



Linköpings universitet

Understanding Childhood- Everyday Life and Welfare System,
from the point of view of Childcare Workers in Finland.

Som Prasad Chaulagai

Master's Thesis Year One – 15 CREDITS

ISRN: LIU-TEMAB/MPCS-A--15/006SE

Master's Programme in Child Studies

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies

Linköping University

Supervisor:

Dr. Bengt Sandin

Department of Thematic Studies – Child Studies, Linköping University

2015 Linköping

Abstract

This study carried out in one children's home in Finland. This study aims to understand how the caregivers collectively perceive their work to secure and construct the childhood of the children living in the children's home. Furthermore, the study mainly includes caregiver's perceptions and practices of upbringing of children in the children's home, which have been thoroughly analysed in the study. The study follows carefully designed two qualitative research methods: focus group interview and text for data collection. The data comprise one focus group interview of seven child care workers that includes five discussion questions about children's home, listening to the children, importance of rules, regulations and daily routines, children's future and difficulties in the work. References have been given to the 'text', i.e. institution's policy documents- rules and regulations and the Finnish Child Welfare Act for the analysis of the data. However, the study does not include the analysis of the 'text' itself. Moreover, thematic analysis is used for data analysis.

The study highlights that understanding childhood comprise the process of trust building between children and care workers- allowing children's voice, agency, independence and protection respecting the child rights, personal integrity with the provision of safe home, trustable adults and permanent routines and individual child care plan. In addition, the same body 'caregiver' who, at the same time, allows child autonomy, agency and independence, also regulates the children's everyday life, controls children and creates limitation, bridge trust and protect them from developing deviancy and asocial behaviours. Such process gives special consideration to the children's psychological as well as physical incompetency such as age, immaturity and the vulnerable past in the children's home that partly creates dilemmas/conflicts in delivering full agency to the children as mentioned in the legal frame work. The study reveals that building trust takes place through interaction between children and care workers and is a long-term process that backs up bringing corrective experiences in children. Listening to the children means helping and teaching them to recognise own feelings, emotions and stand independent and strong for oneself in the future. Likewise, respect to the child rights and organising everyday life delivers protection and safety net to the children. The study reveals, despites various difficulties at work, such as changing welfare act, complicated bureaucracy, unlimited parental rights and surprising legal interference, the child workers have the professional as well as moral obligations to protect children and provide them a safe and intact growing environment. Finally, the study reveals that future of the children is based on the personal choices they make in future and only a few of them will have relatively better life than others. However, all of the children are always under potential risk of post-traumatic collapses.

Keywords: childhood, child perspective, agency, children's voice, building trust.

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my work colleagues and director of the children's home, whose generous support made this research possible. I am also genuinely grateful to my research supervisor, Bengt Sandin, for your enthusiasm, encouragement and friendly support during my research process. Your proactive role, comments and few Skype calls helped me to produce a quality research report at the end.

Finally, I also take this opportunity to thank my dear wife and children for being very supportive and understating, and making my study possible.

Som Prasad Chaulagai

May 2015

Table of contents	
Abstract	2
Acknowledgments	3
Introduction	5
Background	8
Prior Research and Theoretical Perspectives	10
Research Question and Aim	13
Research Methods	15
Ethical Consideration	17
Data Analysis	18
Results	20
Building trust.....	20
Children’s Voice.....	25
Right Holding.....	30
Organizing Everyday.....	34
Difficulties in the Work.....	37
Children’s Future.....	40
Conclusion.....	42
References	46
Appendix 1: Phases of Thematic Analysis.....	51
Appendix 2: Focus Group Interview Questions.....	52
Appendix 3: Sample of the Letter of Consent.....	53
Appendix 4: Sample Letter of Research Permission (in Finnish).....	55

Introduction

This study has been conducted in one children's home in Finland. The employees of the children's home are the main participants of the research. The study mainly includes their opinions on upbringing of children in the children's home, which are, later on, lined up/referred with the rules and regulations of the children's home as well as the Finnish Child Welfare Act while analysing them. The employees, on the one hand, are responsible for allowing children their agency and independence within legal framework (child perspective) and on the other hand, for regulating their everyday lives upholding rules and regulations. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the type of childhood they construct in their narratives and how these are negotiated with the aid of the policy documents, such as institution's rules and regulations as well as Finnish Child Welfare Act.

The history of child saving in Europe dates back to the 19th century and the end of the nineteenth century has been referred to as the 'century of the child' (Wells 2009, p.27). The central strategy of the 19th century child savers was to save children from families whose moral degeneracy was the cause of their impoverishment, in the view of social reformers. Discourse of child saving constructed by a sense of moral duty was substituted by a discourse of social rights after 1910 (Wells 2009, p. 30). Simultaneously, the rise of child welfare became a public concerns in Finland during the 19th century. Internal mobility of Finns from rural to town or to forestry industrial communities brought significant changes in family structures. Education became a responsibility of public schools. Finns got educated and gradually old moral values disappeared. Finnish child experts travelled abroad to study development of modern child welfare in other country and later worked together with religious bodies for implementation of education in modern child welfare (Satka and Harrikari 2008, p.653-654).

Children were kept in priority in political debates in the beginning of 20th century. As the result, the first child welfare advice centre was opened in 1904. This followed the establishment of a network for mothers and children outside marriage in 1907. Consequently, The Finnish welfare act was passed in 1927 by the Finnish parliament and provision for taking children care was introduced in 1936. Simultaneously, the meaning of children and childhood shifted over time and new definition was opted politically and legally. Finland introduced globally unique maternity pack in 1938 and that followed gradually child benefits, parental and child clinic. In addition, Finland became the first country to introduce free school meals in the world. Thus, change and development became the rapid process in Finland. At the same time, Finland emerged as a Nordic welfare state, 1980s welfare act replaced the first child welfare act

and Finland ratified UNCRC in 1991 (The Ministry of Social and Health Affairs, child and family policy in Finland 2013, p.9-10)

‘The meaning of childhood, and relationship between children, parents, society, and state have been affected by the construction of welfare’ (Fass and Grossberg 2012, p.110) in Finland. The state is in charge legally monitoring children’s best interest and rights and providing family support, however, parents are the primarily responsible for safeguarding children’s wellbeing. One of the most central ideological changes in child welfare policy has been that ‘social prevention now has to compete with the tactic of early intervention and the current ‘focus of interest is in the assessment and management of individual children, in particular, from the point of view of risks’ in Finland (Satka and Harrikari 2008, p.650, 656)

The reasons for entering a child into foster/ institutional care in Finland have changed dramatically over last century. Parental death or abandonment of children was quite common reasons for entering a child into foster care in the past. In the present context, reasons are mainly the negligence and maltreatment of children resulting from parental alcohol abuse and mental health problem (Muuri 1993, cited in Kalland and Sinkonen 2001, p.514). Having myself worked in the children’s home, I have encountered similar reasons for children to be taken into care by the state. All of the children are the victims of negligence and maltreatment resulted form their parents various problematic situations, therefore, have diverse traumatic background. Simultaneously, their social behaviour and cognitive development is partly affected by those traumas.

According to the statistics published by National Institute for Health and Welfare of Finland (2013), There were 4 202 children in emergency placement in 2013, showing an increase of 6.6 per cent on 2012. Its been growing since 2005. All in all 18 022 children and young people were placed in out-home placement in 2013, which is one percent more than previous year (7.6 %) and boys accounted 52 percent of all children. Child protection notifications was made all in all for 64 471 children in 2013. There were 1.7 child welfare notifications per child in 2013. Support interventions in community care had a total of 88 795 children and young persons as clients, the proportion of new clients being 43.3 per cent (38 477), which is 2 percent more that on the previous year. However, the interventions seem to be active and increasing in numbers in Finland; the primary responsibility of child wellbeing rests with child’s parents and other custodians. According to the Finnish Child Welfare Act, ‘the state or the public authorities must support parents and custodians and provide and refer necessary assistance at sufficiently at early stage and in childcare and upbringing by arranging the necessary services and support measures’ (417/2007, section 2).

The main task of the foster homes and family is to safeguard the children's wellbeing and their childhood (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland, 2015). The children's home strongly stands for safeguarding children and their balance growth. As an employee in children's home, I have also encountered diverse conflict situations with the children repeatedly while addressing daily routine as well as rules and regulations. In the worst cases, I have seen them turning violent against employees and encounter myself violence from the children. In those situations, I have often heard from the children that 'they are not heard, their demands/needs are not fulfilled well, nobody cares them, adults are unfair to them, they hate the children's home etc. On the other hand, the team of the employees is made of a very diverse background. The employees' backgrounds as well as personalities differ from each other. With no doubt, they are the product of their diverse upbringing and cultural norms and values, and have very distinctive knowledge about upbringing of children. It is, therefore, interesting and important to see how they collectively perceive their work/role to secure and construct the childhood of the children living in the children's home.

In the following chapters, I will write about background of Child Welfare in Finland and briefly about the children's home, theory and literature review, research aims and questions, methods, data analysis, ethical issues, results gradually and conclusion in the end.

Background

According to Hearn et al (2004, p. 36), the idea of protecting children from their parents was the leading principle of Finland's first child protection act in 1936. However, the nature of the Child Protection Act was not the holistic one, rather was meant to protect orphans or the children abandoned by the parents by taking them into public care as part of poor relief. Further, children challenging social norms by committing criminal offences were sole responsibilities of the justice system. Otherwise, children's well being in Finland was mainly laid on patriarchal and autonomous family system. Then, the child protection act was under heavy criticism for being too narrow in social and family policy to address only some financial needs of family and children. The 1960 and 1970 were the ideological turning point welfare, as its emphasis moved from child protection to the development and promotion of the rights of children (Hämäläinen & Vornanen, 2006, cited in Hiilamo 2009, p.178). Hiilamo further describes that contraceptive pills and abortion act was introduced respectively in 1960 and 1970 in Finland. As the result, the developed context was given as a cause for decrease in child protection cases in 1970 and first half of 1980 in Finland (Tuurala 2006, cited in Hiilamo 2009, p.178). According to Hiilamo, these decades were described as golden years of welfare state (2009,p.178).

In the early 1980, a new act replaced the first child protection act. The radical change in approach occurred. The second child protection Act (1983) was supported by the legislation directed towards families and children, custody issues among others, as such welfare of children and the best interest of children were given first priority. Social, psychological and financial supports were prioritized. Open care was the initial phase of family intervention by state where home help, financial support and day care tailored to family and children. In addition to the social welfare boards, other institutions such as schools, health care institutions and town planning authorities became responsible for wellbeing of children and families. Placement of the children was the last resort. In municipalities level, social workers became more central as most social welfare boards delegated their decision-making power to the social (case) workers. 1990's economic recession became one of the backdrops for increase of child protection factors in Finland (Hearn et al, 2004, p.36). Finland ratified the Convention on the rights of the child in 1991(Central union for child welfare, Finland, 2015). Besides Finland has its own Child Welfare Act, which has been reviewed and amended over times. Finnish child welfare provision is child specific and family specific at the moment and lies on principles of protection, provision and participation (UNCRC 1989, Article 3).

The children home, where I have conducted this study, is a registered private child

welfare institution in Finland and also my employer. It has two different units: a special unit and a youth unit, and provides home gradually for seven (0-12 years old) and seven (13-17 years old) children. I have worked myself as an employee in the special unit since October 2013 till date. The institution is devoted and specialised to ensure and safeguard the balance growth, development and wellbeing of children. It is supported to provide a long-term specialised, restorative, therapeutic as well as preventive care to children with various types of traumas and psychological problems to combat further damages in children, and to meet the challenges of child protection within the excellent multi-professional team, such as schools, hospitals, doctors, therapist, social workers, psychologist etc. with a wide range of networking. Furthermore, It also provides a regular work counselling in groups as well as individual psychiatric counselling to its employees every month to ensure a safe working environment for themselves as well as to recognise the needs of children through therapeutic guidance.

Furthermore, the children's home services and activities are grounded as well as directed by the Finnish Child Welfare Act as stipulated in its objective "the objective of this Act is to protect children's rights to a safe growth environment, to balanced and well-rounded development and to special protection" (No. 417/2007; amendments up to 1292/2013 included, chapter 1, section 1). Besides the children's home stands mainly for its unique values and principles, which are individuality and equality, security and proper care for the children.

Prior Research and Theoretical Perspectives

Child protection is a matter of public concern in Finland. The responsibilities to notify the issue of child protection go to various institutions in Finland such as day cares, schools, police, criminal sanctions agency, fire and rescue services, health and social care officials, reception centres for asylum seekers, education and training provider, other health and service providers, customs, border guard and the enforcement authority of the people as well as each individual who feel the necessity of child protection (Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, 2015). In contrast, academic researches on child welfare were almost non-existent in Finland until 1990s. However, students of social policy and social work did carry out a considerable amount of research in their masters' theses (Hearn et al 2004, p.36). Research shows that child welfare research stood on constructionist line in 1990s, and ethnography and discourse analysis became popular research methods (Hearn et al 2004, p.38). By realizing this fact, I must confess here that it was considerably difficult for me to find the researches done in and about foster care homes. One of the reasons for the situation is partly my incompetence in Finnish language, however, my communicative skills in Finnish is manageable.

Besides those difficulties, I have been able to have access to few researches from late 1990s that relates foster care in Finland. Kähkönen (1997, p.427) conducted a research in cooperation with the Family Research Unit of the University of Jyväskylä and the Jyväskylä Social Welfare and Health Office. The research analyzed the visibility of mother, father/partner, and child(ren) in child welfare practice during the placement process, using ethnographic content analysis of case records. The result shows that situation of foster trap highlighted and social workers were only taking care of mothers as clients and father/partners and children were left unheard. As the result the parent-child relationship as well as marital relationships broke down. Likewise, Hiilamo (2009, p.177) conduct a research to find out the reasons for increment of out-home-placement in Finland during 1990s to 2000. Child placement outside home in Finland is most clearly associated with long-term economic hardships and the rate of change in the share of children placed outside the home is associated with alcohol and substance abuse. Simultaneously, another research shows that the child's position and the closely related issue of the best interest of the child during supervised meetings, however, it is paradoxically the interest of parents, specially who demands more attention, therefore need more reflection on children. Such supervised meetings are aimed at safeguarding the children at verge of risk (Forsberg and Pösö 2008, p. 52).

Furthermore, Ellonen and Pösö (2011, p. 197) conducted a research on violence

(physical and psychological) experiences of children at care (at home and substitute care home). The result shows that children report more physical and psychological violence by adults in their homes than children do in residential homes or foster homes. Although, children with psychological problem meet less violence in substitute care home than at home, article suggests more conceptual and methodological analysis of violence at care.

Furthermore, Kohli (2011) presents a paper, which considers the meanings of safety, belonging and success to unaccompanied asylum seeking children in richer and safer countries. The author conceptualized these three elements, taking account of journey from the country of their origins to a sense of a 'home' in a new country and how these elements are manifested in possible outcome of asylum claim i.e. permanent resettlement, temporary admission and enforced return to the country of origin of the children. The paper concludes that the experience of safety measured through a series of acts that require careful planning, and a steady co construction of trustworthy and workable alliances between the minors as applicants and others as judges and protectors but the sense of home remains under the threat of rapture because of uncertainty exposed in asylum process. Thus, the paper delivers that the state of knowledge is currently uncertain in relation to each element, with some good evidence of safety and belonging in the context of permanent resettlement and relatively poor understanding of success when children and young people are forced to return away from the country of asylum (p.311, 321).

All of the researches show that personal integrity is today's human rights that all the people are entitled to, including children and families. Respect to integrity means children are also seen as an autonomous subjects in society, not only simply dependent objects or 'becomings' (Kouvonen 2010, p.111). Therefore, I have adopted the concepts, such as childhood, agency, best interests and children voices (James and James 2012, p.3, 6,14,24) in order for crystalizing the notion of childhood with inputs of child perspectives in my research. Finnish child protection's departing point is child and his/her wellbeing. According to UN convention on the Rights of the Child and European convention on Human Rights clearly emphasized that the placement of children should be avoided whenever feasible by preventive measures (Hiilamo 2009, p.177). However, the cases of child protection are increasing in recent years in Finland. Finnish welfare clearly stands for two ideologies: the best interests of children is a paramount concern, sees children as individual subjects and family work (Kähkönen 1997, p.430).

A child perspective offers a way to examine how children are positioned in policy documents and encompasses political aims and guidelines for local professional practice. However, Halldén claims the concept to be an ambiguous concept with strong rhetorical force derives from UN convention determination of 'the child' (Halldén 2003: 13- 15, 21, cited in

Sparman & Lindgren 2010, 250). Finland, as the country with the well-known Nordic welfare system (Christensen & Mikkelsen 2013, p.199), child protection holds a significant position in its welfare state policy and prioritizes children's rights as its paramount importance in current policy and legislations that encourages children's participation. Such has been possible only by legislative reformation of social and family policy over times (Eydal & Kröger, 2010; Eydal & Satka, 2006, cited in Pösö, Skivenes & Hestbaek, 2014, p. 478). As the result, state intervention within family has institutionalized children and has led children to spend more time under closer adult supervision within spaces particularly designated for them (Christensen & Mikkelsen 2013, p.199).

Finnish Child Welfare Act together with UNCRC advocates children as a social group and children constitute the social structures of the society and consequently should be valued as people, who contribute, participate, join in and have relevant knowledge, and experience to contribute (Mayall 2013, p.34).

Research Question and Aim

The main aim of the research is to investigate how the caregivers collectively perceive their work to secure and construct the childhood of the children living in the children's home. Although, all of the children are taken into the care by the child protection authorities and all of the employees are qualified child protection officials, both children and caretakers have diverse background history, norms and values. Consequently, their backgrounds certainly also have significant impacts in the negotiation of childhood in children's home. However, both groups are monitored and guided by the Finnish Welfare Act as well as institution's own policy. Therefore, it is very interesting to investigate on the type of childhood they collectively construct in the children's home. That is why, I decided to conduct a research on 'childhood' in this particular children's home. The research has conducted by using carefully designed qualitative methods and has focused solely on adult's perspectives. The research question lay on the features of the new sociology of childhood and advocate the idea that 'children are and must be seen as active in the construction and determination of their own social lives, the lives of those around them and of the societies in which they live' and challenging that they are not just the passive subjects of social structures and processes' (James and Prout 1997, p.8).

Moreover, the idea, children as 'social actor', has been seen very core to the development of new paradigm during 1990 (James and James 2012, p.2). It has perceived children as active agent of the society. Furthermore, Kehily (2012, p.241) considers agency as property of human being 'to act as agents of change in the world'. However, Kapadia (2014, p.334) argues that defining concept of childhood is a very challenging task, which is culturally and socio-historically constructed and is influenced by culture, sociology and outlook. Childhood sociology did not developed alone rather it has developed along with psychology, history, anthropology and geography (Mayall 2013 p.15-19) and has currently established as an interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary discipline (Mayall 2013, p.36) in academia. In this sense, Finland sustains a significant historical development as well as transformation in is social as well as family policy. In Finland, the child protection systems cover a wide range of childhood, youth and family troubles, and the measures range from providing 'light' in-home services to strongly intervening measures such as out-of-home placements (Pösö, Skivenes & Hestbaek 2014, p. 478). Finnish child protection services or service providers, the children's home I am conducting my research, are monitored and guided by the Finnish Welfare Act. Complementary to the Finnish Welfare Act, the children's home has its own policy document as well as local

rules and regulations, and values and principles. They are the main guidelines for running everyday lives in Children's home.

Having referred to the children home, the employees are responsible for both safeguarding the child rights within legal framework and regulating the children's everyday lives. On the one hand, they are responsible for advocating children's best interest, and ensuring independence and agency to the children at the best. On the other hand, they control and create proper boundaries to the children while regulating everyday life situation giving importance to the balance growth, physical and psychological states, immaturity and vulnerability of the children. It creates the dilemma between allowing child agency/independence and upholding rules and regulations in the children's home. Therefore, I found it very important and interesting to investigate how professionals perceive their work to secure and construct the childhood of the children living in the children's home. Thereby, I have mainly intended to look into the 'childhood' by asking caregivers on different issues concerning children referring to the Finnish Child Welfare Act.

Hence, the research will investigate on following research question and answers will be analysed carefully with the aid of appropriate theory.

- What type of childhood does professionals perceive that the children's home construct?

In order for investigating 'childhood' in the children's home, the focus shall primarily be given on *what* professionals say about upbringing children and issues concerning children's balance growth in data collection phase. In this way, various themes shall be identified from whole data corpus. Those themes shall be, later, analysed in the findings of the study with the aid of various academic theories as well as policy documents of children's home and the Finnish government.

Research Methods

As to the original ideas portrayed in my research proposal, I have used ‘focus group interview and text’- two carefully designed qualitative research methods for data collection. The research data are based on only one focus group interview with children’s home employees and texts that refers to institution’s policy documents- existed rules and regulations and Finnish Child Welfare Act.

Although, the focus group interview was conducted on 23rd March 2015 at children’s home’s meeting room, I have gone through a very chronological process to accomplish this study. Once my initial research proposal to include children’s as the participants of the research was advised to modify at the University giving reason to the possible ethical dilemmas. I found a solution together with my research supervisor to conduct a research including caregivers instead of children as my research participants. In the next step, I discussed with my employer about this and also with my colleagues separately. My employer immediately got convinced on my ideas and promised me a permission to conduct the research and ask me to forward my research proposal. My colleagues also got interested in initial proposal and asked me to brief them about research and how and when it will be conducted. I felt very fortunate to have their initial promising eagerness to help me in my studies. After receiving permission from the ethical vetting board at Child Studies department, I forwarded my research proposal to my employer and gave information about the study and my planning about conducting focus group interview to my colleagues orally at first. After reviewing my proposal, my employer issued a letter of permission to conduct the study at the children’s home and also agreed to count the hours I spent with my colleague in focus group interview as their working hours. My colleagues also agreed to be the part of my research. Then after, I issued the written consent letter including information about my research and forwarded it to prospective participants by email in advance. Thereafter, Focus group interview was scheduled after employees’ regular monthly meeting session, thinking that all of them are available in the same working shift unless there are exceptions. Fortunately, no exception occurred and every one gave their final words to participate. We signed the consent letter together before the focus group interview and exchanged. Then, I briefed again about my research to my colleagues before kicking off the session. I must confess that the access to my participants and children’s home for conducting the research was very simple and smooth. The reasons are: I work there, my employer trust me

and my colleagues know me very well and trust me and I know some of them from my previous university.

There were seven participants in focus group; however, I initially planned to form a group of 5-6 participants. According to Silverman (2011, p.207), focus group interviews will be implemented by recruiting small group of people, 6-8 in numbers, who usually share a particular characteristics and it encourages an informal group discussions focused around a particular topic or set of issues. The participants interviewed by me are all qualified child protection worker and abide by the institution's policy as well as Finnish Welfare Act. I worked myself in the special unit of the children's home; therefore, I decided to involve the employees of youth unit in my study. By doing this, I have tried to avoid possible ethical dilemmas that may occur because of my closeness, togetherness and familiarity of knowledge with my colleagues at the special unit. Thereby, the selection of research participants was made giving importance to these facts to not have any taken for granted ideas in my research. I must acknowledge here that I am very grateful to the openness of the participants and sincerity they posed during the focus group interview. They were very cooperative and respectful in their discussions. The focus group discussion is following by 5 separate questions regarding everyday routines, safety issues, child-adult communication- children's voice, leisure time, rules and regulations, participation and difficulties (Appendix 2). The data revealed by focus group carries a particular strength. They carry employee's (participants) experiences and viewpoints about children's situation and children's home in professional manner. Reflection on children's position seemed to be important to them; therefore, it was very easy to motivate them for the discussion. I have recorded focus group in audiotapes with participants written consent that lasted for 1:55:56 hours, and transcribed and analyzed using conventional techniques for qualitative data- 'thematic analysis' (Silverman 2011, p.208). The advantages of recording audiotapes are: tapes are public records, they can be replayed and transcripts improved and preserve sequence of talk (Silverman 2011, p. 278).

Furthermore, focus groups are usually employed within a multi-method research design (Silverman 2011, p. 210); as such I could fit 'text' as a method with the focus group. Although the focus group was used by the sociologist as a research method for conducting commercial market research in the beginning, it became a popular research method across broad range of disciplines after 1990s. Texts are marvelously rich data, naturally occurring, easily accessible without any dependent of access or ethical constrain. They are quickly gathered; therefore, they encouraged me to begin early data analysis (Silverman 2011, p.229-230).

Ethical Consideration

Linköping University's ethical vetting board at the Child Studies unit has accessed my research proposal and has granted me the permission for conducting this research on 13th March 2015. Since my research has not directly included children as participants, I am not worried about direct ethical dilemma linking to the children in my research. In any case, giving ethical consideration has been the most prioritised issue during and shall be after the completion of my research project. Farrell (2005, p. 29) states that ethics is about helping researchers to become aware of hidden problems and questions in research, and ways of dealing with these, though it does not provide simple answers. I am aware of the fact that ignoring ethical issues in my research makes me go down a 'slippery slope' and prevent me from 'doing a good job' (Silverman 2011, p.87). Finnish language has been used as negotiating/mediating language for obtaining consents and data collection. Therefore I have been immensely careful about translation of data into English language. I have remained relatively close to the original language without distorting its meaning into English.

As to original ideas portrayed in my research plan, I have obtained the written permission letter from the children's home (See Appendix 4) and written consent from the seven participants of the research (See Appendix 3). Researcher and participants have signed the consents and both received own copies for the record. The consent includes the information on my research such as aims/research questions, data collection and analysis methods, report writing as well as overall process of research project, making sure that its been understood clearly and ensured the participation in the research is voluntary (Silverman 2011, p.98). I have also briefed them individually before focus group interview about my research to 'ensure that all participants in the research understand the process in which they are to be engaged, including why their participation is necessary, how it will be used and how and to whom it will be reported' (British Educational Research Association, 2004, p. 6, cited in Gallagher et al. 2010, p.474). During the focus group interview, issues concerning children and their parents are discussed in a very respectful manner. Likewise, I have kept my participant's comments, behaviors and identity as well as the identity of children's home confidential in my report to minimize potential harms in any forms to employer, employees, children as well as their parents and relatives. In this way, my research project is committed to maintain the protection of private life and the other basic rights which safeguard the right to privacy, as well as to promote the development of and compliance with good processing practice while processing the personal data," (Personal Data Act (523/ 1999), chapter 1,section 1).

Data Analysis

I have analysed the collected data corpus by implementing thematic analysis. According to Braun and Clarke, 'thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data' and one of the benefits of thematic analysis is its flexibility (2006, p.78-79). In my analysis, I have not tried to fit the data into any pre existing coding frame rather found out the themes within whole data corpus. Furthermore, I have sought to understand meaning from *what* participants of the research rather than *how* they said it in the focus group interview and illustrate the findings (Silverman 2011, p.228) referring to 'text- the Finnish Child Welfare Act' by adopting following six steps described by Baraun and Clarke (See Appendix 1). The main purpose of the analysis is to find the answers for my research question.

As portrayed in table 1 (see Appendix 1), I familiarised myself with the collected data at first. I carefully listened the recordings and transcribed the data on my computer under five discussion questions respectively. I found the task extremely difficult as well as time consuming and it took altogether more than twenty hours for me to accomplish. After transcribing the data, I read the whole data corpus once again and started coding under each discussion question respectively. Coding refers to 'naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data' (Charmaz 2006, cited in Saracho 2015, p.409). I have collected different ideas and separately generated initials codes and develop themes under all focus group questions. Furthermore, I have highlighted the meaningful data extracts with different colours from data corpus and group them accordingly in order produce 'transparent' as well as 'true' and a 'good analysis' (Braun and Clarke 2008, p. 88). In this way I have prepared myself for creating thematic map for further analysis of data. After coding the data, I searched semi concrete themes within the codes. This phase, which re-focuses the analysis at the broader level of themes, rather than codes, involves sorting the different codes into potential themes, and collating all the relevant coded data extracts within the identified themes (Braun and Clarke 2008, p.89). Firstly, I created an initial thematic map in order to recognize relation between codes and themes.

In the next level of thematic map, I have reviewed the themes according to my research question within whole data corpus. In this stage I have greatly given importance to the fact that data within themes should cohere together meaningfully, while there should be clear and identifiable distinctions between themes (Braun and Clarke 2008, p.90-91). In the end of this phase, I bear in my mind that what the different themes are, how they fit together and overall

story they tell about.

After this step, I moved ahead in order to define and name the themes, so that, I could already know the meaning and essences of them and how/ at what mode they will answer to my research questions. The analysis will follow an inductive thematic analysis. 'An inductive approach means the themes identified are strongly linked to the data themselves'. The whole data corpus have been collected specifically for the research by conducting focus group interview and 'text' method, therefore, produced data are both 'researcher-provoked and naturally occurring data' (Silverman 2011, p.276). Thereby, the themes identified bear little relation to the specific questions that were asked of the participants" rather 'the analysis is data driven' and 'ignores the researcher analytic preconception' (Braun and Clarke 2008, p.83). Thus, I have focused on the themes that are specific to my research question and aim that relates to securing and constructing the childhood with the adult perspectives. Thereby, six different themes are generated from the whole data corpus. These themes are named as building trust, children's voice, rights holding, organising everyday, difficulties in the work and children's future, and elaborated further in separate topics in /from the next chapter onward.

At this stage I have already decided on different headings for further report writing/analysis under results of the research. The special focus is given to scholarly writing, appropriate theoretical background to the analysis and its validity. According to Braun and Clarke (2008, p.93), It is important that the analysis (the write-up of it, including data extracts) provides a concise, coherent, logical, non-repetitive and interesting account of the story the data tell within and across themes. In addition write-up must provide sufficient evidence of the themes within the data, i.e. enough data extracts to demonstrate the prevalence of the theme. Therefore, a special focus have been given in providing an academic and valid analysis on my research project, analytic narratives are not only be a mere descriptions of data rather create argumentation lining up my research questions.

Results

The following major themes were identified in the data collected from focus group interview. I have classified them into several topics such as building trust, children's voice, rights holding, organising everyday, difficulties in the work and children's future in the following chapters. After classification of the topics, I have analysed them with the aid of various related academic theory as well as relevant excerpts from the data corpus.

Building trust

During the focus group, the respondents of the research expressed their views on children's home and its priorities diversely, however, the concluding facts designate children as autonomous subjects of the society and need proper protection and care for having intact growth.

They said that:

Even though we are an institutional care home under laws and acts, our first carrying thought is to highlight the concept of safe and a 'home' for the children taken in to care with behavioural disorders and traumatic backgrounds to provide a secure and intact growth environment.

In above-mentioned arguments, the respondents of the research greatly underline the significance of adopting child perspective in their service model. The argument strongly backs of the idea of legality as well as normative ideology of home. The child perspective adopted in this particular children's home constitutes two ways for implementing them: encouraging children's perspective, own opinions and views on subject matters and children's home's own understandings of how a child (a particular child or any child) might think and react in a given situation (Hallden 2003, cited in Ottosson et al 2013, p.254).

During the focus group, respondents significantly highlighted that all of the children somewhat suffer from attachment relationship problems at this stage. The main reasons for such are not having appropriate, permanent and proper caring adults in their childhood. They have suffered from traumas; poor care and maltreated childhood because of their parent's sickness, substance abuse problems, and violent behaviors or all of them together. The other reasons are uncertainty of out-home placements and changing adults in their lives. During focus group, it came to my knowledge that most of the children have at least 2-7 out-home placements within 5-7 years of time and several changing caregivers. Bowlby (1973, 1980 Cited in Zilberstein 2014, p.93) describes that 'attachment between children and caretakers first form in infancy from the

child's need for nurturance, comfort, and protection'. That is why, it is extremely important to have permanent, secure and reliable adults in children's lives to achieve a balance growth in them. Thereby, the matter of trusting others come normally and children dare to trust and have capacity to identify good or bad in accordance with their age. Consequently, I found in focus group data that children's home strives for its best services to the children and orients for bringing corrective experiences and integrative care to the children. One of the respondent responded on the subject matter as follows:

Our care is based on attachment theory. We provide children with corrective experiences of 'becoming a whole' through interaction. Interaction cannot run alone, needs both children and adult and clear rules and limitations. Children will not get corrective experiences unless caregivers are not ready for developing professional relationship with children and the unique personal caregivers relationship or personal caregiver's relationship with children is very secret from other caregivers. Therefore, Caregivers have a great challenge in front. No matter how difficult it is to bridge relationship with children. Caregivers must dare to let the children attached with them and get attached with children.

In order to build trust and intact growth of children, the respondent explained that the emphasis is given on child-adult interaction through appointing personal caregivers to each child as well as providing collective, permanent, trustable and professional adults in children's lives. According to the respondents of the research, childcare plan, daily routines, activities, adult presence, rules and limitations and different types of therapies are major tools for the children's homes to bring feeling of trust, care and love among children. Adults in children homes, in general, attend to routine needs of the children including their schooling, mealtime, sleeping time, personal hygiene and health, playing, spending time with children through out the days and being available for children's strong emotional bonds as well as ups and downs. Children's living in youth section are above 13 year old, therefore, adults roles lies in educator's role in helping children to manage their feelings providing with the sense of security and availability of trustable adults (Colmer, Rutherford and Murphy 2011, p. 19).

However, building trust is not the easiest task with children of that age. During the focus group interview, all of the respondents express their opinions and point out children's history and mental health to be the major downsides for building a very smooth and trustable relationship between children and respondents. One respondent said that:

Many uncontrollable things have happened in our children's lives, which don't make any logic in their childhood. But the children living in normal family know what has happened in their lives. Only uncountable number of children in normal homes face situation like: suddenly mother and father are not at home when they woke up at night, or parents are drunk or there is no food or mealtime or something like that. I see that X child had that situation.

The respondents view that because of devastating history of children and its consequences is major obstacle for building a sound relationship with children in children homes. It is claimed that ‘each attachment pattern has been linked to certain caretaker behaviors and child responses’ (Ainsworth et al., 1978; De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997; Main & Solomon, 1990, cited in Zilberstein 2014, p. 93) and ‘insecure attachment results when caretakers are emotionally unavailable or only intermittently responsive to children’s cues and stresses’ (Ainsworth et al., 1978; De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997; Main & Solomon, 1990, cited in Zilberstein 2014, p. 94). The respondents of the research did not give any specific examples about unavailability (physical and emotional) of parents in children’s lives in their childhood. During the focus group, they mentioned that children were taken into care because their normal growth was in the risk because of negligence from the parent. The respondents also argued that children have difficulties in trusting adults in children home because of insecure attachment in their early childhood in their own homes, mental health and unpredictable situations they faced in previous out-home placements process i.e. changing out-home placements and changing adult in their lives. That is why, most of the children, in accordance of the respondents, are either skeptical about bridging trustable relationship, frightened and confused about their relationship in children homes or attachment style differs many times with same adult or different adults. One of the respondent elaborated the situation as follows.

It can be terribly paradoxical situations for youths in his/her personal care planning meeting, when confrontation situation between parents and children’s home authority be usually seen. In this case he/she remains to consider whom to listen and who to trust.

The respondents showed their concerns over the situation that the children have faced in care planning meeting between parents and workers in above-mentioned excerpt. On the top of all attachment disorders, traumas and mental health problems, children are forced by the situation to think over who to listen and who to trust in the meetings where children, parents, social workers and caregivers meet together. It may create a moral fear inside children for not listening own parents and hearing their feelings and at the same time, not trusting children’s home (caretakers) knowing the fact that they are the one who provided him/ her a safe home and secure adults with a safe and intact growing environment. The respondents view that situation to be very challenging for the children to show up their own opinions and make choices.

Another respondent explained about one particular situation where the child finds himself conflicting with his childhood experiences and feelings lived with him.

Then, when X-child had problem with minor drug problem. One day I was going to X-

place with X-child and I am his personal caregiver and have good relationship with him. I told him not to get in any trouble and told him that he is very important for me and I care and love him. I don't want that something bad happen to you. Then, he answered to me, Listen now..... think that the person who has been kidnapped for 15 year and was kept like a prisoner in basement for his whole childhood for 15 years. Then that someone comes and tells me that you are important for me and I love you and trust me and it cannot be that difficult.

The above excerpt by respondent indicates horrifying childhood experiences and traumas of that particular child, which has been produced by the intervention of the state. He seems to be pretty angry and confused about what happened in the past. It indicates that the situation he experienced in his childhood was beyond his understanding. He thinks that he was kidnapped and prisoned, which is ironical to the situation of living in the children's home. Therefore, he is having issues in trusting adults in children's home. The caregiver thinks that s/he has good relation with the child but the child himself is having trouble receiving good care from the caregiver.

During the focus group interview, it came to the exposure that the participant viewed 'adolescence is a time of identity crisis, exploration and commitment; therefore, the primary goal of psychosocial state is to develop a coherent and stable identity in which identity confusion vs. identity synthesis is the psychosocial task ((Erikson, 1950, 1968; Marcia, 1967, cited in Wiley and Berman 2012, p. 1204). In addition, children suffer diversely from attachment disorders in accordance with respondents. Therefore, the main emphasis of the children home's service model is to work together with children to recognize and validate their feelings and work appropriately to commemorate those feelings. Letting them know that feelings are real and no one should afraid or ashamed of it. It means creating secure space for children through interaction, integrity for their individuality, routines, teachings, proper care, love and affection, and trustable adults. Giving them the feelings that you are safe, free and can just be a child.

I found that the service model of children home correspond to the model the 'circle of security' (Cooper, Hoffman, Marvin & Powell, 2000, cited in Kaye, Lynne and Murphy 2011, p. 17) that describes 'a child's needs in terms of attachment and exploration, and explains the adult's role in meeting those needs'. However, It was acknowledged openly as well as seriously in focus group interviews by the respondents that building a trusting relationship, especially with the children living in their children's home, takes generally longer period time because their trust has be abused in the past by neglecting or abusive parents or the system that could not address their need on time appropriately (Chasmore 2002, p. 843). Continuing to this argument, they all expressed collectively that in order to build a trusting relationship with the children, adults in the

children homes should strive their best lining up their professional skills to bring the feelings in children that they are heard, safe, loved and cared. According to the respondents, they are doing it by allowing child agency/independence and at the same time regulating children's everyday lives with strong uphold to the daily rules and regulations. One of the respondents elaborates the situation as follows:

When X-child moved to our children's home, we already knew that he speaks very slowly and express himself in the same way. Therefore, we have knowingly given him enough time to speak out, sometime even five minutes.

For that they need one or several trustable adults in their lives who listens to them and provide a secure space to bring up their feelings and emotion and who brings the feelings of individual integrity in children, according to the respondents. Another respondent told about giving limited options to the children because children are different by nature and not all of them are able to express themselves. He meant that giving only few options to the children, when he or she is struggling with what to do or what to say is also one way to bring good feelings in children. On the other hand, regulating children's everyday life and allowing child agency is employee's responsibility. The respondent told that:

We, adults, are very different by our nature and so do the children. Some of us want the answers immediately and others wait. Therefore, in case of X-child (who is very slow and have difficulties in making choices or expressing), it is better to help him by providing him simple options 'this or that'. It is always very easy for both of us to understand each other.

The above-mentioned excerpt by the respondent explains about importance the caregivers give to the individuality of the children on the basis their capacities and at the same time the recognition their agency by ensuring proper support according to his or her needs in the children's home. According to the respondents, respecting the integrity of the children regardless of the diversity they have at children's home, allows proper agency to the children. Thereby, it helps them to bridge further relation with children.

Children's Voice

Listening to the children and their participation carries the paramount significance in the service model of Children's home. On the other hand, it is also legal mandate in Finland. The UN convention on the Rights of the Child sets out in the article 12 that 'every child's right to express her or his views freely in matters affecting her or him'. Later, it is grounded and incorporated in the Finnish Child welfare Act 417/2007 as well. It provides an opportunity to children to be heard in judicial as well as administrative cases concerning him or her, for example in child protection issues. In the Finnish context 'children's rights, advocacy, interaction and experiences are some of the aspects emphasized by approaches to children's participation' (Pölkki et al. 2012, p. 109). All of the respondents of the research exclusively agreed on the fact that every child living in their children home is a very unique child with distinct needs, therefore, they admitted listening to children's voices and encouraging their participation on the issues affecting their lives is significantly important. In addition, the respondent told that the children deserve to know what is happening in their lives and why. As one of the respondent expresses his opinion as follows:

And yes all the decisions made on behalf of children should be well justified to themselves (the persons who decide) and also to the child that why it has been decided in favor of something.

However, after analyzing the whole data corpus collected from the focus groups, I could clearly identify the matter of listening and participating children in decision-makings having double standards in the children's home. I mean here the dilemma between allowing child agency and independence according to legal framework and regulating children's everyday life upholding the regulations. The main ideological reasons behind this situation are also the matters of protection that also links to their age, maturity, history and Finnish Welfare Act. In addition, almost all of the children suffer from minor to major psychological and physical traumas, have maltreated history, abusive and neglecting parents. According to the respondents, they have experienced situations that children having difficulties in expressing their opinions on issues concerning them or found those situation very destructing children's psychological as well as physical wellbeing. One of the respondents referred to situation that:

Children always complain about the meal that we prepare in children's home. One day, X-child (he normally does) started complaining about the food that we prepare 'shit food, always shit food'. At that situation, we have asked him to suggest us the meal he wants to prepare for next week, so that we could plan it together but he never responded to it.

Another respondent referred to the situation spending personal caregiver's time together with a child. He responded that:

Every time I go for spending quality time (only the child and caregiver) with X-child outside children's home, I have given him full freedom and responsibilities in making choices on what he wants to do and what he wants to eat. But it is very difficult for him to decide on such. He always says 'I don't know' and asks back to me what you want to do. In some particular way, he is used to the fact that there had been always some one in the past who decided on his behalf.

Respondents represented children like 'being very helpless' referring to the past experiences the children have, in making decisions or difficulties they face in making choices, therefore, the respondents (employees) are morally and legally obliged many times to decide on behalf of children or teach the importance of making decisions and at the same time obliged to listen children's opinions. That seems to be problematic time and again in children's home. Similarly, Finnish Welfare Act clearly directs professionals to listen to the children and encourages their participations on the matter directly affecting them. On the other hand, it is objectified to protect the children from exiting and potential risks and create a safe and intact growing environments. As one of the respondent mentioned the issue as follows:

It must also be taken into account the fact that listening to the child or adolescent means providing him chance to have his say by not interfering automatically with our own opinions on what is best for him/ her rather helping the child to bring it out. However, the children's opinions may contradict with what we believe is best for him. Because there can be a lot of things children have experienced in the past that we can not even understand and imagine according to our own experiences.

Having referred to the above statement, it can be claimed that children are individual with rights to expression and at the same time, to protection. According to the respondents, although listening to the children and their participation in the children's home departs from children own psychological and physical wellbeing, the importance of listening children and participating them is considered by giving importance to children's history and experiences. Thereby, respondents (employees) of the children's home have moral and legal obligation to advocate the best interest of children and regulate their everyday life, however, it carries a lot of conflicts on the subject matters. According to the respondents of the research, listening to the children and their participation defines generally 'as interaction; belonging; and integration into and influence on society' (Pölkki et al. 2012, p.108) that brings corrective experiences in children such as they are heard and cared. It indicates to the issues of the empowerment of children and respect to their personal integrity, i.e. recognizing the local needs of children and provide proper support, encouraging them to participate and have a say, giving importance to

their individuality, teaching them normal household and celebration of different occasions, advocating their rights etc.

As I mentioned above age and maturity of the children is another factor for creating the double standard in the matter of listening children, which has solely indicated by respondents of the research. Because of the vulnerability, such as lack of knowledge, skills and competence, they bear in practicing agency in relation to their biological state age and maturity' (James and James 2012, p.23), adult perspectives are actively brought in to the service model of children's home for special protection of the children. To some extent, it generates ethical and political problems in response to the ideology of 'social actors' based on children as participant according to the current well-established theme in child studies (Sparman, Sandin and Sjöberg 2010, p. 12). To the contrast, services model of Children's home correspond to the best interests of children to be protected for the balance growth to cope up with outer world later on. Most of the respondents referred to the age and capacities of the children to be affecting factors. One of them responded that:

In my opinion it depends much on children' age and age standard. How much it is worth to listen children. For three years old you can ask their opinions on which shirt he wants to put blue or red but with older children we have to ask their opinions in bigger issues but limitations are much. Here we hear much of critics from youth that they are not heard. But it is unfortunate that adolescent thinks he is not heard because things does not work the way he wants.

The excerpt indicates that listening to the children in the children's home stratifies in various levels. Age, immaturity and children's own understanding of being heard are the major factors to have levels. The respondents indicate that younger children have limited opportunity to have their say on different issues considering their ages and vulnerability, whereas older children have larger opportunities to have their say. However, in the case of older children, they feel not being heard when things are not done the way they want. So, It is a clear dilemma in the children home.

According to the data collected, it has come to my knowledge that most of the children have very different childhood than the conventional notions of the normative childhood i.e. childhood having safe, loving and interacting parents or caregivers, friends, normal routines such as food, play, sleeping time, mealtime et cetera. Thereby, listening to the children and participating them in decision making differs somehow from what it is legally mentioned in the Finnish Child Welfare Act. The Act has already indicated what are supposed to be the best interests of the children. Having considering the backgrounds of children living in children's home, most of the respondents responded children's best interest to be slightly different from what is normally mentioned in policy documents. They are likely to be determined by the immediate needs and

emotional curves of the children. Therefore, the respondents of the research responded that listening and participation indicates various aspects in the children's home, such as giving opportunity to children to put forth his/her opinion, teaching the importance of rights in life, giving importance to their individual needs and personal integrity, teaching conventional norms and values of the society/ responsibilities, access to the relevant information concerning them, trustable adults or mentors, involving or asking their opinions on organizing everyday routine or forming rules and regulations concerning their living in children's home, giving feedback and taking feedback, encouragement and appreciations etc.

The respondents of the research said that listening does not mean deciding on what children ask for, rather creating suitable environment to children to express their opinions in proper way that could be either in support of or against the activities or decisions made in the children's home concerning them. One of the respondents said that:

We are organizing abroad holiday for children this spring and have already decided on where they go and have already asked with children's opinions on with whom they want to share rooms with in the hotel. We will consider their wishes looking at whether it is good to put them in the same rooms or not. If we see any potential risk putting them together in the same room, we will decide on this.

The above excerpt by the respondent confirms that participating children and listening to their opinions are very important and children are encouraged to do so but it is relatively conditional. Adults hold the authority to evaluate the situation and decide further. The made decisions holds back on the issues of the safety, which means they do the risk assessment and decisions are made accordingly. Likewise, other respondent told about teaching them the importance of own opinions and practice of own rights:

We consider about listening children but decision-making power should be on adults. As the children have already face various difficulties in their childhood for not having secure adult in charge. Our task is to teach them little by little importance of own opinions. So that they could express themselves better in the future. In my opinion more we teach them to express their opinion in younger age better we prepare them for future. Therefore, they participate in their own meeting with parents; social workers and children's home's adults, even though adults are the one who decide on their issues.

However, according to the excerpt by the respondents, adults hold the decision making power, children are encouraged to participate in the meetings. The aim lies to allow children their agency as well as prepare them to speak for their own agency and rights in future. Simultaneously, the purpose is also to create the adult included safety network in their lives, which they have apparently missed in their biological homes. Other respondent tells about encouraging children's participation for teaching responsibilities.

When we were establishing this children's home. We thought that it is very important to

involve children in developing the services. When we involved children, they thought that they are the one who decides on rules and regulations of the children's home. After interviewing the children, it came to our knowledge that children want to talk only about their rights and want to completely ignore the responsibilities. In such situation, we, adults, have obligations for putting limitation and letting them know about their responsibilities. Then after, children felt that they have not been heard.

The excerpt confirms that listening to the children and allowing their agency, involving them in decision-making and developing mutually rules and regulations for the children seems eventually important in the children's home. At the same time, by doing this, respondents feel very obligated to teach children their responsibilities not only rights because rights and responsibilities comes together, which creates a conflict situation among them. In this phase, adult hold the authority and resolve the issues but conflict still exist.

Other respondent speak about brining good experiences in children:

For some children, it is very difficult to express their opinions or make decisions. Since it is hard task for children to decide on issues, in my opinion, adults should remain subtle and give helping tools to children for decision-makings, So that children get feelings of success. In my opinion, bringing the feelings to be heard in children is also the important skills of adults.

The excerpt indicates that adults must have the skills to recognize the children's immediate individual needs and work according to their needs. It will encourage children to trust on themselves, which ultimately brings happiness. Therefore, the respondent view that it is very important for employees to have professional as well as practical knowledge to allow children's agency recognizing children's capacity. In this way, most of the respondents replied that listening to the children and participating them in decision-making lies in various levels. Therefore, the real importance is given on their psychological and physical wellbeing, while listening children. All of the children have very low self-esteem and confidence about who they are and what they are because of their dreadful childhood.

Right Holding

Children as the right holder are the rhetoric derives from the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC 1989) that is grounded in Finnish Welfare Act 417/2007. Therefore, Finnish Child Welfare Act recognizes children as the rights-bearing individuals with rights to participation in decisions over themselves (Wells 2009, p.32). It literally describes children as individual human as subject who is universally free, autonomous, rational, choosing individual (Wells 2009, p. 166). However, children are entitled to protection from harm by the virtue of their specific vulnerabilities (Wells 2009, p.32). Therefore, it is also adult's duties to protect children from potential harm and monitor their rights properly. Sandin (2012) and Wall (2010) also emphasize that children's agency should not only refer to expression of competency of the child but also should value the vulnerability of children (Cited in Sparman, Sandin and Sjöberg 2010, p.12).

During the focus group it came to my knowledge that the concept of children as right holders laid in various level within children's home. One of the respondents explained about weekly meeting of one child with her mother. According to the respondents, one of the reasons for taking this child into care is his mother being a risky subject for her balance development and direction has been given by the social office on how to support child-mother relationship. Therefore, the employees monitor the meeting between the child and her mother in the children's homes every time. As per the respondents, they always asked the child first whether he wants to meet his mother or not. They think that it is the Rights of the Child to meet his/her parents. However, a responsibility to make the right assessment of the situations lies on the employees. One of the respondent elaborate the situation as follows:

Lets talk about X- child and her meeting with mother. X- child generally gets anxious, when he meets his mother in children's home. It is ok for us that she wants to preserve her rights to meet her mother and it is also her rights. But if she gets too anxious in meeting and about meeting, then we have to think what is good for her. We have to make sure that meeting does not destroy her physical and psychological wellbeing.

According to the respondents, although the children are the right bearer individuals with no doubts, separation of the right holder from the moral agent, i.e. (not) considering their vulnerability (psychological and physical), scattered childhood, poor social skills and attachment relationship problems, undermines the claim in the delivery of the rights (Wells 2009, p.32). Therefore, realizing the fact that children may not always be able to hold their agency, children's

homes employees see themselves as being responsible for advocating children's rights on their behalf (Pupvac 2001.100, cited in Wells 2009, p.32) in and with different levels together along with corrective as well as integrative care activities.

During the focus group interview, I noticed that the rights of the children has paramount importance in the description of the children's home and its activities but those rights are monitored by the professionals in order to meet children's emotional, physical and psychological needs. It starts from safe growing environment to independent human beings. As I have already mentioned many times in this report that according to the respondents, all of the children living in this children's home never had proper home and adults. They suffer from minor to major attachment disorders and carry plenty of horrific traumas and psychological disorders produced by maltreated childhood and negligence of parents or their problems. While monitoring the child rights, it begins with safe home, nutrition and safe adult and continue to corrective experience, individuality, health related therapy and care, schooling, hobbies, family bonds, learning societal norms and values and independency in the children's home. One respondent responded on the matter of the child's rights:

Firstly children's home stands for the idea that we are home for children for longer period of time with corrective and integrative care plan that comes under children's basic rights.

All of the respondents agreed on above statement, which also hold back to the principle objectives of the Finnish Child Welfare Act- a balance and safe development of the child. According to the respondents, every child needs permanent home and trustable adults that support their normative childhood development. Furthermore, it is also the children's best interest. Therefore, they see the long term care home services to be very important for the balance growth of the children and result oriented.

Many of the respondents highlighted in discussion that the children living here are very confused about the concept of normal home and normal family. They were literally abandoned by the rights to have safe home, family and growing environment in the past. They described that children know that it is safe to live in here and they live like in the family: safe growing environment, routines, meals, hobbies, love, care, own room, however it is sometime difficult for them to decide what is their home. That's is why, respondents told that being involved with children and bridging trust, they are striving to bring essence of home and family in children. They believe that the child for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality should grow up in a family environment, which idealized by full of loving and nurturing environment (Wells 2009, p.71). It is also children's right and comes under their best interest.

One of the respondents explained about establishing tradition of home and family:

Of course, these children get traditions here and learn to celebrate Christmas, Easter, birthdays or whatever celebrations and learn routines. Like every home has certain routines such as mealtime, play time, sleeping time etc and celebrates festive seasons, we have routines and traditions in this children home and it is extremely important and meaningful matter for children to learn these routine and traditions here.

The above excerpts emphasize on the importance of delivering different traditions and customs to the children. The respondents of the research also see the values of delivering traditions to the children through celebrations and permanent routine to be essential, which, on the one hand, delivers the normative ideas of home to the children, on the other hand, gives opportunity to have balance growth with the sense of belonging, safety and success.

Respondents also referred to respecting individuality of children as another corner stone of advocating children's rights. According to them children living there have diverse ranges of problems and the past. That is why, their needs regarding care, emotion and participations are raised according to children's own conditions. In the children home, professional assessments are made in order for the implementation of proper care to the each individual child. In addition to children's individual care management plan, they also said that they have individual daily routines for almost every child.

Another way to advocating the rights of children is offering adult in charge services. That refers to the idea that adult is always available to the children to deal together with their feelings as well as to draw clear boundaries to the children. Almost all of the children do not much have experiences of proper parental care as well as lived without proper routines and limitations. Therefore, granting this opportunity to have a balance growth is also paramount priorities of the children's home. One of the respondents responds on the subject matter as follows:

We use the word 'adult in charge' here, it is written in our model norms and thoughts that adults are in charge of children. That means, we lift our position from professionals to the level of parents to provide proper parental care to the children in children's home. It is normal that parents must demand certain things from children and expect children to take care of some issues. In the same way, children learn to be self-determined. Likewise adults need to be always around children to teach them basics of life to take responsibilities, such as when to take garbage out, when to prepare bed and so on. In this children home, Adult is always there to support and advice the children in such issues. It balances the adult-child relationship as well as children's wellbeing.

In this way, respondents responded that children are taught to live a normal life as well as practice their rights, such as right to school, right to love, emotion and care, right to participation and expression. According to them, by adult mentoring of children, they have aimed to teach them to be independent to live a normal life later on. As the children homes have their own

proper written policy plan on how to support and mentor the adolescent to live normal life and do normal things that are demanded by the society, so that they could live balance life after 18 years old. According to respondents, however, priorities are given to the safety of children and their physical and psychological wellbeing.

According to the respondent, they have fallen, time and again; in conflict with adolescents understanding of practicing child rights what was too harmful for his/her physical and psychological wellbeing. One respondent responded on the matter:

Now youths are in important phase of their lives, which is really challenging. X-child is in right developmental phase. He wants to decide over his issues himself: therapy and taking medicine, schooling etc. He is extremely self-determined on own issues, and he thinks that no one can demand him to do things; no one can say anything to him, not even laws and act. He has the feelings that he should be soon leaving the children home to live independently and he also tries a lot to be independent but unfortunately he lacks capacity to cope up with life independently. It is seen normally when he leave things undone.

The excerpt indicates that the child has very ambivalent ideas of practicing his rights. He has very strong opinions about his rights and its implementation but ignores the whole parts of his responsibilities as well as health conditions as per the respondents. Here, respondents fall in conflict with the child. They see the child falling in risk, therefore, they feel obliged for his protection but the child thinks differently. Another respondent continues to the argument:

But if you think in the next step, we have to trust and prepare ourselves that if something happens to him, we will take care of him (when he is a child). But there are certain rules, regulations and values in the society, which we have to teach the children before they leave the children's home.

Furthermore, the respondents describe their roles as safeguarding adult for children when he/she gets in trouble regardless of how children revolt against them. However, they keep teaching children normative social norms and values in homely environment, so that children can live a normal life in future as care leavers according to the respondents.

Thus, the findings suggest that children rights carry paramount importance in children home and are often monitored by the adult considering children's age vulnerabilities as well as physical and psychological vulnerabilities.

Organizing Everyday

According to the respondents, organizing everyday lives is done together with children but the adults are responsible for implicating them in daily basis. Most of the respondents described that almost all of the children living in this children's home have countless numbers of challenges including development delays, physical and psychological problem and attachment disorders. Majority of them comes from underprivileged biological homes and have stressful childhood with traumas and toxic stress in form of abuse or neglect (Meloy and Phillips 2011, p. 252). Having referred to the facts, it can be assumed that the biological home they lived might have chaotic natures. Children might have lived without routines and proper boundaries, love care and safety. Most of the respondent referred those daily routines are for to provide safety, corrective experiences as well as balance growth of the children. One respondent responded routines to ensure safety of the children:

Some children need stricter routines to manage a proper day, which could be X-child's day and some need less. For example, in case of X-child daily routine and proper timetable in extremely important in terms of meal because of his sickness 'diabetes' and to provide proper care to the sickness, for example injecting insulin in timely manner.

Some of the respondents' highlighted that routines are equally important to the adults (employees) to work with children. However, all the employees are professionally equipped, they are different individuals with their own backgrounds and personalities at work. Most of the respondents referred to it seriousness during focus group interviews. One of them responded that:

The more adults involved working every day's activities at children's home, the better, precise and clearer, and simpler set of rules is needed, so that it is easier for adults to operate daily lives.

Similarly, the respondents explained that children living in the children home carry a very diverse background and their needs differ from each other. Therefore, it is extremely important for employees to familiarize themselves with children's routines, so that caregivers can be effective at their work while implementing them in everyday lives of children according to the respondents. Consequently, They viewed that repetitive routines gradually help to stabilize children's lives and create the sense of safety among children. One of the respondents gave his response on the subject matter as follows:

Routines backup safety issues. It brings children and young people the feelings of safety that the things occur proactively. Such rules are quite often made in the starting of any institution. There can many fresh employees as well as fresh working teams, no one

knows rules much in the beginning. The rules make it less messy situation for those who are new. It also provides the sense of protection to adults. As such, it is often adult motivations behind creating routines and rules for children. For example X-child's daily routine is also routine for adults, so that adults day remain organized. If the adult remains organized children and adolescent's days remain organized and normal. Then they (children) feel secure.

In addition, while talking about routines in focus group interview, all of the respondents referred to the two different natures of routines. They talk about automatic routines, which are collective ones and routines that are decided in the children homes, which are individual ones. As one of the respondent responded:

When we talk about routines. There are routines that are automatic and apply to the all children i.e. school for school age children, mealtime, sleeping time etc. They are not decided at all. Likewise, there are routines that are usually decided with children or commonly with working team according to the children's individual needs. They are individual routines such as hobbies, therapies (some have and some do not have) and repetitive daily routines in case of X-child according to his very personal needs. However basic routines apply to every child and it brings stability in children's lives. The smaller the children, the more important the routines are.

Having following to the argument, respondents of the research signalled routines to be the best interest of the children as mentioned in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRCN 1989, article 3(1). Therefore, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all the actions taken concerning children, whether it is by public or private social welfare institutions, administrative authorities or legislative bodies. It is also grounded in Finnish Child Welfare Act 417/2007, under section 4 (2) referred as main principle of child welfare. Having continuing to the argument, respondents discussed that individual routines bears the flexibility in case of each child and they are commonly agreed.

When we talk basically about basic routines and sets of rules and its creation, we have tried to include adolescent's opinions what seen mutually appropriate. Rules and routines can be flexible but very private in case of each child. However, we do not have many rules at the moment. Only the important rules what we have is that you can neither hurt yourself nor the employees and not allowed to break stuffs (no tolerance to violence).

The respondent explained that violent behaviours of children are unaccepted in children's home. In case of children violent behaviour, i.e. self hurting or hurting others, physical holding takes places in children home as containment policy. Such holding are performed either by adults (employees) of children's home or security personnel. According to respondents meaning of holding is to ensure the safety of the children and protecting them from possible physical harm.

During the focus group interview, respondents vividly discussed other importance of routines and, rules and regulations in terms of the children living in the children home and its stability. Importance of routines were also discussed as important means for children to take responsibilities as well as significant tools for spending normative lives in the Finnish society in their adulthood. One of the respondent referred routines for recognising own responsibilities as follows:

For example, X-child gets sometimes a ride from us for going for his hobbies, which are seldom and supposed to be extra facilities. Otherwise, he has to go by himself. But once he gets the ride, he automatically thinks that he must get the ride everyday to go for his hobbies.

The statement tells about importance of stabilizing the routines to keep the children update with own responsibilities. Even though the ride was exceptional, according to the respondents, rules were agreed commonly in the beginning with the children that he will be responsible for taking care of his hobbies himself in terms of transportation. Therefore, a bicycle was bought for him.

Furthermore, other respondent referred routine as tools for children to cope up with normative life in their adulthood.

In fact, it is extremely important for children to learn about cleaning and household work, as I myself think it is important. The environment what we create to those children meaningfully carries their future. Likewise, when we talk about rules, there is not only right or wrong ways of doing things. Rather there are different ways of doing things. It is ok for some of us that those children keep hats on inside children's home because some of us ourselves keep hat on inside children's home and for some of us not. It is because we are bunch of people working with children with our different backgrounds, which is richness in the terms of children's growth. This way we have brought different ways of upbringing child; which they carry in their adulthood.

Majority of the respondents agreed on above statement. They considered that learning basic household works such as cleaning, doing laundry, cooking food, having good behaviour in dinner table, learning to make choices and dressing up appropriately in different events are apparently basic tools for the children to live the normative lives in the society in their adulthood. To this perspective, it can be claimed that childhood in children's home is considered as a social institution and objectivised as social structure (Oswell 2013,p.44) that provides and limits the spaces and opportunities for children to act as an independent being (James and James 2012, p. 49). In this way, with the help of organized routines and sets of rules the child is expected to involve in social relations and activities of different kinds in future and is thus positioned, foremost, as a *social* actor (James 2009, p. 38) who is rather 'being' than 'becoming' lived in time with remembrance of past to proceed for a normative adulthood (Prout 2005, p.66).

Difficulties in the Work

During the focus group, majority of the respondents explained about the factors that hinder them to do the good job. All of them suggested that changing nature of welfare act and legal interference, media coverage, parental rights and complicated bureaucratic procedures are the major factors that directly or indirectly affect their good work. Two of the respondent gradually explained:

Currently one of the factors creating difficulties at our work is the Child Welfare Act, which is pretty much, in my opinion, for the parental rights than the child's rights. It fits more with the idea that every parent has rights for the parenthood.

And every child has right to have childhood with their parents but they do not have it when they need it, and this is the terrible situation I mostly face at my work, why is it so?

The respondents of the research think that the one of the major factors for hindering them to do a good work is the Child Welfare Act. It gives, in their opinions, a lot of rights to the parents, which means it is pretty much encouraging parents to claim their parenthood all the time. In contrast, children's rights to have good childhood with their parents are time and again put aside in their opinions. The respondent's expression relatively signals their frustration they experience at their work.

According to the Finnish Child Welfare Act 417/2007 under section 4 in article 3,

If substitute care is needed in view of the interests of the child, this must be arranged without delay. When providing substitute care, the aim of reuniting the family must be taken into account in a manner that accord with the child's interests.

Article confirms that the main ideology of Finnish Welfare Act is based on both child-centric and family centric service model. It is also clearly mentioned in the Act that reuniting the family must be based on child's best interest. However, parents or caregivers are excessively given with the rights for appeal in administrative as well as supreme court (Finnish Child welfare Act 417/2997, chapter 15, sections 89-92) in case they are not satisfied with the decisions made by the authorities about out-home placement. Therefore, many of the parents whose children are living in these children's homes have appealed in courts one after receiving another-negative decisions. According to the respondents, such unlimited and excessive rights of appeal to the parents or caregivers directly affecting them to accomplish the good work according to the best interest of children and keep them busy in doing unnecessary paper work. One of the respondents refers to the situation and explains that.

Finland has everlasting rights for appeal and every decision can be appealed through

administrative court. And decisions about children are made on the paper. In my opinion, this is hampering to address the best interest of the children. Children are thrown from one authority to another like a ball and there is no one to catch the throw properly, for example they decide when to school, when to health care, psychological and neurological treatment and child protection. Then later, they ask children to read such legal paper, which is undeniably not suitable for children. For example, in case of X-child reading those legal papers and responding them is not at all good for his balance growth and development.

Some of the respondents pointed out the changing nature of Finnish Welfare Act to be one of drawbacks for their work. However, they described its importance in terms protecting children, protecting parents and protecting the whole out-home service providers. They described the Act to have terribly short sight. According them, first they developed the law and actively apply them and in later phase begin to research on whether it works or not. This situation has often kept children's balance growth extremely in risk. They also described about the technical mistakes made by social workers and follow up to the court decisions. The finding suggests that in some cases court identifies on the paper that it is the children's best interest to reunite with the family and replaces children to their parents for a trail knowing that children could be in possible risk. Thus, respondents think that interference of legal authorities and changing nature of the Act creates the situation of ambiguity at work.

Likewise, respondents also commented on complicated bureaucracy and unnecessary media coverage to be one of the obstacles of their work. Most of them told that writing reports are the only way to ensure employee's rights safe and keep transparency among various networks. However, Respondents explained that it is the very unpleasing fact that 50 percent's of their work includes report writing and basic household work i.e. cleaning, cooking food, doing laundry etc. According to them, bureaucracy is changing tougher and tougher day by day that is preventing them to do good work together with children. In addition they also described their concerns over changing nature of social workers in social offices and media interference in child protection issues. One of the respondents responds to the fact as follows.

The situations of changing social workers in social offices are frequenting now a days. As the result, pace of trust between out-home placement and social workers are widening and child's proper care might be in risk. Media critic against child protection is very strange and degrading. If I signal to the case of 'Eerika (murder of 8 years old girls by her caregivers)', it is very exhausting situation to the social workers. Social workers are somehow are seen as culprits and seen as responsible for the tragedy. Who wants to be social workers to make decisions after this? I understand those who are behind the table, they make the decision very carefully. There is no one to defend them. They have to justify everything why they have decided like this. It is terrible to settle and justify the decisions to anyone, whether they are parents, social workers, child itself or children's home's authority. On the top of that, the risks they take are bigger than what they receive

as the salary. If you make a tiny mistake or something, you are on YouTube or somewhere.

The respondents also explained about trust issues between children's home's professional and other professional network i.e. hospital, doctors, psychologist, legal authorities and strange procedures of bureaucracy to be one hindering factor to accumulate good work. Likewise, they also think that strong media critics and direct legal actions against social workers in Finland in recent days is creating fear situation amongst social workers. Therefore, they think social workers are hesitant or afraid of making minor human errors without realizing it or too careful while deciding on the child protection issues as the risk they take is bigger than their salary. One of the respondents told about arranging substance abuse care/ rehabilitation to the father of one child.

X-child's social worker cannot ask the child's father to the rehabilitation and help him. Therefore, I am going tomorrow with papers to talk to X-child's father about rehabilitation. Arranging rehabilitation to the father is not only rehabilitation, in the bigger picture; it is also future of the x-children that father goes to rehabilitation. But bureaucracy stops social worker to go directly to him.

Other respondent responded on the subject matter:

Affecting factor/body is that who does not know the children and their needs. They neither listen to our viewpoints nor know about children. X-child is the victim of such situation, who has suffered the most. Co-operation between authorities does not work when they don't have trust on other professionals and their evaluation capacity. It has never worked, for example between social work and health care. Psychological care keeps child protection workers somehow unknown or uninformed about children's psychological problems, which have taken care of the children for five years continuously.

The above-mentioned two excerpts indicate that bureaucracy is very complicated and not being favorable for doing smooth work for the respondents. Likewise, the respondents think that other professional partners of welfare institutions such as health professionals undermine their evaluating capacities in terms of children's psychological states. That is also creating frustrations among the respondents. Hence, the finding suggests that various legal and practical issues such as, act, legal procedures, bureaucracy and change, media and untrusted co-operation between authorities are experienced as the major obstacles for accomplishing good work in the children's home.

Children's Future

During focus group interview, one of the discussions took place on children's future as well. Children's future was referred here to the situation of current children living as an adult or after out-home placement care. All of the respondents predicated that future of the children living in their children's home would have very diverse and distinct from each other. One of the respondents told that:

Quite different, it is pretty much child specific. Or depends a lot in child. I feel that some of our children from our children's home, for example X1 and X2 are potential taxpayers, in the way that they could go to work and live a normal life. Then, of course, other youths will have a lot of challenges in that term. In the case of X3, X4 and X5, they need, for sure, more or less support and care almost their whole life. It depends on individual case

The respondents see that it is pretty much child specific and can be assumed differently case-by-case. The very reasons for this situation, they described, were given to children's personal histories, childhood traumas, and physical and psychological states of the children. However, the respondents of the research claimed that all of the children are given with the best possible means to cope up with the society and societal norms and values in future. One of the respondents responded:

But in any case, if I think in general about what kind of future children will have as the whole. Each of them who have ended in our children's home has received already better position and tools for the future than in their own biological homes. No matter who will be what, but generally they will have better future than why could have.

Many of the respondents seem to be worrying about possible post-traumatic situation in children that may unbalance their future. They elaborated the situation in terms of after they moved out from the children's home and lived independently. No matter how traumatic childhood they had, they have been able to create some type of security network in children's home. In case of minor accident within that security network, they might fall in risk to have physical as well as psychological disorders again. In this way, respondents highlighted that vulnerability created in their childhood could never be corrected fully; therefore, they might always remain prone to physical and psychological downfall in future. One of the respondents describe the situation as follows:

It is the fact that when they leave out for outer world independently from this children home, they have good positions and tools to be a good taxpayer and to live perfectly. As they have create a security network within this children home during their childhood and adolescent time. A minor traumatic situation within that security network might drag

them back badly and destroy every work they and we have done earlier because traumas from childhood are still strong in them.

Majority of the respondents responded that children's future depends on their individual choices and it is a long-term process, which develops with age and maturity. Some of the respondents strongly claimed that the meanings of happiness and quality of life are very individual. It defers from each other and also the product of their own choices. Therefore, no one can determine how he or she should live. One of the respondents elaborate the argument as follows:

How and who decides someone's future. No one can do that on behalf of any one. I feel that I am satisfied that I have great present and great future. In a way, X-child might have the same feelings. If he goes to pick up matchsticks for 2 hours at work and eat micro-pizzas every day, he might feel himself to be as happy as me. Although we are different, we have great future in our own point of views.

Other respondent explains:

Well, my job is to, for example in case of X-child, urge him to go to school and provide him with best possible support for that. But if he does not stick to them, it is X-child's choice.

Hence, all of the respondents gave emphasis on their proper immediate and integrative care for the children than worrying about their future, so that they could achieve corrective experiences from their childhood. This already aims for the balance future of the children.

Departing point is to manage to prevent the possible damages in child; however, there is always little risk involved. If burden of risk come on children, our task is to make it light. Preventing them from ending up in prison. I want to highlight the issue here about attachment disorder. The time what they have been with us, and the experiences what they have gotten here; they will carry it with them in their lives. Hopefully, they carry it when they have their own children that their children will not be taken into care. Then we are successful in our work. If we could disconnect the tradition of child protection what many of our children have in their biological family and that has been continued as burden to the state from one generation to another. If we could do that we are successful at our work.

According to the respondents, their emphasis in care is to provide children with safe and trustable adults, intact growing environment, brining rich and corrective experiences, protect them from possible dangers of developing deviant and asocial behaviours and ending up in prisons and as the whole to support balance growth of the children. However, the respondents think that the children are always under the risk of developing behavioural disorders. Another main goal of the children's home is to disconnect the family tradition of child protection that has been continued in few generations in case of these children. Some of their parents or grand parents have history of child protection that has continues from generation to generation.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I will include the summary of the main findings and critically reflect upon the whole research process as well as limitations of the study. In addition, I will discuss about factors and aspects of the research process that have direct or indirect influence on the study results.

This study exclusively aimed at finding out the ‘childhood’ that the children’s home constructs and how it is negotiated or perceived in everyday life according to the child care worker’s perspective. In order for investigating the childhood, a focus group interview has initially been conducted among seven employees of the children home. Later on, policy documents i.e. institutions own policy referred to general rules and regulations and the Finnish Child Welfare Act was lined up with the whole data corpus for the analysis. With the aid of thematic analysis, I found out six different themes from whole data corpus in order to answer the research question of this study and thereby, developed and analyzed in the result section under different chapters. These themes includes building trust, rights holding, allowing children’s voices, organizing children’s everyday life and their future as well as reality of the child protection work (difficulties).

The study indicates that the Children’s home, on the one hand, legally represents and stands for the objectives and main principles of the Finnish Child Welfare act and recognized children as autonomous subjects where priorities are given in the matter of safety, individuality, personal integrity, participations, proper care and balance and intact growth of the children. On the other hand, the background histories, traumas and vulnerabilities have determined the local, and immediate needs and capacities of the children and required instant adults interventions for controlling and deciding limitation for the children. Thereby, the employees of the children’s home are professionally perceived as the persons for allowing children’s agency, autonomy and independence within the legal framework and as the persons for regulating everyday life of children upholding institution’s regulations, controlling and creating boundaries for children, allowing children to grow in normal environment and brining corrective experiences, building trust and listening to them. It creates very interesting dilemmas while negotiating childhood in the children’s home.

Although building the trust relationships between children and child care workers carries the paramount significance in the children’s home, the findings suggest that the respondents find building a trusting relationship, the children living in the children’s home, takes generally longer period of time because their trust has be abused in the past by neglecting or abusive parents or

the system that could not address their needs on time appropriately. In additions, the children suffer from minor to major attachment disorders, mental health issues, traumas as well as have the experiences of various short term/ changing adults and out-home placements in the past. The findings suggests that according to the respondents the children's home primarily focuses on providing children a safe home as well as permanent and trustable adults, that are followed by proper care, love, communication, routines, celebration, and rules and regulations. In this way, it aims at bringing correctives experiences as well as integrative care to the children. Thereby, trust building process takes places and mesmerize at various levels between children and adults. In addition, the study indicates that interpersonal relationship and level of trust between the children and caretakers in the children's home consistently differs according to the children's personal wellbeing and immediate individual needs. Thus, trust building process is not conflict free, rather based on constant interaction between children and caretakers and caretakers have the major professional responsibilities to bridge trust relationship with children.

The study confirms that giving voice to the children and their participation over decision making in general issues as well as issues concerning them have also paramount significance in the children's home. However, it is not the easiest task at all. The age, immaturity as well as physical and psychological states of children resulted by maltreated childhood and traumatic past, are the major obstacles for the children to have their wishes fulfilled and they contrast with the legal stipulation constantly. On the one hand, listening to the children and their participation carries paramount importance within the Finnish legal framework. On the other hand, it is also described that protecting children from possible risk is the best interest of the children. The findings indicates that the children are, therefore, encouraged to participate and have a say on the issues concerning them, even though their wishes serve against the best interests of children stipulated and can not always fulfill. The main motivation behind such encouragement is to teach children to recognize their feelings and emotion together with the adult and speak for their rights, so that they will possibly have courage and skills to cope up with conventional societal norms and values and live independently in future. The finding confirms that listening does not mean deciding on what children ask for, rather creating suitable environment to children to express their opinions in proper way that could be either in support of or against the activities or decisions made in the children's home concerning them.

The findings also suggest that preserving the child rights and organizing everyday life of children means creating a safety net for children to grow up in a healthy environment. For the employees of the children's home, monitoring the child rights begins with safe home, nutrition safe adult, routines and continue to corrective experience, individuality, health related therapy

and care, schooling, hobbies, family bonds, learning societal norms and values, responsibilities and independence for the children. The results show that this ideology ultimately falls in conflicts with children's understanding of their rights time and again. Therefore, professionals meet immense challenges everyday and fall in conflict with children. Furthermore, organizing everyday life follows repetitive routines, personal childcare plan and immediate needs of each child. There are two types of routines for the children in the children's home: collective and individual routines. Collective routines are automatic and partly stands for legal framework, such as schooling, security, health care, mealtime, sleeping time and individual routines are agreed mutually with the child according to the immediate needs of the child, such as hobbies. The study confirms that routines are also seen as means to teach responsibilities and children basic skills such as, cooking, cleaning, personal hygiene and bring the sense of belonging, so that they manage better in their adulthood.

The finding also suggests that professionals maintains to provide opportunities to the children to live a normal life with love, care, trust, safety environment, regularity, boundaries as well as to provide basic tools to survive as an individual in the society in future, i.e. disconnecting child protection tradition continued from many generation in the family and have a normal family in future. However, the respondents think that only few of them possibly have normal lives in future and all of them bear the risk of posttraumatic collapses. Furthermore, all or many of them may need one way another support from the state to live independently. Therefore, the results confirm that the respondents see having a quality of life and living happily in future for children can differ from each other regardless of the childhood they have in children's home.

The result also shows that the Finnish Child Welfare Act to be balancing factor in monitoring children's best interests in Finland. At the same time, its radical changing nature creates more confusing situation among children and employees. Furthermore, result highlights that proper research work is need before changing the Act. Likewise, the result unravels that radical media coverage; trust issues between various networks, changes of social workers and unlimited legal rights of appeal for parents and legal interference creates difficulties in doing good work at children's home.

Having a talk about my research process, I am personally very satisfied with my research achievements and learning outcomes regardless of limited period of time. My research journey began already on 24th March and I have accomplished the report writing within the timeline as portrayed in my research plan. After the receiving the permission to kick off my research on 13th April, I manage to receive official research permission from Children's home and individual consents from respondents of the research, so that I could arrange the focus group interview

already on 23rd April. All of the respondents actively participated in focus group discussions from beginning to the end; however, I had the feelings that some of the participants were hesitant to speak out during the discussions, and they seem to be very careful about what to say and how to say. There could be two possible reasons for the situation. First one, I recorded the interview and the second one, I had mentioned in the consent letter that the recordings might possibly be handed over to the Child Studies unit after the completion of the research. I included this clause in the consent letter after discussing with my research supervisor. I was confused about what to do with the recordings after completion of my research. Furthermore, It is also normal human nature to be a little bit reserve and careful on what they say and how they say when their voice is recorded. Otherwise, as a colleague I have professionally very trustful relationship with everyone. In addition, I realized as the researcher that I had the same level of relationship with the respondents. I noticed that before I started the interview session, they were very comfortable about with me about the interview but they were telling each other that what you will say will be recorded so think before you say. I responded that discussion with my smile. During the interview, some of them ask with me how formally they have to speak about the issues such as use of languages. I replied them to come up the way they are but request them to be professional and respectful to the issues and matter comes up during the interview concerning children, parents and others. This could have made them more reserve and careful during the session, which I interpreted as being hesitant and careful in my report.

Although I am very much satisfied with the findings of the research as well as the whole research process and the research methods applied, individual interviews as the method instead of focus group interview, with each respondent would possibly have given me very private, diverse as well as unique opinions. The major challenges I faced during this study was coding the data corpus as well as selecting for report writing and translating the data into English without distorting its meanings. Another challenge I met was in the process of structuring the report. With the prompt help and inspiring support from my supervisor made it possible for me to accomplish the study successfully.

References

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology'. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3, 77-101.

Carsten, J. (2004) *After Kinship* [online]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Central Union for Child Welfare (2015) The all-important UN Convention on the Rights of the Child [online] Available from <
http://www.lskl.fi/en/central_union/what_we_do/children_s_rights_child_welfare_policy_and_international_child_welfare_work> [6th March 2015]

Chasmore, J. (2002) 'Spotlight on Practice: Promoting the participation of children and young people in care'. *Child Abuse & Neglect* [online] 26(8), 837-847.

Christensen, P. & Mikkelsen, M.R. (2013) 'There is nothing here for us..!' How girls create meaningful places of their own through movement'. *Children & Society* [online] 17(3), 197-207.

Colmer, K., Rutherford, L. & Murphy, P. (2011) 'Attachment theory and primary caregiving'. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood* [online] 36(4), 16-20.

Ellonen, N. & Pösö, T. (2011) 'Violence Experiences in Care: Some Methodological Remarks based on the Finnish Child Victim Survey'. *Child Abuse Review* [online] 20(3), 197-212.

Farrell, A. (2005) *Ethical research with Children* [online]. Berkshire: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education

Fass, P.S & Grossberg, M (Eds.) (2012) *Reinventing childhood after World War II* [online]. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.

Forsberg, H. & Pösö, T (2008) 'Ambiguous position of the child in supervised meetings'. *Child and Family Social Work* [online] 13(1), 52-60.

Gallagher, M., Haywood, Sarah L., Jones, Manon W. & Milne, S. (2010) 'Negotiating informed consent with children in school-based research: A critical review'. *Children &*

Society [online] 24, 471-482.

Hearn, F., Pösö T., Smith C., White S., & Korpinen, J. (2004) 'What is child protection? Historical and methodological issues in comparative research on lastensuojelu/ child protection'. *International journal of Social Welfare* [online] 13(1), 28-41.

Hiilamo, H. (2009) 'What could explain the dramatic rise in out-of-home placement in Finland in the 1990s and early 2000s'. *Children and youth service review* [online] 31(2), 177-184.

James, A. (2009) 'Agency'. In *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies* [online]. Eds. by Qvortrup, J., Corsaro, W., & Honig M.S. Palgrave MacMillan. 34-45.

James A. & James A. (2012) *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies*. 2nd edn. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.

James, A. & Prout, A. (1997) 'Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood'. *Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood* [online]. London: Falmer Press.

Kalland, M. & Sinkonen, J. (2001) 'Finnish Children in Foster Care: Evaluating the Breakdown of Long-Term Placements'. *Child Welfare* [online] 80(5), 523-527.

Kapadia S. (2014) 'Childhood Into the 22nd Century: Creativity, the Finland Example, and Beyond'. *Childhood Education* [online] 90 (5), 333-342.

Kehily, M.J (Ed.) (2013) *Understanding Childhood: a cross-disciplinary approach*. United Kingdom: The Policy Press.

Kohli, R.K.S (2011) 'Working to Ensure Safety, Belonging and Success for Unaccompanied Asylum-seeking Children'. *Child Abuse Review* [online] 20 (5), 311-322.

Kouvonen, p. (2010) 'Re-negotiating Personal Integrity in Finnish Child Welfare'. *International Journal of Children's Rights* [online] 18(1), 111-125.

Kähkönen, P. (1997) 'From the Child Welfare trap to the Foster Care trap'. *Child Welfare* [online] 76 (3), 429-446.

Mayall, B. (2013) *A history of the sociology of childhood* [online]. London: Institute of Education Press.

Meloy, M.E. & Phillips, D.A. (2011) 'Foster children and placement stability: The role of childcare assistance'. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* [online] 33(5), 252-259.

Ministry of Justice, Finland (2015) Unofficial translation, translation completed on 31.03.2001. Personal Data Act (523/1999, amendment followed up 986/2000) [online] Available from <<http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990523.pdf>> [13th February 2015]

Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland (2015) *Unofficial translation: Child Welfare Act (No. 417/2007; amendments up to 1292/2013 included)* [online] Available from <<http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2007/en20070417.pdf>> [29th January 2015]

Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland (2015) *Child and Family Policy in Finland 2013* [online] Available from <http://www.stm.fi/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=6511570&name=DLFE-25916.pdf> [8 May 2015]

Ministry of Health and Social Affairs (2015) *Lastensuojeluilmoitus* [online] Available from <<http://www.thl.fi/fi/web/lastensuojelun-kasikirja/tyoprosessi/lastensuojeluilmoitus-ja-lastensuojeluasian-vireilletulo/lastensuojeluilmoitus#Kuka%20voi%20tehdä%20lastensuojeluilmoituksen%20ja%20kenellä%20on%20velvollisuus%20ilmoittaa?>>> [6 May 2015]

National Institute for Health and Welfare of Finland (2015) *Child Welfare 2013* [online] Available from <<https://www.thl.fi/en/web/thlfi-en/statistics/statistics-by-topic/social-services-children-adolescents-and-families/childwelfare>> [8 May 2015]

Oswell, D. (2013) *The Agency of Children. From Family to Global Human Rights* [online]. Cambridge University Press.

Ottosson, L., Eastmond, M., Schierenbeck, I. (2013) 'Safeguarding a Child Perspective in Asylum Reception: Dilemmas of Children's Case Workers in Sweden'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* [online] 26 (2), 247-264

Prout, Alan (2005) *The future of childhood: Towards the interdisciplinary study of children* [online]. London: Routledge Falmer. 59-75.

Pölkki, P., Vornanen, R., Pursiainen, M. & Riikonen M. (2012) 'Children's Participation in Childprotection Processes as Experienced by Foster Children and Social Workers'. *Child Care in Practice* [online] 18 (2), 107-125.

Pösö, T., Skivenes, M. & Hestbaek, A.D. (2014) 'Child protection systems within the Danish, Finnish and Norwegian welfare states—time for a child centric approach?'. *European Journal of Social Work* [online] 17 (4), 475-90.

Pösö, T., Skivenes. M. & Hestbaek, A.D (2014) 'Child protection systems within the Danish, Finnish and Norwegian welfare states—time for a child centric approach?'. *European Journal of Social Work* [online] 17(4), 475-490.

Saracho, O.N. (Ed.) (2015) *Handbook of Research Methods in Early Childhood Education: research methodologies, volume 1* [online]. US: Information Age Publication Inc.

Satka, M. & Harrikari, T. (2008) 'The Present Finnish Formation of Child Welfare and History'. *British Journal of Social Work* [online] 38 (4), 645-661.

Silverman, D (2011) (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data: a guide to the principles of qualitative research*. 4th edn. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Sparrman, A. & Lindgren, A. (2010) 'Visual documentation as a normalizing practice: a new discourse of visibility in preschool: Special issue on children and surveillance'. *Surveillance & Society* [online], 7 (3/4) 245-258.

Sandin, B. & Sparrman, A. (2012) 'Situated child consumption: An introduction'. In *Situating child consumption: Rethinking values and notions of children, childhood and consumption*. Eds. by Sparrman A., Sandin B. & Sjöberg J. Lund: Nordic Academic Press. 9-31.

United Nations Human Rights (2015) *Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989* [online]
Available from < <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>> [6 May 2015]

Wells, K. (2009) *Childhood: In a Global Perspective*. London: Polity.

Wiley, R.L. and Berman, S.E. (2012) 'The relationships among caregiver and adolescent identity status, identity distress and psychological adjustment'. *Journal of Adolescence* [online] 35(5), 1203-1213.

Zilberstein, K. (2014) 'The Use and Limitations of Attachment Theory in Child Psychotherapy'. *Psychotherapy* [online] 51(1), 93-103.

Appendix 1: Phases of Thematic Analysis

Phase	Description of process
1. Familiarizing yourself with your data	Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.
2. Generating initial codes	Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code
3. Searching for themes	Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme
4. Reviewing themes	Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic 'map' of the analysis
5. Defining and naming themes	Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6. Producing the report	The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

Source: Baraun and Clarke 2008, p. 87

Appendix 2: Focus Group Interview Questions

1. What do you think this institution is giving to the children? – Desired elaboration with how and why question in addition.
2. What do you think about daily routines and rules to the children and its importance? Who does create them, how and why? Desired elaboration in situations and justifications.
3. How important is it to listen children (child-adult roles and relationships- dialogue) and why? -Desired different perspectives.
4. What does it make difficult to do good job here? -Desired in relation to management, child welfare act, and any other factors?
5. How do you see the future of children living in this children's home?

Appendix 3: Sample of the Letter of Consent

Dear Participant,

I would like to invite you to participate in my research, called 'Doing Childhood' in XXXXXX. The research project is part of my master's studies (Master's Degree in Child Studies) at Linköping University, Sweden. In Particular, I am interested in the type of childhood XXXXXXXX creates.

Since you are being invited to participate in my research project, I would like to inform following issues about my research and its process.

TITLE OF THE RESEARCH: *'Doing Childhood' in XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER: *Som Prasad Chaulagai*

NAME OF THE DEGREE & UNIVERSITY: *Master's Degree in Child Studies, Linköping University, Sweden*

RESEARCH QUESTION AND AIM: *The main aim of the research then to discover type of 'childhood' the children's home creates by keeping aside institution's policy document such as rules and regulations, and Finnish Welfare Act with everyday routines in Children's home. My motivation and aim is to look into how they all fit together and what types of childhood it creates. Hereby, research question is: What notion of childhood does the children's home XXXXXXXXX create?*

RISKS AND BENEFITS: *There are no anticipated risks associated with this study. You will not receive any direct benefit from participation. I cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.*

TIME INVOLVEMENT: *Your participation in this study will not require more time from you other than 2-3 hours FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW.*

PAYMENTS: *You will not be paid to participate in this study.*

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand following:

- *FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW will be conducted among YOUTH SECTION's employees and will take 2-3 hours.*
- *Focus group interview will be audio taped. Those tapes are properties of the University; therefore, if it is required, recording will be handed over to the University to keep them safe in the archives after the research is finalised.*
- *Focus group interview will be conducted in FINNISH language, later transcribed and translated into ENGLISH.*
- *Direct quotations from the FOCUS GROUP will be borrowed in the research report for the analysis. However, your personal identity, comments, behaviors will be kept confidential during and after the research and in the research report as well.*
- *Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.*
- *Initially the research is part of my master's studies, therefore it will be presented in the University and published online in University page. Please note that the report may be used for any other academic purposes later with the consent of the researcher.*
- *The results of this research study will be presented in XXXXXXXXXXXX meeting to the working team and it may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals. However, your identity will not be disclosed.*
- *Research results will be informed to the participants by email according to their wishes.*

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in the study. You will be given a copy of this document for your records and one copy will be kept with the study records. Be sure that questions you have about the study have been answered and that you understand what you are being asked to do. You may contact the researcher if you think of a question later.

I agree to participate in the study. As part of my consent, I agree to be audiotaped.

_____	_____	_____
Name of Participant	Date	Signature
_____	_____	_____
Name of Researcher	Date	Signature

Appendix 4: Sample Letter of Research Permission (in Finnish)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(Includes name, address, email and telephone number)

Tutkimslupa

Title of the research:

Name of the researcher:

Name of the Degree and University:

(Description of the letter in Finnish language) XXXXXXXXXXXX (name of the children's home) antaa Som Chaulagaille luvan suorittaa opiskeluihin liittyvä tutkimus. Tutkimusta vartenon lupa käyttää XXXXXXXX papereita sekä tehdä haastattelu nuorten yksikön työryhmälle.

Place and Date.....

(Signature of the Director of the Children's Home)