

RESILIENCE AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: VARIABLES IN PROTECTION OF MINORS WHO RESIDE IN JUVENILE FACILITIES

RESILIENCIA E INTELIGENCIA EMOCIONAL. VARIABLES DE PROTECCIÓN EN MENORES RESIDENTES EN RECURSOS DE PROTECCIÓN

RESILIÊNCIA E INTELIGÊNCIA EMOCIONAL. VARIÁVEIS DE PROTEÇÃO EM MENORES RESIDENTES EM RECURSOS DE PROTEÇÃO

Raúl CARRETERO BERMEJO
Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM)

Received date: 12.I.2018
Reviewed date: 6.III.2018
Accepted date: 26.III.2018

KEY WORDS:

resilience
emotional
intelligence
minors
social education
social intervention
juvenile facilities

ABSTRACT: Youths who reside in juvenile facilities find themselves with having to leave the centre when they reach 18 years old to become completely independent. In this difficult background, we ask ourselves what tools they are equipped with when facing this new situation. We find Emotional Intelligence and Resilience as two variables associated with their success, i.e. academic, social, professional at a relationship level, and in overcoming adverse situations.

Thus, the aim of our study was to find out their scores in Emotional Intelligence and Resilience and compare them to scores of minors who live outside of these centres. The expectation was to find a significant difference between the two groups, where the minors who reside in a juvenile facility would get significantly lower scores in the two variables than the minors who live within family units and have no relation to social services.

In the design of the study, youths in their 3rd and 4th year of the secondary school and the higher secondary 1st and 2nd courses were selected from both groups to examine variables in relation to their academic level, background and family motivations. A questionnaire was designed to gather social and family information data; it included the TMMS-24 test (Fernández-Berrocal, Extremera & Ramos, 2004) to probe their impressions on their emotional intelligence and the RESI-m test (Palomar & Gómez, 2010) to find information related to Resilience.

The results show significant gaps in the scores obtained by the two groups. The minors who live in juvenile facilities qualify for significantly lower scores in Emotional Intelligence and Resilience, which implies they have fewer resources available to confront an adverse situation, as abandoning the centre when they become of age could be.

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS: RAÚL CARRETERO BERMEJO. Plaza de Agustín Salido, 7, 1º A 13003 Ciudad Real.
info@raulcarreterobermejo.com

<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: resiliencia inteligencia emocional menores educación social intervención social centros de protección</p>	<p>RESUMEN: Los jóvenes residentes en centros de protección se encuentran con la situación de que tienen que abandonar el recurso al cumplir los 18 años y pasar a vivir de una forma completamente independiente. En este complicado contexto nos preguntamos acerca de las herramientas con las que cuentan para enfrentarse a esta nueva situación, presentándose la Inteligencia Emocional y la Resiliencia como dos variables relacionadas con el éxito (escolar, social, laboral y relacional) y la superación de situaciones adversas.</p> <p>Así, los objetivos de nuestro estudio eran conocer las puntuaciones en Inteligencia Emocional y Resiliencia de estos menores residentes en centros de protección y comparárlas con las puntuaciones de menores que no residen en este tipo de recursos. Esperábamos encontrar diferencias significativas entre ambos grupos, donde los menores que residen en algún recurso de protección obtienen puntuaciones significativamente inferiores en estas dos variables a los menores que residen en su unidad familiar y sin vinculación y/o relación alguna con los servicios sociales.</p> <p>Para el diseño se ha decidido seleccionar a jóvenes de ambos grupos que están estudiando 3º, 4º de ESO y 1º, 2º de Bachillerato para controlar variables relacionadas con nivel académico, formación y motivaciones familiares. Se ha construido un cuestionario que recoge información sociofamiliar e incluye el TMMS-24 (Fernández-Berrocal, Extremera & Ramos, 2004) para recoger la información relativa a las creencias de estos jóvenes sobre su inteligencia emocional y el RESI-m (Palomar & Gómez, 2010) para recoger la información relativa a Resiliencia.</p> <p>Los resultados muestran que existen diferencias significativas en las puntuaciones obtenidas por ambos grupos. Los menores residentes en centros de protección obtienen puntuaciones significativamente inferiores en Inteligencia Emocional y en Resiliencia, lo que supone contar con menos herramientas para hacer frente a una situación, en principio, más adversa.</p>
<p>PALAVRAS-CHAVE: intervenção psicoeducativa adolescência comportamento antissocial programas baseados na evidência profissionais</p>	<p>RESUMO: Os jovens que residem em instalações juvenis se vêem obrigados a deixar o centro quando chegam aos 18 anos para se tornarem completamente independentes. Neste contexto difícil, nos perguntamos com que ferramentas eles estão equipados para enfrentar essa nova situação. Encontramos Inteligência Emocional e Resiliência como duas variáveis associadas ao seu sucesso, ou seja, acadêmico, social, profissional em nível de relacionamento e na superação de situações adversas.</p> <p>Assim, o objetivo do nosso estudo foi descobrir suas pontuações em Inteligência Emocional e Resiliência e compará-las a dezenas de menores que moram fora desses centros. A expectativa era encontrar uma diferença significativa entre os dois grupos, onde os menores que residem em uma instalação juvenil receberiam pontuações significativamente mais baixas nas duas variáveis do que os menores que vivem dentro das unidades familiares e não têm relação com os serviços sociais.</p> <p>No delineamento do estudo, jovens de 3º e 4º ano do ensino médio e de 1º e 2º ano do ensino médio foram selecionados de ambos os grupos para examinar variáveis em relação ao seu nível acadêmico, antecedentes e motivações familiares. Um questionário foi elaborado para coletar dados de informações sociais e familiares; incluiu o teste TMMS-24 (Fernández-Berrocal, Extremera & Ramos, 2004) para investigar suas impressões sobre sua inteligência emocional e o teste RESI-m (Palomar & Gómez, 2010) para encontrar informações relacionadas à Resiliência.</p> <p>Os resultados mostram lacunas significativas nos escores obtidos pelos dois grupos. Os menores que moram em instalações juvenis se qualificam para pontuações significativamente mais baixas em Inteligência Emocional e Resiliência, o que implica que eles têm menos recursos disponíveis para enfrentar uma situação adversa, pois o abandono do centro quando atingem a idade poderia ser.</p>

1. Introduction

Minor under guardianship by the Administration who reside in any of the juvenile facilities managed by the Administration can encounter the often complex situation of having to leave the centre where they lived and where all their basic needs were catered for and have autonomous lives. There are specialised resources to make this transition easier although they are not available to all the individuals in this situation and, therefore, most of the minors who leave their juvenile facilities confront this change without any institutional

or family assistance. In this situation, complicated at the very least, Emotional Intelligence and Resilience are outlined as two powerful tools for the minors to overcome this situation successfully (Muñoz-Silva, 2012; Palma-García & Hombrados-Mendieta, 2013).

Different studies point to Emotional Intelligence as one of the main variables to indicate individuals' academic success (Ferragut and Fierro, 2012; Jiménez Morales and López Zafra, 2009), employability and labour integration (Solano-Gómez, 2013) and psychological well-being (Salguero, Palomera & Fernández-Berrocal 2012).

In the same way, Resilience shows as a positive variable in relation to academic success (Gaxiola, González, Contreras and Gaxiola, 2012) after having overcome risks or especially adverse situations (Rutter, 2007) or as the key factor to social development (Masten, 2007). It also stands out as a relevant variable for overcoming family exclusion problems (López, Rosales, Chávez, Byrne & Cruz, 2009; Gómez & Kotliarenco, 2010). On the other hand, the definition of resilience itself, i.e. *“the ability resulting from the interaction of different personal variables that allows an individual to face and resolve situations of diverse adversity and/or risk level that could have been traumatic, in an adequate manner, integrated to individuals’ cultural background and allows them to achieve a normalised situation, adapted to their cultural level”* (Carretero-Bermejo, 2010) is explicit in the resolution of adverse situations (Vera, Carbelo & Vecina, 2007).

In this particularly challenging context, Emotional Intelligence and Resilience are presented as protection variables that play a key role in this group of minors compared to those who live with their families – considering different family scenarios – that, in principle, have more resources and help available to face this change, difficult in itself as it is.

The abilities that comprise the Emotional Intelligence construct can vary significantly based on the study model. Scientific literature presents two main types of Emotional Intelligence models: mixed models and ability models. If we approach Emotional Intelligence as a theory of intelligence, we find a clear distinction between the mixed and the pure or ability-based Emotional Intelligence models. While the latter focus in personal cognitive aspects used in emotional processing of information, the mixed models contain diverse capabilities, behaviours and personality traits.

This study is based on the theoretical perspective of Mayer and Salovey’s ability model (1997.) This model concentrates on cognitive aspects, where Emotional Intelligence is defined as the “ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional meanings, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote both better emotion and thought” (Mayer and Salovey, 1997).

This approach introduces Emotional Intelligence from a perspective closer to the intelligence models built with four interrelated abilities: 1) Ability to identify and express emotions with precision: perception and expression of emotions 2) Ability to channel emotions to ease thought flows and reasoning (intelligent use of emotions)

3) Ability to understand emotions and its language (emotional understanding/comprehension) and 4) Ability to control one’s and others’ emotions (emotion management).

These four skills that comprise the Mayer and Salovey model are intimately related in such a way that misusing one of them impacts directly on the performance of the others. It would seem obvious that we cannot adjust emotions if we are not aware of them or we fail to identify them. Emotional Intelligence is defined from two perspectives under this model: On the one hand, it refers to using Emotional Intelligence for the self (known as Intrapersonal Intelligence) and, on the other; it refers to using Emotional Intelligence with other individuals (referred to as Interpersonal Intelligence).

Resilience studies aim at identifying the variables in individuals who are able to overcome an adverse situation where others cannot. There was a belief that resilient responses were exceptional and even pathological, whilst not being able to overcome adverse situations was regarded as the norm.

At present, based on different and abundant scientific studies, the reality differs greatly, and resilience can be a frequent response where its manifestation is free from pathological associations and is related, instead, to healthy adjustment responses when confronting different adverse situations. Resilience is, therefore common and frequent and derives from common adaptive functions and processes in human beings (Cyrulnick, 2001).

The Resilience construct is managed differently by American and European researchers. From the European point of view, mostly French, Resilience is related to the concept of posttrauma growth, as Resilience is also defined in this case, as the capacity to overcome an adverse situation unscathed, learn from it and improve specific skills or abilities as a result of this process.

From the American perspective, the definition of Resilience refers solely to the individual’s confrontation process to get over an adverse situation and remain intact, but it does not link to the concept of posttrauma growth. Resilience reflects the ability or capacity to maintain a balance throughout the entire process (Bonnano, 2004).

Resilience is presented as a construct inferred on the one hand on the existence of an adverse situation and, on the other, the definition of growth and normalisation of a situation.

Resilience involves fulfilling three essential characteristics: Firstly, the existence of a threat, an adverse or risky situation posed to an individual; the second consists in the individual acquisition

of a tendency to overcome adverse circumstances and subsequently adapt, and finally, individuals must show competence in the development task based on their age and sociocultural context (Gaxiola, Frías, Hurtado, Salcido & Figueroa, 2011).

Despite Resilience manifesting in one individual, it is the result of the interaction of personal variables, e.g. intelligence quotient, social skills or emotional intelligence and environmental or contextual variables, e.g. family, reference groups, belonging and participation in associations or school (Carretero-Bermejo, 2010). Therefore, it is not possible to obtain sufficient variables, not that they are required, that result in a Resilience onset. However, we define risk factors as those that increase risk and/or failure to overcome adverse situations, and protection factors as those that encourage success and overcoming adversity (Carretero-Bermejo, 2010; Masten, 2007).

2. Justifications and objectives

The scores of the minors who live in juvenile facilities can reveal much about the tools with which the minors are equipped to face their reality. They can also explain the difficulties and problems they face, which, based on the perception of the Social Services professionals, often end up in remedy of reconsideration, conviction, prison and repeating exclusion models.

Besides, comparing their scores to those of the group of youths unrelated to the Social Services can shed some light on the role that juvenile facilities play in the education, development and satisfaction of needs of minors they care for as well as on potential training gaps for staff.

This can be key information to justify, in the first place, specific measures in regards to training and experience required for workers in juvenile facilities. Secondly, it can justify the distribution and operation of these resources and, in third place, the variables and dimensions to be considered in the evaluation processes of the centres.

Our study aimed, in the first place, at finding out about Emotional Intelligence scores of minors who reside in a juvenile facility overseen by the authorities in the reference Autonomous Community. In the second place, we compared these two scores with those of the minors who live with their families with no additional protection measures or Social Service resources. Finally, the objective of this study was to find information about the variables Emotional Intelligence and Resilience that helped us to understand and improve the change processes that minors undergo in juvenile facilities.

Resulting from these objectives, our working hypotheses were: 1) Underage individuals who

reside in juvenile facilities have significantly lower Emotional Intelligence scores than minors who live with their families and have no protection measures or help from the Social Services; 2) minors who reside in a juvenile facility have significantly lower resilience scores than minors who live with their families and have no protection measures nor are intervened by the Social Services.

3. Methodology

To carry out this study, a non-probabilistic sample of 486 people was selected for convenience with a 5.66% margin of error. The participants were classified by gender, age, study level and home city.

After having reviewed all the forms, we decided to keep 408 forms of those individuals who had completed them correctly, based on the investigation's design. The participants in this design are between 14 and 18 years old, with an average age of 16.89. From these, 198 were female (48.5%) and 210 male (51.5%).

In our sample, 138 participants (36.8%) declared having protection measures and living in a juvenile facility for minors cared by the public administration and the 270 remaining (63.2%) live with their families without any protection measure or there is no intervention from the Social Services.

Due to confidentiality reasons and the minors' legal rights to privacy with regard to their situation in protection centres, we decided not to publish any data in relation to cities, communities and/or provinces, juvenile facilities or public institutes who participated in this study. Besides, this measure was explicitly requested and a mandatory condition to decision-makers from the participating centres.

To carry out this analysis, it was requested, in the first place, to have an interview with decision-makers willing to take part in the study in order to walk through its content and discuss the purpose of the same. A written permission to gather information about the individuals who lived in the centres was requested to the authorities in the capacity of guardians and legal custodians. It was decided to avail of teaching staff, along with a technical team, in every facility so that the educator would distribute the forms to minimise interferences in the routines of the centre.

In parallel to this, we contacted the management teams in those high schools where the juvenile facilities are and requested their permission to gather data from these centres. In this case, we agreed that the forms were distributed during tutorial hours by those responsible the design. Prior

to this, the course tutors who participated in this study, circulated permission forms among the students for their families to give their consent. Participation in each of the design phases was voluntary and anonymous to guarantee the individuals' rights to privacy and comply with the existing legislation.

A questionnaire was designed to gather information about the social and demographic situation of each participant.

Secondly, it was decided to include the TMMS-24 test (Fernández-Berrocal, Extremera and Ramos, 2004). This test is comprised by 24 rather short items that must be agreed on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale collects information of three key aspects of intrapersonal Emotional Intelligence: attention to one's feelings (defined as the attention level that individuals pay to their own feelings and emotions), emotional clarity (i.e. the way individuals perceive and repair their own emotions. It refers to the individual's ability of interrupting negative emotional states and extending the time for the positive ones). This is the most widely used scale to assess Emotional Intelligence in studies carried out in Spanish speaking population groups.

Thirdly, the RESI-m test (Palomar & Gómez, 2010) was included to collect information in

relation to Resilience. This test is comprised by 43 items, with 5 response option Likert-type. It evaluates 5 dimensions: Personal Competence, defined as the feeling of adequacy, efficacy and competency to confront challenges and threats; Social Competence, defined as the capacity or ability to succeed in the interaction with the individual's background and self-satisfaction of needs; Family coherence, defined as the time every individual shares with their family unit and loyalty and strength levels of this relationship; Social Support, that refers to individuals' bonds with other individuals around them: and Personal Structure, defined as the rules and activities used by individuals to organise their life.

The reliability of the tests performed, i.e. internal consistency established by means of Cronbach's coefficient alpha, is high and accurate (0.83).

All the statistical analyses have been carried out using the software statistical package SPSS 20. The Student's t test in independent samples was employed to compare the average of the study groups and considering the statistical significance level for $p < .05$.

4. Results

Table 1: Comparison of averages in Emotional Intelligence

	N	Emotional Intelligence	Attention	Clarity	Emotional Adjustment
Juvenile facilities	138	62.20	21.95	20.56	20.08
Family residence	270	85.84	27.68	27.42	30.73
Mean difference		23.23	5.73	6.85	10.64
Sig. Bilateral		.000	.000	.000	.000

The results in Table 1 show statistically significant differences in the average scores of Emotional Intelligence and in the 3 abilities comprised in the questionnaire: Attention, Clarity and Emotional Adjustment in the groups of youths who are cared for by the Administration and who live in juvenile facilities and youths who live with their families and do not have any help from the Social Services, where the second group obtained

significantly higher scores in all the variables in this study.

These data show that there is a larger gap in the variable Emotional Adjustment. Furthermore, this variable has a higher average score value in the group of individuals who live in their family homes and a lower average score value in the individuals who live in juvenile facilities and are cared for by the Administration.

Table 2: Comparison of averages in Resilience

	N	Resilience	Strength	Competence	Family Support	Social Support	Structure
Juvenile facilities	138	133.47	55.80	24.08	18.52	14.63	15.47
Family residence	270	139.00	58.08	25.22	19.73	16.24	14.33
Mean difference		5.52	2.27	1.13	1.21	1.60	1.14
Sig. Bilateral		.029	.062	.090	.027	.009	.005

The results presented in Table 2 show that, the group of people who live in a juvenile facility obtained significantly lower scores than the group who lived with their families and had no contact with the Social Services. In regards to the dimensions in the questionnaire, the group of people who lived with their families obtained higher Resilience scores in all the dimensions except for Structure. However, these differences are not relevant to all the dimensions. We found significant differences with higher scores in the group of individuals who lived with their families in Resilience, Social Support and Family Support and in the group of people who lived in a juvenile facility at a Structure dimension level. We did not find significant differences in the scores for Strength and Competence.

These findings allow us to confirm our working hypotheses for Emotional Intelligence. In the case of Resilience, our assumption has been confirmed through the differences, which are significant here. Nonetheless, the above clarifications of the dimensions covered by the questionnaire to measure Resilience levels must be taken into consideration.

5. Discussion and conclusion

After analysing our data and, in relation to the results related to Emotional Intelligence, the following conclusions can be derived: Firstly, the results suggest that there is a need to develop emotional abilities of those individuals who live in a juvenile facility. From a systemic and ecological point of view, we believe that we could achieve better results if we approach this development task from two angles: by working directly with the minors who reside in the juvenile facilities, by enhancing and promoting their emotional abilities and by working with the staff, educators and carers, provided that, in most cases, these employees become the main attachment figures and referents, at an emotional level too, for the youths they are responsible for.

Secondly, while it is true that youths who live in juvenile facilities have scored significantly lower in the three emotional abilities explored in this study (i.e. Attention, Clarity and Emotional Adjustment), these differences are significantly higher in the case of Emotional Adjustment. Based on the data available, the difficulty to adjust emotions and, therefore, to adapt one's behaviour to a specific situation can explain, at least partially along with the other variables, why the minors who used juvenile facilities are more likely to use rehabilitation centres too. Regardless of this insight, it seems evident that the minors living in juvenile facilities will show higher difficulties to adjust their emotions and, consequently, to choose an adequate behaviour for each situation.

Thirdly, in spite of the higher scores achieved by the Control Group in comparison to the experimental group, it seems clear that there is a need to include emotion and emotional content in high school and primary school curricula. There are different reasons for this: individuals with specific emotional intelligence difficulties who do not have a stable family (in the long term, they may lose their connection to family members too), are students in these centres and have a changing environment in regards to their attachment figures may not have access to adequate models for their emotional development. Furthermore, the fact that the youths who live with their families scored higher, the scores in relation to the indicators in the questionnaire are not necessarily high, as they can be improved and, therefore, the success of the entire population would increase. In the last instance, it is time to normalise and include emotional content in the curriculum as a means to render this content visible and highlight its importance. Considering that the aim of the educative system is, precisely, to educate, we believe that leaving the emotional aspects out of the system implies neglecting a vital part of personal development.

Therefore, it is likely that the minors who live in juvenile facilities find more difficulties to succeed academically (Ferragut & Fierro, 2012; Jiménez Morales & López Zafra, 2009) based on the significantly low scores in Emotional Intelligence and that they will encounter more difficulties to find a job (Solano-Gómez, 2013) and/or have reduced their psychological well-being (Salguero, Palomera & Fernández-Berrocal, 2012).

Regarding the results obtained for the variable of Resilience, we find one more time, that the group of youngsters who live in juvenile facilities obtain significantly lower scores than the group who do not have any relation to the Social Services, although with some remarks; these scores show that the youths cared for by the Administration and who live in a juvenile facility are generally less prepared in terms of emotional management and resilience when they need to face high adversities. This assertion needs to be analysed in detail. We find that, the minors who live in juvenile facilities scored higher, also significant at a statistical level, in the area of Structure, which refers to norms and ways to organise life. This could point at the fact that juvenile facilities are able to provide norms and vital organisation during the time the minors spend in the centre. In any case, we wonder whether this information is ultimately positive to individuals, as they will see that structure and organisation go after they are 18 years old and they will have to create and build their own after finding themselves short of the necessary tools. At least, according to the results of this study, they will be more poorly equipped than the youths who live with their families and do not have contact with the Social Services.

However, based on the scores in Social Support and Family Support, it seems that the centres are not able to provide their residents with adequate social and family relation skills or encourage their Resilience levels at least. In any case, Resilience levels would not match with the levels provided in external families who are foreign to the Social Services. We cannot ignore that the main function of a juvenile facility is to replace the original family and create alternative attachment relationships and reference figures for the minors who live there. Based on the results of this study, this is not being achieved, or not to the same extent as in families without any contact with the social services. Therefore, the youths in the juvenile facilities are left in a disadvantaged position, let us insist, before a high adversity situation.

On the other hand, while Social Support can potentially last over time, after the minors have to abandon the juvenile facility, the results of this

study have revealed that this support is generated at a significantly lower extent than for minors who live with their families without contact with the Social Services. Even at present, the youths who live in juvenile facilities carry a stigma of having belonged to a social protection centre, which will condition the social relationships, at least in an initial stage, of this population group. The implication of this could be that all or most of the responsibility in relation to Family Support lies with the juvenile facilities and their staff and management, although they are supervised by the Administration. In the case of Social Support, however, the responsibility is shared between the centre, the staff and management but also the rest of institutions and services: primary and secondary schools, medical centres and care centres in the municipality. Therefore, any potential measure to be implemented would need to take into consideration all the agents who provide social support and education processes to minors under the guardianship of the Administration who live in juvenile facilities.

If we ignored these results in a scenario where they were confirmed for larger and more representative population groups, and after pondering the results of Resilience studies and their effects in different personal areas, we could be, again, limiting the potential academic success of the minors who live in juvenile facilities (Gaxiola, González, Contreras & Gaxiola, 2012), reducing their chances of success and of overcoming specially adverse situations (Rutter, 2007) and perpetuating their situation of exclusion by depriving them of some of the tools that would boost their development (Masten, 2007).

From the definition of resilience and its multi-dimensional character (Palomar & Gómez, 2010) and the diversity of personal and environmental variables, different action areas can be noted to increase Resilience scores for the minors who live in juvenile facilities: training staff and managers in Family Support, optimising resources shared by employees in the centres, identifying individuals' strengths and weaknesses, i.e. enhancing the former and improving the latter. This would be comprehensive, ecological and systemic work, as it would include individuals and their environment and not just the person at whom the Resilience development tasks are targeted.

5.1. Difficulties in the design of the study

The design of this study showed, firstly, some constraints in relation to missing or refused permission to access statistics on the number of minors who lived in juvenile facilities and are currently

in rehabilitation centres. Secondly, admittance to juvenile facilities proved difficult due to legal reasons and internal policies in the centres. The conditions to gain access to the centres varied according to their location and decision makers. In this sense, the size of this sample was impacted by the inaccessibility to some juvenile facilities and the administrations that were contacted. Finally, in regards to the partial sample provided, we have encountered constraints in how the data were obtained for the control groups with no contact with the Social Services, as there was no means to determine whether contact had been established after this study.

The size of the sample is representative in the locations selected for this study but does not extend to the entirety of centres in Spain and, therefore, this study serves as an initial approach to diagnostic evaluation of this situation. Once our assumptions are confirmed, it provides a line of work to pursue further investigation with the aim of improving the conditions for those minors who will have their protection measures discontinued after they are 18 years of age. Therefore, these results may not be representative of the group of minors who live in a juvenile facility elsewhere in Spain.

At last, it is worth mentioning that data obfuscation, e.g. access to previous measures of individuals who are in rehabilitation centres, difficulties encountered when assessing the situation of minors who live in juvenile facilities, by those responsible of the protection and rehabilitation areas, has posed serious challenges to the design of this analysis while it could have had a more simple solution, in our opinion.

5.2. Potential lines of work

We believe that it is essential to the minors' future cared for by the Administration in juvenile facilities, to deepen in the analysis of the abilities they have acquired to guarantee their success in their emancipation from the centres. It is equally critical to include, on the one hand a larger group of individuals in the study, so the results can be generalised to the entirety of the population, and, on the other, further variables that can explain the youths' situation in detail and provide us with information on the work content in the centres to increase the chance of success of the minors.

According to us, there may be a need to study the variables in scenarios where minors have been admitted to rehabilitation centres, regardless of their background. This could help to prevent these situations by working on them from the centres: juvenile facilities, foster families, primary and secondary schools and other institutions. Besides, this information could justify the design of work plans, study plans and, why not, further laws in relation to education, centres and minors cared for by the Administration to improve their situation when they are 18 years old.

Finally, we believe it is imperative to have an understanding of the situation, abilities and skills of those individuals who avail of additional protection measures: permanent or temporary foster families and who have declared a risk situation or an intervention process by the Social Services. This would allow us to identify their emotional abilities and Resilience levels and would ultimately shed some light on whether the work carried out by foster families or social centres turns out to be positive and to what degree, for individuals subject to fostering or intervention processes.

References

- Bonanno, G. A. (2004) Loss, trauma and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20-28.
- Carretero Bermejo, R. (2010). Resiliencia. Una visión positiva para la prevención e intervención desde los Servicios Sociales. *Nómadas. Critical Journal of Social and Juridical Sciences*, 27 (3).
- Cyrułnyk, B. (2001). *Los patitos feos. La resiliencia: una infancia infeliz no determina la vida*. Madrid. Gedisa.
- Fernández-Berrocal, P., Extremera, N. & Ramos, N. (2004). Validity and reliability of the Spanish modified version of the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 751-755.
- Ferragut, M., & Fierro, A. (2012). Inteligencia emocional, bienestar personal y rendimiento académico en preadolescentes. *Revista latinoamericana de Psicología*, 44(3), 95-104.
- Gartzia, L., Aritzeta, A., & Balluerka, N. (2012). Inteligencia emocional y Género : más allá de las diferencias sexuales Introducción. *Anales de Psicología*, 28, 567-575.
- Gaxiola, R., Frías, A., Hurtado A., Salcido, N., & Figueroa, F. (2011). Validación del inventario de resiliencia (IRES) en una población del noroeste de México. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 16 (1), 73-83.
- Gaxiola, J., González, S., Contreras, Z., & Gaxiola, E. (2012). Predictores del rendimiento académico en adolescentes con disposiciones resilientes y no resilientes. *Revista de Psicología*, 30 (1), 49-74.

- Gómez, E., & Kotliarenco, M. (2010). Resiliencia Familiar: un enfoque de investigación e intervención con familias multi-problemáticas. *Revista de Psicología (Santiago)*, 19, 2-10.
- Gorostiaga, A., Balluerka, N., & Soroa, G. (2014). Evaluación de la empatía en el ámbito educativo y su relación con la inteligencia emocional. *Revista de Educación*, 364, 43- 61.
- Jiménez Morales, M.I., & López-Zafra, E. (2009). Inteligencia Emocional y rendimiento escolar: Estado actual de la cuestión. *Revista latinoamericana de psicología*, 2 (1), 69-79.
- Lampel, J., Bhalla, A., & Jha, P. P. (2014). Does governance confer organisational resilience? Evidence from UK employee owned businesses. *European Management Journal*, 32 (1), 66-72.
- López Peláez, A. (2012). Profesión, ciencia y ciudadanía: retos para el Trabajo Social y los Servicios Sociales en el siglo XXI. *Azarbe. Revista Internacional de Trabajo Social y Bienestar*, 1, 61-71
- López, M., Rosales, J., Chávez, M., Byrne, S., & Cruz, J. (2009). Factores que influyen en el pronóstico de recuperación de las familias en riesgo psicosocial: el papel de la Resiliencia del menor. *Psicothema*, 21 (1), 90-96.
- Manciaux, M. (2003). *La resiliencia: resistir y rehacerse*. Barcelona: Gedisa
- Masten, A. S., (2007) Resilience in developing systems: Progress and promise as the fourth wave rises. *Development and Psychopathology* 19. 921-930.
- Masten, A. S. (2004) Regulatory Processes, Risk, and Resilience in Adolescent Development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1021, 321-319.
- Masten, A., & Obradovic, J. (2006) Competence and resilience in development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094, 13-27
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). *What is emotional intelligence? Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 197-215.
- Muñoz-Silva, A. (2012). El estudio de la resiliencia desde la perspectiva evolutiva y su aportación a la comprensión del riesgo y la protección en la intervención social. *Portularia. Revista de Trabajo Social*, 12 (1), 9-16.
- Palma-García, M., & Hombrados-Mendieta, I. (2013). Trabajo Social y resiliencia: revisión de elementos convergentes. *Portularia. Revista de Trabajo Social*. 13 (2), 89-98
- Palomar, J., & Gómez, N.E. (2010). Desarrollo de una escala de medición de la resiliencia con mexicanos (RESI-M). *Interdisciplinaria*, 27, 7-22.
- Rutter, M. (2007). Resilience, competence, and coping. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 3, 205-209.
- Salguero, J.M., Palomera, R., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2012) Perceived emotional intelligence as predictor of psychological adjustment in adolescents: a 1-year prospective study. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 27(1), 21-34.
- Salovey, P., & Grewal, D. (2006). Inteligencia Emocional. *Mente y Cerebro*, 16, 10-20.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990) Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9 (3), 185-211.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., & Caruso, D. (2002). The positive psychology of emotional intelligence. In C. R. Snyder, y S. J. Lopez (Eds.). *The Handbook of positive psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Solano-Gómez, A. (2013). Inteligencia Emocional en el trabajo. Sus implicaciones y el rol de la psicología laboral. *Humanitas*. 10 (10). 201-214.
- Vera, B., Carbelo, B., & Vecina, M.L. (2007) La experiencia traumática desde la Psicología Positiva: Resiliencia y crecimiento postraumático. *Papeles del psicólogo*, 27. 40-49.

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Carretero-Bermejo, R. (2018). Resiliencia e inteligencia emocional. Variables de protección en menores residentes en recursos de protección. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 32 129-138. DOI:10.7179/PSRI_2018.32.10

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Raúl Carretero Bermejo. Plaza de Agustín Salido, 7, 1º A 13003 Ciudad Real.
info@raulcarreterobermejo.com

ACADEMIC PROFILE

Raúl Carretero Bermejo. Doctor en Educación por la UNED con la tesis titulada “Inteligencia Emocional y Sexismo. Aproximación al componente emocional del Sexismo” en la que obtiene la calificación de Sobresaliente con mención Cum Laude. Licenciado en Psicopedagogía en la UCLM y diplomado en Magisterio. Ha trabajado como profesor asociado en la Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación de Cuenca, UCLM, en el grado de Educación Social. En la actualidad es profesor asociado en la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM).