Kultura – Przemiany – Edukacja t. XVIII (2026)
https://journals.ur.edu.pl/kpe/ ISSN 2300-9888; ISSN online 2544-1205

DOI: 10.15584/kpe.2026.18
Artykuł oryginalny

Data nadesłania: 31.07.2026 r.
Zaakceptowano do druku: 14.09.2026 r.
Opublikowano: 31.12.2026 r.

Kacper Radzki

Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Wrocław
ORCID: 0000-0002-5431-5089

Between safety and inclusion: Experiences of youth with adaptation difficulties in residential rehabilitation institutions

Między bezpieczeństwem a inkluzją. Doświadczenia młodzieży z trudnościami adaptacyjnymi w instytucjach resocjalizacyjnych

Abstract

The article examines the relationship between safety and inclusion in residential rehabilitation institutions, focusing on the experiences of youth with adaptation difficulties residing in an Okręgowy Ośrodek Wychowawczy and a Młodzieżowy Ośrodek Wychowawczy. The study is based on the assumption that institutional safety cannot be understood solely in formal terms but should be conceptualized as a subjective, relational experience shaped by everyday interactions and the social climate of the institution. The research adopted an empirical approach and employed author-developed instruments designed to assess youths' sense of safety within institutional settings. The findings reveal distinct patterns of safety and inclusion across the two types of institutions. In the OOW, a high level of structural safety was observed alongside the risk of subtle social marginalization. In contrast, in the MOW, safety was primarily psychological in nature and strongly influenced by emotional vulnerability and organizational stability. The comparative analysis demonstrates that safety is a necessary but insufficient condition for social inclusion, which requires stability, dialogue, and a reflective professional staff. The article concludes with practical implications for rehabilitation institutions.

Keywords: safety, inclusion, social rehabilitation, socially maladjusted youth, residential care institutions

Streszczenie

Artykuł podejmuje problem relacji między bezpieczeństwem a inkluzją w instytucjach resocjalizacyjnych, analizując doświadczenia młodzieży z trudnościami adaptacyjnymi przebywającej w Okręgowym Ośrodku Wychowawczym oraz Młodzieżowym Ośrodku Wychowawczym. Punktem wyjścia jest założenie, że bezpieczeństwo w warunkach instytucjonalnych nie ma wyłącznie charakteru formalnego, lecz jest doświadczeniem subiektywnym, silnie osadzonym w relacjach i klimacie społecznym. Badania miały charakter empiryczny i zostały przeprowadzone z wykorzystaniem autorskich narzędzi pomiaru poczucia bezpieczeństwa, dostosowanych do specyfiki badanych placówek. Wyniki wskazują na odmienne konfiguracje bezpieczeństwa i inkluzji w OOW i MOW. W OOW dominowało bezpieczeństwo strukturalne przy jednoczesnym ryzyku „cichej" marginalizacji części wychowanków. W MOW poczucie bezpieczeństwa miało głównie wymiar psychologiczny i było

silnie zależne od wrażliwości emocjonalnej oraz stabilności organizacyjnej. Analiza porównawcza potwierdza, że bezpieczeństwo stanowi warunek konieczny, lecz niewystarczający dla inkluzji społecznej, która wymaga stabilności, dialogu i refleksyjnej postawy kadry. Artykuł formułuje również wnioski praktyczne dla instytucji resocjalizacyjnych.

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczeństwo, inkluzja, resocjalizacja, młodzież niedostosowana społecznie, instytucje wychowawcze

Introduction

Contemporary resocialization institutions operate within a space of conflicting systemic and social expectations. On the one hand, they are obliged to ensure safety, understood as maintaining order and preventing threats; on the other, they are expected to support development, subjectivity, and the social inclusion of young people with adaptive difficulties and experiences of exclusion. The tension between control and subjectivity constitutes one of the key dilemmas of contemporary resocialization pedagogy.[1]

A particularly sensitive group in this context comprises juveniles with adaptive difficulties and disabilities, whose functioning is shaped by prior experiences of violence, deprivation, and unstable relationships. Research indicates that young people residing in educational and resocialization centres demonstrate heightened vulnerability to stress related to the organization of institutional life, the relational climate, and the style of educational interventions.[2] In this sense, safety cannot be analyzed solely in terms of formal procedures but should be understood as a subjective experience embedded in relationships and everyday educational practices.[3]

The literature emphasizes that inclusion under institutional conditions is not a straightforward consequence of declared values, but rather a relational process requiring stability, trust, and genuine participation in group.[4] Inclusion understood in this way does not imply the removal of boundaries or the abandonment of control; instead, it involves creating conditions that enable experiences of acceptance,

[1] M. Konopczyński, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna wobec (re)socjalizacji młodzieży w „rzeczywistości poszerzonej”*, "Resocjalizacja Polska" 2020, No. 19, pp. 9–33; P. Szczepaniak, *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej dla resocjalizacji i penitencjarystyki*, "Profilaktyka Społeczna i Resocjalizacja" 2014, Vol. 24, pp. 143–169.

[2] M. Bernasiewicz, M. Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz, *Efektywność resocjalizacji nieletnich prowadzonej w środowisku zamkniętym w Polsce*, "Chowanna" 2019, No. 2(53), pp. 49–68; M. Dobijański, *Włącza(nie) społeczne dzieci i młodzieży w instytucjach opiekuńczo-wychowawczych i resocjalizacyjnych*, "Student Niepełnosprawny. Szkice i Rozprawy" 2016, No. 16(9), pp. 41–60.

[3] M. Bernasiewicz, M. Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz, *Efektywność resocjalizacji*… Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion in education: Finding strength through diversity*, Paris 2023.

[4] Cf. M. Mółka, *Między inkluzją a ekskluzją w resocjalizacji. Perspektywa biograficzna*, Kraków 2018; P. Szczepaniak, *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej*…

predictability, and agency while maintaining a framework of safety.[5] The absence of this dimension fosters phenomena of apparent adaptation and "silent" marginalization of residents, despite their formal presence within the institutional structure.[6]

At the systemic level, this issue is embedded in broader discussions on child-friendly justice and equal access to safe and supportive educational environments. International analyses indicate that a lack of organizational coherence, staff overload, and intra-institutional tensions significantly reduce both young people's sense of safety and the actual level of inclusiveness within.[7]

In this context, it becomes pertinent to ask whether – and under what conditions – a resocialization institution can be both safe and inclusive. This article addresses this question by treating safety and inclusion not as opposing demands, but as interrelated dimensions of the quality of functioning of resocialization institutions.

Theoretical framework of the analysis: safety and inclusion in resocialization institutions

Safety from institutional and psychological perspectives

Safety in resocialization institutions is most often conceptualized primarily in formal terms, referring to regulations, procedures, and control systems designed to prevent violence and risky behaviors. Although formal safety constitutes a necessary condition for the functioning of residential facilities, it does not determine residents' subjective sense of safety. A high level of institutional control may foster stabilization, but it may also be associated with increased anxiety, tension, and emotional withdrawal, depending on the quality of relationships and the social climate of the institution.[8]

From a psychological perspective, safety has a relational and emotional character, embedded in everyday interactions with peers and educational staff. It encompasses a sense of predictability, clarity of rules, and the availability of adults who respond in a consistent and appropriate manner. Of key importance are trust in educators and the conviction that the institution fulfils a protective function rather than a purely controlling one.[9]

---

[5] A. Łuczyński, M. Socha, *Edukacja włączająca w procesie resocjalizacji podopiecznych młodzieżowych ośrodków wychowawczych*, "Resocjalizacja Polska" 2022, No. 2, 405–425.

[6] M. Bernasiewicz, M. Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz, *Efektywność resocjalizacji*…

[7] Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion*… Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Child-Friendly Justice Framework: Building a people-centred justice system*, Paris 2023; L. Pilnik, *Improving health and safety as youth and young adults leave the justice system: State implementation of policies to strengthen continuity of care at reentry*, Health & Reentry Project 2025.

[8] M. Konopczyński, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna*… Cf. L. Pilnik, *Improving health*…

[9] M. Bernasiewicz, M. Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz, *Efektywność resocjalizacji*… Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion*…

Experienced (perceived) safety plays a significant regulatory role in emotions and behaviour. Its deficit among young people with histories of violence and environmental instability fosters impulsivity or withdrawal, whereas a stable and predictable institutional environment enables a reduction of tension and the development of self-regulation competencies. In this sense, safety constitutes a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for effective resocialization interventions.[10]

Inclusion as a relational process

Inclusion in resocialization institutions is often reduced to formal access to education, therapy, or group activities, which does not reflect its complex nature under conditions of institutional compulsion. The literature emphasizes that inclusion does not mean abolishing boundaries or abandoning control, but rather creating conditions conducive to treating residents as subjects while maintaining a clear structure and rules.[11]

Understanding inclusion as a relational process highlights the importance of everyday interactions and real opportunities for participation in group life. It includes access to relationships based on acceptance, the possibility of attributing meaning to one's own experiences, and a sense of agency within institutional roles.[12] The absence of these elements leads to situations of formal belonging without genuine inclusion, resulting in the marginalization of residents within the group.

A crucial condition for inclusion is maintaining a balance between demands and support. Excessive control based solely on a system of sanctions fosters exclusion, whereas excessive relaxation of norms leads to chaos and a diminished sense of safety. Inclusion becomes possible when the institutional structure supports relationships rather than replacing them with formalism.[13]

The tension between control and subjectivity

Resocialization institutions simultaneously perform protective and developmental functions, which generates a persistent tension between control and the subjectivity of residents.[14] An institution may be a source of stabilization and safety, but also a space in which mechanisms of exclusion are reproduced.

A particular manifestation of this tension is the phenomenon of "silent marginalization," which involves residents functioning on the periphery of group life without

[10] Cf. L. Pilnik, *Improving health*…

[11] P. Szczepaniak, *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej*…; A. Łuczyński, M. Socha, *Edukacja włączająca*…

[12] Cf. M. Mółka, *Między inkluzją*…

[13] A. Łuczyński, M. Socha, *Edukacja włączająca*…

[14] M. Konopczyński, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna*…

open conflict, yet also without genuine inclusion. This form of marginalization often remains invisible in formal assessments of functioning, despite its significant impact on the sense of safety and the effectiveness of educational interventions.[15]

Analyzing the tension between control and subjectivity allows safety and inclusion to be understood as two poles of the same institutional dynamic. Excessive movement toward control leads to formal safety devoid of a relational dimension, whereas neglecting the need for structure weakens both safety and inclusiveness within the institution. From the perspective of resocialization pedagogy, a key task becomes the search for solutions that enable the simultaneous strengthening of young people's sense of safety and their genuine inclusion in the social life of the institution.[16]

Research objectives and research questions

The aim of the present study was to gain an in-depth understanding of how young people with adaptive difficulties experience safety under institutional conditions, as well as to analyze the relationship between the sense of safety and social inclusion in resocialization facilities. The point of departure was the assumption that safety within an institution is not solely formal in nature, but is subjectively experienced and shaped by relationships, the social climate, and the organization of the institution's everyday functioning. At the same time, it was assumed that inclusion is not a simple consequence of being present within an institutional structure, but rather a process requiring the genuine involvement of residents in group life and dialogue with adults.[17]

The main objective of the study therefore comprised:

a) understanding how young people with adaptive difficulties and/or disabilities experience safety in institutional settings;
b) analyzing whether, and to what extent, the sense of safety co-occurs with the experience of social inclusion in resocialization facilities.

The implementation of the main objective was specified through the formulation of the following specific objectives:

a) identifying factors that foster residents' sense of safety and social inclusion;
b) identifying barriers that hinder the social inclusion of young people under institutional conditions;

[15] M. Bernasiewicz, M. Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz, *Efektywność resocjalizacji*… Cf. M. Mółka, *Między inkluzją*…

[16] P. Szczepaniak, *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej*… Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Child-Friendly*…

[17] Cf. M. Mółka, *Między inkluzją*…; P. Szczepaniak, *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej*…; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion*…

c) comparing the experiences of residents of the District Educational Centre (a residential resocialization institution for court-referred juveniles) and Youth Educational Centre (a court-mandated residential resocialization institution for adolescents) with regard to safety and inclusion.

Based on these objectives, the following research questions were formulated:

1. How do residents of resocialization facilities perceive and experience safety under institutional conditions?
2. Which elements of institutional functioning facilitate, and which hinder, the experience of social inclusion among young people with adaptive difficulties?
3. Whether and in what way is the sense of safety related to residents' experience of social inclusion?
4. What similarities and differences occur between the experiences of residents of OOW and MOW in the analyzed areas?

The objectives and research questions formulated in this way defined the methodological framework of the study and constituted the basis for further analysis of the results, taking into account both the specificity of individual types of facilities and the broader institutional context of the functioning of socially maladjusted youth.

Research methodology

The study was empirical and conducted in two types of resocialization institutions operating within the system of care for socially maladjusted youth. Its aim was to examine the subjective sense of safety and the conditions facilitating or hindering social inclusion in everyday institutional functioning. Although different research instruments were applied in each facility, the core research assumptions and analytical framework were consistent, allowing for a comparative interpretation of the findings.

Characteristics of the studied institutions

The research was carried out in a District Educational Centre for boys and a Youth Educational Centre for girls, both functioning as residential resocialization institutions providing educational and therapeutic support to juveniles placed there by court decisions. Despite similar formal objectives, the institutions differ in organizational and psychosocial contexts. The District Educational Centre is characterized by a clearly structured organization, group stability, and predictable rules, whereas the Youth Educational Centre is marked by greater relational dynamics and higher emotional sensitivity among residents. These contextual differences influenced everyday functioning and justified the use of differentiated research approaches, while maintaining a common focus on relational and subjective dimensions of safety.

Research sample

The research sample consisted of residents present in the institutions at the time of data collection. In the District Educational Centre, participants were boys experiencing behavioural disorders, difficulties in emotional regulation, and problems with internalizing social norms. In the Youth Educational Centre, the sample included girls with adaptive difficulties, experiences of violence, a reduced sense of emotional safety, and interpersonal problems.

Although the sample was homogeneous in terms of gender within each institution, it was heterogeneous with regard to individual experiences and types of difficulties, which enabled the analysis of safety and inclusion within typical institutional conditions.

Research Instruments and Measurement Areas

Different diagnostic instruments were used, adapted to the organizational context and functioning of residents in each institution. In the District Educational Centre, measurements focused on group climate, peer and staff relationships, and the overall institutional atmosphere. In the Youth Educational Centre, tools addressed psychological aspects of safety, including emotional tension, experiences of violence, and individual adaptive resources. All instruments were author-developed and designed to capture safety as a multidimensional phenomenon embedded in institutional structures, relationships, and subjective experiences. This approach reflected the assumption that standardized questionnaires inadequately capture the specific conditions of resocialization facilities, where safety is closely linked to everyday interactions, organizational practices, and relational contexts. [18] The exploratory use of the PBwOW instrument enabled the collection of data adequate to the research context and research questions, focusing on qualitative dimensions of safety and inclusion rather than standardized psychometric diagnosis.

Research results – District Educational Centre (DEC)

Group climate and relationships

The analysis of results obtained in the District Educational Centre indicates a relatively high level of positively evaluated social relationships and a sense of safety in both formal and relational dimensions. The majority of surveyed residents declared acceptance by the peer group and the availability of educators whom they could trust. At the same time, the data reveal the existence of a group of residents functioning on the periphery of the institution's social life.

[18] D. Macomber, *Education in juvenile detention facilities*, "Journal of Correctional Education" 2010, No. 61(3), pp. 223–261.

Table 1. Assessment of group climate and relationships in the DEC (self-eported results)

Area of analysis	Indicator	Percentage of positive responses
Group climate	Perception of the group as cohesive	75
Peer relationships	Sense of acceptance within the group	72
Relationships with staff	Sense of acceptance by educators	89
Trust	Having an educator one can trust	86

Source: Author's own elaboration.

The results indicate that the DEC creates a relational environment conducive to a sense of stability and protection. At the same time, not all peer relationships are inclusive in nature, which suggests the presence of mechanisms of selective acceptance and differentiated levels of integration among residents within the group.

Safety and adaptation

In the next stage of the analysis, attention was focused on the relationship between the declared sense of safety and residents' engagement in group and institutional life. The results show that a high level of formal safety does not always translate into active participation in group activities or a sense of belonging.

Table 2. Sense of safety and adaptation of DEC residents

Area of analysis	Indicator	Percentage of positive responses
Safety within the group	Sense of safety in the residential group	89
Institutional safety	Sense of safety throughout the institution	83
Engagement	Lack of engagement in group life	40

Source: Author's own elaboration.

The interpretation of the results points to a significant discrepancy between safety understood as the absence of direct threat and emotional and relational safety. A considerable proportion of residents, despite declaring a sense of safety, remain passive in relation to group life and do not engage actively in social relationships. This phenomenon can be interpreted as functioning under conditions of formal safety without full emotional inclusion.

The findings suggest that institutional safety in the DEC fulfils its protective function, but does not always lead to the genuine inclusion of residents in the social life of the facility. Some young people function "alongside" the group, maintaining emotional distance and limiting their participation to the minimum required by regulations. In this sense, safety appears as a necessary condition for adaptation, but an insufficient one for building an inclusive educational environment.

Research results – Youth Educational Centre (YEC)

Psychological sense of safety

The analysis of results obtained in the Youth Educational Centre indicates that the residents' sense of safety is largely psychological in nature and is strongly linked to individual cognitive resources and relational experiences. In particular, significant associations emerged between cognitive flexibility, the level of dogmatism, and the subjective sense of safety.[19]

Table 3. Psychological determinants of the sense of safety among YEC residents

Area of analysis	Indicator	Direction of the relationship
Cognitive resources	Cognitive flexibility	Higher flexibility → higher sense of safety
Cognitive styles	Dogmatism	Higher dogmatism → greater tension and anxiety
Relational experiences	Experience of violence (primarily psychological)	Reduced sense of safety

Source: Author's own elaboration.

The results indicate that cognitive flexibility functions as a protective factor, enabling residents to cope more effectively with institutional demands, reinterpret difficult experiences, and seek alternative ways of adaptation. In contrast, a high level of dogmatism was associated with greater rigidity of responses, increased emotional tension, and difficulties in utilizing the support offered by the institution.

An important element of the psychological picture of safety was also the experience of violence. Some residents reported previous or current experiences of violence, primarily of a psychological nature, which significantly reduced their sense of protection and fostered the consolidation of distrustful attitudes toward their surroundings. At the same time, the majority of respondents indicated the presence of at least one staff member to whom they could turn in a difficult situation, which constituted an important protective resource.

Barriers to inclusion

The second area of analysis concerned organizational and relational factors identified by the residents as barriers hindering both the sense of safety and genuine social inclusion under institutional conditions.

[19] K. Radzki, *Otwartość i elastyczność myślenia oraz poziom dystansu społecznego wśród młodzieży niedostosowanej społecznie z subkultury przestępczej*, "Humanitapp. Pedagogika i Psychologia" 2025, No. 2(32), pp. 85–104.

Table 4. Barriers to inclusion and safety in the YEC – residents' perspective

Organizational area	Identified barrier	Subjective effects
Daily organization	Overloaded daily schedule	Fatigue, tension, lack of space for recovery
Living conditions	Lack of privacy	Sense of constant control and reduced psychological comfort
Stability	Frequent changes of groups and dormitories	Disorganization, difficulties in building relationships
Institutional climate	Conflicts among staff	Decreased trust, sense of inconsistency of rules

Source: Author's own elaboration.

The results indicate that barriers to inclusion in the YEC are largely organizational and structural in nature. An overloaded daily schedule and the lack of private space were experienced by residents as factors generating chronic tension and limiting opportunities for emotional regulation. Organizational instability, manifested, among other things, in frequent changes of residential groups and accommodation, hindered the development of lasting relationships and strengthened a sense of temporariness and lack of rootedness.

Conflicts among staff emerged as a particularly significant factor lowering the sense of safety, as they were noticed by residents and interpreted as signals of inconsistency and ambiguity of the norms operating within the institution. As a result, despite its declared protective function, the institution was at times perceived as an environment that was not fully predictable, which hindered the process of inclusion and reinforced attitudes of withdrawal or heightened vigilance.

Comparative Analysis of the District Educational Centre (DEC) and the Youth Educational Centre (YEC)

The comparative analysis of results obtained in the District Educational Center and the Youth Educational Center reveals different configurations of safety and inclusion, resulting both from the organizational specificity of the institutions and from the psychosocial conditions shaping residents' functioning. Although the formal objectives of resocialization interventions in both institutions are similar, the ways in which safety is experienced and the mechanisms of social inclusion take distinctly different forms.

In the District Educational Centre, everyday functioning was highly structured, which supported order and a sense of safety. Clear rules and group stability facilitated adaptation; however, they also risked marginalizing some residents who remained emotionally withdrawn and engaged only minimally. In this context, exclusion took the form of passivity and relational distance rather than open conflict.

Table 5. Comparison of experiences of safety and inclusion in the DEC and YEC

Dimension of analysis	DEC (boys)	YEC (girls)
Organizational structure	High stability, clear rules, predictability	Greater variability, frequent reorganizations
Sense of safety	High in formal and relational dimensions	Differentiated, strongly dependent on emotional state
Dominant risk factor	"Silent" marginalization, withdrawal from group life	Emotional tension, experiences of violence
Adaptation mechanism	Adjustment to rules without full engagement	Heightened vigilance, need for relational support
Character of inclusion	Selective, not always encompassing all residents	Fragile, vulnerable to organizational overload

Source: Author's own elaboration.

In contrast, the Youth Educational Centre was characterized by higher emotional sensitivity and tension. Here, safety was primarily psychological and depended on relationship quality, staff stability, and opportunities for emotional regulation. Inclusion proved fragile, as organizational overload, lack of privacy, or staff conflicts quickly undermined residents' sense of protection and trust.

A comparison of both institutions shows different barriers to inclusion: in the DEC, excessive structuring favoured formal adaptation over emotional engagement, while in the YEC insufficient organizational stability hindered the sustainability of inclusive practices. In both settings, safety emerged as a necessary but insufficient condition for genuine social inclusion.

Comparative analysis, discussion, and practical implications

The comparative analysis of the District Educational Centre (DEC) and the Youth Educational Centre (YEC) reveals distinct configurations of safety and inclusion shaped by organizational and psychosocial conditions. In the DEC, a highly structured environment fosters formal adaptation and a relative sense of safety, but may also lead to the silent marginalization of some residents who remain minimally engaged despite the absence of overt conflict.

In contrast, in the YEC safety is primarily psychological and strongly dependent on emotional sensitivity, relationship quality, and organizational stability. Elevated tension, experiences of violence, and structural instability make inclusion fragile and easily disrupted, with even minor inconsistencies in educational interventions reducing residents' sense of security.

Overall, the findings indicate that different pathways to (non-)inclusion operate in each setting: in the DEC, excessive structuring limits relational engagement, while

in the YEC insufficient organizational stability undermines inclusive processes. Safety thus emerges as a necessary but insufficient condition for sustainable social inclusion in resocialization institutions.

The discussion of the results leads to the conclusion that inclusion under institutional conditions should be understood as a process requiring organizational stability, dialogue, and a reflective stance on the part of staff. Of key importance are the quality of educator–resident relationships, the coherence of rules, and the predictability of the institution's everyday functioning. An important systemic factor is also the psychological condition of staff – organizational burnout reduces the capacity of personnel to respond in a supportive and consistent manner, which directly affects young people's sense of safety.[20]

Based on the obtained results, the following practical conclusions can be formulated as relevant for the functioning of resocialization institutions: the need for systematic strengthening of educator–resident relationships; the provision of psychological support for staff; and the promotion of cognitive flexibility as an adaptive resource among residents. Equally important are limiting group rotation and organizational chaos, maintaining a balance between systems of sanctions and rewards, and creating safe – though institutionally bounded – private spaces that allow for emotional recovery. These measures foster the simultaneous strengthening of safety and inclusion, treated as two interrelated dimensions of the quality of resocialization interventions.

Conclusion

The conducted analyses confirm that safety and inclusion in resocialization institutions do not constitute separate or competing categories but rather remain in a close and dynamic relationship. Safety deprived of an inclusive dimension is reduced to control and formal order, which may ensure organizational stability but does not lead to genuine developmental change. Conversely, inclusion detached from a sense of safety remains an illusion – unable to be sustained under institutional conditions and insufficient as a foundation for educational interventions.

The research findings indicate that effective resocialization requires the simultaneous consideration of structure, relationships, and the subjectivity of residents. The humanistic core of resocialization interventions is expressed in treating safety as a condition that enables development, rather than merely as a mechanism of control.[21] Within this perspective, inclusion becomes a process realized through relationships, dialogue, and predictability, rather than through formal declarations or purely organizational solutions.

[20] Cf. L. Pilnik, *Improving health*… Cf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion*…; *idem*, *OECD Child-Friendly*…

[21] M. Konopczyński, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna*…

The article emphasizes that the human being – their experiences, needs, and resources – should remain at the centre of the resocialization system, rather than the institution itself or its procedures. Only such an approach makes it possible to create educational environments in which safety and inclusion mutually reinforce one another, fostering durable and meaningful changes in the functioning of socially maladjusted youth.

References

Bernasiewicz M., Noszczyk-Bernasiewicz M., *Efektywność resocjalizacji nieletnich prowadzonej w środowisku zamkniętym w Polsce*, "Chowanna" 2019, No. 2(53).

Dobijański M., *Włącza(nie) społeczne dzieci i młodzieży w instytucjach opiekuńczo-wychowawczych i resocjalizacyjnych*, "Student Niepełnosprawny. Szkice i Rozprawy" 2016, No. 16(9).

Konopczyński M., *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna wobec (re)socjalizacji młodzieży w „rzeczywistości poszerzonej"*, "Resocjalizacja Polska" 2020, No. 19.

Łuczyński A., Socha M., *Edukacja włączająca w procesie resocjalizacji podopiecznych młodzieżowych ośrodków wychowawczych*, "Resocjalizacja Polska" 2022, No. 24.

Macomber D., *Education in juvenile detention facilities*, "Journal of Correctional Education" 2010, No. 61(3).

Mółka M., *Między inkluzją a ekskluzją w resocjalizacji. Perspektywa biograficzna*, Kraków 2018.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Equity and inclusion in education: Finding strength through diversity*, Paris 2023.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Child-Friendly Justice Framework: Building a people-centred justice system*, Paris 2023.

Pilnik L., *Improving health and safety as youth and young adults leave the justice system: State implementation of policies to strengthen continuity of care at reentry*, Health & Reentry Project 2025.

Radzki K., *Otwartość i elastyczność myślenia oraz poziom dystansu społecznego wśród młodzieży niedostosowanej społecznie z subkultury przestępczej*, "Humanitapp. Pedagogika i Psychologia" 2025, No. 2(32).

Szczepaniak P., *Inspiracje inkluzji społecznej dla resocjalizacji i penitencjarystyki*, "Profilaktyka Społeczna i Resocjalizacja" 2014, Vol. 24.