

Interdisciplinary Evaluational and Interventional Models in Estonian Juvenile Offenders' Rehabilitation

In my presentation I will discuss the practical, philosophical-theoretical and methodological context on research concerning constructions of rehabilitation service for juvenile offenders in Estonia by different stakeholders. In Estonia, there are not too many open debates and critical analysis on new directions and those effects in social policy and social work field. But there are multiple signs and phenomenas that the implementing **new public management**, governmentalism, new liberalism and managerism is taking place (efficiency-, optimization- etc -centred approaches).

The phenomena mentioned (NPM) concerns problems of advocacy / subjectivity / engagement of clients and different groups associated with the social work practice field. Are their **voices heard**? If yes, than in what extent and by who? If no, then what should be done about it and by who? Is the world of service using / providing **process created in co-operation, constructed through engaging all stakeholders** or not? These are the leading questions for the current research.

Contemporary research is focused on one sensitive client group – **juvenile offenders and rehabilitation service**, which should be supportive social service and „punishing-controlling“ sanctional service at the same time. We can perceive the complicated **contradiction** inside the topic. Thus there is a need and importance why the research focused on different stakeholders from various power positions is practically needed and academically interesting.

The aim of my research is to describe and analyse the **construction of Estonian rehabilitation service** (focusing especially on mapping and analysing the evaluation and intervention models) which is naturally constructed by actors in service:

- developmental (ministries),
- administrative (Security Board),
- network partners (child protection workers, juvenile commissions) and
- direct practice levels (juveniles, parents, rehabilitation commissions).

And through that give a voice to all actors in rehabilitation field, focusing on the construction of rehabilitation service. Under the special investigation, there are the possible differences between formal requirements, governmental expectations (implementation of NPM principles) and practice, experiences and constructions by actors.

The empirical study contains a **mixed methods approach**:

- Juridical acts and registres (years 2008 – 2011 continuously done) -> description and analysis of context
- Interviews with coordinators (in 2008 two interviews and in 2011 four interviews done) -> description and analysis of context, constructed by „power“ position
- Client case files (in 2011 fifty cases – the first results) -> the context of providing service, constructed by rehabilitation specialists
- Interviews with juveniles (targeted sample: 5 + 5 cases; not completed) -> the context of rehabilitation service, constructed by juveniles
- Interviews with juveniles' parents (targeted sample: 5 + 5 cases; not completed) -> the context of rehabilitation service constructed by parents
- Telephone interviews with child protection workers and juvenile commissions (targeted sample: 1 + 1 specialist, associated with the each juvenile in the sample) -> the context of rehabilitation service constructed by child protectionists and juvenile commissions (evaluating bodies in local level)
- Focus group interviews with rehabilitation teams (rehab-teams associated with juveniles in sample), maximum 10 teams = focus groups -> the context of rehabilitation service constructed by rehabilitation teams (10 focus groups) vs disciplines (6 focus groups)

The ethical aspect about data collection: documented data (signed by juvenile and his / her parent, that they are aware that their data can be used and analyzed); sample of juveniles, parents and stakeholders: based on volunteer agreements with juveniles and parents.

The juridical acts, registres and documents have been analyzed using the **content analysis** method; the interviews in association of case files will be analysed by using the **cross-case analysis** method according to the principles of grounded theory.

There are several **complex dilemmas** considering the research process:

- power issues (external side: data gathered through ministry's supporting attitude and expectation for the results to improve the efficiency and optimization in the service administration; internal side: rehabilitation teams' fears in connection with possible evaluation, critique, unpredictable changes in system)
- subjectivisation of clients – are they ready to be the equal partners in service analysing process (empowering aspect)
- heterogeneity of the phenomenon – are there all influencing / existing aspects considered
- possible role conflict - based on 5 years practical experience, ability to hold myself in neutral researcher position (understanding, but not influencing or having pre-knowledge)
- borders and limitations – it is essential to explain very clearly to all stakeholders and other engaged „sides“ the purpose and possible outputs, those influences in the „real“ world

Keywords: juvenile offender, rehabilitation service, Estonia, new public management, participation, social constructivism

References (in presentation):

- Albrecht, G., Higginbotham, N., Freeman, S. (2001). Transdisciplinary thinking in health social science research: Definitions, rationale, and procedure. *Health Social Science: A Transdisciplinary and Complexity perspective*, 4, 78-89.
- Barr, N. (1992). *The Economics of the Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bateman, N. (2000). *Advocacy Skills for Health and Social Care Professionals*.
- Berger, P., Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Allen Lane.
- Freeman, L. C. (2000). Visualizing social networks. *Journal of Social Structure*, 1(1). URL: <http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/project/INSNA/joss/vsn.html>
- Gage, M. (1998). From independence to interdependence. Creating synergistic health care teams. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 28(4), 17-26.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *New Rules of Sociological Method*. 2nd Ed with a new introduction. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mikan, S. M., Rodger, S. A. (2005). Effective health care teams: A model of six characteristics developed from shared perceptions. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 19(4), 358-370.
- Mumma, C.M., Nelson, A. (1996). *Rehabilitation nursing: Process and applications* (2nd ed., pp 20-36). St Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Parsloe, P. (Ed). (1999). *Risk Assessment in Social Care and Social Work*. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Sheehan, D., Robertson, L., Ormond, T. (2007). Comparison of language used and patterns of communication interprofessional and multidisciplinary teams. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 21(1), 17-30.
- Strasser, D., Uuomoto, J.M., Smiths, S. J. (2008). The rehabilitation team and polytrauma rehabilitation: Prescription for partnership. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 89, 179-181.
- Wiman, R. (1990). Towards an Integrated Theory of Help. *The National Board of Social Welfare in Finland. Publications*, 2/1990. Helsinki.