



## YOUNG OFFENDER RESISTANCE TOWARDS STATE HEGEMONIC PRACTICES: CASE STUDY OF “LPKA BELANTARA”

William Maxey<sup>1</sup>\*, Sri Setiawati<sup>2</sup>, Zainal Arifin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Masters of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, FISIP, Universitas Andalas, Padang, West Sumatra.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Anthropology, FISIP, Universitas Andalas, Padang, West Sumatra.

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

Submitted : 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2022  
Review : 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2022  
Accepted : 27<sup>th</sup> May, 2022  
Published : 05<sup>th</sup> June, 2022  
Available Online : June 2022

### KEYWORDS

Young offender; resistance; hegemony;  
young offender institutions

### CORRESPONDENCE

\* E-mail: [wil.maxey@gmail.com](mailto:wil.maxey@gmail.com)

### A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this article is to describe the resistance of young offenders toward hegemonic practices of the State. Following qualitative research practices with a descriptive design, this article employs the concept of habitus to analyze the nexus of actor and agency within the field of Belantara Young Offender Institution and the processes formed from resistance within the space. The findings show that young offenders attempt to resist the State's control as they thwart the goals and values of the dominant power. The resistance of young offenders within Belantara Young Offender Institution consists of control of space, shaping discourse, rule-breaking, open defiance, conformity, and foot-dragging. Due to the imbalance of power between young offenders as a subaltern group and the staff at Belantara Young Offender Institution as the dominant group, the young offenders resist primarily through the hidden transcript. The data show a cycle of hegemony and resistance maintained by both groups which form a set of resistance. The research suggests the State reassess whether young offender institutions are the best place for young offenders as the cycle of hegemony and resistance creates a setting that cannot adequately rehabilitate.

### A. INTRODUCTION

In his report to the United Nations, Manfred Nowak paints a morbid picture of more than 410.000 children deprived of liberty in the administration of justice globally (2019, p. 249). In Indonesia, data from 2015 shows 2.962 children<sup>1</sup> held in places of detention (Kemenkumham, 2015, p. 51). According to Nowak (2019), the outside world does not understand nor take interest in places of detention. Prison walls serve two functions: to contain those held within, while keeping others out. Nowak describes detention centers as “settings of structural violence” (2019, p. 10).

Research in Indonesia on young offenders (*Anak yang Berkonflik dengan Hukum*; lit. Children in Conflict with the Law) has uncovered issues within young offender institutions (*Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak*; lit. Juvenile Development Centers) as settings of structural violence. Several Indonesian authors have addressed problems faced by young offenders, including: difficulty in receiving adequate education (see Z & Rinaldi, 2019; Yustrisia & Kardiayah, 2019), lack of oversight from local

government (Z & Rinaldi, 2019), issues with anger management, difficulty in expressing their thoughts (Lestari & Santoso, 2019), being confined with adult offenders (Yuliyanto, 2020; Ratomi, 2013), stigma and exclusion faced by young offenders upon assimilation (Yuliyanto, 2020; Destritanti & Syafiq, 2019; Ratomi, 2013; Elviana dkk., 2017; Mariana & Sagita, 2019), and stigma due to being perceived as a threat to society (Republik Indonesia, 2012).

The previous literature employs a research methodology based on jurisprudence, evaluating young offender institutions on their failures and successes in rehabilitation. Thus far, there remains a research gap dealing with young offender's resistance toward the State using qualitative research methods. This article describes how the State detains young offenders and controls them through hegemony. As a subaltern group (Gramsci, 1999) young offenders in turn respond with acts of resistance. The research assumption is that young offenders create and maintain their own methods of resistance.

A foundational concept in this article is that of resistance, defined as: “any act(s) by member(s) of a subordinate class that is or are intended either to

<sup>1</sup> Defined as under the age of 18.

mitigate or deny claims made on that class by superordinate classes or to advance its own claims" (Scott, 1985, p. 290). According to Scott there are several points to bear in mind concerning class resistance. Firstly, resistance can be individual or collective. Secondly, it is the goal of mitigating claims from the superordinate class or advancing its own claims that classifies acts as resistance, not the outcome itself. Young offenders, subaltern in their position to hegemonic power, resist in similar ways.

In this article, State hegemonic power is described in three levels: the criminal justice system; the institutions within that system that detain the young; and the individual actors within the institution (ie guards, teachers, administrators of the institution). The young offender institution is an actor that controls and dominates by setting the rules and parameters of the carceral space. According to Scott, the parameters set in place by dominant institutions have a role in affecting resistance towards the institution itself (1985, p. 299). Young offenders are expected to obey the stated code of conduct without agency to agree or disagree with it; therefore, their resistance can be observed in the agency they employ to act contrarily.

Literature on resistance in carceral settings emphasizes hidden resistance, or resistance within the "hidden transcript" (Scott 1990, 1985). A hidden transcript is formed as "a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant" (Scott, 1990, p. xii). Scott addresses four forms of political discourse, two of which will be addressed in this article: 1) the hidden transcript and 2) the rupture of the "*cordon sanitaire* between the hidden and public transcript" (1990, p. 19). "Hidden" acts of resistance by the young offenders within the walls of the institution are juxtaposed against the public transcript of the hegemonic power that seeks to conceal resistance. The significance of bringing to light the forms of resistance within Belantara Young Offender Institution is to highlight the influence of space and *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977) in creating a setting of resistance.

## B. METHOD

This research is an instrumental case study of Belantara Young Offender Institution as a bounded system (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 153). Resistance towards State hegemony is not limited to only Belantara Young Offender Institution (as it is one of thirty-three young offender institutions in Indonesia). For this research, data was collected from Belantara Young Offender Institution over a period of four months. Initially, data was collected through a literature review to determine the scope of the study. Then participant observation and ethnographic interview were employed within the space of the young offender institution. Eight in-depth interviews with young offenders were conducted to triangulate data and allow for data redundancy (Denzin & Lincoln 2018, p. 562).

## C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Within Belantara Young Offender Institution, resistance is ubiquitous. Clemmer (1940) describes *prisonization* as a form of secondary socialization through which prisoners learn to adapt towards prison life. This socialization creates "cultures of resistance and adaptation" (Fielding & Fielding, 2008, p. 78). The culture of resistance and adaption with Belantara Young Offender Institution forms the social conditions surrounding young offenders. According to Fielding and Fielding, change and adaptation can be seen as a spectrum that ranges from withdrawal to perpetual open defiance. To situate the resistance of young offenders within Belantara Young Offender Institution, the structure of the field must first be explained.

### 1. Structure of Belantara Young Offender Institution

Belantara Young Offender Institution is the primary field that confines within its physical structure rules and parameters, ideologies, and agents. Bourdieu (1977) understands *field* to be the space within which agents and their social positions are held. The social agents engage in competition over varying forms of material and symbolic power. Within each field exists a system of social positions structured internally based on relations of power. The agents in Belantara Young Offender Institution can be separated into two sub-fields: the young offenders and those who staff the institution.

The first sub-field is comprised of the young offenders who are detained within the living quarters known as Block A. Block A is a field in and of itself with its own relations of power amongst young offenders. At the same time, Block A is a sub-field within the larger field of Belantara Young Offender Institution. The term *Block A* has two distinct meanings. The first refers to the space curated by Belantara Young Offender Institution comprised of rooms, a mosque, a cafeteria, a kitchen, classrooms, a library, a soccer field, and several other rooms. This first meaning defines Block A according to its physical attributes. The second meaning is to refer to the young offenders themselves. Within the article, the young offenders are referred to using their emic term "Kids of Block A" (*Anak Blok A*).

The second sub-field within the space is comprised of the staff who work at Belantara Young Offender Institution. Within the institutional structure, many of the staff in administration rarely interact with the young offenders. The correctional officers comprise a subset of staff within the institution who are most active in competing for social power as they supervise the Kids of Block A.

The forms of resistance young offenders take vary according to their environment as well as personal dispositions. To unpack the forms of resistance that were observed as well as the meaning behind them, resistance of young offenders in

Belantara Young Offender Institution is categorized in six ways: control of space, shaping discourse, rule-breaking, open defiance, conformity, and foot-dragging.

## 2. Control of space

Control of space is a main form of resistance toward State hegemony. Because the State enacts its control through the creation and enforcement of a code of conduct (ie rules) within the space, the conduct of young offenders takes on forms of resistance against it. This resistance can be seen as a spectrum from simple everyday resistance to extreme forms of self-harm.

Mary Bosworth writes that within prisons the ability of individuals to become agents is constantly under attack as the prison system undermines the capacity of an individual for independence and the ability to make personal life choices (1999, p. 130). Through control of space, the Kids of Block A can regain control over their ability to make decisions within Belantara Young Offender Institution. Several examples below showcase young offender resistance through control of space.

### a. *Becoming a Correctional Officer Assistant (Tahanan Pendamping)*

The most effective way the Kids of Block A can break the cycle of being confined in their cells is by becoming correctional officer assistants. These unpaid positions are given to three young offenders who are deemed by the institution responsible and having good behavior. Because the correctional officer assistants work alongside the officers to oversee Block A, they are not locked into the rooms alongside the other offenders.

The correctional officer assistants are allowed to sleep in several locations, including in their own unlocked rooms, in the guard post, and in the double-doored entryway into the prison. In addition to these locations, one assistant sleeps in front of the locked rooms in Block A to prevent escape attempts.

Correctional officer assistants are not only exempt from being confined within the rooms, they are also the ones often entrusted to lock and unlock the rooms of the young offenders. Acquiring this position to control space is one way that young offenders can resist being controlled within the institution.

### b. *Play*

The Kids of Block A are usually confined to their rooms beginning at around 17:30, and released from their rooms around twelve hours later at 5:30. Because the soccer team is allowed to practice until sundown (around 18:30) there are several young offenders who joined the team to extend their time outside of the cell.

When the primary purpose of playing sports is to increase the amount of time outdoors (thus limiting the

number of hours they are confined to their cell) the Kids of Block A perform passive resistance. They do not openly resist confinement within the rooms, but instead shape the situation to allow for flexibility within a rigid system that they perceive keeps them locked in their rooms for too long.

### c. *Escape*

Because the punishment for attempted escape is severe, the Kids of Block A seldom choose this form of resistance. However, when they do, young offenders attempt to control the space by removing themselves from it. Due to the high risk and low chance of success, there are only a couple escape attempts each year. By escaping the situation that confines and exerts dominance over them, young offenders resist the system by removing themselves from it.

### d. *Self-Harm*

There is a place in Belantara Young Offender Institution that has been left vacant for several years. It comprises a couple of toilets and a small hallway collecting dust locked behind a fence. Over the initial first days of research, this space was never mentioned, prompting questions into its purpose. Because the young offenders are placed 8-12 children in a room with only one toilet, it would be logical to unlock the gate and put the extra toilets to use. One morning, the first author asked one of the young offenders why the space wasn't cleaned and used. He responded, "Don't you know someone hung themselves there?"

At its core, self-harm is an attempt to resist by declaring that one has control over oneself. Young offenders who choose to self-harm directly oppose the dominant ideology of hegemony which declares that the State has control over their bodies. In the most extreme cases of self-harm, such as taking one's life, a young offender expresses their agency. By removing oneself from the space, the agent asserts control.

## 3. Shaping Discourse

As the State shapes discourse to maintain its power, the young offenders in turn resist through their own attempts. By shaping discourse, young offenders seek to increase their social positions by resisting the State's ideologies. Within the next sub-sections, the researchers delve into two examples which showcase how the Kids of Block A attempt to resist the dominant discourse.

### a. *Into the cage*

Young offenders attempt to shape discourse by defining their detainment as a form of structural violence. The use of the term *cage* (*kandang*) when referring to their rooms is an attempt by young offenders to shape discourse within the hidden

transcript. The term *cage* represents the critique of power that the Kids of Block A use as a subaltern group that is not discussed in front of the correctional officers who are the dominant group (1990, xxi). Instead, this argot is developed in secret (Sykes, 1958).

One morning while the researcher was purchasing food at the canteen along with several young offenders, the rollcall bell began to ring. "Into the cage" muttered one of the young offenders under his breath. Because animals are usually confined within cages, there was an express purpose to his word choice. The young offender was not making a claim on his lack of value or a personal view that young offenders are animals. It was by using the emic term *cage* that the young offender was attempting to shape the image of the State as an actor that treats young offenders like animals.

The researcher never heard the term *cage* being used when confronting the staff at Belantara Young Offender Institution, however, behind the scenes the terms *cage* and *into the cage* were often used. Because young offenders believe they should be able to exercise agency over their bodies and the spaces they inhabit, the State is found guilty in their eyes when described as an actor that forces them into cages like animals. This shaping of discourse thus becomes one form of resistance the Kids of Block A employ.

#### *b. Redefining and Avoiding Labels*

Throughout the research process it became easy to separate the young offenders into two separate groups: those who openly accept the label given by the State, and those who avoid being labeled. Though not all young offenders followed this pattern, in general, those charged with possession and selling illegal narcotics are more likely to accept the label while those detained for statutory rape avoid the label given them.

There are several ways the Kids of Block A redefine the labels given to them surrounding drugs, specifically marijuana. One of the ways they redefine their label is to compare the laws in Indonesia with those in other countries. When young offenders under drug charges address the fact that marijuana is legal in other "advanced" countries, they create an image of themselves that is not entirely guilty, because in their minds it is the State which is at fault for being backwards. By claiming this, young offenders accept but redefine the label given to them by the State. This becomes a way of discourse-shaping which attempts to prove they are not guilty of the punishment and are in fact innocent.

While some young offenders resist by redefining labels, many of the Kids of Block A resist by avoiding labels altogether. Though the largest category of offenders within Belantara Young Offender Institution is comprised of those charged with statutory rape, it does not imply that they openly accept the label. In fact, throughout the course of research young

offenders charged with statutory rape rarely addressed their charge with the researcher, attempting to avoid discussing it.

#### **4. Rule-Breaking**

Belantara Young Offender Institution is based on an extensive system of rules. In line with a current national correctional facilities program, one of the rules within Belantara Young Offender Institution is *Zero Halinar*, a zero-tolerance policy for cell phones, bribery, and narcotics. In addition to this national program, there exists a structure delicately balanced through the implementation of various other rules.

If the Kids of Block A frequently infringe upon the rules, the balance within the space cannot be maintained. To maintain the balance within the relations of power, the staff at Belantara Young Offender Institution punish rule-breakers to dissuade other offenders. Not all rules are punished to the same degree, there is a spectrum ranging from minor to severe punishments.

As the Kids of Block A understand the delicate balance within the system, acts of resistance in rule-breaking are chosen specifically to bring them the most benefit. Within many of the rule-breaking categories, the Kids of Block A work together to achieve their objectives, while sometimes rule-breaking is done individually. Below are several examples of rule-breaking as acts of resistance performed by young offenders against the State's hegemony.

##### *a. Minor Offenses*

Minor offenses are categorized as offenses for which the only punishment is a stern warning. One such example would be the act of playing cards. The prohibition against card-playing is so loosely enforced that almost every night young offenders in at least one of the three rooms will get together to play. If no significant disruption takes place, the correctional officers ignore the offense. In this way, the Kids of Block A increase their social position through their own agency by bending the dominant power's rule without consequence.

##### *b. Moderate Offenses*

Moderate offenses include violations of rules that result in stricter punishments than simple warnings, but do not lead to solitary confinement. One example of a moderate offense would be smoking cigarettes. Cigarettes hold symbolic power within Belantara Young Offender Institution as staff openly smoke without fear of punishment. When the Kids of Block A break the rule and choose to smoke, they do so in a time and place where there are either no correctional officers or the officers are unable to clearly see what they are doing. When staff smoke, they are symbolically declaring their position of dominance within the field since the prohibition does not apply to

them. Interestingly, the young offenders' possession of cigarettes is directly coordinated with the buying/selling of cigarettes and other contraband items by the officers themselves. Within the institution, officers themselves provide the means for resistance by selling young offenders cigarettes while creating no-smoking policies that are enforced with punishments.

### c. Severe Offenses

Severe offenses are punished by time in solitary confinement. As a result, young offenders take great risk when violating these rules. The most common form of severe offense is smuggling cell phones and use of cell phones within Block A. By having control of a personal cell phone, the Kids of Block A communicate using social media as they did prior to being detained. By sending text messages and WhatsApp messages, they acquire for themselves privacy in communication that is otherwise not available to them within the institution<sup>2</sup>. The State's oppression of the children by stripping them of private communication enforce hegemony and control of the discourse. Therefore, the punishment for the possession of a cell phone is the most severe as it holds the potential to rupture the *cordon sanitaire*.

## 5. Open Defiance

The forms of resistance discussed above follow the pattern defined by Scott that when the power gap between groups is too great, acts of resistance are rarely performed in front of the dominant group. In general, a subordinate group will maintain the public transcript, thus not engaging in open defiance.

However, when the muted thoughts that young offenders have stifled within the hidden transcript are brought to the surface, the most explosive form of political discourse occurs. Scott likens it to the rupture of the *cordon sanitaire* between the hidden and public transcript (1990, p. 19). Because the Kids of Block A rarely rupture the *cordon sanitaire*, the following example describes how in specific settings and with the right set of conditions, the Kids of Block A will resist the State's hegemony through open defiance.

One morning, during a traditional dance lesson for the young offenders led by an outsourced instructor, it was observed that the Kids of Block A worked together to disrupt the class by refusing to participate correctly and ultimately causing the instructor to become flustered and unable to lead their lesson. The young offenders did not want to be taught by the instructor who they perceived as gay. In their own emic terms, the Kids of Block A called the instructor *satan*, *fag*, and *transvestite* (*setan*, *banci*, *bencong*). Their intent in disrupting the class was to exercise dominance and power (over someone they considered to be subaltern to them) (Fielding &

Fielding, 2008, p. 79). This in turn was a form of resistance toward the institution as the young offenders made it clear that they would not tolerate the institution's choice of instructor.

Every day Belantara Young Offender Institution exercises dominance towards the young offenders. When the Kids of Blok A in turn are given the opportunity to lash out and exercise their own forms of dominance towards other actors, they form their own resistance identity (Castells, 2010). Resistance identity encapsulates the group's rejection of the dominant power. According to Manuel Castells, resistance identity is created by "actors who are in positions/conditions devalued and/or stigmatized by the logic of domination, thus building trenches of resistance and survival on the basis of principles different from, or opposed to, those permeating the institutions of society" (2010, p. 7).

Castells defines resistance identity as one that is created by actors who are devalued. Out of this position, the actors create principles that are in opposition to the values and principles of the dominant institution. Belantara Young Offender Institution seeks to maintain a setting of order, obedience, and discipline. Through open defiance the Kids of Block A shape new values and principles as their form of resistance identity.

## 6. Conformity

Because the staff of Belantara Young Offender Institution retain a position of power and create imbalance between the two sub-fields, the Kids of Block A must survive by forming social relations and relations of power within Block A itself. If the young offenders cannot work together and maintain conformity, they will live in non-conformity. Non-conformity within the social world and social structure of Block A would result in the erosion of social order. To strengthen the social order amongst young offenders, the Kids of Block A enforce and create an environment of conformity.

The first example of this conformity is the creation of "family" within Block A. Within Blok A familial terms are used to describe one's relationship to another (like younger brother, older brother). Similarly to the way family's traditionally eat together, the Kids of Block A choose to eat collectively as well. The evening meal is served to them in their cells, and while the food is individually portioned in plastic containers, the Kids of Blok A combine all the food together in one pile and share it among themselves while sitting together on the floor. Similarly, they share the contents of packages that they receive from their families, like rice, snacks, and drink mixes. The packages are not seen as individual property but are divvied up and shared with roommates and other offenders within Block A as a way to maintain conformity to and within "the family" of Block A.

One young offender described the other offenders as "family both near and far." When the Kids of Block A take high risks in rule-breaking, they must

<sup>2</sup> The space provided within Belantara Young Offender Institution for phone calls is always monitored by a correctional officer.

know that their *family* will support their resistance. In the case of smuggling in cell phones, young offenders must be certain no one will snitch as the repercussions of time in solitary confinement would be severe. As a result, as actors within the sub-field they create a setting of conformity that becomes a form of resistance against the State's hegemony.

According to Bourdieu, when agents from a class group are shaped by similar factors, a *class habitus* is formed (1977, p. 80). This concept of class habitus can be applied to the resistance of the Kids of Block A. Because the structural factors within Belantara Young Offender Institution are the same for all the young offenders, those same conditions help to maintain conformity without an explicit attempt towards cooperation.

Bourdieu argues that homogenizing of group occurs when class habitus forms agents and their actions to become increasingly aligned and in harmony (1977, p. 80). Though this conformity has no consciously political agenda (Rubin, 2015, pp. 26-27), conformity thus becomes a form of resistance because in Scott's terms it is an everyday resistance (1985) that mitigates and disrupts the dominant power's goals by creating a space where young offenders are able to break rules.

## 7. Foot-dragging

Foot-dragging in this case is the reluctance to complete an action, and is a form a resistance specifically seen during rollcall. A common form of foot-dragging the Kids of Block A engage in is the intentional act of leisurely attending rollcall, or feigning sick in order not to attend rollcall. Because rollcall is a way to take count of all the young offenders, it is expected that when the rollcall bell is tolled, the Kids of Block A will swiftly come to attention at the central guard post. A simple and yet daily form of resistance is intentionally taking time to come to rollcall.

This action almost without fail successfully irritates and aggravates the correctional officers who feel disrespected and must respond by ordering the Kids of Block A to hurry up as a way of enforcing their dominance.

When a young offender does not show up for rollcall, his roommates will explain his absence because of sickness. By using sickness as an excuse, the young offenders can skip morning rollcall even if it is simply out of a desire to spend more time sleeping. The young offenders who are in attendance build the same discourse as an act of conformity, unwilling to snitch on their friends. When done this way, foot-dragging and lying to skip rollcall is a form of resistance by the young offenders toward the officers and the rules of the institution that increases their sense of agency within the field of the carceral space, especially when they succeed without punishment.

## 8. Analysis of Young Offender Resistance Towards the State

The intent of this article is to analyze young offender resistance towards the State, specifically in the case of Belantara Young Offender Institution. Following the definitions of Giddens (1984) and Scott (1985; 1990), agency in this article is seen not simply when actors are aware and intent on specific results, but whenever agents have the ability to act. Actors are often unaware of the consequences of their actions within relations of power. Their actions and behaviors arise because of the habitus or socialization they have gone through. Sociologist Robin DiAngelo summarizes habitus as follows:

According to Bourdieu, habitus is the result of socialization, the repetitive practices of actors and their interactions with each other and with the rest of their social environment. Because it is repetitive, our socialization produces and reproduces thoughts, perceptions, expressions, and actions. Thus, habitus can be thought of as a person's familiar ways of perceiving, interpreting, and responding to the social cues around him or her. (2018, p. 102)

The agency of the Kids of Block A is expressed not only when resisting formal power. The Kids of Block A are well-aware of the State's power and their inability to replace that structure entirely. This realization does not constitute a validation of the State's power, it is simply a statement on the space within which they can enact their own agency. As a result, the resistance of young offenders is most often hidden, and they are muted by the State.

Muted Group Theory explains the various ways that through its communication a dominant group suppresses, mutes, or devalues the words, ideas, and discourse of subordinate groups (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009, p. 667). This most often occurs when there is asymmetrical communication between the two groups. Because the staff at Belantara Young Offender Institution shape discourse to suppress and mute the Kids of Block A, young offender resistance is primarily formed within the hidden transcript.

The Kids of Block A are significantly shaped by the recurring socialization of the habitus within their field. Because the individuals within Block A spend most of their time with other actors within the same field, they create a form of resistance through conformity because of group homogenization (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 80). The thoughts, perceptions, expressions, and actions of the young offenders within the institution are shaped by the same structural conditions which result in homogeneity.

Through conformity, young offenders perform acts of resistance without being aware of their consequences. They create a system of "family" that strengthens them individually and that allows for cooperation when they more openly resist oppression. The example of smuggling cell phones into the Block showcases the need for cooperation and togetherness

in creating a means for private communication to the outside world.

There are forms of resistance that are consciously political, such as attempted escape. Young offenders who attempt to escape understand their goals in defying the formal power that cages them. From the six categories of resistance listed within this article, each category reveals the different ways young offenders express agency through the rejection of the State's control.

Social action is recursive (Giddens, 1984, p. 2). Human actors create structural conditions through their continual actions across time and space. These structural conditions recreate and maintain the actions of agents which form their own new structural conditions. As a result, agents don't directly act, it is rather indirectly that they respond to the conditions they themselves created beforehand.

The Kids of Block A display recursive resistance that shapes the structural conditions within Belantara Young Offender Institution. For example, when young offenders break rules, the staff respond by punishing them. By observing the affirmation of State power through punishment, the Kids of Block A repeat their resistance as a response towards the conditions within the institution that they themselves created with the staff.

In sum, the Kids of Block A are not only socialized to resist due to interactions with the staff, homogenization of group also plays into the conditions which push them to resist. Through this complex and recursive set of interactions, a setting of resistance is both created and maintained within Belantara Young Offender Institution.

#### D. CONCLUSIONS

The data findings show that resistance of young offenders cannot be separated from State hegemony, as a cycle within Belantara Young Offender Institution is both created and maintained. The State, through its institution of detention, maintains control over young offenders, creating their identity as a subaltern group. Out of this position as a subaltern group, young offenders perform acts of resistance towards the dominant power.

Resistance thus becomes a byproduct of a setting created and maintained by both the State and

young offenders themselves. Young offenders shape resistance identity through the hidden transcript, at times daring to rupture the *cordon sanitaire*. There are several forms of resistance young offenders take: control of space, shaping discourse, rule-breaking, open defiance, conformity, and foot-dragging.

These forms of resistance are most beneficial to the young offenders as they are curated specifically to the space and setting of Belantara Young Offender Institution and its near-total control. Due to the reality that young offenders can never change their status as a subaltern class, their forms of resistance are simply ways of increasing their social position within the space. This social competition creates an endless cycle, if young offenders are detained, they will resist the dominant power.

The researchers suggest the State reassess whether young offender institutions constitute places adequately situated to care for young offenders. The research findings suggest that the setting of resistance within Belantara Young Offender Institution is not able to sufficiently rehabilitate. The data supports Foucault's (1977) work along with other leading scholars who view places of detention as milieus of delinquency (p. 267). This article chooses to employ the term *milieu of resistance* for the culture of resistance that is created and maintained within Belantara Young Offender Institution.

The longer young offenders are socialized within a milieu of resistance, the more likely they are to adapt towards acts of resistance. The State must do everything within its power to seek avenues for rehabilitation outside of young offender institutions. The State must work to bolster finding peaceable solutions such as diversion and other culturally sensitive methods to reduce the number of children held in detention.

#### E. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Master's Program of Anthropology within the Faculty of Sosial and Political Sciences of Universitas Andalas. This research was conducted as the first author's thesis project and the authors would like to thank the professors and lecturers who provided invaluable insight and corrections.

#### REFERENCES

- Bosworth, M. (1999). *Engendering resistance: Agency and power in women's prisons*. Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The power of identity* (2nd ed.). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston, MA: Christopher Publishing House.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Destritanti, R., & Syafiq, M. (2019). Identitas diri remaja yang berhadapan dengan hukum. *Character: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 6(1), 1-11.
- DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Elviana, Afdal, & Yusuf, A. M. (2018). The career planning of young prisoner study at Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak (LPKA) Tanjung Pati. *International Conferences on Educational, Social Sciences and Technology*, 762-768. <https://doi.org/10.29210/20181111>
- Fielding, N. G. & Fielding, J. L. (2008). Resistance and adaptation to criminal identity: Using secondary analysis to evaluate classic studies of crime and deviance. *Historical Social Research*, 33(3), 75-93. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0038038500000419>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1999). Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. In Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (Ed.). *Essential Classics in Politics: Antonio Gramsci*. London, UK: ElecBook, the Electric Book Co.
- Kementerian Hukum dan HAM. (2015). *Laporan tahunan 2015 Kementerian Hukum dan HAM Republik Indonesia*. Jakarta Selatan.
- Lestari, M. A., & Santoso, M. B. (2019). Penguatan karakter pada remaja berhadapan dengan hukum di Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak (LPKA). *Prosiding Penelitian & Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 6(3), 297-306. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jppm.v6i3.23026>
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2009). *Encyclopedia of communication theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mariana, R., & Sagita, M. P. (2019). Strategi regulasi emosi narapidana anak di Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak (LPKA) Klas II Tanjung Pati Payakumbuh. *Psyche* 165, 12(1), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.35134/jpsy165.v12i1.49>
- Nowak, M. (2019). The United Nations global study on children deprived of liberty. Presented at the 74th session of the General Assembly. Published 11 July 2019.
- Ratomi, A. (2013). Penyelesaian Anak yang Berkonflik Dengan Hukum dalam konteks sosial masyarakat (penghindaran labeling terhadap Anak). *Journal de Jure*, 5(2), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v5i2.3004>
- Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2012 tentang Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak*. Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2012, No. 153. Sekretariat Negara. Jakarta.
- Rubin, A. T. (2015). Resistance or friction: Understanding the significance of prisoners' secondary adjustments. *Theoretical Criminology*, 19(1), 23-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480614543320>
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Yuliyanto. (2020). Pembinaan Anak yang Berkonflik dengan Hukum. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 20(1), 103-116. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2020.V20.103-116>
- Yustrisia, L., & Kardiya, D. S. (2019). Pelaksanaan hak Anak Pidana untuk mendapatkan pendidikan dan pengajaran di Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak Klas II Tanjung Pati. *Pagaruyuang Law Journal*, 2(2), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v2no2.1764>
- Z, F. Y., & Rinaldi, N. (2019). Transformasi penanganan terhadap Anak yang Berkonflik dengan Hukum di LPKA Klas II Tanjung Pati. *Ensiklopedia Social Review*, 1(2), 164-171.