which 'the threat of crime has become a routine part of modern consciousness' (1996: 450; 46). Durão, for instance, has noted how police work in Portugal is still dominated, notwithstanding contrary political discourses, by an ethos built on the country's low level of violence and the idea of a 'safe and tranquil' society (2010: 145; 58). The LTE represents, however, as will be clear from what follows, a pronounced move towards discourses and strategies of responsibilisation (Muncie and Goldson 2006: 213; Garland 1996: 458) and a tendency towards the 'adultification' of young offenders.

Education, Values and Personality: Judicial Discourses on Young Offenders

The Portuguese law on young offenders emerges out of a fundamental contradiction. On the one hand, the Portuguese Penal Code (CP: Art. 19) considers all persons below the age of sixteen to not be criminally responsible (*inimputável*), in the same terms as persons with a 'psychical anomaly' (CP: Art. 20). On the other hand, the LTE calls youth aged twelve to under sixteen to account for acts considered to be crimes within the penal law, and, as a whole, it is built on notions of responsibility. The LTE states, for instance, that one of the main objectives of institutionalisation in a YDC is to enable offenders to 'conduct their lives in a socially minded and juridically responsible way' (Art. 17.1). Similarly, the law which regulates the operation of YDCs, in its preamble, cites 'the idea of a pedagogy of responsibility' as one of the pillars of the YDC's functioning (DL-323).

[7] Eurostat data for 2013 ("Intentional homicide offences in largest cities") quote a rate of 0.54 per 100,000 inhabitants for Lisbon, compared to, 1.27, 1.28 and 1.85 for Berlin, London and Paris, respectively (http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database, accessed 21 February 2016).

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

As its name suggests, the LTE places great emphasis on the education of juveniles. The law's concept of education, though, is left rather fuzzy. All so-called 'tutelary educational measures' aim to 'educate the minor for the law',[8] leaving open what is actually meant by this expression. The law which governs the YDCs subscribes to the idea of the primacy of education, consistently designates the juvenile inmates of the Educational Centres as 'pupils' (*educandos*), and demands that YDCs draw up a distinct 'Personal Educational Project' (PEP) for every individual juvenile.

However, the offenders' supposed need for education is—as the very first article of the YDC law makes clear—not the only motive for their internment; the 'defence of order and of social peace is equally [to be] taken into account' (DL-323: Art. 1.1). The same notion of responsibilisation and institutionalised containment can be traced through the sentencing praxis of the judiciary. For example, in deciding that a youth accused of robbery would be taken into custody, the judge observed that the sanctions provided by the LTE 'are based on the idea of calling the minor to account, showing him/her that behaviours which constitute illegal crimes […] are not tolerated by society'. The judge further emphasised the 'understandable social alarm' and 'sentiments of insecurity within the community at large', supposedly provoked by groups of juveniles in Lisbon's metropolitan area.

Although the fact that an offender has dropped out of school is often mentioned in court decisions, it is not generally the lack of formal education which, in the reasons of the judges, is the rationale for imposing sanctions such as internment. Frequently, offenders' misbehaviour is linked to their supposed 'lack of values'. In this way, education is conceptualised as a process of imparting certain values, in accordance with the LTE's guidelines (Art. 17.1). To give an example, in one decision—in which a juvenile was sentenced to two years of custody—the offender's supposed 'lack of values and ethical principles' was cited as one of the 'multiplying factors [for the risk of] committing new delinquent acts'. Custody in a YDC thus is conceived by the judiciary as allowing juveniles to acquire the very values which they are supposedly lacking. The discourses deployed by the judges in these cases often resemble one another closely, with statements such as: 'only an ambience of containment will ensure that [the juvenile offender] internalises the norms and values of life in society'; and 'the need of applying a sanction of containment to the deviant

[8] *Para o direito*; hereafter to be translated as 'in accordance with the law'.

behaviour of the juvenile is evident, that is, a custody sentence which aims at enabling the juvenile […] to internalise the values concurrent with law'.

The juridical discourse on offenders' (lack of) values is sometimes extended to their 'personality'. Although the LTE recognises the accused minor's right 'not to respond [to questioning] regarding her/his behaviour, character or personality' (Art. 45.2c), it nevertheless permits to take an offender into custody for the sole purpose of 'examination of personality' (Art. 51.1c; Art. 69). In addition, the law provides for judicial interrogation on 'facts regarding the personality and the character of the minor', which may subsequently be taken as evidence both for the determination of guilt and the choice of sanction (Art. 66.2). The judiciary often takes up the law's interest in the personality of the offender. In one judgment, for example, a young person's crimes are considered 'to reveal a deficient development of personality of the minor'; in another decision, the offender's statements are questioned 'in view of his personality and former behaviour'. The 'need to correct the personality' of the offender is emphasised, in still another decision, as being a legal prerequisite for the imposition of a sanction.

The reasons given by the courts frequently point to an appraisal (and sentencing) based, not only on the crime committed, but also on the individual's marginal way of life, living conditions and 'milieu'. Rather than being considered extenuating circumstances, such signs of marginality are regularly cited in support of the need for juridical sanctions, particularly internment. For example, cases refer to the fact that an offender was 'habitually accompanying "problematic elements and frequented dangerous areas, maintaining a pro-delinquent lifestyle"'; 'strolling around in the city of Lisbon in company with other juveniles associated with marginality and drug consumption'; and 'strolling in public without the supervision of adults'. Such judicial observations generally rely on—and quote, as in the first example above—other, non-juridical discourses, such as reports from the offender's previous school, as well as the 'social report with psychological assessment', and the report on the 'examination of [the offender's] personality', both of which are required in any case in which a custody sentence is possible (LTE 1999: Art. 69, 71).

In line with this, a supposed lack of parental care—from which many of the juveniles in fact suffered—is often deployed as a further argument in support of placing an offender in a YDC. Portugese judicial discourse thus partly exemplifies the move towards parental responsibilisation observed in other countries (Muncie 2006: 771). For example, in one case,

the 'gravity of the crime committed' was relied upon, together with 'the unstructured life [the accused] was living and the conditions of his family', in order to reach the conclusion that the court could not be 'permitted to believe that there is a non-institutional sanction which would, at present, guarantee [the offender's] education and strengthened socialisation'. In another case, it was ruled that:

> in face of the gravity of the offence, the lack of integration in school or labour market, and the incapacity of the family to provide for [the offender's] appropriate social integration, the only sanction that stands out is the one suggested by the public prosecutor: custody in an Educational Centre [YDC].

In a similar manner, an offender's prior institutionalisation seems to increase the chances that the court will opt for a custodial sentence. One inmate, for instance, reported that as he 'had already been to a child welfare institution, [the court] said that I wasn't able to behave. And that they were afraid that I would do more mischief'. As a consequence, he was sent to a YDC. The fact that an offender's 'unstructured life', the precarious social and economic 'conditions of her/his family', and a lack of schooling and professional training are not considered to be extenuating circumstances which mitigate the sanction imposed, but instead provide support for imposing the most severe form of sanction allowed for by the law, may seem at first disconcerting. It is, however, in perfect accord with some of the basic principles of the LTE, and is an example of the way in which the law's discursive knowledge on juvenile justice interacts with the discourses of other relevant institutions.

Naturally, the LTE does not suggest that the pre-trial marginality of an offender (in terms of education, family background, and economic standing) provides a justification for passing a custodial sentence. To the contrary, the law provides that 'the court shall give precedence […] to the sanction which represents the least intervention in the minor's freedom of will and way of life' (Art. 6.1). It does, however, set up a kind of general discursive framework for the interpretation of its individual norms, which, in judicial practice, ends up inverting the notion of 'least intervention'. First, as previously mentioned, all sanctions, including secure custody, are described not as sanctions but as 'educational measures'—in accordance with the designation of the LTE as a law concerning 'tutelage and education' (rather than being penal law). The regulatory law of YDCs promotes the LTE's educational discourse, by relating internment to the 'educational necessities' of the offender (DL-323: preamble).

Finally, the judiciary embraces and simultaneously extends the educational discourse of both laws by conceptualising the proceedings as being a process directed not *against* the

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

accused (as in a criminal case), but *to the benefit* of the juvenile. Consequently, court proceedings under the LTE are invariably 'instituted *in favour of* the offender', and it is, as explained in one decision, the 'superior interest of each of the three youths [which] leads to the imposition of a custody sentence' (of two years, in that case). As a result, the educational stance of the law, in judicial practice, brings about a dilution of one of the LTE's main achievements, namely, the implementation of due process in juvenile justice. While the law provides the juvenile suspect those rights enjoyed by adult defendants in criminal proceedings, the protectionist (or paternalistic) reading of its educational discourse by the judiciary and, subsequently, by the YDCs make for a downplaying of the seriousness, and the potential harmful impact, of secure custody for young citizens.

Curiously, juvenile defendants (who, during proceedings, are not named defendants, but 'minors'), their parents, and their defence lawyers, generally 'agree' with the sanctions suggested by the public prosecutor and imposed by the judge, subscribing to the supposedly educational role of custody articulated in judicial discourse. As a consequence, an offender's internment more often than not seems to take place on a voluntary basis, as in the following opinion of court: 'Having heard the minor and the highly honoured defence counsel with regard to the proposed sanction … all declared to accept it, as it was [considered] appropriate in view of the facts and the personality of the minor'. In another case, one of my interviewees reported having been asked by the judge 'if he would *mind* going to an Educational Centre [YDC] for one year'. He replied that he would not mind, his rationale for making this statement being that 'the judge would have interned [him] one way or the other'.

Due to this reinterpretation of the LTE's educational spirit in judicial practice, custodial sentences do not always follow the law's requirement that they be 'a measure of last resort' (DL-323: preamble). A number of Belleterre's residents had been taken into custody for relatively minor crimes. One youth had been sentenced to six months for wilful damage to property (having broken a billboard); another was sentenced to fifteen months for breaking a door in a child welfare institution; yet another youth was sentenced to two years for trespass and wilful damage to property; and a further young person was given a two year custodial sentence for possession of an illegal weapon (a butterfly knife). All were first time offenders.

Although there is no official data which allows for a comparison of penalties for minor offences imposed under the former law with those made under the current law, it seems that the enactment of the LTE has not resulted in a 'net widening' of Portuguese juvenile justice as

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

experienced in some European countries,[9] in which more 'young people have been drawn into the formal networks of control, at an earlier age, for more minor transgressions' (Smith 2007: xii, referring to England and Wales). However, as the sentences imposed upon the Belleterre inmates exemplify, the law's mingling of the concepts of responsibilisation (derived from penal law) and education (derived from the former protectionist approach), together with the judiciary's understanding of custody as educative, makes for a practice of juvenile justice within which young offenders continue to be interned either unnecessarily or for periods out of proportion to the seriousness of their offences. Remarkably, in the body of judicial decisions analised for this study, I came across one lone judicial voice (in the trial of two youths accused of causing bodily harm) who criticised the 'excessive intervention of [juvenile] courts in the education of young people' and who cautioned against the 'counterproductive effects on the healthy growing up of children and their right to err and go through conflicts' engendered by the law's application in judicial practice.

In general, judges have made little use of the non-institutional measures provided for by the LTE. In none of the case files studied did the courts apply restorative measures (provided for in Art. 11). However, in the cases where non-institutional sanctions were imposed, such as charitable work or so-called 'educational support', these appear to have been ineffective. As one youth reported, educational support was limited to well-intentioned advice, such as the maxim that he 'should follow the instructions of [his] mother'. Moreover, in a number of cases there was a very long lapse of time between the date of the crime and the start of the court proceedings, which effectivly thwarted the law's precept that 'a need for education […] remains in existence at the time of the decision' (Art. 7.1). One minor had been interned just before reaching the age of majority for crimes he had committed two and a half years previously (when he was fifteen years old); another inmate was sent to a YDC for a crime committed more than three years prior to sentencing. Not surprisingly, neither offender found the claimed justification for the sentence to be convincing.

[9] Carvalho (2005) cites a total inmate population of more than 500 for the months before the coming into effect of the LTE, of which around three quarters were interned for suspected offences. Five years later, the total YDCs' inmate population had dropped around 40% (of which roughly 15% may be attributed to decline in population of youth).

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Discourse and Practice of Juvenile Custody

Before examining the discourse and practice of YDCs, I begin this section by briefly characterising Belleterre's inmates from a socio-cultural perspective.[10] The overwhelming majority, as (unfortunately) was to be expected, can be described as 'marginalised' in a multitude of ways. In the first place, almost all of them belonged to economically disadvantaged families. Their parents were either unemployed, worked in low paid jobs such as cashiers and cleaners or, if financially better off, were employed in trades such as floor tilers, electricians and motor mechanics. Most inmates, before being admitted tot he YDC, were either living in one of the many peripheral neighbourhoods of the greater Lisbon area (predominantely in social housing), or were in child welfare institutions. A number of parents suffered from health problems, particularly mental health issues (such as depression or schizophrenia), or were reported to be dependent on alcohol or other drugs. Both of the parents of one of the juveniles had died from an overdose just after her birth. Another's parents had died of cancer before he reached the age of fifteen. Some of the inmates reported health problems of their own, such as cerebral aneurysm or renal disease, or were diagnosed with psychiatric disorders such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

In addition to economic, spatial and corporeal (health related) marginality, in many cases the juveniles and their families experienced a kind of 'institutional' or 'juridical' marginality and/or exclusion. That is, in around half of the cases, members of the offender's family either currently or in the past had been imprisoned or interned, often for drug-related crimes or offences against property, but also for less 'common' crimes such as arms trafficking or homicide. In three cases, each of the juvenile's parents was serving a prison sentence, as a result of which the juvenile had to be entrusted to other members of the family (normally the grandparents). Regrettably, of those who had the 'privilege' of being raised by their own parents, more than a third reported incidents of domestic violence, some of which were particularly brutal. Others reported the widespread presence of physical violence within their neighbourhoods as well as institutional physical violence (in one case, within a child welfare institution; in the case of all male juveniles at the hands of police officers; see Zoettl 2016).

Notwithstanding the fact that many youths' pre-detention lives had been marked by both suffering as well as the perpetration of violence (generally committed in the context of an

[10] The following notes refer to those inmates who were either formally interviewed or whose case files were studied in detail (totalling 35).

offence such as mugging), that life appears also to have been a time of considerable freedom. A number of the youths had dropped out of school (which was described as 'a big bore'), and parental and institutional authority was often minimal or completely absent. Finding themselves suddenly within the confines of a YDC, and being obliged, under threat of punishment, to obey an extensive catalogue of minute rules and regulations, at first constituted a traumatic experience for the majority. Moreover, in some YDCs, a new arrival was accommodated, for the first three to five days, not in their own room, but in a special 'containment room'. This space is ordinarily used for so-called 'protective confinement', that is, the solitary confinement of an inmate, which is allowed by the LTE up to a maximum of twenty four hours in order (amongst other reasons) 'to break down the minor's violent resistance to orders and instructions of the staff' (Art. 183, 179). The 'pains of imprisonment' (Sykes 1958) of juvenile offenders during the initial days, weeks and months in a YDC were apparent in their memories:

> When I arrived at the YDC … I felt 'my heart sink to my boots, and a profound sadness inside me'. [self-reflection note filled in by the inmate during admission procedures]
>
> They took away everything, all of a sudden. It was horrible, it was my freedom.
>
> It was very bad. Always crying, crying, crying. The first days, I was very withdrawn. I didn't speak to anybody.
>
> Damn, it was really bad. That was the only time that I … when I got here, I really cried.

These quotations bring to mind that, while the discourses of law, the judiciary and the YDCs are abstract, their effects in practice are very real and palpable for the youths affected. The successive concretising of legal and institutional texts—from the highly abstract LTE and the less abstract law of YDCs, to the concrete judge's sentence and the YDCs' house rules and to their final implementation in the daily practices of a centre—may have repercussions that were not originally intended. For instance, the desire to maintain discipline in a custodial environment which accommodates not only 'docile bodies', but also sometimes obstreperous adolescents, may induce YDCs to stretch the legal limits of the applicability of solitary confinement as a means by which to facilitate the orderly functioning of the institution.

The implications of this reification of discourse in institutional practice may also be illustrated by reference to the law's notion of inmates' 'reform'. One of a juvenile's many duties, as laid down in the LTE, is that of 'correctness' (*correção*), defined as: 'to address others politely and appear appropriately clean and orderly' (Art. 172.5). In the subchapter

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

'Living in boarding school', the law of YDCs then stipulates that all centres should 'endeavour that the pupil [*educando*] acquires habits of personal hygiene […] in order to develop care of personal appearance and a sense of self-esteem' (DL-323: Art. 62.4). Finally, based on these legal norms, Belleterre's House Rules determined that:

> For hygienic and/or sanitary reasons, during the first 72 hours of internment, the Director of the Educational Centre [YDC] may authorize a youth's hair cut, never using a comb below the size of 'comb 2'. To this effect, the Director of the Centre designates an employee with aptitude for this task. After the period of admittance and in the course of internment, the maintenance of the haircut may only vary between the sizes 'comb 2' and 'comb 5', in accordance with the youth's wish.

A number of Belleterre's residents reported having had their hair cut during admittance procedures. Some inmates (particularly those of African descent) arrived at the centre with a dreadlock hairstyle, others' hair simply would have been considered too long. This putting into practice of the—increasingly concrete—norms regarding offenders' personal appearance (that is, the duty of correctness) through what might appear to be a subsidiary rule of minor importance, however, was experienced by all the juveniles concerned as a painful deprivation of their personal, corporeal self-determination:

> When I arrived, I wore my hair long. When I arrived, they cut my hair. It was the worst thing they've done to me. Because I loved my hair. I adored my hair.
>
> I didn't wear my hair like this when I entered the centre. I had dreadlocks back here. They cut them. It was horrible. It was the worst.

Naturally, the centre's concern with the length of juvenile offenders' hair was not only a matter of hygiene, but also related to certain notions of discipline and orderly behaviour. Other rules of the centre, detailed in the Pupil's Guide (*guia do educando*)—a booklet all newly arriving inmates received—included prohibitions against using 'provocative or obscene gestures and language' and against using 'jargon' (the was actually derived from the rule prohibiting the use of languages other than Portuguese). According to the Guide, juveniles were to address the staff of the centre in prescribed ways ('Mr/Mrs', 'Mr/Mrs Doctor', 'Mr Director', etc), were required to walk in single file between the various centre buildings, and were obliged to 'await instructions to start eating meals standing up and in silence, behind the chair on which [the inmate] will sit down'. Unlike the law, which expresses a primary concern for education and responsibilisation, the discourses of Belleterre thus manifested an elevated interest in inmates' discipline, considered as being essential for the running of the institution.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Educate and Punish: Privileges, Penalties and Objectives

It is important to note that neither the rules, nor the way they were implemented in the daily practices of Belleterre, were intended to harm or belittle the residents. On the contrary, the centre's staff appeared very concerned with the juveniles' well beingand showed great personal commitment to the task of educating (in whatever sense) the offenders who had been entrusted to them. Relations between the inmates, on the one side, and the centre's administration, staff, teachers and security personnel, on the other, were generally very good. A number of offenders who had been transferred from other YDCs expressed relief at what they considered to be Belleterre's more 'relaxed' overall atmosphere, and Belleterre was described by one as a 'five stars' YDC.

While some of the centre's rules may seem odd at first, the majority of them in fact derived from Belleterre's character as a closed door Goffmanian 'total institution'. The rule of walking in single file, for instance, sprang from security concerns and the necessity to control the movements of groups of nearly twenty interned young offenders per residential unit, who were normally under the supervision of not more than one staff member and two security guards. Discipline within the confines of the centre was enforced, not only as part of a treatment model which linked offenders' supposed pre-internment lack of rules to their delinquent behaviour, but to a significant extent simply for practical reasons. Belleterre's institutional practices were shaped primarily—in accordance with the LTE's demands—by its stage and ward system, and a privilege/token system which rewarded or penalised everyday behaviour. Thus, in the first paragraph of the Pupil's Guide, the centre's functioning was explained to the newly arrived inmate in the following way:

> You are in Belleterre Educational Centre, to serve a custody sentence within the scope of the Law for Tutelage and Education and the Court's decision. From now on, it is in this educational centre that you live, you are educated in accordance with the law and you attend educational and recreational activities. In this centre, there are two regimes of internment: the Open and the Semi-open. What distinguishes one from the other are the privileges you will be able to benefit from, depending on your behaviour over the course of the sanction.

The early reference to the 'privileges' a resident could be granted hints at the 'carrot and stick' approach which characterised the centre's everyday routine. Behaviour was constantly assessed, and juveniles received marks from staff members and school teachers (all attended school and/or vocational training). Marks ranged from zero to five: a zero (in school) would

be given for 'acting with hostility', for instance, having 'carried out an act of physical violence' or having 'insulted or seriously disrespected' a teacher or fellow resident. A one would be given for 'acting negligently', for example, 'having disrespected' a teacher or fellow inmate 'without serious consequences', or having 'stood up and spoken without authorisation'. A two corresponded to 'inconsistent social behaviour', for example, if a resident 'did not make an effort or was unwilling' in relation to the teacher. A three (the first positive mark) was given for 'elementary social behaviour'; a four for 'developed social behaviour'. Finally, a five was awarded for 'behaviour worthy of admiration', such as when an inmate 'helped to solve conflicts'.

Marks were recorded and entered three times a day (corresponding to the staff's eight hour shifts) in a table entitled 'daily evaluation summary'. Bad marks had serious consequences for the juveniles. A two could mean the loss of benefits such as being able to keep a radio in their room, or being allowed to stay up half an hour later than others, or even the loss of weekend parole. 'Open' and 'semi-open' wards differed principally with regard to the possibility of weekend parole (of varying frequency) during a given phase of the centre's stage system. A score of one or zero would immediately result in disciplinary proceedings. The consequence was more severe punishment through one of the disciplinary measures provided under the LTE and YDC law, such as 'suspension […] from communal life with fellow [inmates]' (LTE: Art. 197f). This would mean that a juvenile would be required to stay in his room all day, for a period of up to one week. Furthermore, disciplinary proceedings would slow down a resident's progression from one stage to the next, thus reversing in-centre 'career' development and thereby reducing the number of privileges the juvenile could enjoy.

Taking into account the difficulties which most inmates experienced in coping with the severe limitations on their freedom of movement, action, and development as a consequence of their custody in a YDC, it is not surprising that the possible loss of privileges, as a result of receiving bad marks, was a perpetual fear. Being allowed to keep a radio in one's room, for instance, constituted a treasured benefit, particularly given that the number of personal objects a resident was allowed was extremely limited: in Stage One, for example, only a photograph of the family and the inmate's boyfriend or girlfriend was allowed. In the final Stage Four, nine additional objects of decoration were permitted, as well as four journals, four CDs, a radio or MP3-player, and authorized objects of personal hygiene.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Weekend or day parole was considered a great relief from the 'pains of imprisonment', and its granting or refusal thus became an event either of joyful anticipation or great frustration. In fact, the centre's system of conceding and withdrawing privileges proved very efficient in influencing overall behaviour. A number of juveniles openly acknowledged that the prospect of benefits and privileges had a strong impact on their everyday conduct in the centre, which they articulated in terms of achieving their 'objectives':

> I concentrated myself mainly on the objectives. I concentrated myself so that … if I change my attitudes, if I change my stance, if I change everything in me, I may have more objectives and more benefits. My objective is to obtain the benefits, so that the custody sentence will pass as quickly as possible.

> It was when I learned that I could already go home [on weekend parole] and manage to obtain my privileges that I paused to think.

> Today I'm completing ten months [of internment], and I think that the time I spent up there [another YDC] didn't avail to nothing. In the three month I'm here, I've been changing completely. In here, in this centre, I'm acting differently. Because I know that I have objectives to accomplish to be able to get out. Today I'll be promoted to the next stage. […] [Now] I can already go out. I can already get [weekend] parole. […] I can already spend Christmas at home.

The centre was also fairly successful in containing outrage and rebellion against internment which some inmates had displayed in other YDCs. Apparently, this was due to the fact that the *modus operandi* of Belleterre's stage and privilege system, for the most part, was considered comprehensible and reasonable by the majority of offenders. One juvenile, for example, who had been repeatedly subjected to solitary confinement for periods totalling several weeks in another YDC, managed to, as she described it, 'stipulate objectives' for herself in order to bring her at times aggressive behaviour towards staff and fellow residents under control. Reflecting on this behavioural change, she stated:

> Now I manage to control myself, because I have objectives. Because, if I were like I was up there [another YDC], if I saw that I had nothing to lose, let's say if I go for one of them [attack a staff member], one of the Youth Offending Workers [*educadora*] who would irritate me, I'd go for it. But no, now I have objectives. My objective for the moment: tomorrow I'll go … tomorrow I turn eighteen, I'll be together with my family for a while, I will be two hours out there. And from then on, it'll be Christmas. I'll really focus on Christmas.

Some inmates even came to recognise the value of what they considered iniquities in their treatment, on the basis that this had enabled them to gain self control. As one youth described, 'I know you are treating me unjustly, but I won't bother about it. I'll stop protesting, because I've learned that it will lead to nothing'. Learning to control their 'impulsiveness' and gaining

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

'self-control' thus were described by many as being achievements gained during their custodial term. A number of residents—including some who described their internment in negative terms overall—recognised a considerable change in their conduct over the period, stating that they had started to become 'calmer', 'more mature' or had begun to 'act differently'.

From Law to Practice: Discipline, Agency and Adaptation

Foucault has been criticised for his supposed 'tendency to marginalise law' contrary to what appears to be the centrality of law in modern societies (Hunt and Wickham 1994: 59). Foucault's view of law is indeed ambiguous: on the one hand, he contrasted the 'penality of the norm' (derived from the disciplinary mechanisms) to the 'penality of the law', and considered the former to be 'irreducible in its principles and functioning' to the latter (Foucault 1979: 183). The disciplinary mechanisms of power, according to Foucault, 'function in opposition to the formal framework' which established, in the course of the eighteenth century, egalitarian juridical liberties. The disciplines are not an 'infra-law' but rather a 'counter-law', or the 'dark side' of the democratising processes manifest in coded law, operating 'on the underside of the law', and potentially undermining 'the limits that are traced around the law' (1979: 222-23). However, Foucault also frequently pointed to the way in which the disciplinary apparatus is intertwined with law, observing, for instance, that the 'disciplinary technique […] insidiously and as if from below has invaded' penal justice (1979: 227); and that disciplinary techniques of power have gradually become 'recoded' in forms of law (1978: 109).

The interplay of the LTE and YDC law, on the one hand, and a centre's House Rules or Pupil's Guide, on the other, combined with the sentencing practice of the youth courts and the everyday institutional praxis of a particular YDC, epitomises this complex relationship between the legal and the disciplinary. The LTE and YDC law set the framework for the courts' and the centres' praxis, taking an educational perspective as their starting point. However, due to the necessarily abstract coding of its legal-discursive knowledge, the law leaves ample leeway for interpretation and for divergent modes of implementation,which may ultimately undermine the primacy of education and turn a juvenile's internment into a prison-like experience. At the same time, both legal texts exemplify what Foucault has called the

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

'colonialisation' of law and legal institutions (1980: 107; 1979: 231) by disciplinary techniques and mechanisms. Both laws code a whole complex of penalties for interned youth which allows for the in-centre punishment of 'light', 'serious' and 'very serious' disciplinary offences (LTE 1999: Section VI).

It is within this section of the LTE (entitled 'Disciplinary Regime') that the law, in what might constitute a unique discursive slip, finally comes to enunciate the word 'punish' in relation to a sanction applied within its scope (Art. 189.3). The YDCs' institutional routine, however, is imbued with the 'micro-physics' of disciplinary power and is clasped by a web of 'infra' or 'micro-penalities' (Foucault 1979: 178). These penalties constitutes their chief *modus operandi,* which is held together by the centres' elaborate stage and token system. The following grounds for disciplinary proceedings which had been taken against Belleterre's residents (either in Belleterre itself or in YDCs in which the juveniles had previously been held in custody) illustrate the YDCs' 'punishing universality' (Foucault 1979: 178): defiant posture (for example, 'During lunch [the inmate] continued to manifest a posture of defiance, not eating the entire meal'; the inmate addressed the centre's staff inappropriately, by using the informal Portuguese personal pronoun *tu*; the inmate 'spoke out against the teacher'), lack of respect or 'arrogant' behaviour (for example, the inmate 'responded arrogantly'; the inmate showed 'disrespectful behaviour' towards the director; the inmate 'destabilised the normal functioning of the centre' by calling members of the staff by nicknames), loss of self-control (for example, the inmate got up at the end of the lesson, 'violently hitting the ground with the chair'; the inmate 'was beating violently against the walls and the room door' at night; the inmate broke two fingers by punching with his fist against the room window), breaking the centre's rules (for example, the inmate 'gave cereal to a fellow inmate without authorisation'; the inmate 'faked' having washed his hair), or simply for not obeying the staff's instructions (for example, the inmate refused to participate in the exercises 'doing what he felt like').[11]

It would be wrong, however, to conclude that the juveniles' fear of punishment, and particularly the loss of privileges, turned them into heteronomous, subjected bodies, stripped of all agency. As Kivett and Warren have noted (based on their study of a residential home for delinquent boys in the USA), within the walls of total or quasi-total institutions, 'power may become bidirectional, moving between and among staff and inmates' (2002: 4). At Belleterre,

[11] All quotations derive from formal disciplinary proceedings instituted by the centres according to law (LTE: Art. 204). In each case, the quoted infractions were generally only one among a number of infractions which together resulted in the institution of proceedings.

newly arrived residents' initial shock at the sudden and near complete loss of freedom in most cases gradually gave way to a process of adaptation to the centre's norms and modes of operation, making bearable the everyday experience of being locked up. As 'consumers' of the centre's disciplinary regime, most quickly learned to develop 'tactics' to maintain or successively regain some agency and, potentially, to 'manipulate the mechanisms of discipline and conform to them only in order to evade them' (Certeau 1984: xiv). One resident, for instance, described himself as being 'intelligent [enough] to know how to handle things in here', and another affirmed that 'the *doutora* [senior staff member] likes me a lot. That's why I know that I'll get from her whatever I want, if I behave well. Whatever I want, within her reach. That's why I make an effort'.

Belleterre's staff were generally well aware of the juveniles' tactics of 'playing it cool', frequently referring, for example, to 'manipulative' behaviour or the suspicion that an inmate was 'acting up' (*fazer fitas*). Paradoxically, the successful adaptation to the centre's routines thereby constituted both what was demanded *and* potentially a justification for a negative evaluation:

> [The inmate] did not reveal difficulties in adapting to the institutional dynamics, adjusting his behaviour in terms of observance of [another YDC]'s norms, although doing so in an instrumental fashion, seeking to ascend within the stage system, or as a way of not being penalized. (Inmate's final social report)

> [The inmate] adopts a near exemplary behaviour in a variety of contexts, both on the level of school/vocational training and leisure activities, and interpersonal communication. Evaluation of off-grounds leave has also been favourable. However, his posture, although adequate, is characterized by its functionality, and is an adaptive response to the institutional demands and programme intervention […]. (Inmate's stage transition evaluation)

> At the behavioural level, she demonstrates a great capacity of self-control, visible through her appropriate responses to different situations, however, the strategies she adopts are mostly feigned (*dissimuladas*), so as to convey a positive image of herself. (Inmate's periodic report)

The above quotations exemplify what Halsey has called 'absolutely incongruous demands' on young offenders in custody, such as developing 'self-responsibility for their futures despite not being permitted to decide when they will go to the toilet, when they will eat or when they will sleep' (2007: 362). Franzén and Holmqvist similarly have exposed the 'ideological dilemma of control—freedom' and the steering of youth offenders (at a Swedish YDC) towards certain forms of behaviour, which are expected to be enacted from the inmates' 'own free will' (2014: 548). At Belleterre and other Portuguese YDCs, reactions to

the centres' demands were either (mostly temporary or intermittent) defiance, or else 'the adoption of an institutional persona' (Cox 2011: 602). The gradual behavioural changes displayed over the course of a custodial sentence—rated by the centre's staff either as a 'functional' adaptation, or as a genuine success of the treatment programme—were described by my interviewees as being a way of avoiding trouble (often called 'being intelligent'). A number of youths attributed these changes to their need to 'play along', to be 'cynical' or 'false', and to 'bite the bullet' (*engolir sapos*) within the confines of the centre. The following three statements exemplify how the majority of the inmates conceptualised the workings of custody and the supposedly best manner of 'work[ing] their way through incarceration' (Halsey 2007: 338):

> In here we have to play along, have to know how to play along. We have to know how to be cynical. False. That's what I am. In here I'm false. I'm cynical. I surely am. We have to know how to bite the bullet. They tell us to keep silent, we have to know to swallow, to be close-mouthed. That's why the only thing I take advantage of in here is the school, nothing else.
>
> In these kinds of places, you have to know how to be cynical. And you have to know how to play along like the others play along.
>
> I feigned to be a person I ain't. I contained myself a lot, I controlled myself a lot, to get what I wanted. And now that I don't have anything … it's not just the fact that I don't have anything to lose. It's also my nerves. The anxiety of being released. Coming closer and closer. This is what makes me turn into a different person. Not the one I really am. But I'm being a different person than the one I was during nearly all of my custody sentence.

These statements suggest that many of the changes in behaviour triggered over the course of their term in a YDC tended to be superficial and, potentially, short lived. At the same time, a number of youth recognised that they had developed greater self-control (for which they gave credit to the centre). In some cases, they acknowledged the fact that their internment had prevented them from committing more crimes, as one juvenile jocularly explained: 'I would have stopped, but in the EPL [Lisbon's central prison for adults]'. Others observed that internment had allowed them to complete secondary school qualifications, something they would have had difficulty achieving otherwise. Furthermore, there were inmates who declared that their time in custody had made them attach more value to their families and to personal relationships in general.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

Conclusion: Law, Respect and Education

On one subject, however, the juveniles' narratives proved to be very ambivalent, namely, education 'in accordance with the law'. Some were confident in their determination to abstain, in future, from criminal behaviour, with one interviewee declaring he would 'never steal anything again in my life'. Others—particularly those who were serving long sentences of two years or more—admitted (mostly in the informal conversation that took place once I had turned off the audio-recorder) that they would change their offending habits only to the extent of trying to be more clever in future. Drawing on his own experiences and on those of neighbourhood friends who had served sentences in other YDCs, one of the youth articulated his overarching view of juvenile education and rehabilitation: 'Educational Centres [YDCs] serve to re-educate. Re-educate doesn't mean that the youth won't rob again. The youths here … the Educational Centre, in my opinion, the only effect it has, is to make them think twice before doing so. Nothing else'.

Although most of the Belleterre's residents participated in one of the specific obligatory training programmes for juvenile offenders, the centre's disciplinary regime of rewards and punishments left little room for an educational practice based on self-reflection and the development of self-awareness. Rather than originating from the discourses found within the law, the centre's inclination to confine itself primarily to a disciplinary educational model derived from its institutional praxis of secure residential care. Within this context, penalising a juvenile for sharing his morning cereal 'without authorisation' was not only expression of, perhaps, the sporadic officiousness of an overtaxed staff member. Security concerns and the orderly functioning of the institution were, almost inevitably, the top priority of staff and administration, and translated into the predominance of the centre's disciplinary apparatus over the law's educational ethos.

As a consequence, the 'internalisation' of values—frequently referred to by the discourses of law, the judiciary and the centres alike as one of the main objectives of youth custody—was often reduced to the conditioning of perfunctory behavioural changes within a centre's day-to-day disciplinary praxis. A number of Belleterre's Youth Offending Workers, who had been employed in residential institutions under the former legal regime, were of the view that their work had come to resemble that of prison guards, as a result of the institutional changes introduced pursuant to the LTE. While emphasising the skills which inmates would acquire over the course of their sentence (in terms of self-control, attitudes, and manners), staff

members—many of whom stayed in touch with the juveniles after their release—also acknowledged that behavioural changes within the centre did not necessarily lead to changes in offending behaviour in post-institutional 'real' life.

My final quotation—which I leave without comment so as to cede the last word to one of Belleterre's inmates—illustrates this divergence between the objectives and the outcomes of an educational model which is grounded primarily on behavioural discipline. As the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire emphasised, people's 'view of the world, manifested variously in their action, reflects their situation in the world' (2005: 96). This is especially true for young marginalised citizens, whose *Weltanschauung* is gradually formed by the experiences they acquire, be it at home, in the neighbourhoods in which they grow up, in their encounters with agents of state power, or within the confines of the custodial institutions that for some of them, often for a number of long years, come to figure as surrogates for their family home. Failing to take into account that young offenders' modes of conceptualising their own acts and their condition is related to these experiences, will tend to thwart all efforts directed both at educating them 'in accordance with the law' and at instilling respect for the values (and property) of dominant society:

> I improved a lot [my behaviour]. *What exactly did you improve?* To respect. *To respect what?* The adults. *Respect in what way?* Obey what they say, these kind of things. *This is 'to respect'?* Or rather, to me this is not 'to respect'. To me, this is what I was saying before: you learn how to live through. Because you don't change. Because, if you tell me: 'Hey [interviewee's name], do this or that. I go there and do it. But it doesn't mean that I respect you. I only know how to live through. I go there and do it because I know that you have power over me. Before, I knew that you had power over me, but I nevertheless didn't do what you told me to do. *But you said that before [your internment] you also respected [other people]?* I don't respect anybody. I only do what I think is better for me to do […]. *So when you say that you've learned 'to respect', it doesn't mean…* It is not that kind of respect… But yes, within this context here, you can say that it is 'respect'. But to me, this is not respect.
>
> ----------

The research for this article was funded by a postdoctoral scholarship (SFRH/BPD/99782/2014) from the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT). The author would like to thank the Portuguese Directorate General of Reintegration and Prison Services (DGRSP), and the administration, staff and inmates of the YDC where the fieldwork for this study took place for their interest in and continuous support of my research. I equally wish to express my appreciation for the anonymous reviewers' helpful suggestions and critical comments on earlier drafts of this article.

For the published version, refer to:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663916689727

References

Bickel, Christopher. 2010. "From child to captive: constructing captivity in a juvenile institution." *Western Criminology Review* 11: 37.

Carvalho, Maria João Leote de. 2005. "Jovens, espaços, trajectórias e delinquências." *Sociologia, problemas e práticas* (49): 53-70.

Certeau, Michel de. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cox, Alexandra. 2011. "Doing the programme or doing me? The pains of youth imprisonment." *Punishment & Society* 13(5): 592-610.

CP. 1995. "Código Penal". DL n.º 48/95, de 15 de Março. Portugal.

DL-323. 1999. "Regulamento Geral e Disciplinar dos Centros Educativos". DL n.º 323-D/2000, de 20 de Dezembro. Portugal.

Dünkel, Frieder (Ed.). 2011. *Juvenile justice systems in Europe: current situation and reform developments*. Mönchengladbach Forum Verlag.

Durão, Susana. 2010. "Engenharias do policiamento em Portugal. No campo com os policiais de segurança pública." in *Conflitos, direitos e moralidades em perspectiva comparada* (vol. 1), edited by Roberto Kant de Lima, Lucía Eilbaum and Lenin Pires. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond.

Feeley, Malcolm M. and Jonathan Simon. 1992. "The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and its Implications." *Criminology* 30(4): 449-74.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The history of sexuality*, Vol. 1: An Introduction. New York: Pantheon Books.

—. 1979. *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

—. 1981. "The Order of Discourse." Pp. 48-78 in *Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader*, edited by Robert Young. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

—. 1982. *I, Pierre Rivière, having slaughtered my mother, my sister, and my brother… A case of parricide in the 19th century*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Fox, Kathryn J. 1999. "Reproducing Criminal Types." *Sociological Quarterly* 40(3): 435-53.

Franzén, Anna G and Rolf Holmqvist. 2014. "From punishment to rewards? Treatment dilemmas at a youth detention home." *Punishment & Society* 16(5): 542-59.

Freire, Paulo. 2005. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Garland, David. 1996. "The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society." *British Journal of Criminology* 36(4): 445-71.

—. 1997. "'Governmentality' and the Problem of Crime: Foucault, Criminology, Sociology." *Theoretical Criminology* 1(2): 173-214.

Goldson, Barry. 2008. *Dictionary of youth justice*. Cullompton, UK ; Portland, Or.: Willan.

Gray, Garry C. and Abigail Tsionne Salole. 2006. "The Local Culture of Punishment: An Ethnography of Criminal Justice Worker Discourse." *British Journal of Criminology* 46(4): 661-79.

Halsey, Mark. 2007. "On confinement: Resident and inmate perspectives of secure care and imprisonment." *Probation Journal* 54(4): 338-67.

Hartjen, Clayton A. 2008. *Youth, crime, and justice: a global inquiry*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Hazel, Neal. 2008. "Cross-national comparison of youth justice." *London: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales*.

Hunt, Alan and Gary Wickham. 1994. *Foucault and law: towards a sociology of law as governance*. London: Pluto Press.

Junger-Tas, J. and Scott H. Decker. 2008. *International handbook of juvenile justice*. New York, NY: Springer.

Kivett, Douglas D. and Carol A. B. Warren. 2002. "Social Control in a Group Home for Delinquent Boys." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 31(1): 3-32.

Lei-147/99. 147/1999. "Lei de protecção de crianças e jovens em perigo". Lei n.º 147/99, de 01 de Setembro. Portugal.

LTE. 1999. "Lei Tutelar Educativa". Lei n.º 166/99, de 14 de Setembro. Portugal.

Martins, Cláudia Sofia Antunes. 2012. "Das primeiras leis de protecção da infância e juventude, em Portugal, à entrada em vigor da LPCJP." *Revista de ciências empresariais e jurídicas* (22): 133-79.

Muncie, John. 2006. "Governing young people: Coherence and contradiction in contemporary youth justice." *Critical Social Policy* 26(4): 770-93.

Muncie, John and Barry Goldson (Ed.). 2006. *Comparative Youth Justice. Critical Issues*. London: Sage.

Neves, Tiago. 2012. "The managerialist turn and the education of young offenders in state care." *European Journal of Social Work* 16(1): 105-19.

OTM. 1962. "Aprova a Organização Tutelar de Menores". Decreto Lei 44.288, de 20 de Abril. Portugal.

PL-266. 1962. "Aprova a Lei tutelar educativa". Proposta de Lei 266/VII. Portugal.

Rose, Nikolas. 2000. "Government and Control." *British Journal of Criminology* 40(2): 321-39.

Smith, Roger S. 2007. *Youth justice: ideas, policy, practice*, 2nd edition. Cullompton; Portland, Or.: Willan Publishing.

Sykes, Gresham. 1958. *The society of captives: a study of maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wacquant, Loïc. 1999. "How penal common sense comes to Europeans." *European Societies* 1(3): 319-52.

Zoettl, Peter Anton. 2016. "Minor narratives: Extrajudicial punishment of youth offenders by police officers in Portugal." *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*: in press.