

2020

Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated Juveniles

Amy Rhoads Jozan
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Amy Jozan

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Sandra Caramela-Miller, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Ethel Perry, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Laurie Westlake, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated

Juveniles

by

Amy Jozan

MA, Walden University, 2017

BS, Valdosta State University, 2015

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2020

Abstract

Prosocial bonds have been key in juvenile criminal desistance. Juvenile facility placement has resulted in deterioration of important prosocial supports and social isolation, increasing risk for recidivism. Loneliness has been increasingly prevalent in a facility setting, often leading to ongoing behavioral and health problems. Youth incarcerated longer than 1 year have experienced higher rates of physical and mental health challenges, lasting into adulthood. Lengthy juvenile incarceration impacts loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance implications have been underexplored. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore themes associated with reaffiliation motive, or lifelong problems resulting from loneliness, after experiencing youth incarceration longer than 1 year. The analytical process utilized was interpretive phenomenological analysis to understand the 8 participants' cognitive processing of the unexplored phenomena. Research Question 1 was designed to explore lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, and postrelease relationships. Research Question 2 was designed to explore these concepts in relation with desistance processes. Social maladaptation, institutionalization, stigmatization, identifying with prosocial support, antisocial peer dissociation, and loneliness were 6 overarching themes discovered. Therapy targeting social maladaptation, alternative rehabilitation efforts, and provision of relatable prosocial support systems for youth are recommended. Future research should focus on generalizability of findings applicable to diverse forensic populations. Findings may be used to promote positive social change for improving public safety, mitigating recidivism, and avoiding negative transgenerational effects of mass incarceration.

Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated

Juveniles

by

Amy Jozan

MA, Walden University, 2017

BS, Valdosta State University, 2015

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2020

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated for my God who has put me into the position to maintain an educational platform of proliferating positive social change. God is my biggest support and provider. My husband has supported my journey and encouraged me from beginning to end. My best friend, Kristina Dunagan, empowered me during hardship. Nursing staff have provided care, support, and love to my medically fragile son so that I may achieve professional aspirations. This process would not have been possible without the love of my parents and children. The faces of my children inspired me to keep pursuing my goals. Inspiration coming from the love that you all have provided is how I was able to achieve my goals. All glory is given to God.

Acknowledgments

I would like to share my love and gratefulness for my God, the Father. He built my endurance by encouraging me to persevere. Although life has been met with special challenges, God has pulled me through this journey by His unyielding grace. God has strengthened me and provided me with this opportunity. I am forever grateful.

I would like to acknowledge those who are directly responsible for assisting in my completion of this dissertation, Dr. Caramela-Miller, Dr. Perry, and Dr. Westlake. Kristina Dunagan assisted with intercoding and peer review, resulting in overall quality for this project. Together, you have encouraged me to be a greater writer and developed my scholarly voice. You all were responsible for helping me through this process and a substantial part of my success. There were special challenges with my medically fragile son, and you all have encouraged me to push forward, despite any hardship. I would like to acknowledge my program instructors who provided me with the tools for completion of my dissertation and development as a scholar. I am profoundly grateful for those who had a direct and indirect impact on the completion of this journey. I pray that God blesses you all in your future endeavors.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Problem Statement.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Theoretical Framework.....	8
Nature of the Study.....	10
Definitions.....	11
Assumptions.....	13
Scope and Delimitations	15
Limitations	17
Significance.....	18
Summary	20
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Literature Search Strategy.....	24
Theoretical Framework.....	25
Reaffiliation Motive.....	25
Literature Review Related to Key Concepts.....	29

Incarceration	29
Loneliness	36
Relationships.....	45
Recidivism	56
Summary and Conclusions	61
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	65
Introduction.....	65
Research Design and Rationale	66
Role of the Researcher	67
Methodology.....	69
Participant Selection Logic	69
Instrumentation	73
Recruitment Procedures	77
Data Analysis Plan.....	79
Credibility	81
Transferability.....	82
Dependability	82
Confirmability.....	83
Intercoder Reliability	83
Ethical Procedures	84
Summary	86
Chapter 4: Results.....	88

Introduction.....	88
Pretest	89
Setting	89
Demographics	91
Data Collection	92
Sample Selection.....	92
Data Analysis	93
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	96
Credibility	96
Transferability.....	97
Dependability	97
Confirmability.....	97
Results.....	98
Summary	111
Chapter 5: Conclusions	115
Introduction.....	115
Interpretation of the Findings.....	116
Limitations of the Study.....	120
Recommendations.....	122
Implications.....	125
Positive Social Change Implications	126
Theoretical Implications	129

Practice Implications	131
Conclusion	133
References.....	139
Appendix A: Recruitment Advertisements.....	168
Appendix B: List of Search Terms and Databases	169
Appendix C: Consent To Audio Record.....	170
Appendix D: Consent To Advertise.....	171
Appendix E: Consent Form	173
Appendix F: Interview Protocol.....	176
Appendix G: Procedural Checklist	178

List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Demographics.....	92
Table 2. Overarching Themes and Subordinate Themes	99
Table 3. Social Relationships Postrelease.....	100
Table 4. Social Support Needs.....	102
Table 5. Reentry Experience Related to Social Support and Desistance.....	105

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Adult physical and mental health are negatively impacted after 1 year of youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Incarceration has resulted in social isolation, loneliness, and deterioration of critical social supports for youth (Pettus-Davis, Doherty, Veeh, & Drymon, 2017; Reid, 2017). Social isolation has been more prevalent in a facility after experiencing disconnection from family and friends (Berg, Beijersbergen, Nieuwbeerta & Dirkzwager, 2018; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Feelings of loneliness and depression have been positively correlated with aggressive behaviors in emerging adults (Yavuzer, Albayrak, & Kılıçarslan, 2018). Loneliness, or loss of relationships in incarcerated juveniles, has negatively impacted future relationships needed for successful desistance (Gray, 2018; McMahon & Jump, 2018) and healthy development (Ma, 2019).

Prosocial relationships and feeling socially connected have been difficult to maintain for postrelease populations (Moore & Tangney, 2017; Tracey & Hanham, 2017). Barriers in adolescent prosocial relationships have resulted in challenges for desistance (McMahon & Jump, 2018; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). One of the largest protective factors for recidivism has been quality prosocial relationships (Metcalf, Baker, & Brady, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Loneliness has been a common experience for incarcerated populations, often resulting in social withdrawal (Moore & Tangney, 2017; Smet et al., 2017). Youth have been at higher risk for experiencing loneliness and social isolation, leading to problematic life trajectories (Danneel et al., 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019).

Lengthy youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018) and loneliness have been affiliated with debilitating consequences for mental, psychological, and physical health (Williams & Braun, 2019). Investigation of desistance barriers in youth is beneficial for fashioning developmentally appropriate intervention services (McMahon & Jump, 2018; Mizel & Abrams, 2017). Exploration on lengthy juvenile incarceration, postrelease prosocial relationships, and implications for desistance is necessary (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Juvenile desistance barrier discovery may result in development of effective rehabilitative efforts, social services, and policy for younger populations.

Research on desistance barriers impacted by lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, and challenges in postrelease prosocial relationships may have positive social implications. Youth recidivism has been a public safety issue (Hancock, 2017) and can be mitigated by increasing social capital (Coppola, 2018). Crime disengagement through more effective service delivery may be a result of this exploration. Loneliness and youth recidivism have been a public concern, necessitating further investigation of interrelated phenomena to improve public safety efforts (Fuller, 2019; Hancock, 2017).

Challenges associated with long-term youth incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism are described in the remainder of Chapter 1. Juvenile recidivism has been studied extensively and remains a substantial problem (Tabashneck, 2018). Youth incarceration has resulted in heightened experiences of loneliness (Reid, 2017). Loneliness varies across ontology and may negatively impact the nature of social interactions needed for successful desistance (Fuller, 2019; Gray, 2018). The theoretical framework was used to explore consequences of loneliness in lengthy

youth incarceration, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance. The discovery of youth desistance barriers can result in more comprehensive, effective, properly tailored programs.

Background

Incarceration of juveniles has been positively correlated with negative impacts on subsequent adult mental, physical, and psychological health (Barnert et al., 2018; Porter & Demarco, 2019). Youth incarceration for any length of time has been positively correlated with worsened adult health outcomes (Baćak, Andersen, & Schnittker, 2019; Barnert et al., 2018). Adult suicidality rates, mental health, and physical health have significantly worsened after 1 year of youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarceration has resulted in the systematic deterioration of healthy development (Barnert et al., 2018). Key determinants of social and behavioral health can be addressed without youth confinement (Barnert et al., 2018).

Incarceration has resulted in experiences of loneliness or social isolation (Reid, 2017), having negative ramifications on youth development and future relationships (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness has been positively correlated with negative behavioral and health implications for youth (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018). Prolonged loneliness has been associated with persistent problems throughout the lifespan (Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness from incarceration may result in lifelong depression, social withdrawal, and difficulty with relationships (Gray, 2018; Williams & Braun, 2019).

Loneliness has been more prevalent in certain populations throughout development (Fuller, 2019). Youth have had higher rates of loneliness with propensity for continuation throughout the lifespan (Williams & Braun, 2019). Adolescence is a phase where substantial development occurs (Demers et al., 2019) often accompanied by more severe experiences of loneliness (Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness and social isolation have resulted in deteriorating motivation to develop prosocial bonds needed for healthy development, life satisfaction, and avoiding persistent criminality patterns (Demers et al., 2019; Ma, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Williams & Braun, 2019). Incarceration has been associated with deterioration of important social support systems (Berg et al., 2018), critical to positive youth development (Ma, 2019).

Adolescents' relationship needs shift towards higher focus in quality romantic relationships and friendships as part of developmentally normative behavior (Shulman, Seiffge-Krenke, Ziv, & Tuval-Mashiach, 2019). The ability to have quality social bonds, especially after incarceration, is critical for healthy development and positive life trajectories (Hecke, Vanderplasschen, Damme, & Vandavelde, 2019; Ma, 2019; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Strained family relationships for adolescents have had negative implications on developmental transitioning, criminality, and future romantic relationships (Eichelsheim, Blokland, Meeus, & Branje, 2018; Jin, Zhao, & Zou, 2019). Juveniles require developmentally normative patterns toward romantic relationships fulfilling a natural progression toward steady intimate relationships (Shulman et al., 2019). Romantic relationships for juveniles are interrupted during incarceration and this may have an aversive impact on recidivism.

Close social support networks have reduced stress, recidivism, and other risk factors for postrelease youth (Johnson, Pagano, Lee, & Post, 2018; Kras, 2018; Shannon & Hess, 2019; Valera & Boyas, 2019). Youth detainment has been associated with higher levels of loneliness (Reid, 2017). Loneliness has been positively correlated with adverse health, social withdrawal, and maladaptive behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019). Adolescents are at highest risk for experiencing prolonged loneliness (Williams & Braun, 2019). Maladaptive behavioral patterns resulting from loneliness may adversely impact prosocial interactions (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships postrelease, and how these factors inform the ability to desist crime are undiscovered (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Increased understanding on lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism can result in positive transgenerational impacts (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Reising, Ttofi, Farrington, & Piquero, 2019).

Problem Statement

Youth incarceration has been associated with heightened loneliness (Reid, 2017), having negative implications for prosocial relationships needed in successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Juvenile incarceration and recidivism have been a massive global problem (Adekeye & Emmanuel, 2018). Detainment has had adverse impacts on future employment, exacerbated preexisting mental illness, and can result in higher recidivism rates (Gifford, 2019). Youth incarceration has correlated positively with health problems in subsequent adult functional limitations, physical, mental, and developmental

problems (Barnert et al., 2018). Functional limitations, depression, and suicidality rates have been significantly worsened after 1 year of youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Negative impacts on health and development from incarceration have transferred generationally (Reising et al., 2019). Youth incarceration has had little appreciable impact on recidivism (Brame, Mulvey, Schubert, & Piquero, 2018) and has presented as a health risk (Barnert et al., 2018).

Youth incarceration has resulted in disconnection from important social supports during development, exacerbating experiences of social isolation, loneliness, and depression (Smet et al., 2017; Duke, 2017). Depression and loneliness during youth has had a negative correlation with adult health, future relationships, and increased aggression (Fuller, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018). Loneliness has been a public concern for physical health, mental health, and civic engagement (Duke, 2017; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019). Mental illness has had a positive correlation with heightened recidivism risk (Cuddeback, Grady, Wilson, Deirse, & Morrissey, 2019; L. Honegger, & K. Honegger, 2019). Youth loneliness or lack of prosocial support has been positively correlated with problems in development, poor physical health, and problematic mental health (Fuller, 2019; Ma, 2019).

Social isolation and loneliness have been common experiences during incarceration (Gray, 2018). Incarcerated populations have often experienced loneliness (Gray, 2018), negatively impacting prosocial interactions needed in protection against development of unhealthy pathologies and recidivism (Backman, Laajasalo, Jokela, & Aronen, 2018). Propensity toward maladaptive behavior subsequent from experiencing

loneliness in populations requires more discovery (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Prosocial relationships' feature in recidivism after lengthy juvenile incarceration has been unspecified and exploration can provide insight for desistance barriers (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance was explored to address barriers for youth crime disengagement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance. Phenomenology was the research paradigm used to explore youth desistance barriers after lengthy incarceration. I used the phenomenological paradigm to explore and describe phenomena (Smith, 1996). Experiences of young adults incarcerated longer than 1 year in adolescence, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism were the central focus for exploration. I conducted this phenomenological study to describe lengthy incarceration of youth, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and how collective phenomena *impact* desistance processes.

Impact in qualitative research typically references participants' truths regarding their lived experiences of particular phenomenon (Howard, Katsos, & Gibson, 2019). In qualitative research, the word *impact* refers to data generated from participants, who voluntarily express first-hand experiences in their own words and how they have been affected by a particular phenomenon. This process can result in participants speaking of multiple or complex influences involving a particular phenomenon. Therefore, *impact* referenced the participant's own truths regarding their experiences.

The intent of exploration was to describe desistance barriers and impeded prosocial relationships, subsequent to experiencing loneliness from lengthy youth incarceration. Descriptions of desistance barriers were based on participants' experiences aligning with the phenomenological research approach (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). Specific concepts investigated were lengthy incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance. Primary objectives were to develop understanding of how lengthy incarceration impacts loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and impedes desistance for youth.

Research Questions

Research Question 1 (RQ1): How does the lived experience of loneliness in young adults, who as juveniles underwent a lengthy incarceration, impact prosocial relationship formation postrelease?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): How does the lived experience of postrelease relationships in young adults formerly incarcerated as juveniles inform the ability to desist criminality?

Theoretical Framework

I used reaffiliation motive (RAM) as a framework guiding concepts related to juvenile lengthy incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism (Qualter et al., 2015). The origin of RAM derived from Qualter et al.'s (2015) theoretical explanation for loneliness being a strong motivational force across development driving human behavior (Qualter et al., 2015). Loneliness has been theorized as an important component of evolution (Hawkey & Schumm, 2019). The

motivation to reconnect to others is essential for reproduction, developmental growth, and survival (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Spithoven, S. Cacioppo, Goossens, & J. Cacioppo, 2019).

RAM is a theoretical explanation for prolonged loneliness resulting once the motivation to reconnect fails (Qualter et al., 2015). Loneliness is a common experience across development and may result in cognitive maladaptation (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Cognitive reaffiliation processes become defective if lonely people within certain environments become hypervigilant to social threats, creating reinforcing maladaptation (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Qualter et al., 2015). Youth under lengthy confinement have been considered medically fragile (Barnert et al., 2018) and frequently experience loneliness (Reid, 2017). Youth in general have heightened risk of experiencing prolonged loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015). Loneliness may result in social withdrawal (Qualter et al., 2015; Williams & Braun, 2019), negatively impacting prosocial relationships needed for desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Loneliness as it relates to lengthy youth incarceration, postrelease prosocial relationships, and implications for recidivism, collectively required further investigation (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Qualter et al., 2015). RAM was utilized to explore how loneliness of lengthy youth incarceration impacted postrelease prosocial relationships and desistance. Exploration of lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and implications for recidivism may result in understanding possible desistance barriers (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Qualter et al., 2015). I further discuss RAM and major theoretical propositions in Chapter 2.

The theoretical framework of RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) aligns with a phenomenological approach for exploring unexamined phenomena (Flocco, 2020; Smith, 1996). I developed RQ1 to explore concepts of lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, and impacts on prosocial relationships postrelease through participant cognition (Noon, 2018). Qualitative approaches can be utilized for describing phenomena through personalized experiential interpretations (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). I developed RQ2 for exploring participant experience regarding the ability to desist criminality based on collective experiences of lengthy juvenile incarceration and postrelease relationships. RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) can be used to enhance understanding of experiences by utilizing a qualitative approach (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). I developed research questions to address explorational goals through use of semistructured and unformalized conversation interview techniques. I utilized semistructured interview techniques to gain deeper exploration of phenomena (Noon, 2018).

Nature of the Study

The exploratory approach that I applied was a phenomenological design (Noon, 2018). Exploration was the central focus of this research. I utilized interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in data interpretation to describe subjective and *true* essence underlying the lived experiences of participants (Noon, 2018). My goals of explorational research with the phenomenological design, utilizing IPA as an analytical method. IPA is widely used in phenomenological studies for exploring unearthed phenomena (Flocco, 2020).

Lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism were the phenomena that I investigated. Juvenile incarceration durations, loneliness, and prosocial relationships during reentry, were collectively requiring discovery to gain intellect on possible desistance barriers (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Porter & Demarco, 2019). Exploration was focused on descriptive accounts in participant cognition relating to personal understanding of phenomena experienced (Mant, Kirby, Cox, & Burke, 2018; Noon, 2018). I utilized IPA methods to explore participants' experiences in relation with personal communication, social, contextual, and emotional recognition as a central analytical focus (Mant et al., 2018).

Young adults with former experiences of lengthy incarceration during adolescence were used for the sampling frame. I recruited voluntary participants after they responded to flyers placed at consenting locations, or through online advertisement. Semistructured interview and informalized conversation techniques were used to gain detailed descriptions for thematic interpretation (Mant et al., 2018; Noon, 2018). I interpreted data using IPA methodology to find thematic elements describing the true essence of phenomena (Noon, 2018).

Definitions

Developmentally appropriate interventions: Youth have different developmental needs than adults, and this should be reflective in rehabilitation interventions (Tabashneck, 2018). Developmental pathways may be intertwined, and rehabilitation delivery must account for multiple aspects of development simultaneously to enhance outcomes (London & Ingram, 2018).

Life-course-persistent offenders: Individuals classified as life-course-persistent offenders characteristically begin offending early in adolescence and have significant criminal histories (Brame et al., 2018).

Loneliness: Loneliness is a subjective emotional response to experiencing social isolation or dissatisfaction in quality of social relationships (Williams & Braun, 2019). Prolonged loneliness has had a variety of adverse results on psychological wellness and health (Chiao, Chen, & Yi, 2019).

Long-term youth incarceration: Developmental, mental, and physical differences have resulted in differential impacts of a prolonged incarceration on populations (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarceration for more than 1 year has had a profound impact on subsequent adult health, indicative of lengthy incarceration for younger populations (Barnert et al., 2018).

Prosocial relationships: Prosocial relationships have been positively correlated with youth desistance (McMahon & Jump, 2018). Prosocial relationships have been defined as having human associations encompassing social factors consistent with rehabilitation goals (Best, Musgrove, & Hall, 2018).

Recidivism: Recidivism has been challenging to measure and involves understanding patterns of offending over time (Brame et al., 2018). The definition used for recidivism relates to repeating offenses consistent with lengthy patterns of offending (Brame et al., 2018) and supervision term violations (Harding, Morenoff, Nguyen, & Bushway, 2017).

Social isolation: Social isolation is quantifiable and represents an objective lack in relationships or contacts (Beller & Wagner, 2018). Social isolation is an independent construct from loneliness that has shared small relational correlation (Beller & Wagner, 2018).

Young adulthood: Adolescence is ages 13 to 17 years and young adulthood spans from 18 throughout 29 years old (Christian et al., 2019).

Youth antisocial relationships: Partners promoting antisocial acts or delinquency, reflect antisocial relationships for youth (Backman et al., 2018). Antisocial relationships have been associated as an individual risk factor for delinquency and antisocial behavior (Angulski, Armstrong, & Bouffard, 2018).

Youth incarceration: Prosecution and sentencing resulting in detention was attributed to youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarceration has been defined as spending time in prison, jail, a juvenile detention center, or any other correctional facility (Barnert et al., 2018).

Assumptions

Assumptions critical to the study meaning were young adults with prior experience of lengthy juvenile incarceration may represent adolescent offenders impacted by loneliness. Incarceration commonly has resulted in heightened experiences of social isolation (Gray, 2018). Loneliness and social isolation are independent concepts (Beller & Wagner, 2018), that have had common prevalence within incarcerated individuals (Gray, 2018). Loneliness may result in formation of maladaptive attributes, having negative impacts on prosocial opportunities (Fay & Maner, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid,

2019). Adolescent populations are at heightened risk for forming maladaptive attributes subsequent from experiencing loneliness (Vanhalst, Luyckx, Petegem, & Soenens, 2018; Williams & Braun, 2019). Prosocial supports are a necessary part of youth development (Vanhalst et al., 2018) and desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Assumptions underlying the study were incarceration durations impact loneliness, having implications for prosocial supports postrelease, and desistance patterns in young adults. Assumptions were based on collective study findings relevant to the phenomena investigated and essential for investigational context. Participants who have backgrounds of prolonged incarceration as a juvenile may not have the same experiences or perceptions. Loneliness is a subjective state resulting from a combination of interrelated factors and personal perception (Chiao et al., 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019). Participant information may not be entirely verifiable, and I assumed that responses were truthful. Participant honesty was promoted through preserving anonymity, confidentiality, and understanding withdrawal from the study was optional at any time without ramifications. Credibility was further enhanced by using eight participants to reach adequate levels of data saturation (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Noon, 2018). Results of the study may be credible based on member checks, mutual engagement, and using direct quotes for data analysis (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Assumptions were all essential in conducting this study to explore adolescent lengthy incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance patterns.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of the study was based on juvenile incarceration durations longer than 1 year, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and implications for desistance. Lengthy incarceration has resulted in heightened loneliness (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017) and poor mental health (Barnert et al., 2018). Loneliness has had negative implications for prosocial relationships (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) needed to successfully desist (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Lengthy youth incarceration, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance were collectively lacking in evidence (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Loneliness across ontology, diverse populations, and varying contexts are required to understand maladaptive behavior (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). I developed research questions to address problems associated with experiencing lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance.

I selected the focus of phenomena based on a current gap in knowledge having potential implications for juvenile maladaptation and recidivism. Maladaptation resulting from loneliness has important implications for prosocial involvement (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) crucial in avoidance of postrelease adolescent criminality patterns (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Studies with quantitative methodology have been exhaustively used to quantify concepts of incarceration durations, loneliness, relationship dyads, and recidivism. I selected a phenomenological investigation to address unearthed phenomena based on participant experiences, resulting with enhanced depth of data not obtainable through using quantitative methodology (Noon, 2018).

I accomplished participant recruitment through self-voluntary response to study advertisements (see Appendix A). Participants were young adults who experienced juvenile incarceration for 1 year or longer and currently reside within their community. Participants were young adults (ages 18 to 29 years) experiencing reentry no longer than five years to prevent cognitive bias in memory recollection and maintain homogeneity for producing more accurate thematic data. Memory consolidation is not a stable phenomenon (Macleod, Reynolds, & Lehmann, 2018; Tambini & Davachi, 2019) and bias may be introduced overtime for emotional self-regulation (Vrijisen et al., 2018). Participants were geographically diverse resulting in differential impacts on individual experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of phenomena (Ou, 2019). Recruitment methods did not include purposefully targeting vulnerable populations such as pregnant women, prisoners, mentally ill, physically ill, or children (Lapid, Clarke, & Wright, 2019). I did not include certain identities for exploration of the participants' intersectionality within this study. Theoretical frameworks not utilized, and germane to loneliness, are based on social reconnection, evolutionary processes, motivation, and social systems.

I selected RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) to ground the study and expand upon undiscovered phenomena (Flocco, 2020). RAM was used in place of other theories as it is most relevant to the present study purpose and approach. Other related theories of loneliness have grounding in evolutionary premise (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). RAM is a current theory on motivational forces and environmental associations of loneliness driving human behavior, having more pertinence

to the present inquiry (Qualter et al., 2015). I used RAM to rationalize investigation of maladaptive behavior resulting from loneliness after experiencing lengthy youth incarceration and how these factors impact prosocial relationships needed for desistance.

I discussed theories and concepts in relevancy to RAM throughout Chapter 2 with enhanced detail. I did not investigate myriads of other factors related to juvenile offender challenges in reentry or desistance. The investigation focus was young adults' experiences of lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and implications for desistance. Generalizability is an inherent restriction within qualitative designs composed of smaller sample sizes and can make transferability challenging (Daniel, 2019). Rigor and consistency in qualitative methodology results with transferability of findings applicable on alike populations (Daniel, 2019).

Limitations

Transferability of findings being utilized in other settings or populations may be challenging (Daniel, 2019). The findings may be useful within similar contexts by using rigorous methodology congruent to producing transferability in comparable qualitative studies (Daniel, 2019). Transferability in qualitative studies are consistent with rigor established through trustworthiness, credibility, and auditability (Daniel, 2019). I obtained thick and rich descriptions from participants to establish transferability of findings (Noon, 2018). Semistructured interviews are commonly utilized to achieve depth of data needed for transferability (Noon, 2018).

I ensured dependability in findings through careful documentation of all processes for auditing (Flocco et al., 2020). Methodological limitations are results may not be

generalizable (Noon, 2018). Phenomenology was the study design and sample sizes are relatively smaller than larger quantitative studies (Garwood & Hassett, 2019; Mant et al., 2018). Findings may not be generalizable across other diverse populations and quantitative replication might pose as challenging. The results of the study are beneficial and may be utilized to guide future research.

Inherent limitation to the study may be personal researcher intersectionality if included in interpretation of participants' responses (Larsson, Holmbom-Larsen, Torisson, Strandberg, & Londos, 2019). Influence of personal bias in qualitative designs may heighten risk for contaminated data (Larsson et al., 2019). Personal influence in qualitative designs are inherently unavoidable (Baksh, 2018; Thurairajah, 2019). Reflection and oversight limited personal bias and avoided misrepresentation of data (Larsson et al., 2019; Roshaidai & Arifin, 2018). Qualitative data is a subjective research methodology and may be regarded less reliable or valid than alternative methods. Rigorous methodology is applied to qualitative research for performing exploratory studies on phenomena lacking examination (Flocco, 2020). Reasonable measures to address limitations are comparable to rigor utilized in other qualitative studies. Rigor used to address methodological limitations encompassed data triangulation, careful documentation, member checks, saturation, reflexivity, and peer review (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Flocco, 2020).

Significance

This research may be used to understand unexplored phenomena of 1 or more years of juvenile incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and

desistance. Recidivism has had detrimental consequences and remains a substantial risk for youth with former criminal justice involvement (Brame et al., 2018). Youth crime addressed through lengthy incarceration has resulted in deteriorated health and problematic development (Barnert et al., 2018). Incarceration has been an economically impractical crime reduction strategy, having indirect health care costs for individuals with relation to detained persons (Provencher & Conway, 2019). Incarcerated populations have been understood to experience increased feelings of loneliness during detainment (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017). Loneliness has been positively correlated with a variety of health problems and may result in maladaptive behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Maladaptation has resulted in problematic prosocial interactions (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) and has implications for barriers to successful desistance (Moore & Tangney, 2017). Barriers for desistance in emerging adults require discovery to mitigate social problems caused by recidivism (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Marginalized populations have effectively voiced perceptions, leading to enhanced service delivery or reentry transition strategies (Herman & Sexton, 2017; Tracey & Hanham, 2017). Investigation on unexplored phenomena regarding recidivism will result in effective reentry service planning and rehabilitation programming. Proper intervention planning can result in substantial positive implications. Early intervention, cognitive treatment, and access to supportive resources, have been associated with reductions in recidivism (Makarios, Cullen, & Piquero, 2017; Menon & Kandasamy, 2018; Mizel & Abrams, 2017). Results were used to recommend effective programming and policy for more appropriate sanctioning practices. Policy directed at community-

based programs having favorable long-term benefits, in place of punitive practices, should be considered (Drake, 2018).

Summary

Youth recidivism has been a major social problem warranting investigation of risk factors, protective factors, and correlational variables for repeat offending (Brame et al., 2018; Coppola, 2018). Recidivism has been the result of the interaction between different variables and continues to increase (Adekeye & Emmanuel, 2018). Marginalized populations need their voices to be heard resulting in better informed research and service provision (Tracey & Hanham, 2017). Desistance barriers for postrelease youth is a current problem requiring more exploration (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Youth incarceration has resulted in deteriorated subsequent adult mental and physical health (Barnert et al., 2018; Porter & Demarco, 2019). Adolescence is characterized by substantial development positively correlated with sharp increases in risk behavior, which halts prior to reaching adulthood (Rocque, Beckley, & Piquero, 2019; Tabashneck, 2018). Punitive sanctioning in the form of youth detainment may be contradictory towards rehabilitation goals (Tabashneck, 2018). Incarceration has resulted in increased experiences of loneliness and social isolation (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017). Loneliness may result in maladaptation impeding future relationships (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019) critical to successful desistance for youth (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

RAM was the theory that I used to understand interactional impacts of juvenile incarceration for more than 1 year, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and desistance

patterns (Qualter et al., 2015). Research regarding juvenile incarceration duration, impacts on prosocial relationships, and desistance barriers has been scarce (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Maladaptation resulting from loneliness across ontology requires further discovery (Qualter et al., 2015). The purpose of this investigation was exploring phenomena regarding longer juvenile incarceration durations, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and implications for recidivism. I applied IPA methodology to this exploration for understanding the participants' interpretations of phenomena (Noon, 2018). Outcomes have resulted in information necessary for rehabilitation efforts targeting youth recidivism and guiding future research. There is a thorough review of scholarly content, justification for exploration, and significant research gap development provided in Chapter 2.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The specific problem that I addressed through exploration was barriers to desistance subsequent from experiencing lengthy juvenile incarceration and interruption of prosocial relationships. Prosocial relationships have been crucial for young offenders in the reentry process (Shannon & Hess, 2019). Incarceration has resulted in the separation of individuals from important support systems (Mikytuck & Woolard, 2019; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Incarceration duration has been positively correlated with worsened health outcomes (Barnert et al., 2018) and experiences of loneliness (Reid, 2017). Juveniles undergoing lengthy incarceration may develop maladaptation from experiencing prolonged loneliness (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Reid, 2017), having negative implications for future relationships and desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

The investigation purpose was to explore collective factors of lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, postrelease relationships, and desistance. I used IPA to explore and describe undiscovered phenomena with participant cognition as a central focus (Noon, 2018). Barriers in desistance related to postrelease prosocial support after lengthy juvenile incarceration durations, necessitated additional discovery (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Studies on maladaptive patterns caused by loneliness across context, age progression, and ontology using IPA methodology, are unestablished (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). I used IPA methods to alleviate a gap in knowledge regarding lengthy incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and discovery of possible desistance barriers.

Juvenile incarceration has commonly resulted in experiences of loneliness (Reid, 2017), having negative lifelong consequences (Gray, 2018; Williams & Braun, 2019). Poor adult health, social withdrawal, and psychological challenges have been associated with loneliness across development (Chiao et al., 2019; Duke, 2017; Fuller, 2019; Gray, 2018; Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness has been positively correlated with social withdrawal, problems in social interactions, and depression (Gray, 2018). Prosocial relationships are crucial to development (Ma, 2019) and desistance for a young population (McMahon & Jump, 2018). Social support has had positive mental health and physical benefits needed to avoid maladaptive pathologies (Backman et al., 2018; Macrynika, Miranda, & Soffer, 2018). Juvenile incarceration has been associated with experiences of social isolation and disconnection from prosocial supports (Reid, 2017; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Experiences of loneliness within the context of incarceration, may have lifelong implications for youth prosocial support and recidivism.

I described the literature search strategy, theoretical framework, scholarly content related to key constructs, and provided a comprehensive summary in Chapter 2. I reviewed studies to describe constructs and previously used methodology, leading to an identified gap in knowledge (Bonfield, Fearnside, & Cramp, 2018; Umar, Ameh, Muriithi, & Mathai, 2019). I utilized a theoretical framework section to rationalize the selected theory guiding logic for impacts of prolonged loneliness within criminological context (CohenMiller & Pate, 2019; Collins & Stockton, 2018). Loneliness of incarcerated youth has been common (Reid, 2017), having implications for maladaptive behavioral patterns (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) impeding social

relationships needed in successful reentry (McMahon & Jump, 2018). Scholarly research specific to the phenomena resulted in development of constructs, insights, and significance (Bonfield et al., 2018).

Literature Search Strategy

Library database variations resulted in narrowing parameters for content relevant to specific fields of study, topics, and variables (Bonfield et al., 2018). I utilized Criminal Justice Database, ProQuest Central, PsycARTICLES, Thoreau Multi-Database, Google Scholar, Sage Journal, and Elton B. Stephens Company (EBSCOhost) to discover scholarly studies on variables of interest, across a variation in specializations. I searched concepts and key terms of interest, along with synonyms, across various databases, aligning with previously used methods for literary synthesis (Umar et al., 2019). These concepts include *lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism*. The keywords that I searched to develop the theoretical framework were *loneliness across lifespan, social isolation, relationships and development, theories of loneliness, loneliness in youth, reaffiliation motive, and affiliation motive*.

Key terms on relevant concepts searched in all the *utilized* databases with study parameters encompassing peer review, full text, published between 2017 and 2019 were *loneliness, post-release challenges, recidivism, juveniles, delinquency, incarceration, prosocial relationships, long-term incarceration, social isolation, social relationships and desistance, childhood loneliness and criminal behavior, relationships and child development, relationships and adult outcomes, relationships and criminal behavior, attachment theory*. Terms selected for searches specific to Criminal Justice were *creation*

of juvenile justice, risk factors for recidivism, juveniles with mental health problems in detention centers, and incarcerated youth and rates of trauma. Key terminology used solely in Thoreau Multi-Database with filter specifications applied for scholarly were *motivation theory, mental health care, female crime, protective factors for crime, social control theory, informal social control by Sampson and Laub, relationship adjustment, and social learning theory.* Databases accessed to incorporate into this review were through Walden University Library, commercial search engines, and the World Wide Web. A list of search terms and databases are located in Appendix B.

I utilized study parameters to ensure articles were current and peer reviewed (Bonfield et al., 2018). Scholarly journals relevant to RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) or key concepts were located using *Boolean* operators (and, or, not), synonyms, and combinations of key terms (Bonfield et al., 2018). A systematic literature review was performed by identifying, synthesizing, and critiquing existing studies using rigorous methodology protocol (Bonfield et al., 2018). Searches performed on lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism resulted with locating a gap in knowledge for possible desistance barriers (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Theoretical Framework

Reaffiliation Motive

RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) is a theoretical basis for prolonged loneliness across ontology, holding applicability in the context of incarceration. I selected RAM theory for several reasons. Loneliness is more prevalent in adolescent populations (Qualter et al.,

2015), has been a common experience within the context of incarceration (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017), and may impact relationships needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). More research on loneliness across diverse populations in different environmental contexts is necessary to understand RAM, or the impacts of prolonged loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015).

Origin of RAM is attributed to Qualter et al.'s (2015) research on prolonged loneliness and failed motivation for reaffiliation. Human behavior is driven by motivation to connect with others after experiencing perceived loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015). Motivation to reconnect with others can fail after experiencing loneliness, generating lifelong challenges in relationships, psychological wellness, physical health, and social withdrawal (Qualter et al., 2015). Failed reaffiliation processes may result in maladaptive behavioral patterns and social withdrawal (Qualter et al., 2015).

RAM is applicable within criminological context regarding implications for lengthy incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and desistance patterns. The theoretical framework was used to link impacts of prolonged loneliness from adolescent lengthy incarceration, how this may impede reconnecting during reentry, and implications for recidivism. RAM is an explanation on aspects of loneliness across development and how the experience may result in maladaptive attributes (Qualter et al., 2015). Youth incarceration has resulted in higher propensity for experiences of prolonged loneliness from perceived social isolation (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017), impacting important relationships recognized to protect against recidivism (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

RAM has been applied in exploration focused on experiences or biological evolution of loneliness (Sbarra, 2015) having consequences for poor health outcomes and maladaptive behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Subjective experiences of isolation across the lifespan has implications for future social interactions (Qualter et al., 2015). Previous exploration on RAM and transient loneliness revealed temporary loneliness as having negative consequences for social interactions (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Chronic and transient loneliness have had a significant negative correlation with health status (Martín-María et al., 2019). RAM's previous use as a theoretical framework resulted in tentative explanations for how perceived social isolation interferes with positive social interaction (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Research on experiences of chronic loneliness is limited for youthful populations in varying contexts (Qualter et al., 2015; Vanhalst et al., 2018).

Adolescents are at high risk for loneliness having life course implications in comparison to other age groups (Williams & Braun, 2019). Reentry has been associated with social withdrawal from fear of negative social interaction and anticipated stigma (Davis & Francois, 2019). Individuals fearing social rejection have created self-reinforcing maladaptive behaviors disrupting future relationships (Fay & Maner, 2018). Incarceration has been associated with high levels of perceived social isolation or loneliness in populations (Gray, 2018), increasing propensity for maladaptation (Qualter et al., 2015).

Research on RAM or effects of loneliness in forming maladaptive behavioral patterns across populations, requires further exploration (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Qualter et

al., 2015). I utilized RAM to provide rationale for study exploration on impacts of loneliness in youth who experience lengthy incarceration, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism. The current examination was guided by the premise that loneliness subsequent from lengthy youth incarceration impacts prosocial relationships crucial for successful desistance. RAM was fashioned by integrating research on ontogeny and phylogeny of loneliness to understand subjective experiences in isolation across lifespans (Qualter et al., 2015; Sbarra, 2015).

I utilized RAM as a foundation for understanding phenomena central to the current investigation. Loneliness during lengthy incarceration has been common (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017). Incarcerated juveniles experiencing loneliness may form maladaptive attributes, having negative ramifications for important prosocial supports needed during reentry (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). RAM is applicable within the forensic context for exploring maladaptation caused by loneliness in incarcerated youth (Qualter et al., 2015). Maladaptation caused by loneliness has resulted in problematic behavioral patterns for future relationships (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) needed in successful community reintegration and desistance (Moore & Tangney, 2017).

Research questions were designed to build upon RAM's theoretical basis regarding maladaptation in juvenile populations experiencing loneliness within the context of incarceration. Maladaptation resulting from perceived loneliness has important implications for prosocial relationships (Qualter et al., 2015) crucial in the desistance process (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Incarceration experiences (Blankenship, Gonzalez, Keene, Groves, & Rosenberg, 2018) and loneliness in populations necessitates

investigation (Qualter et al., 2015). Exploration resulted in more understanding of desistance barriers, a huge problem for adolescent offenders (Hecke et al., 2019; Walker, Higgs, Stoové, & Wilson, 2018).

Literature Review Related to Key Concepts

Juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism were the core constructs for investigation. Lengthy youth confinement has implications for chronic patterns of loneliness (Reid, 2017) resulting in maladaptive attributes (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Maladaptive attributes developed as a result of experiencing loneliness, has implications for negatively impacting prosocial relationships (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Youth are a vulnerable population within the context of detainment (Barnert et al., 2018) and for experiencing chronic loneliness (Vanhalst et al., 2018; Williams & Braun, 2019). Exhaustive review on scholarly works for youth incarceration, loneliness, relationships, and recidivism is presented to exemplify current significance and a gap in knowledge.

Incarceration

Juvenile incarceration. Juvenile justice was created with respect toward goals of rehabilitation and fostering healthy adult transitioning (Troutman, 2018). Adolescents have been treated differently than adults in legislation, reflecting developmental differences more conducive to treatment amenability (Tabashneck, 2018; Troutman, 2018). Juvenile reforms more reflective of developmentally appropriate justice requires further evolution (Tabashneck, 2018; Troutman, 2018). Constitutional protections have recently been put into place for adolescent offenders and rehabilitation elements are still a

component of juvenile justice (Troutman, 2018). Juveniles have been arrested and incarcerated in large portions despite recognized needs of developmentally appropriate rehabilitation (Tabashneck, 2018).

Youth incarceration may be counterproductive toward rehabilitation goals, future prognosis, and impede proper development (Barnert et al., 2018; Tabashneck, 2018). Juveniles undergo substantial developmental processes (Sarı & Arslantaş, 2019; Tabashneck, 2018). Incarceration alternatives are being considered with respect to youth development (Tabashneck, 2018). Antisocial behavior and delinquency in youth are attributable to substantial occurrences of psychosocial maturation (Rocque et al., 2019; Tabashneck, 2018). Puberty is associated with brain development in the limbic system and prefrontal cortex (Tabashneck, 2018). Areas of the brain responsible for deliberative problem solving and emotional processing go through drastic changes, rendering youth emotionally prone to poor judgement or impulsively (Tabashneck, 2018). Youth typically have desisted criminality during the transition into adulthood, consistent with developmental perspectives on psychosocial maturation and delinquency patterns (Brame et al., 2018; Reising et al., 2019; Rocque et al., 2019).

Youth classified as serious repeat offenders or life-course-persistent offenders, typically have had early and significant histories of juvenile criminal involvement (Brame et al., 2018). Prior records have increased likelihood for recidivism and have been met with harsher sentencing, longer incarceration durations, while not being contingent upon individual recidivism risk factors (Hester, 2019). Youth incarceration has resulted in deteriorated adult mental and physical health (Barnert et al., 2018), having

no substantially evident appreciable impact on deterrence (Hester, 2019). Mental and physical health problems have impacted recidivism (Link, Ward, & Stansfield, 2019), carrying negative transgenerational impacts (Reising et al., 2019). Juvenile incarceration and harsh sanctioning may defeat the overall purpose of rehabilitation goals targeting recidivism by negatively impacting brain development (Tabashneck, 2018).

Young offenders within the prison context have been positively correlated with adverse impacts on behavioral patterns (Toman, J. C. Cochran, & J. K. Cochran, 2018) subsequent from a disconnection between family and friends (Shannon & Hess, 2019). Incarceration has been positively correlated with decreased prosocial supports and increased stress levels (Smet et al., 2017). Juveniles who are incarcerated may develop unhealthy pathologies (Backman et al., 2018) from the stressful environment (Hancock, 2017). Minority youth have experienced heightened disadvantage from overrepresentation within the context of incarceration and criminal justice system (Leiber & Fix, 2019). This has presented special challenges for minority populations regarding reentry and lifelong trajectories (Leiber & Fix, 2019). Negative consequences on health subsequent from youth incarceration, have had transgenerational impacts (Reising et al., 2019).

Prisoners' mental, physical, and social needs have not been adequately met during incarceration (Smet et al., 2017). Substantial numbers of individuals with serious mental illness have been handled by staff without proper training in jails (Dehart & Iachini, 2019). Incarcerated juveniles have had higher levels of need for social support services (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017), which have not been offered in the facility (Toman et al.,

2018). Incarcerated minority youth have had increased challenges in health and reentry due to overrepresentation (Barnert et al., 2018; Leiber & Fix, 2019). Juveniles with higher level needs for formalized mental health services and social supports have been negatively impacted in a jail environment (Toman et al., 2018).

Youth confinement may result in negative impacts on development from increased exposure to higher levels of stress, weakened social supports, and trauma (Gray, 2018; Piper & Berle, 2019; Pleggenkuhlem 2018). Juvenile detainment has been counterproductive to rehabilitation goals, healthy development, and treatment of mental health care needs (Barnert et al., 2018; Tabashneck, 2018). Alternative rehabilitation methods can be more effective, developmentally appropriate, enhance conductivity for fostering successful development, and decrease transgenerational cycles of disadvantage (Barnert et al., 2018; Leiber & Fix, 2019; Tabashneck, 2018). Further investigational efforts on experiences of incarceration may help determine appropriate rehabilitation efforts reflecting demographic variances to enhance incarcerated individuals' health and welfare (Blankenship et al., 2018).

Durations of incarceration on youth. Long-term incarceration has been typically understood as life imprisonment for adults (Landman, Ncongwane, & Pieterse, 2019). Children are unlike adults developmentally and have experienced negative results from incarceration starting with one month of collective incarceration durations (Barnert et al., 2018). Incarceration of youth has resulted in adverse subsequent adult mental, general, and physical health (Barnert et al., 2018; Porter & Demarco, 2019). Measures of adult general health have been related to morbidity and mortality rates (Barnert et al.,

2018). Incarcerated individuals have disproportionately suffered from poor health before, during, and after detainment regardless of age (Wildeman & Wang, 2018). Youth incarceration after a month has resulted in increased propensity for negative health throughout the lifespan (Barnert et al., 2018). Child incarceration for longer than a month has been correlated with worsened adult health outcomes in functional limitations, general health, and mental health (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarcerated more than 1 year have experienced exacerbation in worsened adult health outcomes of depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation (Barnert et al., 2018). Multiple incarcerations or longer durations have been positively correlated with increasingly worsened well-being in areas of physical, mental, social, spiritual, and overall life evaluation (Sundaresh et al., 2020). Adolescent incarceration impacts are pertinent for defining the duration of time considered problematic on a young population.

Reform has led to reductions in the amount of youth confinement (Tabashneck, 2018). The length of youth confinement has exceeded timelines based on current evidence (Barnert et al., 2018). Confinement of youth has been positively correlated with varying worsened adult mental and health problems known to impact recidivism rates (Anderson, Yava, & Cortez, 2018; Barnert et al., 2018). The majority of youth released from detainment have been in the same developmental stage as when confined (Mowen & Bowman, 2017). Prior records have been positively correlated with reoffending (Brame et al., 2018).

The majority of female youth incarcerated have been detained for low level offending, status offenses, and have had high rates in previous trauma (Matthews, 2018).

Adolescents detained have had higher rates of previous trauma compared to non-incarcerated youth (Yoder, Hodge, Ruch, & Dillard, 2018). Youth detention has resulted in increased exposure to high levels of trauma within correctional facilities (Yoder et al., 2018). Incarceration duration has been positively correlated with exposure to delinquent peers and trauma, increasing risk for recidivism (Villanueva, Valero-Moreno, Cuervo, & Prado-Gascó, 2019; Yoder et al., 2018).

Incarceration for any amount of time has been associated with worsened mental health and poor subsequent physical health (Wildeman & Wang, 2017). Incarceration has been associated with elevated mortality risk and has resulted in widening racial health disparity (Wildeman & Wang, 2017). Detainment has resulted with deteriorated health of those formerly incarcerated and nonincarcerated family members (Wildeman & Wang, 2017). Length of prison exposure is positively correlated with modifiable risk factors for chronic disease (Silverman-Retana et al., 2018). Exploration of different durations and types of detainment effects on health have been scant (Wildeman & Wang, 2017). Incarceration is a public health concern requiring more research into effective interventions to mitigate post incarceration harm (Wildeman & Wang, 2017).

Challenges for postrelease youth. Postrelease youth have experienced many challenges. Incarceration during development typically has interrupted progression towards healthy adulthood (Mowen & Bowman, 2017). Many youths have remained developmentally congruent in age to the time of initial incarceration (Mowen & Bowman, 2017). This interruption in development has been accompanied by barriers to adjusting within the community (Mowen & Bowman, 2017).

Incarcerated youth have been more likely to come from a disadvantaged background (Walker et al., 2018). Incarceration has resulted in increased youth trauma exposure, exacerbating any trauma experienced prior to detention (Walker et al., 2018; Yoder et al., 2018). Rates of poor education, unfavorable employment history, family violence exposure, child abuse, having incarcerated parents, and risky behavioral patterns have been more prevalent within criminal justice involved youth (Walker et al., 2018). The majority of youth incarcerated have been returned to disadvantaged communities (Walker et al., 2018).

Youth reentry has been associated with logistical, socio-emotional, legal, and structural barriers (Hecke et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2018). Challenges in reentry have been exacerbated by social disadvantage, preexisting health conditions, and developmentally related hinderances subsequent to youth incarceration (Walker et al., 2018). Youth with incarceration histories have had higher likelihoods of reincarceration and premature death than incarcerated adults (Barnert et al., 2018; Walker et al., 2018). Incarcerated youth experience interruption of healthy development while detained (Barnert et al., 2018). Nonincarcerated peers have had more access to education, employment, and transitioning towards independence (Walker et al., 2018).

Postrelease youth have been developmentally disadvantaged, often lacking proper resources needed to overcome structural, social, and legal barriers (Hecke et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2018). Adolescents returning to disadvantaged communities may lack cognitive, financial, and social support needed for successful reentry (Walker et al., 2018). Family and peers have provided critical support for postrelease youth and these

relationships have been strained subsequent to incarceration (Walker et al., 2018). Lack in supportive relationships upon reentry has resulted with higher likelihood of social isolation, putting successful community reintegration at risk (Fortune, Arai, & Lyons, 2020). Many postrelease youth have resorted back to criminality after experiencing stress and complications in reentry (Walker et al., 2018).

Postrelease youth frequently have experienced feelings of loss upon reentry (Hecke et al., 2019). Incarceration has been associated with emotional distress, loneliness (Gray, 2018), and anticipated stigma upon reentry (Davis & Francois, 2019; Erylimaz, 2018; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Difficulties in social relationships, stigma, discrimination, economic instability, and fear of mistakes during reentry, have been common (Walker et al., 2018). Delinquency records have been associated with decreased employment opportunities and problems in social interactions (Davis & Francois, 2019; Gray, 2018). Social support has been critical for successful desistance in postrelease youth (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Loneliness

Theories of loneliness. Loneliness is a subjective experience where an individual has discrepancy between desired and perceived levels of social connectedness (Ribeiro, Santos, Freitas, Rosado, & Rubin, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). RAM was derived from Sullivan's (1953) theory of loneliness being a motivational force across development (Qualter et al., 2015). Loneliness have often resulted in social withdrawal and certain individuals may experience maladaptive behaviors consequently, when motivation to reconnect fails (Qualter et al., 2015). Social withdrawal, in limited amounts, can be

attributed to adaptive processes for judgment making regarding appropriate social engagement (Qualter et al., 2015).

Social isolation perceptions are equivalent to feeling threatened, setting off hypervigilance for social threats within an environment (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Individuals perceiving social threats may produce cognitive bias, distance themselves from others, and form maladaptation in behavior by expecting negative social interaction (Fay & Maner, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). The experience of transient loneliness has been transferable, having negative ramifications for social interactions and relationship perceptions (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Prolonged or general social withdrawal has resulted in limitations on social reconnection opportunities and experiences of protracted loneliness (Gray, 2018). Certain populations may be more susceptible to experiencing maladaptive problems from prolonged loneliness (Spithoven et al., 2019).

The evolutionary theory of loneliness (ETL) focuses on phenotypes and traits in individuals, leading to certain propensity for experiencing loneliness within certain environments (Spithoven et al., 2019). ETL is based on ideology regarding loneliness as part of inherited adaptation promoting individuals to seek advantageous reconnections with others when relationships are perceivably threatened (Spithoven et al., 2019). ETL builds onto theoretical premise in Darwin's theory of evolution (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019). ETL theorists postulate loneliness is essential in evolutionary fitness as salutary social relationships are essential to reproduction, genetic legacy, and survival (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019).

Genetic research on loneliness is significant because positive correlations have been found with widespread negative health impacts, mental challenges, and behavioral aggression (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018). Loneliness has been negatively correlated with white matter microstructure responsible for Studies on genetic underpinnings of loneliness have been lacking in substantiality (Spithoven et al., 2019). Recent review of ETL resulted in conclusions that genes have been unlikely to directly impact loneliness (Spithoven et al., 2019). Environmental factors have been higher determinants in the dynamic role regarding genetic contributors to expressions of loneliness (Spithoven et al., 2019).

Evidence has been debated on whether loneliness may be beneficial or detrimental (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Time in solitude has been attributed to result with enhanced mood regulation for adolescents (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Solitude has also been positively correlated with increased loneliness, hostility, exacerbation of mental illness, and aggression in youth (Medrano, Ozkan, & Morris, 2017; Thomas & Azmitia, 2019; Valentine, Restivo, & Wright, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018). Self-determination theory (SDT) is based on motivation processes and corresponding behavioral patterns having important contributions to growth or development (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Thomas & Azmitia, 2019).

SDT is an explanation that psychological benefits result from self-determined behaviors through generally intrinsic motivation in basic human necessity of competence, relatedness, and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Non self-motivated solitude has been correlated positively with maladaptation of social anxiety, depressive symptomology, and

loneliness (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Maladaptation can result from social anxiety, peer rejection, and lack of friendships (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Self-determined solitude can be attributed to desire for reflection, creativity, or contemplation (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Enhanced discovery on loneliness across ontology, environment, and populations have been required for understanding formation of maladaptation impacting behavioral patterns (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Hawkey & Schumm, 2019; Thomas & Azmitia, 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018).

Loneliness in adolescent populations. Loneliness is a common experience for people in the United States and has had adverse impacts if prolonged (Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness effects children at early ages and increases in adolescence (Fuller, 2019). Teenage loneliness is common, has had the highest prevalence rate of other age groups, and may carry across lifespan (Williams & Braun, 2019). Adolescents have been the most susceptible to experiencing loneliness, social anxiety, and depression (Danneel et al., 2019). Adolescent relationship establishment and maintenance has been a critical developmental task where chronic loneliness results in varying negative outcomes (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Adolescent motivational and regulatory processes have been different from chronically lonely youth and those following different trajectories (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Chronically lonely youth have been less likely to accept social inclusion opportunities and motivation for social connections are lower (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Supportive relationships are essential to healthy youth development and avoidance of debilitating consequences associated with prolonged loneliness.

Maladaptation formed after individuals experience loneliness in variations, across context, requires more examination (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018).

Theories on loneliness have resulted in explanations for phenomena having genetic roots, environmental context, and impacted by interrelated factors (Spithoven et al., 2019).

Development and environment have had the strongest association with causes and prevalence of loneliness (Spithoven et al., 2019). Youth have had highest risk for experiencing loneliness having negative permanent implications (Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness may result in formation of harmful maladaptation (Spithoven et al., 2019).

Maladaptation resulting from loneliness is understood to impact social interactions (Williams & Braun, 2019) needed for desistance and healthy development in adolescent offenders (Gray, 2018; Ma, 2019). Loneliness or social anxiety symptoms should be addressed in young populations to avoid substantial impairment on psychological, social, and educational development (Maes et al., 2019; Yan, Feng, & Schoppe-Sullivan, 2018). Loneliness in developmentally sensitive populations of postrelease youth requires further discovery to understand maladaptation subsequent from lengthy incarceration. Research on perceived loneliness and social isolation for younger populations has been limited in comparison to older adult populations (Child & Lawton, 2019). Maladaptive behaviors resulting from loneliness (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) have had implications for aggression or criminality in youth (Yavuzer et al., 2018).

Social withdrawal postrelease. Postrelease offenders have been at high risk for social withdrawal and maladaptive behavior (Gray, 2018; Moore & Tangney, 2017).

Social withdrawal may produce maladaptive behavioral patterns across certain populations, in varying environments (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). Maladaptive behavior formed from social isolation and loneliness have resulted in individuals' reinforcement of negative social interactions (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Incarceration may result in high rates of maladaptive behavior and social withdrawal to cope with anticipated stigma (Davis & Francois, 2019; Eryilmaz, 2018). Offenders have been more hypervigilant to perceived social threats, often responding with social withdrawal (Smet et al., 2017).

Persons with prior records exhibit higher rates of negative pathological individual perceptions, detrimental to social interaction (Eryilmaz, 2018; Moore & Tangney, 2017). Postrelease social withdrawal has predicted recidivism, substance use disorders, mental health symptoms, and poor community adjustment (Moore & Tangney, 2017). Individuals with criminal records or history of incarceration, have exhibited high rates in maladaptation and social withdrawal (Moore & Tangney, 2017). Stigmatization and perceptions of individual disgust commonly has resulted in poor community adjustment for prisoner populations (Eryilmaz, 2018; Gray, 2018). Social withdrawal and maladaptive cognitive processes have resulted in individual perpetuated experiences of loneliness (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Prolonged loneliness has had grave consequences for development, health, and behavior (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018).

Impacts of loneliness on health and behavior. Loneliness has been positively correlated with extensive problems in health, even mortality (Fuller, 2019). Individuals

may reinforce loneliness resulting in hostility, pessimism, stress, anxiety, and low confidence, all contributors of poor health (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Loneliness has been associated with problematic physical health in areas of chronic disease, increased risk for stroke, hypertension, diabetes, Alzheimer's Disease, and cardiovascular disease (Fuller, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Loneliness has been problematic for psychological wellness (Chiao et al., 2019) and social support has had positive correlation with favorable development outcomes (Ma, 2019). Greater loneliness has been predicted to result in worsened depression outcome (Wang, Mann, Lloyd-Evans, Ma, & Johnson, 2018). Loneliness has been positively correlated with poor mental health in addition to deteriorated physical health (Alun & Murphy, 2019; Duke, 2017; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019).

Poor sleep, depression, psychological distress, and low life satisfaction have been associated with loneliness (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Heightened levels of loneliness have been positively correlated with risky health behaviors and lower cognitive functioning (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Risky health behaviors associated with loneliness have been poor diet, tobacco use, and inadequate physical activity (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Richard et al., 2017). Loneliness prevalence rates may vary by age, causation, gender, country, or culture (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Adolescents reported having had higher rates of loneliness compared to other age groups (Chiao et al., 2019; Fuller, 2019). Sociodemographic characteristics also have been associated with rates of loneliness.

Associations between lower socioeconomic status, adverse childhood experiences, educational status, economic status, and loneliness have been discovered in

a multitude of studies (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Protective factors of loneliness have been marriage, trust, social capital, social support, and social engagement (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Loneliness has also been associated with poor social skills and stigma (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Transient loneliness has negatively impacted relational dyads and engagement in positive social interactions (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Loneliness and depression have had a significant positive correlation with youth aggression (Yavuzer et al., 2018).

Loneliness has been associated with social withdrawal and has had negative implications for future social interactions (Gray, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Poor social development has been antecedent for negative life trajectories, including criminality (Makarios et al., 2017). Investigation on factors distinguishing maladaptive from adaptive outcomes, relating to experiences of loneliness and durations in loneliness, is necessary (Vanhalst et al., 2018). More exploration of loneliness will inform behavioral patterns and relationship dyads across diverse populations and is necessary to understand maladaptive attributes (Arpin & Mohr, 2019).

Loneliness and incarceration. Incarceration has shared a positive correlation with feelings of loneliness and social exclusion in youth (Reid, 2017). Juveniles segregated while incarcerated have exhibited statistically higher levels of psychiatric illness and mental health challenges (Valentine et al., 2019). Incarcerated juveniles may be particularly sensitive to permanent impacts of social isolation. Prolonged feelings of social isolation or loneliness has resulted in depression and social withdrawal (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Youth incarcerated have been vulnerable to loneliness and this may

negatively impact postrelease social relationships needed for desistance or future mental health (Reid, 2017).

Incarcerated youth experience social isolation and have commonly identified as loners (Reid, 2017). Incarcerated male adolescents have felt socially isolated based on offense and commitment status (Reid, 2017). Adolescent offenders' feelings of loneliness and social isolation have made adapting to incarceration more challenging (Reid, 2017). Juvenile incarceration has had a positive association with social isolation resulting in negative developmental and behavioral patterns (Reid, 2017).

Youth loneliness and incarceration durations has been positively correlated with development of negative pathologies (Backman et al., 2018). Juvenile incarceration has resulted in deterioration of important family prosocial supports crucial for desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Adolescent prosocial relationships are fundamental to healthy development (London & Ingram, 2018) and overcoming desistance barriers (McMahon & Jump, 2018). Juvenile incarceration duration and the nature of prosocial relationships postrelease has had implications for understanding desistance (Abrams & Tam, 2018).

Youth incarceration may result in loneliness (Reid, 2017), having negative implications for behavioral patterns, adult health, development, and prosocial relationships (Coppola, 2018; Duke, 2017; Williams & Braun, 2019). Loneliness has resulted in weakened prosocial relationships, leading to possible desistance barriers (Gray, 2018; McMahon & Jump, 2018). Individuals' commonly have experienced loneliness and social isolation during incarceration (Smet et al., 2017). Social isolation and loneliness can result in persistent depression throughout life (Peltzer & Pengpid,

2019). Prolonged loneliness or social isolation may result in an individual's inability to form prosocial relationships (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) and interruption of healthy development (Ma, 2019). Juvenile incarceration may result in youth development of antisocial pathologies (Backman et al., 2018) and poor adult health (Barnert et al., 2018).

Relationships

Juvenile relationships and development. Youth are experiencing rapid development (Tabashneck, 2018) and the nature of relationships impacts life trajectories (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). The nature of early relationships have been associated with personality development (Petters, 2019), life satisfaction (Ma, 2019), health, and behavioral patterns (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Patterns of dyadic relationships, quality, and typology are combined factors known to have affected youth development (Jensen & Lippold, 2018). Troubled familial and negative peer relationships have resulted in heightened propensity for delinquency, having implications on future development (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Mowen & Bowman, 2018).

Relationships are critical to overall quality of life (Teike & Sneed, 2018). Juvenile relationship engagement has been important for life transitions, development, and understanding levels of delinquency (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). Youth have required early attachments, positive peer associations, and quality relations for developing healthy intimate relationships (Martí, Albani, Ibáñez, & Cid, 2019; Shulman et al., 2019). Healthy early attachments and positive relationships have resulted in proper adaptation to conventional adulthood roles (Comfort et al., 2018; Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Martí et al., 2019; Shulman et al., 2019). Interruption in early relationships has had negative

consequences for permanent patterns of behavior (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Shulman et al., 2019).

Juvenile incarceration has had a negative impact on prosocial family ties and interrupts natural relationship progression (Comfort et al., 2018; Mikytuck & Woolard, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Shulman et al., 2019). Adolescent family relationships have had an association with the nature and quality of future relationships (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2019). Juvenile family relationship strain has been positively correlated with impediment of future romantic relationships in emerging adults (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). Youth prosocial relationship engagement has shared association with life transitions and less criminality (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). Prosocial relationships have been crucial to positive development and reduced criminality in postrelease youth (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Prosocial relationships in postrelease youth requires more discovery (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Prosocial relationships. Relationships have been associated with development of adolescent pathology, having led to permanent behavioral ramifications (Estévez et al., 2018). Prosocial relationships have been negatively correlated with antisocial and psychopathic pathology traits in juvenile offenders (Backman et al., 2018). The most effective factor disrupting youth development of behavioral deficits has been peer relationships and prosocial behaviors (Milledge et al., 2019). Prosocial relationships for youth result in development of healthy pathology, future relationships, and mitigate recidivism (Backman et al., 2018; Estévez et al., 2018; Kennedy, Edmonds, Millen, & Detullio, 2018).

Prosocial bonds have been one of the strongest protective factors against youth recidivism or risk behaviors (Abrams & Tam, 2018; Backman et al., 2018). Youth prosocial supports have resulted in proper psychosocial maturation, having made a significant impact on decreasing recidivism (Mizel & Abrams, 2017). Quality social bonds result in significant reduction of reoffending (Best et al., 2018; Hecke et al., 2019; Martí et al., 2019; McMahon & Jump, 2018). Social bonds have had large implications for mental and psychological wellness across development (Purewal et al., 2017).

Adolescence is a period of rapid physical, biological, and social development (Tabashneck, 2018). Adolescence is a foundational phase for determining quality of health, emotional wellbeing, behavior, and learning across the lifespan (Purewal et al., 2017). Prosocial relationship support in youth has had positive correlations with life satisfaction, healthy development (Ma, 2019), and has been a known protective factor against recidivism (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Youth in adolescence typically experience substantial changes in social needs and expectations accompanied by normative developmental modifications (Mikytuck & Woolard, 2019; Shulman et al., 2019).

Prosocial relationships are paramount for healthy youth development and have been a significant protective factor against recidivism (McMahon & Jump, 2018; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Marriage has been one of the strongest protective relationships against future recidivism for young offenders (Abrams & Tam, 2018). Marriage or critical prosocial support systems have been less common for returning prisoners and criminal offenders (Davis & Francois, 2019). Incarceration of youth may result in

problematic life trajectories during such a sensitive time of substantial psychosocial maturation (Rocque et al., 2019).

Social bonds of varying types have been important for desistance (Atkin-Plunk & Armstrong, 2018; Holligan & McLean, 2018). Prosocial relationships have had positive implications for health, development, and the ability to lead a life of desistance (Abrams & Tam, 2018). Social isolation has resulted in loneliness, negatively impacting health, psychological wellness, and future social relationships (Beneito-Montagut, Cassián-Yde, & Begueria, 2018). Exploration is needed on juvenile incarceration durations, prosocial relationships, and implications for the ability to desist criminality (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Social theories for motivating human behavior. Theoretical explanations for social motivation are crucial in understanding driving forces underlying deviant behavioral patterns. Social determinants for motivation have been observed, resulting in explanations of human behavior (Sariyska et al., 2019). Affiliation needs in humans are known to strongly influence behavioral patterns (Sariyska et al., 2019). The need for affiliation evolves throughout development across ontology (Qualter et al., 2015). Social rejection may result in decreased or increased social motivation contingent upon the insular cortex (Tomova, Tye, & Saxe, 2019). Chronic loneliness is positively correlated with decreased RAM (Tomova et al., 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018). Chronic loneliness has been associated with changes in dopaminergic responses within the striatum (Tomova et al., 2019). Inability to successfully reaffiliate has resulted in negative behavioral and developmental consequences.

RAM is an explanation for affiliation overtime and impacts of failed affiliation motive activation (Qualter et al., 2015). Early childhood is associated with need for proximity (Qualter et al., 2015). Progression of childhood results in affiliation focus on quality friendship reliant upon validation, disclosure, understanding, and empathy (Qualter et al., 2015). Adolescent affiliation motivation is associated with heightened focus on intimacy (Qualter et al., 2015; Shulman et al., 2019). Peer groups are a central focus for affiliation needs in adolescence (Qualter et al., 2015). Motivational forces driving relationships have been associated with positive development, future relationship quality, reproduction, and life satisfaction (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Ma, 2019). Unmet need for affiliation may lead to loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015). Loneliness typically results in activating the motive for reaffiliation once social threats are perceived (Qualter et al., 2015).

Motivation for affiliation may result from experiencing fear, desiring power, intimacy, or achievement (Sariyska et al., 2019). These motivational drivers for affiliation have been contingent upon development and a variation of other factors (Sariyska et al., 2019). Individuals desire attachment for a variation of reasons (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Motivational framework has been used to explore affiliation needs subsequent to experiencing social exclusion (Fay & Maner, 2018). Experiences of loneliness or social exclusion have resulted in the motivation to seek prosocial relationships (Vanhalst et al., 2018), comparable with seeking warmth after encountering cold stimuli (Fay & Maner, 2018).

Temporary experiences of loneliness may result in motivation to reconnect, having adaptive functioning (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Chronic loneliness may result in maladaptive behavioral patterns and less motivation for social reconnection (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Individual differences in fear of negative evaluation based on social experiences, may also shape behavioral responses regarding social encounters (Fay & Maner, 2018). Fear of negative evaluation has resulted in social withdrawal or maladaptation, stemming from preservation motive (Fay & Maner, 2018). Maladaptive attributes experienced after social exclusion have been aggression, social withdrawal, and pessimistic outlook (Fay & Maner, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019).

Bowlby (1969) provided theoretical explanation for human behavior driven by attachment phenomena (Petters, 2019). Attachment theory was developed as a result from observation regarding human separation and loss of human relationships (Petters, 2019). Personality development has been contingent upon early caregiving environments (Petters, 2019). The nature of early attachments has been associated with human growth and development (Petters, 2019). Bowlby's theoretical premise expands upon Freud's (1856 -1939) motivational theory and psychoanalytic theory (Petters, 2019). Freud's motivational theory has grounding in drive theory (Petters, 2019). Drive theory is an explanation with postulations regarding infants' primary motivations being based on inner drives and little interest in social or physical environment (Petters, 2019).

Recognition that environmental and social aspects significantly impact human behavior, lead to rejection of drive theory (Petters, 2019). Social bonds are crucial in early human attachment and development (Petters, 2019). Attachment theory (Bowlby,

1969) ideology was inspired by ethology and postulations are that attachment is a primary need for developing reciprocal social relationships during ontogeny (Petters, 2019). Theoretical orientations for attachment theory resulted in the understanding that unhealthy early attachments or separation has negative implications on future relationships and mental health (Petters, 2019). Social bonds and attachments evolve throughout ontogeny and remain crucial throughout emergence to adulthood (Campbell & Stanton, 2019).

Social bonds resulting from attachment needs has implications for delinquency or conventional living (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Healthy attachment across ontogeny is crucial for positive development outcomes (Petters, 2019). Unmet needs for affiliation results in loneliness (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Loneliness is a common experience with positive and negative connotations (Thomas & Azmitia, 2019). Loneliness and feeling social isolated typically results in the motivation to reaffiliate with others (Fay & Maner, 2018). RAM may fail, resulting in prolonged loneliness and maladaptive behavioral patterns (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Prolonged loneliness has led to prolonged maladaptation, having important implications for explaining adverse human behavior and future relationships (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). More understanding on failed affiliation in populations, or loneliness across ontogeny, will result with understanding social determinants of maladaptation (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019).

Social theories for crime. Hirschi (1969) explained how social control plays a significant role in criminality patterns (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Social control theory is a

rationale for delinquency and crime prevention within certain contexts (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Underlying premises of social control theory is involvement in conventional activities, conventional belief systems, and strong attachments to institutions or individuals holding these beliefs, predicts criminal patterns (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Weak ties to social bonds may increase the likelihood for criminality (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Presence of all three elements decrease likelihood for delinquency and criminality (Miller & Vuolo, 2018).

Age-graded theory of informal social control (Sampson & Laub, 1993) is a developmental theory for criminal behavior and delinquency. Age-graded theory of informal social control builds onto Hirschi's (1969) social control theory for crime. Age-graded theory of informal social control is useful for exploring correlations between relationships and desistance (Metcalf et al., 2019). The premise of this theory resulted with conclusions that informal social controls significantly explain variances in criminality more than structural background factors (Metcalf et al., 2019; Sampson & Laub, 1993). This theory is a basis for understanding the significance of turning points to change life trajectories (Metcalf et al., 2019).

Informal control factors predicted to result in desistance have been romantic relationships, employment changes, variations of social bonds, military service, and neighborhood change (Metcalf et al., 2019). Age-graded theoretical aspects are applicable to informal social control theory (Metcalf et al., 2019). Marriage has been consistently evidenced as a significant and reliable predictor for criminal desistance (Metcalf et al., 2019). Sampson and Laub's (1993) findings lead to conclusions that

quality relationships have been paramount in predicting criminality patterns (Metcalf et al., 2019).

Social learning theory (Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1977) can be utilized to explore human relational motivation for crime or deviance (Boman, Mowen, & Higgins, 2019; Stodolska, Berdychevsky, & Shiness, 2019). Social processes are contributors for involvement in deviant activities (Stodolska et al., 2019). Violence can be a social phenomenon learned and taught through relationship associations, grounded in inequity (Stodolska et al., 2019). Social learning theory originated from differential association (Sutherland, 1947) and developmental psychological theory of reinforcement (Stodolska et al., 2019). The main premise of social learning theory is criminal values are learned through association (Stodolska et al., 2019). Learning processes develop based on contextual social structures, interactions, and situations, resulting in conforming behavioral patterns (Stodolska et al., 2019). Individuals learn behavior through differential association, imitation, personal values, and differential reinforcement (Stodolska et al., 2019). Social interaction is essential to learning, motivation, and conforming behavior. The nature of social interaction can result in learned deviancy or positive developmental adjustment (Cullen, 1994).

Social support theory (Cullen, 1994) is an explanation describing human interaction as a coping mechanism enhancing psychological wellness. Social support results in the exchanging of beneficial resources mitigating the risk for negative pathology development and criminality (Cullen, 1994). Socially supportive relationships enhance internal defenses within individuals, resulting in adequate coping to stressors

(Cullen, 1994). Positive social supports result in individual connections with prosocial opportunities and resources helping offenders to overcome hardship upon release (Cullen, 1994).

Social relationships have been a significant protective factor for juvenile recidivism (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Postrelease offenders have had a strong desire in reconnecting to others (Tracey & Hanham, 2017) and have been met with various challenges (Gray, 2018; Mowen & Bowman, 2018). Community adjustment for offenders has been associated with stigma, structural challenges, cumulative disadvantage, and results in experiences of social withdrawal (Davis & Francois, 2019; Gray, 2018; Hecke et al., 2019; Tracey & Hanham, 2017; Walker et al., 2018). Social isolation may result in social withdrawal, creating maladaptive behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Antisocial attitudes and maladaptive behaviors have been positively correlated with risk for recidivism (Backman et al., 2018). Quality social supports are understood to protect against criminality and recidivism in youth (Mowen & Boman, 2018). Explanation on lengthy juvenile incarceration and maladaptation impacting these prosocial support systems is deficient (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Juvenile relationships and incarceration. Healthy interpersonal relationship development has been related to lower levels of psychopathy and antisocial traits in postrelease youth (Backman et al., 2018). Prosocial relationships have been a strong protective factor for the juvenile offender population (Backman et al., 2018). Evidence on adolescent incarceration negatively affecting development of unhealthy pathologies and prosocial relationships, has been consistent. Prosocial relationships have been essential

for avoidance of criminality in youth (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Incarcerated individuals have experienced significant shifts in life course trajectories, interrupted prosocial connections, and future intimate relationships (Goodey, Spuhler, & Bradford, 2019; Widdowson, Jacobsen, Siennick, & Warren, 2020).

Incarceration of individuals has resulted in interrupted romantic unions and decreased social support upon release (Wildeman & Wang, 2018). Prosocial supports needed for successful youth desistance have been interrupted by durations of incarceration (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Youth experiencing problematic familial relationships have had challenges in forming healthy future romantic relationships, critical to desistance (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). Incarcerated juveniles have been separated from crucial prosocial support systems of family and friends (Mikyuck & Woolard, 2019). Longer incarceration durations for youth, has interrupted important social support systems known to protect against recidivism. Information is needed for enlightenment on postrelease youths' ability to form and maintain social supports. Barriers to forming prosocial bonds have been affiliated with higher rates in recidivism (Mowen & Boman, 2018). Adolescent offenders may not have access to the high level of social support resources required for achieving successful reentry (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Juvenile relationships and desistance. Prosocial relationships or feeling connected to others, have been significant factors in youth development, healthy maturation, fundamental for quality future relationships, and desistance (Mizel & Abrams, 2017; Tracey & Hanham, 2017; Williams & Braun, 2019). Prosocial

relationships have been crucial for overall quality of life and the ability to desist from criminality, after juvenile incarceration (Hecke et al., 2019). Child development is an evolutionary process and the need for certain relationships advance (Shulman et al., 2019). Adolescent development is a phase where the propensity and causes for loneliness evolve simultaneously, with shifts in relationship expectations (Rönkä, Taanila, Rautio, & Sunnari, 2018; Shulman et al., 2019; Williams & Braun, 2019). Youth shifts in relationship expectations are developmentally normative and healthy for emergence into adulthood (Shulman et al., 2019).

Human development of meaningful relationships is paramount for successful desistance. Juveniles have experienced challenges in reentry from feelings of loss (Hecke et al., 2019). Rehabilitation efforts directed at prosocial goals has had positive effects for youth's ability to overcome structural barriers (Hecke et al., 2019). Juveniles' ability to desist has been largely dependent on the motivation for change and formation of prosocial relationships (McMahon & Jump, 2018). Juvenile incarceration has resulted in impeded prosocial relationship development and causes social withdrawal (Moore & Tangney, 2017). Healthy juvenile social development is critical for transitioning to conventional adult roles and successful desistance (Martí et al., 2019).

Recidivism

Recidivism in youth. United States' incarceration rates increased between the 1970s and 2000s (Harding et al., 2017). Postrelease prisoners have experienced higher levels of community supervision and surveillance through parole or probation. Higher levels of community supervision has resulted in increased imprisonment from low level

offending, or technical violations (Harding et al., 2017). Recidivism causation factors and rates have changed throughout developmental transitions (Harding et al., 2017).

Youth have experienced the sharpest increase in criminal and antisocial behaviors, which characteristically have decreased after transitioning into adulthood (Rocque et al., 2019). Psychosocial maturation is part of youth development and has had an association with risky behavior (Rocque et al., 2019). Psychosocial maturation has had a negative relationship with crime across diverse populations (Rocque et al., 2019). Juveniles with deviant friends, poor individual perceptions, troublesome attitudes, poor parenting styles, peer rejection, lack of familial cohesion, and living in violent environments have experienced disadvantageous risk for increased criminality or poor development (Kennedy et al., 2018). Youth victimization has resulted in higher levels of delinquent behaviors, exacerbated by correctional placement (Lujan & Fanniff, 2019; Yoder et al., 2018; Yu & Chan, 2019). Many adolescent offenders may return to disadvantage upon release with less resources for conventional adjustment (Mowen & Bowman, 2017; Walker et al., 2018).

Postrelease youth have been at high risk for quickly reoffending without immediate reentry service delivery (Cuevas, Wolff, & Baglivio, 2019). Youth offending patterns and criminal histories has had life course implications for adult offending. Youth with high rates of early sanctionable offending have had a higher risk for recidivism and adult offending (Brame et al., 2018). Factors related to criminal offending patterns or dynamic criminogenic risk ingroups of youth, has necessitated more discovery for

developing effectively tailored postrelease services (Campbell, Papp, Barnes, Onifade, & Anderson, 2018).

Risk factors for youth. Risk factors are a combination of individual, environmental, and social factors resulting in criminal behavior (Villanueva et al., 2019). Risk factors specific to youth recidivism have been neighborhood factors, family functioning, gang involvement, substance use, and academic achievement (Kennedy et al., 2018). Developmental processes during adolescence have been positively correlated with antisocial behavior and has typically declined throughout age progression (Villanueva et al., 2019). Family conflict and peer delinquency have been positively correlated with increased rates of substance abuse and offending (Mowen & Bowman, 2017). Family conflict has been associated as a strong driving force behind peer delinquency (Jin et al., 2019; Mowen & Bowman, 2017). Problematic early relationships in youth have increased the propensity for delinquency (Kennedy et al., 2018; Mowen & Bowman, 2017).

Child abuse and other social determinants have increased the likelihood for criminality, or recidivism (Knight, Maple, Shakeshaft, Shakehsaft, & Pearce, 2018). Maltreatment in youth has been significantly associated with higher rates of crime (Cho, Haight, Choi, Hong, & Piescher, 2019). Maltreated youth have been at higher risk for delinquency and experience multiple developmental risks (Cho et al., 2019). Youth maltreatment has resulted in increased violence (Cho et al., 2019; Malvaso, Delfabbro, Day, & Nobes, 2018). Significant social determinants of crime in youth have been

identified as differing maltreatment types, alternative home placements, social factors, individual factors, and gender (Malvaso et al., 2018).

Young people involved in multiple risk behaviors have been at increased risk for crime and negative life trajectories (Knight et al., 2018). Youth risk behaviors resulting in higher crime rates have been identified as antisocial behavior, substance abuse, less education engagement, lacking employment, harm to self, and suicidal ideation (Knight et al., 2018). Dynamic risk factors associated with early failure in males have been antisocial personality, antisocial attitudes, delinquent peers, problematic familial relationships, and school failure (Cuevas et al., 2019). Incarcerated females have had higher rates of psychiatric disease and historical suicide attempts (Altintas & Bilci, 2018). Eight collective central risk factors in youth have been identified as antisocial attitudes, antisocial personality patterns, antisocial peers, history of previous offences, poor family circumstances, lacking education, low employment opportunity, substance abuse, leisure, and recreation (Villanueva et al., 2019). The eight risk factors collectively have resulted in the strongest likelihood of youth recidivism (Villanueva et al., 2019).

Incarcerated youth have had higher rates of untreated mental health care challenges (Toman et al., 2018). Incarcerated populations have had higher rates of mental health problems, early persistent maltreatment, low socioeconomic status, and childhood trauma (Altintas & Bilici, 2018; Knight et al., 2018; Malvaso et al., 2018). Youth incarceration has been associated with poor adult health (Baćak et al., 2019; Barnert et al., 2018). Adolescent incarceration between the ages of 15 and 18 has increased recidivism risk (Hester, Roberts, Frase, & Mitchell, 2018). Social and environmental

factors during reentry may result in heightened risk of recidivism by constrained prosocial opportunities needed towards successful community reintegration (Fahmy & Wallace, 2019). Early incarceration has resulted in significantly higher prevalence of mental health problems (Baćak et al., 2019). Poor health has been positively correlated with recidivism (Lambdin, Comfort, Kral, & Lorvick, 2018). Alternative means for rehabilitation and treating underlying determinants of youth criminality, is recommended (Barnert et al., 2018; Marqua-Harries, Stewart, & Padayachee, 2019). Focus on prosocial and protective factors in youth would benefit interventional planning (Villanueva et al., 2019).

Protective factors for youth. Protective factors for youth have been positively correlated with desistance in accordance to various longitudinal study findings (Villanueva et al., 2019). Lack of protective factors has been positively correlated with youth recidivism (Villanueva et al., 2019). Interventional planning incorporating known protective factors has resulted in decreased likelihood of youth recidivism (Shepherd, Strand, Viljoen, & Daffern, 2018; Villanueva et al., 2019). Protective factors for youth have been identified as positive family circumstances, favorable educational opportunities, prosocial peer relations, positive attitudes, personality typology, and positive recreational activities (Villanueva et al., 2019). Risk and protective factors may be considered to develop optimal interventional planning targeting youth recidivism (Campbell et al., 2018; Villanueva et al., 2019).

One of the strongest protective factors for adolescent offenders has been prosocial support (Best et al., 2018). Many young offenders have faced challenges in reentry from

lack of prosocial support systems (Walker et al., 2018). Youth incarceration has resulted in exacerbated persistent health problems (Barnert et al., 2018), including prolonged loneliness (Gray, 2018). Health problems have been positively correlated with recidivism (Anderson et al., 2018). Enhanced enlightenment on predictive risk and protective factors specific to youth, could result in improved interventional programming targeting recidivism (Walker et al., 2018).

Summary and Conclusions

Lengthy juvenile incarceration may result in heightened experiences of loneliness (Reid, 2017), negatively impacting prosocial relationships needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Juvenile justice was created with a primary focus of rehabilitation in a treatment amenable population (Troutman, 2018). Punitive punishment practices are still utilized on a juvenile population to achieve deterrence and increase public safety (Coppola, 2018). Punitive sanctioning and incarceration of youth may be counterproductive towards goals for rehabilitation or increasing public safety (Barnert et al., 2018; Tabashneck, 2018).

Incarcerated youth have been considered a medically fragile population (Barnert et al., 2018). Incarceration of youth for longer than a month has resulted in problematic adult health compared to older detained populations, or persons never imprisoned (Barnert et al., 2018; Porter & Demarco, 2019). Negative adult health after incarceration has been more significant subsequent to one year of former youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarceration has resulted in systematic health deterioration and

oppression of minority populations (Barnert et al., 2018; Semenza & Link, 2019; Reising et al., 2019).

Incarceration has resulted in experiences of loneliness for detained youth (Reid, 2017). Loneliness may result in social withdrawal, having implications for maladaptive behavior (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). RAM is a theoretical explanation on lifelong impacts of prolonged loneliness when individuals fail to reconnect with others (Qualter et al., 2015). Failed reaffiliation after experiencing loneliness has resulted in maladaptation of cognitive, developmental, and behavioral processes across ontology (Qualter et al., 2015). Individuals' maladaptation experienced from loneliness has created a reinforcing loop of negative social interaction and antisocial behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Maladaptation may negatively impact prosocial relationships, monumental for successful desistance in youth (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Incarceration has commonly resulted in experiencing loneliness, social withdrawal (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017), and deterioration of social support needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

ETL studies have resulted in explanations that loneliness may be essential to evolution and adaptation (Hawkey & Schumm, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). Interrelation of environmental and developmental factors have had substantial impacts on loneliness, more than genetic predisposition (Spithoven et al., 2019). Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969) is an explanation grounded in ethology, describing the importance of motivation for early attachment and impacts on human behavior (Petters, 2019). Failed

reciprocal relationships have been positively correlated with poor subsequent mental health and future relationships (Petters, 2019).

Hirschi's social control theory (1969) is an explanation of how delinquency may be less likely to occur when people have strong social ties, hold conventional values, and involve themselves in prosocial activities (Miller & Vuolo, 2018). Sampson and Laub's (1993) theory of informal social control provides explanation on how certain relationships and contexts have important associations with delinquency patterns (Metcalf et al., 2019). Social learning theory (Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1977) is a tentative explanation for how deviancy and behavioral conformity can be learned through social processes (Stodolska et al., 2019). Cullen's (1994) social support theory is an explanation for how these relationships assist with proper coping, beneficial resources, and psychological wellness needed in successful desistance or community adjustment (Cullen, 1994). Quality social relationships are paramount for shaping individuals and aiding in development (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Maes et al., 2019).

Previous research attempts measuring loneliness and recidivism have largely encompassed quantitative methodology. Quantitative study designs are limited for gaining deeper information obtainable through an IPA approach (Noon, 2018). Postrelease youth have experienced various barriers to successful reentry (Hecke et al., 2019). Exploration is needed on impacts of youth incarceration durations and prosocial relationships (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Loneliness across context, ontology, and problems with reaffiliation require investigation for understanding how loneliness becomes maladaptive (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Awareness on maladaptive behavioral

patterns and barriers in youth desistance, through exploration using IPA methodology, is critical for successfully combatting recidivism (McMahon & Jump, 2018; Mizel & Abrams, 2017). Explications on qualitative methodology establishing rigor for investigation of unexplored phenomena is located in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

Experiences of young adults incarcerated more than 1 year as juveniles, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and desistance was the focus for phenomenological exploration. The purpose of exploration was describing challenges to postrelease prosocial relationships after experiencing loneliness during a lengthy youth incarceration. I performed this exploration to describe possible desistance barriers. Maladaptation caused by loneliness across ontology, in different populations, and within different contexts lacks research (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Detained youth may experience increased levels of loneliness (Gray, 2018; Reid, 2017), having implications for forming maladaptive attributes and prosocial relationships needed in successful reentry (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Moore & Tangney, 2017; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Investigational intent was to address desistance barriers through exploring and describing the true lived experience of participants (Noon, 2018).

Chapter 3 is a presentation of methodological procedures used in accordance with the phenomenological investigation purpose. Procedure details listed encompass purposeful sampling, semistructured interviewing, use of informalized conversation techniques, and coding strategies (Noon, 2018). I established credibility by utilizing research methodology consistent with previous studies (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I carefully documented for addressing concerns in detail to demonstrate trustworthiness (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). I addressed bias through detailed procedures on reflexivity (Larsson et al., 2019). I addressed ethical predicaments

through provision of informed consent, transparency, and following common procedures to decrease ethical concern (Wolff-Michael & Unger, 2018).

Research Design and Rationale

Research Question 1 (RQ1): How does the lived experience of loneliness in young adults, who as juveniles underwent a lengthy incarceration, impact prosocial relationship formation postrelease?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): How does the lived experience of postrelease relationships in young adults formerly incarcerated as juveniles inform the ability to desist criminality?

The central concepts under exploration were more than 1 year of youth incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism. Juveniles are medically vulnerable when incarcerated (Barnert et al., 2018) and may experience heightened levels of loneliness (Reid, 2017). Loneliness is a distressful emotional response from experiencing perceived dissatisfaction in quality relationships (Williams & Braun, 2019). Experiences of loneliness may result in maladaptive behavioral patterns (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019) having negative consequences on prosocial relationships needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Prosocial relationships have been necessary for successful rehabilitation and community adjustment (Best et al., 2018). Maladaptation resulting from experiences of loneliness across context and ontology is understudied (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Youth incarceration durations' influence on loneliness (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer &

Pengpid, 2019) and postrelease prosocial relationships, required further investigation for understanding desistance barriers (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

The research tradition that I utilized to examine uninvestigated phenomena was a phenomenological design (Flocco, 2020; Smith, 1996). IPA was the method that I used for interpreting data (Noon, 2018). Thematic information was derived from participants' accounts (Belotto, 2018). This methodology results in understanding the subjective essence underlying an experience with participant cognition as a central analytical focus (Noon, 2018).

Rationale for the research tradition reflects alignment of stated exploratory purpose (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). IPA is commonly used to understand unexplored phenomena as told through participants' experiences (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). Phenomenological research resulted in a better understanding of undiscovered phenomena and provided methodological originality for the study concepts (Flocco, 2020; Smith, 1996). Meaning derived from human experience resulted in rich descriptions and interpretations to guide future research (Errastibarrondo, Jordán, Díez Del Corral, & Arantzamendi, 2018).

Role of the Researcher

My role as the researcher was to operate as an instrument for data collection purposes through observation of participants. IPA tradition is used by researchers to maximize potential opportunities for understanding deeply rooted causes of phenomena through producing descriptive accounts (Noon, 2018). IPA methods entail mutual engagement between researcher and participant throughout data interpretation processes

for accuracy (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). The researcher may interpret participants' cognition through mutual engagement in interviewing processes (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Bias reduction and bracketing are essential in the role of an IPA researcher (Baksh, 2018; Flocco, 2020; Larsson et al., 2019). IPA accuracy is contingent upon researcher ability to effectively bracket in producing results regarding the subjective experiences of participant experiences (Baksh, 2018; Larsson et al., 2019; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

I recruited participants by online advertising and through response to flyers at consenting locations. Purposeful self-recruitment ensured that researcher and participant relationships are based entirely on voluntary volition. Supervisory relationships were not applicable to the current study. Power differentials were effectively managed through methodology congruent to common qualitative techniques utilized (Lester & Anders, 2018). Strategies used to effectively reduce power differentials within qualitative research are neutrality, mutual engagement, expressing value for participant contributions, and transparency (Lester & Anders, 2018).

Empowerment and rapport establishment effectively reduced power differentials (Griffin, 2018). I provided participants with an opportunity for personally verifying pieces of researcher interpretations to reduce interpretation bias and feel empowered (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Researcher bias may result in data contamination (Baksh, 2018; Larsson et al., 2019). Methods for effectively reducing researcher bias within data interpretation were bracketing, journaling, reflexivity, and peer review (Larsson et al., 2019). IPA researchers must express any personal relation

with phenomena and avoid imposing prejudgments (Flocco, 2020). I offered participants an avenue to communicate experiences without fear of distortion and judgment (Noon, 2018). Transparency in reflection is essential for the role of a researcher (Cheah, Unnithan, & Raran, 2019). Journals and keeping a log of analytic memos effectively managed bias for providing transparency to enhance objectivity (Larsson et al., 2019).

Ethical dilemma under consideration in the study involved unforeseeable recruitment of sensitive populations. Sensitive populations specified by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) are prisoners, mentally ill, physically ill, pregnant women, or children (Lapid et al., 2019). Recruitment involved purposeful voluntary self-selection and advertising listed certain sensitive population exclusions to mitigate harm. Procedures for avoiding harm to participants would have been immediately ending the interview with presence of obvious discomfort. IPA methods entail the use of participant accounts where harm reduction through protecting rights, dignity, and privacies are crucial (Noon, 2018). Ethical challenges involving presence of personal bias were carefully managed through bracketing, reflexivity, documentation, and peer review (Baksh, 2018; Larsson et al., 2019; Thurairajah, 2019).

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

The population selected for exploration was young adults ages 18 to 29 years, who experienced 1 or more years of incarceration during youth. Incarceration periods may have been cumulative, served at separate times, or one detention period to meet eligibility requirements aligned with research on incarceration durations (Barnert et al.,

2018). Participants understood to be sensitive including prisoners or children younger than 18 years old, were excluded for ethical reasoning and harm avoidance (Lapid et al., 2019). Sampling methodology involved the use of traditional IPA research approaches (Noon, 2018).

Sample size in comparative IPA research consists of four to 10 participants (Noon, 2018). Sampling size was contingent on satisfying theoretical data saturation and not generalizability (Garwood & Hassett, 2019; Larsson et al., 2019; Mant et al., 2018; Mbuthia, Kumar, Falkenström, Kuria, & Othieno, 2018). Data saturation is used to develop appropriate sample size when additional participants will not produce new emergent thematic data for answering research questions (Saunders et al., 2018). Preliminary analysis during the interviewing stage resulted in detecting data redundancy. Data saturation and categorical redundancy was further utilized during the coding process, leading to determinations for establishing appropriate sample size (Saunders et al., 2018). Sampling was purposeful and participants met specific criteria relevant to investigational requirements aligning with IPA methodology (Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Criteria specific and purposeful sampling techniques resulted with provision of rich data to investigate undiscovered phenomena from participant perspectives (Noon, 2018).

Criteria requirements for participant selection aligned with the stated study intent, purpose, methodology, ethical considerations, and addressing research questions. Participants were 18 years of age or older during the interview to satisfy ethical responsibility (Lapid et al., 2019). Participants having previous experience of

incarceration for 1 year or more during adolescence were included within the study (Barnert et al., 2018). Participants were between 18 to 29 years old, having not been released more than 5 years for thematic consistency and accuracy in recall. Recruited participants were not incarcerated during the interview (Lapid et al., 2019). Eligible participants were able to express personal experience with reentry and relationships (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Participants were literate, had at least a fifth-grade level education, and fluent in English to ensure comprehension of informed consent. Participants were not required to have been U.S. citizens at the time of incarceration or during interview. Participants with one or multiple preexisting mental health diagnoses were mentally stable for at least 30 days to avoid harm. Eligible participants with preexisting substance abuse disorders had a minimum of 30 days sobriety. All included participants were requested to undergo an audio recorded interview or online synchronized interviewing for the purpose of avoiding data misrepresentation (see Appendix C).

I verified participant age by reviewing state issued identification cards, an official birth certificate, passport, or a driver's license, if questionable. I inquired participants about personal relation to the eligibility criteria listed on recruitment advertising. Participants described incarceration placement, incarceration duration, age of incarceration, postrelease relationships, and recidivism in accordance with the provided operational definitions. Self-volunteered participants who provided pertinent information verifying study criteria was adequately met, were included within the study.

Eight participants sufficed in accordance with comparative techniques and approaches utilized (Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). IPA study sample size recommendations are four to 10 participants (Noon, 2018). Six participants have been used in IPA studies with similar methodology and techniques (Noon, 2018). Two additional participants enhanced overall credibility by ensuring data saturation was met (Saunders et al., 2018). Thematic data were based on rich descriptions from participant accounts obtained through interviewing techniques used in similar IPA studies (Garwood & Hassett, 2019; Noon, 2018; Saunders et al., 2018).

Participant recruitment involved the use of flyers and online advertising. Flyers placed at consenting locations, to social media advocacy groups, and support groups resulted in effective self-voluntary participant recruitment (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Consent was initiated prior to placing flyers on public spaces (see Appendix D). Details listed on flyers were used to advertise for participants with incarceration history of one year or more while under 18 years old. Exclusionary criteria based on IRB review of sensitive populations were included within the advertisement. Exclusionary criteria were that participants are not fluent in English, under 18 years old, did not have at least a fifth-grade reading level, illiterate, currently detained, or required a legal guardian. Participants who did not consent to synchronized online or audio recorded interview were excluded. Individuals who were suicidal 30 days prior to interviewing or experienced a bipolar manic episode within the past 30 days were excluded (Lapid et al., 2019).

Advertisements contained information on electronic mail (email), Skype, and Google Voice number to facilitate a reply from respondents. Decisions of study inclusion

or exclusion were based on specified eligibility requirements discussed during initial contact. Participants were fully informed of the study and individual rights, and I provided them with an informed consent copy following initial contact (see Appendix E). I sent informed consent copies through mail, in-person, or email, based on participant preference. I obtained comprehension and agreement to informed consent verbally, face-to-face, or through email before administration of audio recorded interviews (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I established a date and time for an audio recorded interview as the next step (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I sent a confirmation email, phone call, or Google text message prior to the scheduled interview.

I utilized IPA methodology for studying phenomena and human experience where sample size relates to adequately reaching saturation of data (Saunders et al., 2018). Data saturation is contingent on lack of new emergent thematic information within a defined category (Saunders et al., 2018). Four participants are adequate to reach data saturation with IPA and adding four more participants ensured new thematic data were not missed (Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Researchers using IPA methodology commonly add participants after saturation is met to exhaust rigor in data saturation (Saunders et al., 2018).

Instrumentation

Data collection encompassed utilization of interview protocol, interview transcripts, audio recordings or online synchronized interview, and recorded observations in a reflection journal. The interview protocol was researcher produced. The protocol was reviewed by an expert panel comprised of selected Walden University faculty to ensure

that the research questions engendered adequate responses. I pretested the instrument on family members to enhance validity for instrumentation and addressing questions during development. The developed protocol was fashioned through referencing comparative IPA studies, research on RAM (Qualter et al., 2015), conceptual measurement scales (Russel, 1996), relevant qualitative protocol (Martin, Wood, Houghton, Carroll, & Hattie, 2014), and collective scholarly literature for methods. Common techniques for rapport development were incorporated in the interview protocol (Cheah et al., 2019). The developed interview protocol had space to record observations and add participant verified interpretations.

Participant verification enhances accuracy, empowers participants, and allows for rapport establishment (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Audio recording has been utilized in other contemporary IPA studies (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Telephonic audio recording resulted with respecting anonymity and providing convenience for geographically diverse participants (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Participant preferences of different formatting and recording options may enhance in-depth responses. Reflection through using observation journals are common tools utilized in IPA studies to effectively bracket, enhance analysis, and mitigate presence of bias (Larsson et al., 2019).

I designed research questions to explore phenomena through the lived experiences of participants (Noon, 2018). I utilized IPA methods to explore phenomena through participant cognition as a central focus (Noon, 2018; Smith, 1996). Common data collection instruments used in IPA are interview transcripts and observational notes (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I carefully reviewed observations and transcripts to locate

participant repetition, rationalization, explanation, rhetorical questions, pronouns changes, laughter, or unusual phrasing (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Collective observations resulted in the ability to make sense of participants' thought processes regarding phenomena (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Semistructured interview protocol development was based on collective scholarly sources and comparative studies to answer the stated research questions (see Appendix F). RAM (Qualter et al., 2015) was the theoretical basis used to guide interview protocol question development. RAM is a theoretical explanation on results of loneliness and maladaptation from inability to reconnect (Qualter et al., 2015). Qualitative methodology literature sources were examined to further develop the interview protocol for ensured alignment, rigor, and adequate addressment of research questions (Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Scholarly research on hermeneutic phenomenological interviewing was used to develop interview protocol questions and incorporate techniques (Lauterbach, 2018). Rapport protocol from comparative studies was incorporated into the interview protocol allowing for participant comfortability with exchanging sensitive matter regarding personal experiences (Cheah et al., 2019).

Content validity was established in the interview protocol by reflecting traditional IPA methodology with development, referencing comparative studies, and using comparative techniques for obtaining detailed information (Cheah et al., 2019; Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018). Validity in qualitative research is obtained through careful measure to avoid distortion of reported observation (Flocco, 2020; Hayashi, Abib, & Hoppen, 2019). Interviews were transcribed word verbatim and participant verification

was incorporated into the interview protocol to mitigate distortion of reported data (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Participant verification for pieces of observation enhances rapport, results in empowerment, and increases interpretational accuracy (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

The researcher developed interview protocol allowed for proper addressing of research questions and deriving rich descriptions fitting IPA methodology purposes (Noon, 2018). Interview questions were fashioned as semistructured to adequately answer research questions and for promoting open-ended conversational style aligned with IPA studies (Lauterbach, 2018). The fashioned protocol instrument allowed for prompting more information as necessary, establishing rapport, and saturating data to answer research questions effectively (Weller et al., 2018). Semistructured questions fashioned for directing open-ended conversation is commonly utilized to explore topics in-depth, identify plausible causes of observation, and understand processes (Weller et al., 2018).

The protocol was pretested to ensure research questions and concerns would be adequately addressed during protocol development. Two family members were provided with an invitation and consent form via email. Consent was obtained prior to proceeding with scheduled online synchronized interviews, based on family preference. Family members were provided with an explanation of procedures and roles within the invitation. Family members had time for asking questions prior to the interview. The interviews proceeded at a scheduled and agreed upon time. Family members were debriefed by telephone following the interview. Family members had time to ask

questions or voice concerns with the protocol. Pretest study outcomes are discussed with more detail in Chapter 4.

Recruitment Procedures

I collected data through online recruitment and on the ground flyer placement at consenting locations in Boston, Massachusetts (see Appendix A). Internet use for data collection enhanced efficiency, practicality, and allowed participants flexibility to consider responding. Locations for data collection encompassed local churches, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings, buildings around parole offices, airports, and advocacy group locations in Boston, Massachusetts. Online recruitment through Facebook required permission to post advertisements on “Mothers of incarcerated sons & Daughters...Doing time with your loved one,” “Support Inmates/Ex-Convicts,” and Teen Challenge organization groups. Online recruitment through Facebook advocacy groups and organizations resulted with more geographically diverse participants (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Permission was granted by administrators of advocacy support groups or organizations on Facebook prior to advertising. Participant variability enhanced data saturation for the study and explorational endeavors remained homogeneous where possible (Garwood & Hassett, 2019; Noon, 2018).

Data were collected for a scheduled audio recorded interview, recorded telephone interview, face-to-face recorded interview, or synchronous online interview in response to individual preferences (Howard et al., 2019; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Semistructured interviews lasted from 30 to 60 minutes (Cafferky, Banbury, & Athanasiadou-Lewis, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Participant verification in

interpretational observations during the interview ensured data saturation and accuracy (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Recruitment and data collection durational time period allotted was six months. Six months was sufficient time to gain consent from locations, place flyers, place online flyers, obtain responses, and schedule interviews.

Data were recorded through audio recorded telephone conversation, face-to-face interview recordings through Sony ICDUX560, or synchronous online interview (Howard et al., 2019; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Observational notes transpired during the interview to use for data interpretation. Preference for audio recorded calls, online synchronized interviews, or recorded face-to-face interviews resulted in enhanced confidentiality and substantiality of information exchange. Inability to gain enough participants may have resulted in consulting with related members as a representative resource. Individuals with close relation to the target population has been used as representative sources for exploring experiences in prior studies (Valan, Sundin, Kristiansen, & Jong, 2018).

Informed consent was offered during initial recruitment and at the beginning of audio recorded interviews. Participants were debriefed immediately following the interview. Debriefing involved communicating specific details of the study purpose and taking time to answer any additional questions. Time was allotted in the interview protocol to answer participant questions following provision of informed consent and debriefing. Information and consent for possible email or follow-up phone calls were discussed after the interview concluded. Follow-up was attempted for confirming preliminary interpretation of analysis (Agustin, 2019). Participants could follow-up with

the researcher for any additional questions or concerns. Participants provided preferences for follow-up via email, Google Voice text, synchronized online communication, recorded phone call, or mail. All participants were provided a detailed summary of results through email, as this was their noted preference.

Data Analysis Plan

Audio recorded in-person or telephonic semistructured interviews were conducted as the primary data source to transcribe verbatim. The interview protocol consisted of semistructured questions designed for addressing concepts aligned specifically with RQ1 and RQ2. Transcripts of interviews are commonly used to gain insight on participant perspectives aligned with stated research questions and comparative IPA methods (Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Phenomenological methods involve interpretation of human experience through an ideographic and inductive approach (Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018). Transcripts developed from conducting semistructured interviews resulted in understanding thematic elements of how participants construct meaning on phenomena (Lauterbach, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Semistructured, conversational style interviews are recommended to gain highly descriptive information on participant perspectives and maintain focus (Lauterbach, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). IPA methodology involves the use of transcripts to develop thematic data for basing conclusions and answering research questions (Lauterbach, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Data analysis proceeded through (a) managing data, (b) carefully reviewing data, (c) recording analytic memos based on review, (d) descriptive coding of data for

interpretation, (e) and locating overarching thematic data. Data collection began with conducting semistructured audio recorded interviews or synchronized online interviews and assembling observational notes. Phases in data analysis were bracketing, clustering, and comparing cases to locate overarching themes (Moser & Korstjens, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Data analysis began immediately following completion of semistructured interviews. Audio tape recorded interviews were manually transcribed verbatim for increased accuracy measures (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Transcripts were compared to audio recordings for ensuring accuracy before proceeding with analysis and interpretation (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Transcripts went under rigorous review repetitively to enhance familiarity with the data and additional observations were recorded into a journal (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). The transcripts were examined in more depth paying close attention to participant descriptions and motivations for word choice (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Common patterns were bracketed within a Microsoft Word coding chart to isolate meaning in data (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Commonalities in meaning were clustered to develop reoccurring underlying thematic elements of data (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Attention to participant dialect in areas of contradiction, explanation, rhetorical questions, rationalization, repetition, significant phrases, pronoun usage, and laughter were noted for coding (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Codes were developed manually based on identification of reoccurring themes located through bracketing and clustering.

Observations from the analytic journal and transcripts were labeled with categorical information developed (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Cases were compared for

reoccurring thematic elements to group together (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Interconnections between concepts were located through comparison between cases (Lauterbach, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Reoccurring thematic elements were grouped together to locate overarching themes. Overarching themes were labeled for developing descriptions on collective representative emergent themes to base conclusions (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). A Microsoft Word coding chart was used for visual representation of data organization, illustrate reflexivity, display analytic memos, and demonstrate the coding process leading to conclusions. A discrepant case is presented in detail (see Chapter 4).

Issues of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Internal validity was established by using traditional rigor used in comparative studies. Comparative strategies for establishing credibility were triangulation, audit trials, member checks, mutual engagement, saturation, reflexivity, and peer review through a fellow doctoral candidate (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019; Roberts, Dowell, & Nie, 2019). Member checks were accomplished through observational verification in the interview or follow-up to ensure interpretational accuracy (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Data triangulation is a method to ensure credibility by exhausting multiple sources of data for evidence (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Data triangulation is demonstrated by incorporating multiple pieces of information through interview transcripts, audio recordings, and reflexivity audit trials (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Any follow-up conversations were included in the data

triangulation process. Direct participant quotes were utilized in the coding process to increase reliability of interpretations.

Transferability

External validity is presented through using interviewing techniques understood to produce thick and rich descriptions for analysis (Daniel, 2019; Noon, 2018).

Semistructured interviews enhanced rich information exchange, increasing transferability (Daniel, 2019; Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Qualitative research conclusion validity is contingent upon researcher ability to interpret meaning based on deriving rich descriptions from participant accounts (Noon, 2018).

Documentation of persistent observation resulted with increased transferability (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Contextual and setting information was made available to enhance transferability. Audit trails resulted in enhanced transparency and readers may determine applicability of the study to other settings for replicability (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Methods and techniques incorporated reflect traditional IPA methodology enhancing transferability for subsequent studies (Noon, 2018).

Dependability

Dependability is possible through careful documentation (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Audit trials, data triangulation with multiple sources, and reflexivity is presented, resulting in increased dependability of findings (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Data triangulation ensured supporting methodology is used through conferring of multiple sources (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Limitations in methodology were mitigated through careful data triangulation of multiple sources. Repetition or

consistency in methodology, interviewing techniques, and questioning enhanced dependability of findings (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018).

Confirmability

Conclusions of research were based entirely on data collected and not assumptions. Transparency in researcher bias or predisposition was documented, discussed, and carefully addressed to exemplify reflexivity (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Flocco, 2020). Results were based on participant accounts and member checking ensured confirmability within interpretation (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Meticulous documentation of all processes enhances auditability to further ensure confirmability (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Outcomes and decisions were confirmed through peer review auditing, resulting in confirmability of findings (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Descriptions and explanations of conclusionary outcomes are offered in explicit detail for readers throughout subsequent chapters.

Intercoder Reliability

Intercoder reliability in research is possible with oversight of multiple researchers throughout data analysis (Belotto, 2018). Two doctoral candidate researchers applied an identical coding scheme to reach agreement on the coding of content. Methodological consistency and oversight on coding procedures produce intercoder reliability in findings (Belotto, 2018). Thematic analysis followed strict procedure to produce consistency in data interpretation. Concurrence of interpretation from multiple researchers and participants based on thematic schemes enhanced intercoder reliability in findings (Belotto, 2018). Intercoder reliability methodology is consistent with previous research

techniques used to produce objectivity in findings (Belotto, 2018). Intercoder reliability at 80% may be suitable to reach inter-observer agreement (Lértora & Sullivan, 2019). Intracoding was produced by a single researcher repetitively coding data through multiple cycles (Nghiem-Phú, 2018).

Ethical Procedures

Collaborative methods for protecting participants ensured ethicality was used in data gathering, interpretation, and representation of findings. A committee and University Research Reviewer (URR) reviewed the supporting documents for quality assurance. Agreement to gain participant access and data were obtained by the IRB before research commenced. The IRB approval number, 02-07-20-0658940, was reflected in consent forms made available for review. The IRB provides oversight on research integrity and maintenance that research meets all standards in quality. IRB evaluation results in careful assurance that research processes meet U.S. federal regulations, ethical standards, and Walden University compliance measures (Wolff-Michael & Unger, 2018).

American Psychological Association (APA) principles for guiding research are respecting human participants, autonomy, justice, and beneficence (APA, 2020). Foreseeable ethical dilemmas in recruitment materials or processes were accounted for and addressed by taking necessary steps to mitigate harm (Noon, 2018). Careful deliberation that research benefits outweigh cost of any foreseeable harm or exploitation were accounted for in the study design (APA, 2020; Noon, 2018). Devices, techniques, and strategies were used with full consent and approval of participants in adherence to IRB human protection requirements.

Participants rights were protected by recognizing the right to withdrawal at any time, provision of fully informed consent, and maintaining participation is entirely voluntary (Lapid et al., 2019). Confirmation of oral and written consent with reflected comprehension on voluntary withdrawal without penalty was obtained prior to interviews. Voluntary withdrawal was carefully communicated to ensure participant comprehension of individual rights. A procedural checklist to maintain all participants are fully informed was used, assisting with guiding ethicality in data collection (see Appendix G).

Internet uploads and password protected computers were utilized to store data upholding confidentiality. Strategies for protecting anonymity in research are password protected data storage and replacing identifiable details of information with pseudonyms (Noon, 2018). Organization names, participant names, and other pieces of identifiable information were removed or altered with alias information to protect participant anonymity. Audio recordings were deleted after transcription was checked for accuracy to enhance confidentiality measures. Participants were made aware that only researcher and the team have data access. Stored data are destroyed upon university instruction after a period of five years. Study findings may not be utilized against participants in legal proceedings through careful assurance of confidentiality.

Considerations for ethics encompassed confidentiality measures, anonymity, informed consent, and conducting research on a vulnerable population. Avoidance of harm on participants was a careful consideration throughout this research. Ethical reflexivity results in careful consideration for maintaining study benefits outweigh

foreseeable harm (Wolff-Michael & Unger, 2018). Potential harm on participants was identified with appropriate steps for addressing possible concerns during research.

Participant protection is the researcher's sole concern and responsibility (Wolff-Michael & Unger, 2018).

Justice in practice was upheld by taking necessary steps ensuring potential biases would not lead to unjust outcomes (APA, 2020). Vulnerable subjects were not knowingly recruited in order to avoid any foreseeable harm. Power differentials were successfully managed through necessary steps establishing rapport and transparency (Griffin, 2018). Participants formerly detained are particularly sensitive and full informed consent comprehension is paramount (Barnert et al., 2018). Careful attention to ethics regarding informed consent and voluntary withdrawal for participants involved in the criminal justice system maintained coercion was avoided.

Summary

IPA methodology on juvenile incarceration durations, prosocial relationships, desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017), and loneliness, were collectively insufficient (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Rönkä et al., 2018). IPA is a tradition used for understanding the true essence behind lived experiences, offering original contribution to knowledge (Noon, 2018). Researcher role was operating as an instrument of data collection and subjectively interpreting participant accounts (Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Participant sampling encompassed self-recruitment and purposeful methodology based on criteria specific eligibility requirements aligned with ethical IPA methodology (Lapid et al., 2019; Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Data collection involved the use of researcher developed semistructured interviews reflecting IPA techniques to gain data rich information for interpretation (Noon, 2018). Rigor was established by incorporating methods used in comparative studies known to produce credibility, transferability, dependability, conformability, reliability, and ethical practice (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Multiple pieces of data encompassed audio recorded interviews, interview protocols, manual verbatim transcripts, journaled analytic memos based on observation, relevant scholarly content, and written follow-up. Results were based on dependable techniques used in previous studies fashioned through repetition, iteration, and consistency of methodology (Roberts et al., 2019).

Ethics are paramount in conducting research with human participants (APA, 2020). Ethical considerations in procedures, methods, informed consent, disclosure, recognizing participants' rights, foreseeable risk, and framing have been carefully addressed. Permission granted by the IRB was obtained prior to data collection ensuring ethicality compliances are met. Full informed consent, autonomy, confidentiality, and anonymity were all accounted for in methodological procedures (APA, 2020; Noon, 2018).

Chapter 4 is comprised of rich details on the exploration. Rigor and transparency are achieved through careful documentation of all research procedures (Flocco, 2020). Information on setting, demographics, data collection, analysis, and results are explicated to enhance trustworthiness.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

Incarceration has resulted in social isolation, having implications for loneliness and recidivism (Berg et al., 2018). Lengthy youth incarceration has resulted in harm on subsequent adult mental and physical health (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth experiencing loneliness and interrupted relationships within forensic context may have lifelong implications for maladaptive attributes (Goodey et al., 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). The study purpose was exploring and describing the lived experience of lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and recidivism. I formulated research questions to explore and describe unearthed phenomenon (Flocco, 2020).

RQ1: How does the lived experience of loneliness in young adults, who as juveniles underwent a lengthy incarceration, impact prosocial relationship formation postrelease?

RQ2: How does the lived experience of postrelease relationships in young adults formerly incarcerated as juveniles inform the ability to desist criminality?

Key findings based on participant accounts are presented in Chapter 4. I briefly discussed results of the pretested instrument and expert panel to explicate rigor in protocol development. I elucidated details on demographics and settings to make replication possible. I transcribed and coded interview data to produce thematic data for formulating conclusions. I presented descriptions coupled with visual aids on data collection and analysis to demonstrate trustworthiness in results. I reported intercoding

outcomes, results, and the discrepant case, in meticulous detail, followed by a thorough summary.

Pretest

I recruited two family members to participate in a pretest during protocol development. I coded the transcripts immediately after interviewing. I developed codes through three cycles documented in a Microsoft Word chart for interpreting thematic data. I provided family members with thematic interpretations and verified pieces of information prior to finalizing conclusions. Pretest outcomes were utilized for correcting problematic wording within the protocol. The protocol was slightly altered to ensure participant understandability during data gathering. I simplified words appropriately to ensure participants can understand inquiry and feel comfortable with exchanging details.

Three selected Walden University faculty qualitative expert panel members reviewed the protocol for added quality assurance. I altered the protocol slightly to incorporate probing questions for eliciting more in-depth responses and questions were framed differently. I incorporated these modifications in the protocol to maintain that participants may share their experiences without eliciting an obvious response. The pretest and Walden University faculty qualitative expert panel resulted in improved rigor during instrumentation development, enhancing overall research quality.

Setting

The Walden University IRB provided approval number 02-07-20-0658940 for authorization of research commencement. The study was approved through Walden University committee chair, second committee member, and a URR member. I completed

recruitment through consenting public places in Boston, Massachusetts advertising flyers and online. Semistructured interviews through audio recorded phone calls, online synchronized messaging, Skype, or face-to-face were approved methods for data collection. A change request was approved by the IRB to incorporate \$25 Visa Gift Card incentives for participants. Participants who completed interviews received a \$25 Visa Gift Card through the United States Postal Service. A second change request was approved for amending listed eligibility criteria to concisely define age restrictions aligning with the operational definition of young adults. National quarantine efforts resulted in altered data collection strategy by eliminating face-to-face contact and maintaining recruitment occurred primarily through telephone or internet communication.

I selected eligible participants through self-disclosure and voluntary response to flyers. I listed criteria for recruitment as individuals 18 to 29 years old who experienced incarceration while younger than 18 years, totaling 1 year or more. I developed criteria for exploring the lived experiences of young adults who underwent a lengthy juvenile incarceration in relation with loneliness, prosocial relationships, and desistance. I utilized pseudonyms for concealing any identifiable information to ensure confidentiality. Interviewee pseudonyms were coding and labeled Participant 1 (P1) through Participant 8 (P8) for added assurance of anonymity. I utilized direct quotes in coding to mitigate data contamination and support thematic conclusions (Boletto, 2018).

All participants were young adults who had experiences of cumulative court ordered detainment totaling 12 months or more while younger than 19 years. Participants were geographically diverse as a result of online recruitment methods. Specific state

listings were excluded to protect participant confidentiality. Small sample size encompassing criteria specific individuals was utilized to represent larger populations of young adults impacted by lengthy juvenile incarceration.

Demographics

Participants had varying levels of educational obtainment. All participants had at least a fifth-grade reading level, were 18 to 29 years old, in reentry no more than 5 years, and spoke fluent English. Nationalities varied between the participants. Religious affiliations, socioeconomic status, and other personal belief systems were not recognized as relevant demographical information to the study. Relevant demographical information was participant applied code, pseudonym, gender identity, identified ethnicity, age, cumulative years of juvenile incarceration, and current years in reentry (see Table 1). *Right Direction* was the applied pseudonym utilized to maintain confidentiality for a rehabilitation facility.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Code	Pseudonym	Gender	Ethnicity	Age (years)	Year(s) of juvenile incarceration	Year(s) in reentry
P1	“Evan”	M	White	29	1	3.5
P2	“Darnell”	M	Black	28	1.5	4
P3	“Mateo”	M	Hispanic	20	1	4.5
P4	“Alice”	F	White	18	6	.58
P5	“Matt”	M	White	20	1.5	.25
P6	“Alejandro”	M	Hispanic	28	3.08	4
P7	“DeAndre”	M	Black	22	1.5	3
P8	“Santiago”	M	Hispanic	28	1	.67

Data Collection**Sample Selection**

Participants were eight young adults with histories of juvenile incarceration lasting 1 year or more. Each participant was in reentry no longer than 5 years for thematic consistency and ensuring accuracy of memory recall (Macleod et al., 2018; Vrijnsen et al., 2018). Recruitment procedures encompassed Facebook advertisements or requesting public places in Boston, Massachusetts, to voluntarily display flyers. Recruitment efforts were primarily through telephone and email. I explained to agency personnel the study

purpose and intent of displaying flyers for recruiting eligible participants. Self-identified participants were able to respond with listed contact information located on the flyer.

Participants made initial contact through telephone, Facebook, or email. Total respondents encompassed 17 individuals and nine were excluded based on ineligibility or declining to participate. Eight participants were successfully screened, interviewed, determined eligible, and included in the study. I audio recorded semistructured interviews utilizing a Sony ICDUX560 and lasted from 30 to 60 minutes. Two face-to-face audio recorded interviews took place in a reserved local library conference room for maintaining privacy. I administered six interviews via audio recorded phone call.

Interviews took place primarily through telephone as a result of safety measures during national quarantine efforts. Variations in data collection from Chapter 3 encompassed the provision of a \$25 incentive for participation and amended recruitment language. Interviews took place as scheduled except for two rescheduled appointments based on participants' conflicting work obligations. Rescheduled interviews occurred within a week of the original appointment based on participant preference.

Data Analysis

Potential participants were informed of the study during initial contact. I provided informed consent and consent to audio record copies based on participant preference. Consent was obtained physically, verbally, or through email prior to screening participants for ensuring ethicality. I scheduled interviews, or interviews commenced based on participant preference, following completed screening to ensure eligibility.

I carefully explained consent and procedures to participants before audio recording took place. I inquired all eligible persons regarding preferences for receiving informed consent copies, summary of results, and gift card incentives. I utilized purposeful criteria sampling to ensure thematic consistency and prevent possible contamination of data through memory bias (Ames, Glenton, & Lewin, 2019; Vrijisen et al., 2018). Purposeful sampling resulted in thorough analysis of phenomenon based on persons with direct experience (Ames et al., 2019).

Second phase initiated through audio recorded interviews utilizing conversational style, guided by a semistructured protocol format (see Appendix F). Data analysis commenced immediately following completed interviews. Observational reflection notes were recorded to enhance reflexivity, provide auditability, and use in data triangulation. Interviews were transcribed manually, word verbatim, and reviewed multiple times along with audio recordings for accuracy. I recorded memos through each review to clarify thought processes and promote transparency (Sim, 2020).

Participants answered all questions listed on the protocol and were provided with an opportunity to include additional information. Interviewees were actively engaged and asked to verify certain pieces of information for enhancing interpretational accuracy (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). IPA methods involve hermeneutic approach to understand ideographic nature of participant experience through interpretive interplay between researcher and participant (Larsson et al., 2019). The audio recording was stopped upon participant completion of responses. I debriefed participants and provided them with time to ask additional questions.

I broke down and sorted interview transcripts in a Microsoft Word coding chart used for visual organization. I sent interview transcripts, Microsoft Word coding charts, and initial observational reflections to an intercoder for independent analysis. Commonalities, repetition, and significant phrases were noted through three cycles of coding to develop categorical information for locating overarching thematic data across cases. Researcher bracketing of experience was actively documented throughout data analysis to enhance validity, reduce bias, and produce auditability for peer review. I sent transcripts and preliminary findings to participants for member checking with a 25% response rate. Two participants verified interpretations and accuracy of transcripts. One of the two participants provided more information for inclusion in data triangulation.

I developed descriptive code lists for interpreting participant cognition regarding accounts specific to answering research questions. I utilized an inductive approach to locate emergent categorical data exemplified through code frequency, dominance, and significance for answering the research questions (Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018). I combined categorical data for creating thematic findings and compared outcomes with participant quotes. The intercoder and I selected categories independently based on semantic meaning relating back to research questions.

Initial intercoder agreement was 66.3% and amended to 98.5% consensus after multiple conversations. Outcomes for each consensus discussions and rationales were carefully documented. Categorical consensus between researcher and intercoder was utilized in data triangulation to further develop thematic conclusions for each case. I recorded, condensed, and compared thematic data across cases for basing conclusionary

findings. I sent documented findings for peer review to ensure credibility and accuracy in interpretations. I refined and compared thematic conclusions to participant quotes for basing findings. Results and significant quotes are illustrated in detail, followed by a comprehensive analysis on the identified discrepant case.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Data triangulation and sampling methods commonly used for increasing rigor resulted in data saturation, enhancing credibility of findings (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Member checks or observational verifications were established through offering participants' transcripts and preliminary findings for review (Griffin, 2018; Peart et al., 2019; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Peer review and intercoder utilization through a fellow doctoral candidate enhanced overall credibility of findings (Belotto, 2018). I utilized direct participant quotes in development of categorical data to increase overall interpretational accuracy. I recorded and transcribed interviews word verbatim to ensure overall accuracy of interpretations (Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I compiled documentation to illustrate inductive movement of data units into thematic conclusions made available for peer review, enhancing overall credibility in findings. A discrepant case and direct quotes were purposefully included within thematic analysis to produce credibility. Explication of discrepant cases and disconfirming evidence may illustrate thickness delved from data adequacy in qualitative methodology (Vasileiou, Barnett, Thorpe, & Young, 2018).

Transferability

I established transferability through production of descriptive rich data using common semistructured interviewing techniques to interpret meaning (Daniel, 2019; Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). I enhanced transferability through careful documentation of observations (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). I carefully documented contextual and setting information utilizing a procedural checklist to promote transferability (see Appendix G). I compiled audit trails, exemplifying adherence to data collection processes and interpretation for determining applicability in replication (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Peart et al., 2019).

Dependability

Audit trails increased dependability through careful documentation of all processes for enhanced transparency (Peart et al., 2019). Memos and thought preservation resulted in explicated analytical processes serving as an audit tool. Dependability in findings was evidenced by demonstrating use of participant quotes to represent themes (Lemon & Hayes, 2020). Another researcher and I utilized common IPA methods repetitiously with meticulous documentation of processes.

Confirmability

Research findings were based on interviewee responses. The use of quotes was explicated and illustrated to produce confirmability in thematic findings. Peer review was a useful tool to limit bias from contamination of data (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Peer review through each analytical phase resulted in ensuring interpretations were supported by data (Peart et al., 2019). Multiple researchers reviewed data repetitiously to

limit bias from contaminating data, enhance reflexivity through consensus discussions, and produce credible unanimity for thematic conclusions (O'Connor & Joffe, 2020).

Intercoder consensus discussions promoted reflexivity and congruence in thematic interpretations throughout the data dissemination processes (O'Connor & Joffe, 2020). Reflexivity was enhanced through careful memo documentation and audit trails made available for peer review (Peart et al., 2019). Participant accounts formed the basis of results and member checking was offered with a 25% verification rate (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Summaries were developed and sent to participants in addition with follow-up member checking. Observational verification during the interview resulted in enhanced credibility of interpretation (Griffin, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019).

Results

Subordinate themes were formulated based on categorical data and derived from overarching thematic data across cases (see Table 2). Subordinate themes based on categorical data regarding participant-identified social relationships postrelease are difficult affiliation, rehabilitation support, intimate relationship, prosocial family members, and perceived isolation (see Table 3). Participant-identified needed social support attributes encompass safe outlet, identity, accountability, reentry support, growth, trust, and dependability (see Table 4). Overarching concepts or thematic data are social maladaptation, institutionalization, stigmatization, identifying with prosocial support, antisocial peer disassociation, and loneliness (see Table 5). Direct participant quotes were used in the coding process to formulate categories and emergent themes.

Table 2

Overarching Themes and Subordinate Themes

Overarching themes	Subordinate themes on participant-identified postrelease relationships	Subordinate themes on participant-identified social needs
1. Social maladaptation	1. Difficult affiliation	1. Identity 2. Safe outlet
2. Institutionalization	1. Difficulty affiliation 2. Strained relationships	1. Growth 2. Trust and dependability
3. Stigmatization	1. Difficulty affiliation 2. Strained relationships	1. Safe outlet 2. Trust and dependability
4. Identifying with prosocial support	1. Rehabilitation support 2. Intimate relationship	1. Growth 2. Safe outlet 3. Trust and dependability
5. Antisocial peer dissociation	1. Rehabilitation support 2. Prosocial family members	1. Accountability
6. Loneliness	1. Perceived isolation	1. Reentry support 2. Safe outlet 3. Identity 4. Trust and dependability

Table 3

Social Relationships Postrelease

Theme	Responses	Participant identifier	Excerpt
1. Difficult Affiliation (P1, P2, P3, P4, P7)	5	P1	“It’s hard to talk to people”
2. Rehabilitation Support (P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	7	P2	“They (Right Direction) keep me on track I’ve been sober”
3. Intimate Relationship (P1, P2, P6, P8)	4	P6	“My partner opened my eyes up and is somebody that cares”
4. Prosocial Family Members (P2, P3, P6, P8)	4	P6	“All they wanna do is just made sure that I get to the next level”
5. Strained Relationships (P2, P4, P7, P8)	4	P7	“I’m trying to get close to my mom’s side”
6. Perceived Isolation (P1, P2, P3, P4, P7)	5	P7	“I felt alone at the time but that’s how I feel regardless of the fact anyway.”

Table 3. Participant-identified subthemes are based on descriptive accounts of dynamic postrelease relationships. Many participants described difficulty in reaffiliating with new connections, typically resulting from social anxiety maladaptation. Numerous participants were involved in rehabilitation programs, assisting with community transitioning. Four participants described the need for intimate relationships, two having prosocial attributes. P2 described his intimate partner affiliation as impeding prosocial rehabilitation-based goals of sobriety. P2 felt his need for affiliation resulted in a negative experience, “like I needed somebody, she needed somebody, and really didn’t need each other.” Prosocial intimate partner relationships or prosocial family relationships resulted in developmental progression, wellbeing, and enhanced focus on prosocial values.

Various participants described strained relationships as a result of their experience. Participants experiencing strained relationships often reinforced maladaptive ways of coping. P7 conveyed strained reaffiliation with his mother’s side of the family, impacting overall postrelease hardship “I’m trying to get close to my mom’s side but she she’s kinda playing iffy...my mom was kicking me out like every other weekend.” Perceived isolation was common amongst participants throughout their experience. Social isolation and anxiety often resulted in postrelease challenges relating to others. P2 experienced broken relationships and joined a gang post incarceration. P2 illustrated a cycle of loneliness, maladaptive substance abuse, depression, and re-incarceration.

Table 4

Social Support Needs

Theme	Responses	Participant identifier	Excerpt
1. Safe Outlet (P1, P2, P5, P6, P8)	5	P5	“I’ve learned how to be vulnerable and like call another alcoholic”
2. Identity (P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	7	P3	“Just relieving like oh I’m not the only one going through something”
3. Accountability (P2, P3, P5, P6, P7)	5	P6	“I have to set an example for the young men that I work for”
4. Reentry Support (P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	8	P2	“Definitely need uh people in your corner like Right Direction”
5. Trust and Dependability (P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P8)	7	P6	“She stood there by my side the whole time that I was there.”
6. Growth (P1, P5, P6, P7)	4	P1	“We have grown together and understand each other”

Table 4. Participant-identified subthemes are based on descriptions of social support needs. Social support systems being used as a safe outlet was described to be effective in rectifying maladaptive behavioral patterns. P2 views prosocial relationships and family as a safe outlet, mitigating social maladaptation manifesting through substance abuse, “I’m lucky this time. I came out, and I have the people I have now, and they keep me on track.” Participants clarified the meaning in affiliating or identifying with others through shared experiences to move forward and reduce harmful impacts of loneliness. P3 explained how relating to others through background experiences reduces the feeling of being alone, producing hope, “I’m not the only one going through something so it’s just good to hear somebody else...like, I’m not alone.” Identifying with prosocial others was essential for promoting wellbeing, recovery, personal growth, and successful desistance.

Accountability within social support systems resulted in feelings of responsibility towards others, facilitating focus on desistance. P6 discussed having to be accountable and maintain integrity in values P6 teaches others with similar backgrounds. P6 explained, “I have to set an example for the young men that I work for...my job is to show them that it's possible to step back, look at the bigger picture, and change your life.” P5 emphasized importance in identifying with others who reinforce prosocial values and do not “endorse” antisocial behavior. P5 stated, “find someone (who)...will hold you accountable...cuz I know that's what I needed too.”

Individualized reentry supports were among the social support needs identified by participants. P1 obtained a lack in postrelease support, having negative impact on sobriety, ascertaining housing, employment, and finding legitimate ways of conforming to conventional adulthood roles. Participants expressed the importance in reentry supports being facilitated prior to release, encompassing basic needs coupled with mental health care for treating maladaptation. P4 stated, "I think they just need to come up with a plan before you get out." Many participants experienced social maladaptation from trust issues, requiring social supports encompassing characteristics of trust and dependability. P5 described the dependable, positive influence one individual demonstrated during his incarceration, leading to recovery, "He would come and visit me every single Sunday... and he took me through the 12 steps of AA...I owe him a lot."

Trust and dependability were necessary attributes defined by participants to support personal growth, recovery, and focus on desistance. P6 strongly advocated the value of prosocial relationships to continually move forward, "There are two people there that gave me the seed and gave me the tools to flourish into something beautiful." P1's intimate partner relationship exemplified consequential reduced impulsivity, improved judgement-making, and enhanced problem-solving abilities. P1 stated, "We have grown together and understand each other, and like how far I've come, and like my um stubbornness, to my irritability, and everything else... it's always alright, we'll find the way around it instead." Participants emphasized the importance of prosocial supports facilitating positive growth and avoiding negative affiliations to augment continual focus on rehabilitation-based goals.

Table 5

Reentry Experience Related to Social Support and Desistance

Theme	Responses	Participant identifier	Excerpt
1. Social Maladaptation (RQ1: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	8	P1	“That overwhelming anxiety was too much, and I went back to smoking weed”
2. Institutionalization (RQ1: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7)	7	P5	“I was never able to really grow up while incarcerated”
3. Stigmatization (RQ1: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6)	6	P3	“I felt like a criminal.”
4. Identifying with Prosocial Support (RQ2: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	8	P5	“They can identify with the feelings that have come behind those situations”
5. Antisocial Peer Dissociation (RQ2: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8)	8	P6	“You need to stop surrounding yourself by people that make you look like you're one of them.”
6. Loneliness (RQ2: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7)	7	P6	“I felt like nobody understood”

Table 5. Overarching thematic data is explicated with the use of participant quotes. Three themes emerged in participant responses to RQ1 encompassing social maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization. RQ1 was developed to explore underlying essence of experiencing lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, and participant cognition regarding impact on prosocial relationship formation postrelease. Three themes were developed based on interviewee responses to RQ2 encompassing identifying with prosocial support, antisocial peer dissociation, and loneliness. RQ2 was formulated to delve in participant cognition regarding personalized experiential implications for desistance processes.

Theme 5.1: Social maladaptation. Participant social maladaptation reinforced loneliness experienced after institutionalization through barriers in reaffiliating with new prosocial relationships. Numerous participants reported social anxiety maladaptation. Participants recalled difficulty in relating to new prosocial people. Social anxiety maladaptation frequently resulted in social withdrawal and reinforced social isolation through participants portraying an aggressive exterior. P1 described excessive social anxiety, fear, and loneliness resulting in a difficult community transition. P1 reverted to hustling and smoking marijuana after experiencing severe anxiety postrelease, “I would still have to I would go over what I was gonna say before I would speak it...I would even hesitate and then I would talk...that overwhelming anxiety was too much and I went back to smoking weed.”

Theme 5.2: Institutionalization. *Institutionalization* experiences resulted in postrelease barriers for relating with prosocial others through inopportunity to learn

conventional adult values and functioning. Institutionalism was equivalent to participants' interpretation as being an environment resulting in survivalist mentality. Participants viewed institutionalism as an experience where morality, values, healthy development, and adult functionality were not promoted. Participants reported forming affiliations through gangs or correctional staff for self-preservation. Participants expressed feeling lost postrelease and experienced hardship with conforming to conventional adulthood roles. The experience of institutionalism negatively impacted postrelease prosocial relationship formation. P5 recalled institutionalization as resulting in halting development or growth required for community transitioning, "I was never able to really grow up while incarcerated...If anything, I could've learned how to be a better criminal...I was institutionalized per se because they don't teach you how to be a person in there."

Theme 5.3: Stigmatization. Participant experiences of stigmatization and fear negatively impacted new prosocial relationships through self-reinforced loneliness. Participants reported feeling different from others as a result of their experience. Perceived stigmatization resulted in fear or difficulty expressing vulnerability and relating to others. Freedom from judgment was significant to participants for forming quality connections. Participants who felt stigmatized reported cycles of substance abuse, aggression, or social isolation, having negative connotations for living crime free. P2 expressed significance in attaching to others who would not exemplify judgement throughout his process, "they've seen my whole cycle they don't judge me." P2 exhibited concern of stigmatization regarding his age and possible judgement from others in Right

Direction. Perceived stigmatization resulted in difficulty relating or connecting to others, “I don't have a close friend here (pause) and everybody (pause) Jesus, I'm like the oldest one here.”

Theme 5.4: Identifying with prosocial support. Participant ability to identify with prosocial supports facilitated recovery, reinforced rehabilitation-based goals, and created a safe outlet. Participants reported that identifying with prosocial others promoted positive development and mitigating loneliness or maladaptation. P2 interpreted having prosocial support in place as a catalyst for his recent sobriety and success. P3 expressed relating to others' stories as mitigating postrelease loneliness, resulting in hope.

Participants connected to prosocial supports through rehabilitation programming were provided beneficial resources. Participants who were provided rehabilitation assistance maintained a smoother community transition, productivity, and improved safety postrelease. P7 described value in his ability to relate with other influential prosocial males for promoting independence and growth, “I feel like I can closely relate to that because I am...working on becoming that myself.” P8 explained improved reaffiliation post incarceration through being connected to identifiable prosocial supports, “I feel like I can talk to people about anything now, before I used to just keep it all to myself...I got help.”

Theme 5.5: Antisocial peer dissociation. Connection to a relatable prosocial support system and antisocial peer dissociation were critical for reducing recidivism risk. Participants recounted affiliation with antisocial peers as being the largest risk for compromising successful desistance. Many participants found difficulty relating with

new prosocial others postrelease. Participants with adequate familial support would often self-isolate at the house to avoid antisocial peers. P3 explained challenges with antisocial peers that could risk his freedom and stressed importance in avoidance of these affiliations, “Just staying out the way and saying no...Anything that would risk my freedom...Just saying I’m all set.” P4 described antisocial peer affiliations and associated risk behavior postrelease, “When I first got out, I was doing some stuff but I just never got caught...I’m pregnant now, so I don’t do anything.” P4 expressed importance in affiliating with peers who will not endorse risk behaviors and accept prosocial lifestyle choices. P6 described previous setbacks attributable to antisocial peer affiliations, “I should have listened to the people that said you need to stop surrounding yourself by people that make you look like you're one of them.”

Theme 5.6: Loneliness. Chronic loneliness experienced would result in maladaptive cycles, reinforcing recidivism. Participants acknowledged the strong desire to reaffiliate postrelease. Connections to rehabilitation supports or prosocial others mitigated loneliness and reduced recidivism risk. Connection to antisocial others for mitigating loneliness, increased likelihood of recidivism. Numerous participants reported loneliness as a catalyst for maladaptive behavioral patterns of substance abuse and aggression. P5 and P6 explained that maladaptive behavioral patterns would result in further social isolation or depression. P1 provided an account of loneliness after being released, having a negative impact for desistance, “Now there’s really nobody around...You've been around people so long incarcerated, that it's weird being alone... I started back hustling and all these people around me, I felt a little anxiety off of me.”

P2 described how loneliness or failed affiliation resulted in reinforcement of maladaptive substance abuse, “Yeah I'd come out and then go back to doing the same *shit* (pause). I didn't have an outlet, I didn't have, um you know, nothing to rely on except for the bottle.” P3 and P4 expressed difficulty in quality connections postrelease, having negative implications for emotional wellbeing. P5 described how loneliness would be self-reinforced and exacerbated maladaptive behavioral patterns, “That feeling of being alone... I isolated myself even more by getting into fights.” P6 recollected a difficult time in reentry from the painful experience of loneliness, resulting with self-reinforced behavioral maladaptation, “I got a feeling lonely. I felt like nobody understood and it was just like I was going crazy...I hurt a lot of the people around me...I just got into a very, very destructive path of depression.” P7 described how his reentry experience was lonely, having a negative impact on transitioning and emotional wellbeing “I felt alone at the time, but that's how I feel regardless of the fact anyway.”

P8 was identified as a discrepant case, explicating that affiliation improved from overall experience. P8 elucidated improved expression of personal vulnerability with his mother, brother, and affiliations at Right Direction. P8 was able to connect with prosocial others having similar backgrounds in his rehabilitation-based program. P8 was placed in a rehabilitation program with youth workers having similar experiences. P8's improved affiliation may be related to unyielding family support throughout his experience. Numerous participants conveyed strained familial relationships or a lack of identifiable family support. Majority of participants were involved in a rehabilitation program, having

direct consequences on data. All aspects of data were important to the overall analysis for basing conclusionary findings.

Summary

Participant experience of lengthy juvenile incarceration, loneliness, prosocial postrelease relationships, and desistance was explored through an IPA approach. Direct quotes were used to substantiate thematic conclusions, aligning with a participant-oriented IPA approach (Alase, 2017; Lingard, 2019). RQ1 was constructed to explore underlying experience of lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, and postrelease relationships. RQ2 was formulated to gain insight concerning participant cognition regarding collective phenomena impacts on desistance processes.

The underlying thematic data representing experience of participants were that maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization reinforced perceived social isolation. The experience of postrelease prosocial relationships impacts desistance based on youth's ability to successfully identify with prosocial others, knife off antisocial peers, and mitigate chronic loneliness. Participant experiences of social maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization were substantial barriers impacting the ability to relate with new prosocial others. The ability to connect with prosocial others through family, intimate partners, or rehabilitation supports was critical for ongoing successful transitioning. Subthemes were developed based on participant meaning making of significance and necessities within forming quality relationships.

Subthemes derived from participant accounts regarding social needs encompassed safe outlet, identity, accountability, reentry support, growth, trust, and dependability.

Many participants viewed importance of social relationships as a safe way to express emotional processes. P5 and P6 described the need to use others as an outlet, expressing vulnerabilities or emotions, mitigating maladaptation for moving forward. Participants described meaning in being able to identify with others through experiences, background, emotional patterns, and thought processes. Relating and identifying with others was a substantial part of successfully affiliating to quality prosocial relationships. P5 emphasized the meaning of accountability in identifying with others for facilitating successful desistance, recovery, and growth.

Growth was described as essential for forming quality attachment to others. P6 described his underlying motivations in affiliation as potential for growth. P6 elucidated prosocial supports as necessary for development, wellbeing, and successfully desisting crime. Trust and dependability were important to many participants. Various participants experienced social maladaptation formed from abandonment, broken trust, and assimilating to institutionalization. Participants placed significance and importance in the ability to form dependable, trusting relationships with others. Reentry support was a significant aspect for most participants' experiences. Individualized reentry support is crucial for connecting postrelease youth to appropriate prosocial others and fostering healthy adult transitioning. Youth explained that reentry support should initiate prior to reentry and account for individualized needs. Conventional adult functionality should be cultivated prior to release, enhancing chances for successful functioning in the community.

Subthemes derived from participant experience regarding postrelease relationships were difficult affiliation, rehabilitation support, intimate relationship, prosocial family members, strained relationships, and perceived isolation. P1, P2, P3, P4, and P7 expressed difficulty in affiliations postrelease. P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, and P8 were receiving rehabilitation support to assist with community transitioning. Postrelease youth require necessary supports to facilitate functionality towards conventional adult roles. P1 explained the lack of rehabilitation support provided, having a negative impact on his ability to successfully desist criminality. P1 experienced strain in locating housing, employment, mental health care, and feeling connected to others. P1 experienced increased strain and anxiety, exacerbated by perceived isolation, reverting to risk behaviors.

Intimate relationships require a normative progression and are essential in developmental processes (Shulman et al., 2019). Romantic relationships or marriage have been understood as a critical protective factor against recidivism and mitigates harmful impacts of loneliness (Abrams & Tam, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). P1, P2, P6, and P8 described their intimate partner relationships. P1 and P6 acquired meaningful intimate partner relationships. These relationships resulted in developmental progression, increased focus on values, and overall enhanced emotional wellbeing. P2 and P8 described their intimate partner relationships as strained or broken.

Prosocial family members were an active part of P2, P3, P6, and P8's experience. Many of these familial relationships experienced strain and separation during incarceration. P8 views family as a significant support system throughout his experience,

resulting in more successful community transitioning. P8 was discrepant, describing his affiliation as enhanced post incarceration. P2, P4, P7, and P8 all expressed strain in their relationships throughout the experience. Most young adults expressed feelings of social isolation throughout their post incarceration experiences.

Chapter 5 was developed to include conclusionary findings based on analysis. Findings were developed based on participant cognition regarding underlying meaning of the experience. Associations made within the study and extant research are discussed in detail. Limitations of the study are discussed and addressed. Implications and recommendations are offered to guide the direction of future research. Key concepts extracted from data are concisely summarized and related back to the theoretical framework that guided examination.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose for investigation was exploring lived experience of lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships postrelease, and criminal desistance. The study is a phenomenological design used to explore and describe true lived experience of participants (Noon, 2018). I used IPA to analyze data derived from participant accounts (Noon, 2018). I conducted the investigation to describe desistance barriers after lengthy youth incarceration. I developed Chapter 5 to demonstrate integration, synthesis, and evaluation of results with relevant literature.

Key findings to the study encompass three overarching themes per research question. RQ1 overarching thematic data were social maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization. Themes demonstrate the experience of lengthy youth incarceration, having negative implications for participants' forming new postrelease prosocial relationships. RQ2 overarching thematic data were identifying with prosocial support, antisocial peer dissociation, and loneliness. Prosocial support and antisocial peer dissociation resulted in more successful desistance.

Loneliness resulting in successful prosocial reaffiliation produced favorable outcomes for criminal desistance. Loneliness resulting in reinforced maladaptation and chronic depression had negative implications for desistance processes. Participants reaffiliating with antisocial peers, or experiencing maladaptive attributes resulting from loneliness, were at higher risk to recidivate. Subthemes developed from participant reports of experiencing social relationships postrelease are difficult affiliation,

rehabilitation support, intimate relationships, prosocial family members, strained relationships, and perceived isolation. I utilized participant-identified social support needs to develop subthemes of safe outlet, identity, accountability, reentry support, growth, trust, and dependability.

Interpretation of the Findings

Lengthy youth incarceration has been positively correlated with poor subsequent adult health and loneliness (Barnert et al., 2018; Reid, 2017). Loneliness has been positively correlated with a multitude of poor mental health effects and social withdrawal (Gray, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Prosocial supports are critical for postrelease youth development, wellbeing, and desistance (Best et al., 2018; Ma, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017; Shannon & Hess, 2019). Incarceration having a positive correlation with youth loneliness (Reid, 2017), may have negative implications for future relationships needed to successfully desist (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

Youth incarceration or loneliness has been positively correlated with poor neurological development, mental, and physical health (Barnert et al., 2018; Fuller, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Tabashneck, 2018; Tomova et al., 2019). Loneliness has been positively correlated with difficulty in effective RAM and future relationships (Tomova et al., 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018), imperative for successful desistance (Villanueva et al., 2019). Youth development is a phase for rapid development and antisocial behavioral patterns are normative, typically experiencing sharp decline in adulthood (Rocque et al., 2019). Youth are at high risk for experiencing chronic loneliness (Fuller, 2019) and

require healthy normative relationship progression, assisting in wellbeing or conventional adult transitioning (Shulman et al., 2019).

Youth incarceration interrupts natural relationship progression (Comfort et al., 2018, Shulman et al., 2019) and key determinants of behavioral problems may be treated by alternative means (Barnert et al., 2018). Youth incarceration results in heightened loneliness (Reid, 2017), having negative ramifications on health, future relationships, development, and the ability to live crime free (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Tomova et al., 2019). Information was required to understand the dynamics of youth incarceration durations, postrelease prosocial relationships, and implications for desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, postrelease prosocial relationships, and recidivism have been collectively lacking research (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

An IPA study approach was appropriate to explore unearthed phenomena from participants having direct experience (Alase, 2017). I developed research questions to gain a deep insight of underlying experiences for explorational analysis. Semistructured interviewing techniques commonly used in IPA studies produced rich descriptions for data analysis (Alase, 2017; Noon, 2018). I developed RQ1 to gain rich exploration of lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, and prosocial relationship formation postrelease. Participant accounts revealed youth incarceration was often characterized by experiences of loneliness, maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization, having negative connotations for successful prosocial reaffiliation postrelease. Experiences of maladaptation, institutionalization, and stigmatization often resulted in cyclitic self-

reinforced loneliness, having negative implications for desistance. Majority of participants described experienced problematic reaffiliation, strained relationships, and perceived isolation. Participants connected with rehabilitation supports, maintaining successful intimate relationships, and acquiring quality prosocial family relationships, expressed easier community transitioning.

RQ2 was fashioned to explore the experience regarding how collective phenomena features into desistance processes. RAM was the theoretical framework guiding concepts of loneliness, human motivation guiding behavioral patterns toward affiliation, failed reaffiliation, and criminality within forensic context (Qualter et al., 2015). Thematic findings were that identifying with prosocial supports increased likelihood of successfully mitigating loneliness, effective antisocial peer dissociation, and experiencing more ease in resisting criminality. Participants expressed importance in identifying or relating to prosocial others, having a safe outlet, remaining accountable, maintaining reentry support, experiencing personal growth, trust, and dependability. Lack in affiliation with identifiable prosocial relationships encompassing these characteristics resulted in problematic community transitioning.

Antisocial peer dissociation and affiliating with prosocial supports may serve as crucial protective factors (Villanueva et al., 2019). Pre-existing disadvantage was amplified through incarceration experience and resulted in strained relationships for numerous participants. Participants describing strained familial relationships reported problematic substance abuse, difficulty in intimate relationships, and a cycle of recidivism, aligning with extant research (Eichelsheim et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2019;

Mowen & Bowman, 2017). Two participants maintained successful intimate relationships postrelease, exemplifying developmental progression and emotional wellbeing. The relationships were developed from past affiliation and P6 expressed his intimate partner as encouraging prosocial values. Romantic relationships have been understood to foster healthy development, serve as a protective factor, and mitigate harmful impacts of loneliness (Abrams & Tam, 2018; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019).

Participants who reported loneliness often experienced depression and behavioral aggression, reinforcing feelings of isolation. Loneliness and depression have been positively correlated with youth aggression, leading to further social isolation (Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Yavuzer et al., 2018). Maladaptive cycles were mitigated through reaffiliation or connection to rehabilitative prosocial supports for many respondents. Participants who experienced hardship in prosocial reaffiliation reported reverting to cyclic patterns of criminality.

Failed reaffiliation was exemplified with numerous participants throughout their experience. RAM offers theoretical groundings for failed affiliation resulting in a cycle of social withdrawal and reinforced loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015). I extended RAM to a forensic context through this exploration. Failed reaffiliations resulted in social anxiety or aggressive maladaptation for some participants, reinforcing isolation and negatively impacting criminal desistance.

Aggression resulted from the internalization of negative emotions without a safe outlet. Broken trust and institutionalization resulted in increased maladaptive attributes, exemplified by multiple participants. Participants expressed institutionalization as an

experience where affiliation was produced by means of protection and vulnerability resulted in victimization. Participants described institutionalization as inhibiting positive developmental growth and conformity to conventional adulthood roles.

Participant accounts regarding institutionalization and negative impacts for developmental growth has been exemplified in extant research (Mowen & Bowman, 2017). P1 and P5 explained that most knowledge consumed is negative within the context of incarceration. P5 described the inability to learn human functionality, goals, and values throughout incarceration. Identifying and affiliating with prosocial others led to developmental progression for multiple participants, mitigating harmful impacts of incarceration. Prosocial supports operated as a system for accountability and safe outlet resulting in overall enhanced wellbeing. Trust and dependability established through identifying with prosocial others resulted in enhancing development, mitigating risk for recidivism. Reaffiliation to relatable prosocial supports resulted with recovery in various areas of maladaptive behavior impacting recidivism risk.

Limitations of the Study

Transferability is an inherent limitation in qualitative studies, reduced by utilizing methodology to produce rich data (Daniel, 2019). Semistructured interviewing techniques, congruent to traditional IPA methodology, mitigated issues with transferability (Daniel, 2019; Lauterbach, 2018; Noon, 2018; Ravenhill & Visser, 2019). Data saturation and production of rich descriptions based on participant accounts resulted with enhanced transferability in this study (Peart et al., 2019). Sampling encompassed

purposeful criteria specific selection to adhere with IPA methodology and enhance transferability (Peart et al., 2019).

Many participants were attending the same or similar rehabilitation programs. Participants were geographically diverse, having the majority heavily concentrated in Massachusetts. Rehabilitation approaches and opportunities vary from state to state. This may impact interpretational data and pose difficulty in transferability. Certain demographics having impact on experience encompassing gender identity, culture, and geographic location were not a central focus in exploration. Careful documentation for auditability and peer review enhanced replicability within other contexts (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018; Peart et al., 2019). Contextual and setting information was documented to enhance transferability of this study.

Researcher bias may result in data contamination within a study requiring participant-researcher engagement for interpretational analysis (Alase, 2017). I carefully mitigated bias through documenting reflexivity processes and regular discussion with a peer review (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). An intercoder served to enhance confirmability with a final concurrence rate of 98.5% after performing independent analyses and discussing rationales for findings. I compared all thematic findings to participant transcripts maintaining alignment with participant cognition and mitigating possible bias in conclusions. Research focus was on participant understanding and interpretations of direct experiences as the forefront in exploration, aligning with IPA methodology (Alase, 2017). I utilized direct quotes to illustrate that findings are based on participant cognition regarding experienced phenomena.

The quality of qualitative research relies heavily on accuracy in participant recall. Participants were purposefully selected based on strict criteria to maintain accuracy in recall. Age and reentry duration restrictions were put in place to mitigate memory bias or inaccuracies of memory recall from contaminating outcomes. Techniques to produce rapport were established through mutual engagement during interviewing (Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018). Participants may have been reluctant to express criminal temptations or behaviors in detail. Assumptions made were that participants expressed honesty in disclosure of their accounts. Methodological limitations may exist within self-report to produce findings in qualitative research.

Generalizability is an inherent limitation within qualitative studies (Noon, 2018). The study was developed utilizing methodological focus on rich data, requiring smaller datasets for deeper exploration (Garwood & Hassett, 2019; Mant et al., 2018). Qualitative studies are developed to explore unearthed phenomena without focus on generalization (Flocco, 2020). Exploration on collective unexplored phenomena was the central focus and comparative data saturation techniques may address methodological limitations (Alase, 2017; Aldiabat & Le Navenec, 2018).

Recommendations

Qualitative studies are beneficial and may be utilized for describing unexplored phenomenon (Flocco, 2020). Future research efforts focused on generalizability and larger participant sample size may be beneficial for understanding maladaptation resulting from loneliness in forensic populations. The current study may be replicated with other justice involved populations to enhance validity of findings for diverse

persons. Interventions may be developed based on further investigational efforts, specifically targeting diverse groups within the forensic context. Investigation efforts on durations of incarceration, loneliness, and relationships for different age groups would be helpful to develop properly tailored interventions.

Service providers should be cognizant of youthful offenders' developmental needs, background, and account for diversity. Loneliness is a multifaceted experience and may have substantial impacts for youth going through considerable developmental changes (Mikyuck & Woolard, 2019; Shulman et al., 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). Incarcerated youth often experience interrupted relationships that are crucial for promoting lifelong wellbeing and development (Goodey et al., 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019). Environmental and developmental factors have been understood as having substantial impacts on how loneliness presents in populations (Spithoven et al., 2019). Maladaptation may present differently in offenders and individual causes should be identified to optimize therapy targeting problematic behavioral patterns.

People with numerous social connections may experience negative impacts from loneliness (Williams & Braun, 2019). Interventions developed with focus on the nature and quality of social relationships may maximize overall program efficacy (Lim et al., 2019). Intervention services typically encourage social opportunities to reduce loneliness and additional focus on building quality prosocial relationships is recommended (Lim et al., 2019). RAM is a theoretical explanation for maladaptive behavioral patterns resulting from prolonged loneliness (Qualter et al., 2015). Theoretical understandings on how

successful interventions mediate social isolation and loneliness must be further developed (Gardiner, Geldenhuys, & Gott, 2018).

Loneliness may result in maladaptive behavioral problems leading to problematic future relationships (Arpin & Mohr, 2019) needed for successful desistance (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017). Youth are at high risk for experiencing chronic loneliness and research on youth chronic loneliness is dearth (Vanhalst et al., 2018). Loneliness has been combatted through interventions focusing on increasing opportunities for social support, improving social skills, reducing social isolation, or addressing maladaptive cognition (Ypsilanti, 2018). Service delivery developed with primary focus on alleviating maladaptive thoughts has been the most effective at reducing loneliness (Ypsilanti, 2018).

Findings in this investigation result with explicating importance of connecting postrelease youth to identifiable prosocial supports. Lengthy youth incarceration was expressed as a lonely experience, exacerbating maladaptation challenges in connecting with new prosocial supports required for successful desistance. Connection with identifiable prosocial supports or successful reaffiliation resulted in positive development, more harmonious community transitioning, and adapting to conventional adulthood roles. Service delivery should consider rehabilitative programming to incorporate connecting postrelease youth with identifiable prosocial support systems. Future investigational efforts should focus on understanding maladaptation resulting from loneliness across ontology to improve service efficacy (Arpin & Mohr, 2019).

Implications

Mass incarceration results in negative health impacts, loneliness, proliferates oppression, and is economically unviable (Barnert et al., 2018; Reid, 2017; Wildeman & Wang, 2017). Youth incarceration may be counterproductive to combat recidivism and negatively impacts subsequent adult health (Barnert et al., 2018). The impacts of mass incarceration are transgenerational (Reising et al., 2019). Findings may be used to illustrate maladaptive attributes developed from youth experiences of lengthy incarceration. Conclusions may be utilized for guiding future research, informing policy regarding alternative sanction practices, and development of enhanced services. Recidivism reduction of youthful offenders would be fruitful for society (Walker et al., 2018).

The investigation explored RAM and loneliness within a forensic context, through young adult accounts of reentry after lengthy incarceration during adolescence. Exploration resulted in enhanced understanding of how loneliness negatively impacts the ability to reaffiliate and desist criminality. Many participants expressed heightened loneliness and maladaptation throughout their experiences. Maladaptation was evidenced through substance abuse, depression, social anxiety, social withdrawal, and aggression. Young adults experienced cycles of loneliness and perceived social isolation, often resulting in maladaptive coping. Maladaptive cognitive patterns and behavior resulted in exacerbated recidivism risk. Many participants explicated chronic depression and reaffiliation with antisocial peers throughout their experience. Antisocial peer

associations have been understood as a significant recidivism risk factor for youth (Villanueva et al., 2019).

The majority of young adults in this study experienced cumulative disadvantage leading up to incarceration. Youth expressed joining gangs or having antisocial peer relationships, feeling stigmatized, lack of family cohesion, and residing in violent environments. Disadvantageous environments have been understood to be a common risk factor for youth and the results of this study may validate claims (Kennedy et al., 2018). Youth who were able to successfully reaffiliate expressed more ease with antisocial peer dissociation and desisting maladaptation or criminality patterns. Failed reaffiliation and maladaptation was reinforced through cyclic disadvantage, exacerbated with experienced institutionalism. Young adults explicated feelings of social isolation, hopelessness, mistrust, traumatization, and loneliness experienced throughout incarceration. Youth expressed successful reaffiliation and prosocial supports as critical for breaking cyclic maladaptation or successfully living crime free.

Positive Social Change Implications

Findings from this study may be utilized for service development targeting youthful offenders who have experienced incarceration. Youth incarceration may result in feelings of prolonged social isolation (Reid, 2017), having negative implications for forming prosocial connections needed to successfully reenter the community. Youth experiencing reentry require immediate services to mitigate recidivism risk (Cuevas et al., 2019). Postrelease youth are at high risk for recidivism and adult offending (Cuevas et al., 2019; Brame et al., 2018). Services may be properly tailored for criminal justice

involved youth suffering from social maladaptation after experiencing lengthy incarceration. Effective services targeting social maladaptation in postrelease youth may reduce recidivism risk, enhancing overall public safety.

Incarceration and recidivism have had negative transgenerational implications (Reising et al., 2019). Lengthy youth incarceration has resulted in problematic subsequent adult health (Barnert et al., 2018) and is positively correlated with experiences of loneliness (Reid, 2017). Loneliness results with problematic physical and mental health, having negative implications for future relationships necessary in promoting wellbeing (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Chronic loneliness may result in maladaptive behavioral patterns (Spithoven et al., 2019), having implications for reinforced criminality patterns. Recidivism further amplifies negative impacts experienced from mass incarceration and the cyclical oppression of minority populations. Harmful impacts experienced from youth recidivism may be combatted through increasing social capital (Coppola, 2018).

Post incarceration youth experiences of loneliness resulting in maladaptive behavioral patterns may be rectifiable, having widespread positive social change implications. Effective recidivism reduction strategies for youthful populations may alleviate negative transgenerational impacts of mass incarceration, mitigate criminal justice experienced oppression, enhance public health, and increase public safety. Lessons learned from exploration are that combatting loneliness may be accomplished through tailored interventions drawing from scholarly works on enhancing belonging, social skills, motivation, and cognitive-based interventions (Allen, 2020). Quality positive social relationships are fundamental in mitigating harmful psychological and

physical impacts resulting from loneliness (Allen, 2020; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019).

Prosocial support systems for youth result in overall wellbeing, development, and combatting risk behavior (Abrams & Tam, 2018; Backman et al., 2018; Mizel & Abrams, 2017). Tailored therapies coupled with identifiable prosocial supports being utilized as youth workers may result in effectively combatting risk behavioral patterns, recidivism, and loneliness.

Identifiable at-risk youth may be placed with relatable prosocial supports and provided tailored therapy, having implications for proactively treating maladaptation or avoiding youth incarceration. Youth loneliness, recidivism, and criminality patterns may be reduced by tailored programming focusing on combatting perceived social isolation. Provision of support through tailored services and identifiable prosocial support systems may result with proactively rectifying key determinants for behavioral problems. Treating key determinants of behavioral and health problems for youth should be expended or addressed prior to considering lengthy youth incarceration (Barnert et al., 2018). Lengthy youth incarceration may be counterproductive towards rehabilitation goals and has resulted in subsequent poor adult health (Barnert et al., 2018).

Effectively combatting youth loneliness and recidivism by utilizing tailored therapy with connection to identifiable prosocial support systems has positive social change implications for three recognized levels. Increasing social capital for at-risk youth may enhance positive emotional development on an individual level and greatly reduce recidivism risk (Coppola, 2018). Combatting recidivism or at-risk youth behaviors through implementation of appropriately tailored therapy having focus on prosocial

quality connections, may increase overall community safety. Positive social change based on enforcing recommended practice may have widespread societal implications by proactively addressing behavioral challenges in youth without necessitating harmful or costly confinement measures. Policy implementations of recommended proactive rehabilitation measures may result with enhancing national public safety and reducing negative transgenerational mass incarceration impacts.

Theoretical Implications

RAM was utilized to ground the current investigation in exploring perceived loneliness and resulting maladaptation. Exploration on youthful maladaptive behavioral patterns caused by loneliness may enhance understanding of desistance barriers. Participants were all young adults who had experienced lengthy juvenile incarceration. Incarcerated youth often experience loneliness and feel socially isolated (Reid, 2017). Youthful populations are at heightened risk for forming chronic loneliness, having negative implications on future health, relationships, and wellbeing (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018). Findings were compiled from analyzing participant accounts and experiences of loneliness often resulted with problematic self-reinforced maladaptation patterns, creating barriers to successfully desisting.

RAM was developed based on literature regarding human motivation translating into behavioral patterns. Participants expressed that preexisting experiences of loneliness were heightened throughout incarceration or became problematic postrelease. Participants described incarceration as a place where trauma may easily result from

expressing vulnerability. Experienced institutionalism frequently resulted in social withdrawal, aggression, loneliness, and self-internalization. Participants described social anxiety maladaptation and fear of stigmatization postrelease, inhibiting quality prosocial relationship formation necessary for alleviating cyclic criminality patterns. Participants who perceived social isolation postrelease habitually reverted to maladaptive coping skills encompassing aggression, social withdrawal, substance abuse, and affiliation with antisocial peers. Maladaptation exhibited through participants resulted with increased risk for recidivism and numerous incarcerations. Participants all expressed the motivation to reaffiliate and connect successfully postrelease. Numerous participants recalled having problems with maladaptive attributes impacting formation of prosocial connections, while not receiving adequate assistance.

Loneliness is common to human experience and grounded in survival processes (Hawkley & Schumm, 2019; Spithoven et al., 2019). Experiences of perceived loneliness typically results in motivating behavioral patterns to translate towards successful reaffiliation. Unsuccessful reaffiliation may result in self-reinforced maladaptation, chronic loneliness, social withdrawal, depression, mental health challenges, and widespread negative health implications (Arpin & Mohr, 2019; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2019; Vanhalst et al., 2018). The present investigation resulted in contributing information regarding criminal justice involved youth experiences of loneliness. Findings may be utilized to demonstrate how maladaptation negatively impacts relationships needed for successful long-term desistance. Studies on loneliness across ontology and resulting maladaptation is lacking in substantiality (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Research on loneliness

across ontology and resulting relationship dynamics require further investigation in criminal justice involved populations to optimize service efficacy.

Practice Implications

Future research endeavors should have directed focus on RAM and loneliness concerning various forensic populations. Research on chronic loneliness and RAM are underdeveloped (Qualter et al., 2015; Vanhalst et al., 2018). Studies on RAM or loneliness across ontology are crucial for understanding how to address maladaptation and health problems in forensic populations. Research efforts with larger samples of forensic populations would yield more generalizable results. This study may be utilized to guide future research and inform practice regarding treatment of maladaptation in a postrelease youthful population.

Commonalities derived from participant accounts illustrated that services should start prior to release for maximizing efficacy. Participants explained incarceration as halting developmental progression and conventional adult functionality. Rehabilitation programming should be more dynamic than promoting educational or vocational training, and consider addressing life skills (Jolley, 2018). Accounts expressed by youthful participants align with extant research on benefits of early intervention service delivery (Menon & Cheung, 2018).

Therapy targeting maladaptation should commence prior to release for youthful offenders. Multifaceted approaches, or multiple programs, are required to enhance the chances for successful rehabilitation in postrelease youthful offenders (Jolley, 2018). Participants described the necessity for identifying with prosocial others to facilitate

formation of quality connections required in successfully desisting. Service workers having similar backgrounds to youthful offenders awaiting release may be a useful resource. Relatable service workers may operate as an effective means for promoting quality prosocial connections, be a catalyst towards adult functionality, and enhance community transitioning experiences.

Cost analyses have been effectively utilized to understand data on appropriate sanction practices and monetary gains of incarceration alternatives. Several supervision strategies have resulted in effectively producing long-term financial benefits by reducing recidivism, outweighing cost significantly and with high certainty (Drake, 2018). Punitive sanctioning has resulted in financial burden on offenders, inhibiting successful reintegration, limiting future financial opportunity, and weakening positive cognitive transformation (Pleggenkuhle, 2018). Cost analysis on incarceration dosage and mental health outcomes have resulted in understanding the financial burden or negative health impacts experienced by family members of incarcerated loved ones (Provencher & Conway, 2019). Investigational cost analysis would be recommended to determine possible youth incarceration benefits and corresponding levels of community safety risk. Cost analysis on the negative effects of youth incarceration versus providing treatment for at-risk youth in a less restrictive setting would be beneficial towards substantiating effective policy initiative determinations. Effective evidenced-based community rehabilitation programs may be a beneficial alternative consideration to youth incarceration if risk of incarceration outweighs the benefits in less restrictive sanctioning efforts.

Alternative-rehabilitation efforts on youthful offenders should be promoted to reduce physical, mental, and societal impacts of mass incarceration. Further research recommendations may be used to enhance service delivery targeting maladaptive attributes resulting from loneliness experienced within a forensic context. Appropriately tailored services may mitigate post incarceration harm and increase likelihood for long-term successful criminal desistance. Further research with larger sample size could substantiate claims and inform policy regarding alternative rehabilitation programming for youthful offenders. Successful recidivism reduction and treating underlying key determinants of maladaptive behavior for youth criminality would benefit society (Barnert et al., 2018).

Conclusion

Prosocial bonds have been a pivotal part of successful youth desistance (Best et al., 2018). Lengthy incarceration of youth has resulted in subsequent worsened adult health, problematic development, and heightened loneliness (Barnert et al., 2018; Mowen & Bowman, 2017; Reid, 2017). Transient or chronic loneliness has been positively correlated with problematic affiliation, poor mental, and physical health (Martín-María et al., 2019). RAM was developed to explain maladaptation from failed reaffiliation, as a result of prolonged loneliness across development.

Youth experience substantial development and normally exhibit antisocial behaviors, discontinuing with occurrence of psychosocial maturation in young adulthood (Rocque et al., 2019). Youth require normative attachment or relationship evolution for developing, conforming to adulthood roles, and promoting wellbeing (Shulman et al.,

2019). Youth experiencing rapid development and changes in affiliation expectations have a higher propensity for suffering negative impacts of loneliness (Fuller, 2019; Qualter et al., 2015). Studies on loneliness and maladaptation impacting relationship dyads across ontology are dearth (Arpin & Mohr, 2019). Youth incarceration durations and postrelease prosocial relationship formation requires understanding to mitigate recidivism (Pettus-Davis et al., 2017).

This IPA study was developed to explore participant meaning making of unexplored phenomena (Alase, 2017). Lengthy youth incarceration, loneliness, prosocial postrelease relationships, and desistance implications were the focus of exploration. Eight participants were purposefully selected based on specific criteria to obtain deep experiential insight aligned with IPA methodology (Alase, 2017). Participants underwent audio recorded semistructured interviews that were transcribed verbatim and analyzed by two doctoral candidate researchers using identical methodology. The intercoder and I reached a 98.5% concurrence rate after discussing semantic categorical data selection rationales based on coding. Reflective analysis was documented carefully and peer reviewed, producing enhanced credibility of findings (Belotto, 2018). All thematic data were compared to significant quotes and commonalities across cases for basing final conclusions.

The experience of lengthy youth incarceration and loneliness had negative implications for successful reaffiliation with prosocial supports based on three overarching themes. Institutionalization, stigmatization, and resulting maladaptation were central components located in participant accounts, having negative connotations on

reaffiliating with new prosocial supports. Implications for desistance based on participant meaning making is that identifying with prosocial supports are essential in facilitating recovery, mitigating maladaptation, reducing loneliness, and promoting desistance. Antisocial peer dissociation was a central theme stressed by participants as having direct impact on criminal desistance processes.

Youth identified postrelease social relationships and social support needs for successful transitioning. Numerous youths expressed experiences of difficulty affiliating, current rehabilitation program involvement, intimate relationship dynamics, prosocial family members, strained relationships, and perceived isolation. Young adults provided information on social support needs regarding successful reentry. Participants experienced preexisting detriment encompassing lack in family support, cycles of institutionalism, maltreatment, and coming from disadvantaged neighborhoods.

P5 recalls having to develop rapidly, watching his mother shoot up heroin. P5 endured physical abuse as a young child from his mother's associations. P5 was removed from the home at eight years old, where multiple personalities were developed. P5's relationships were developed to feed addiction. P5 recalled learning to lie, cheat, and steal for survival. P5 partook in substance abuse habitually to mask internalized pain and socially isolated for self-preservation. Institutionalization exacerbated learned criminality, experiences of social isolation, and did not foster personal growth. P5 had overdosed six times before turning 18 years old. P5 met someone he could identify with during reentry who would visit P5 weekly throughout his second incarceration.

This individual served as a powerful example and catalyst for P5's recovery. P5 described this relationship as breaking him down and exposing his vulnerabilities. This affiliation held P5 accountable and encouraged his recovery. P5 no longer reinforces maladaptation through substance abuse, aggression, socially withdrawing, and internalizing emotional pain. P5 has found a safe outlet through identifying with prosocial others and overcomes criminality by helping others. Social support was identified as crucial for many participants to facilitate growth, recovery, and mitigate maladaptation.

Social support need characteristics identified as essential were a safe outlet, identity, accountability, reentry support, growth, trust, and dependability. Identifying with prosocial others who enforce accountability was crucial for successful reaffiliation, promoting personal growth, and desistance. Trusting others with vulnerabilities provided a safe outlet to mitigate injurious feelings of negativity or isolation. Participants explained other prosocial reentry support requirements as encompassing basic individualized essentials, social needs, and therapeutic necessities.

Participants who experienced institutionalism expressed various problems that developed into maladaptation. Maladaptation would manifest through substance use, anxiety, aggression, social withdrawal, and depression. Participants who were connected with proper rehabilitation support systems expressed optimized ability to transition, knife off antisocial peers, recover, and overcome criminality. P8 was identified as a discrepant case, expressing improved affiliation postrelease. P4 stated that motherhood served as a catalyst for change, having important implications regarding gender.

Findings resulted in expanding knowledge regarding RAM on a youthful population within the forensic context of lengthy incarceration. Chronic loneliness experienced by participants who underwent lengthy youth incarceration increased risk of maladaptive behavioral patterns, having negative implications for recidivism risk. Confirming evidence resulting from investigation was that prosocial support systems are paramount to successful desistance for youth (Eichelsheim et al., 2018). The ability to disassociate from antisocial peer affiliations resulted with increased likelihood of successfully avoiding cyclical criminality patterns (Villanueva et al., 2019). Prosocial identifiable support systems were described as essential in moving forward towards successful desistance and community transitioning.

Limitations of the present study are that eight participants may not produce generalizable findings. The stated goals of IPA research are to explore unearthed phenomena by obtaining rich data (Garwood & Hasset, 2019; Mant et al., 2018). Study replicability is recommended to validate and substantiate findings. Future research should investigate loneliness and maladaptive attributes within the forensic context employing mixed methods, enhancing generalizability.

Mass incarceration and youth recidivism are large scale societal problems, requiring solution (Blankenship et al., 2018; Hancock, 2017). Youth reentering the community have had a high risk of recidivism without immediate services (Cuevas et al., 2019). Services directed at rectifying maladaptation resulting from perceived social isolation during incarceration may have favorable impacts for successful reaffiliation, crucial in promoting desistance. Connection of postrelease youth to identifiable prosocial

supports assisted with successful transitioning for participants and should be considered in rehabilitation programming. Rehabilitation planning should commence prior to release for ensuring successful implementation and maximize overall efficacy potential. Services may be developed to mitigate post incarceration harm and promote successful community transitioning for youth. Policy should consider rehabilitation-based alternatives to alleviate negative impacts of incarcerating youth.

References

- Abrams, L. S., & Tam, C. C. (2018). Gender differences in desistance from crime: How do social bonds operate among formerly incarcerated emerging adults? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 33*(1), 34-57. doi:10.1177/0743558416684955
- Adekeye, D. S., & Emmanuel, P. (2018). The nexus between early release of inmates and juvenile recidivism. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 38*(9/10), 837-850. doi:10.1108/ijssp-11-2017-0145
- Agustin, E. D. (2019). Adolescents' limited eclectic personal ethics and heuristic ways of resolving moral problems. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(1), 1351-1366. doi:10.29333/iji.2019.12186a
- Alase, A. (2017). The interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): A guide to a good qualitative research approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 5*(2), 1-11. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.2p.9
- Aldiabat, K. M., & Le Navenec, C. (2018). Data saturation: The mysterious step in grounded theory methodology. *Qualitative Report, 23*(1), 245-261. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/>
- Allen, K. (2020). Commentary: A pilot digital intervention targeting loneliness in youth mental health. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 10*, 1-4. doi:10.3389/fpsy.2019.00959
- Altintas, M., & Bilici, M. (2018). Evaluation of childhood trauma with respect to criminal behavior, dissociative experiences, adverse family experiences and psychiatric backgrounds among prison inmates. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 82*, 100-107. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2017.12.006

- Alun, J., & Murphy, B. (2019). Loneliness, social isolation and cardiovascular risk. *British Journal of Cardiac Nursing, 14*(10), 1-8. doi:10.12968/bjca.2019.0093
- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Ames, H., Glenton, C., & Lewin, S. (2019). Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: A worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 19*(1), 1-9. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0665-4
- Anderson, A. Y., Yava, N. J., & Cortez, P. (2018). The conduits and barriers to reentry for formerly incarcerated individuals in San Bernardino. *Prison Education & Reentry, 5*(1), 2-17. <http://doi.org/10.25771/sdf0-1631>
- Angulski, K., Armstrong, T., & Bouffard, L. A. (2018). The influence of romantic relationships on substance use in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues, 48*(4), 572-589. doi:10.1177/0022042618783490
- Arpin, S. N., & Mohr, C. D. (2019). Transient loneliness and the perceived provision and receipt of capitalization support within event-disclosure interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 45*(2), 240-253. doi:10.1177/0146167218783193
- Atkin-Plunk, C. A., & Armstrong, G. S. (2018). Disentangling the relationship between social ties, visitation, and recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 45*(10), 1507-1526. doi:10.1177/0093854818772320
- Bačák, V., Andersen, L. H., & Schnittker, J. (2019). The effect of timing of incarceration on mental health: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Social Forces, 98*(1), 303-

328. doi:10.1093/sf/soy102

- Backman, H., Laajasalo, T., Jokela, M., & Aronen, E. T. (2018). Interpersonal relationships as protective and risk factors for psychopathy: A follow-up study in adolescent offenders. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *47*(5), 1022-1036. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0745-x
- Baksh, B. (2018). To bracket or not to bracket: Reflections of a novice qualitative researcher. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping*, *24*(3), 45-55. Retrieved from <https://reflections narratives of professional helping.org/index.php/Reflections/article/view/1637/1556>
- Barnert, E. S., Abrams, L. S., Tesema, L., Dudovitz, R., Nelson, B. B., Coker, T., Bath, E., Biely, C., Li, N., & Chung, P. J. (2018). Child incarceration and long-term adult health outcomes: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, *14*(1), 26-33. doi:10.1108/ijph-09-2016-0052
- Beller, J., & Wagner, A. (2018). Loneliness, social isolation, their synergistic interaction, and mortality. *Health Psychology*, *37*(9), 808-813. doi:10.1037/hea0000605
- Belotto, M. J. (2018). Data analysis methods for qualitative research: Managing the challenges of coding, interrater reliability, and thematic analysis. *Qualitative Report*, *23*(11), 2622-2633. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3492&context=tqr>
- Beneito-Montagut, R., Cassián-Yde, N., & Begueria, A. (2018). What do we know about the relationship between internet-mediated interaction and social isolation and

loneliness in later life? *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*, 19(1), 14-30.

doi:10.1108/qaqa-03-2017-0008

Berg, C. V. D., Beijersbergen, K., Nieuwbeerta, P., & Dirkzwager, A. (2018). Sex offenders in prison: Are they socially isolated? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 30(7), 828-845. doi:10.1177/1079063217700884

Best, D., Musgrove, A., & Hall, L. (2018). The bridge between social identity and community capital on the path to recovery and desistance. *Probation Journal*, 65(4), 394-406. doi:10.1177/0264550518790677

Blankenship, K. M., Gonzalez, A. M., Keene, D. E., Groves, A. K., & Rosenberg, A. P. (2018). Mass incarceration, race inequality, and health: Expanding concepts and assessing impacts on well-being. *Social Science & Medicine*, 215, 45-52.

doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.08.042

Boman, J. H., Mowen, T. J., & Higgins, G. E. (2019). Social learning, self-control, and offending specialization and versatility among friends. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(1), 3-22. doi:10.1007/s12103-018-9445-7

Bonfield, M., Fearnside, L., & Cramp, F. (2018). A personal experience of performing a systematic literature review. *Journal of Allied Health*, 47(3), 167-171. Retrieved from ProQuest Central

Brame, R., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2018). Recidivism in a sample of serious adolescent offenders. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 34(1), 167-187. doi:10.1007/s10940-016-9329-2

Cafferky, J., Banbury, S., & Athanasiadou-Lewis, C. (2018). Reflecting on parental

- terminal illness and death during adolescence: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Interpersonal: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 180-196. doi:10.5964/ijpr.v12i2.306
- Campbell, C., Papp, J., Barnes, A., Onifade, E., & Anderson, V. (2018). Risk assessment and juvenile justice: An interaction between risk, race, and gender. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(3), 525-545. doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12377
- Campbell, L., & Stanton, S. C. (2019). Adult attachment and trust in romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 25, 148-151. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.08.004
- Ceah, P., Unnithan, P. N., & Raran, A. (2019). Interviewing criminal justice populations without electronic recording devices: A guide. *Qualitative Report*, 24(4), 705-716. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/>
- Chiao, C., Chen, Y., & Yi, C. (2019). Loneliness in young adulthood: Its intersecting forms and its association with psychological well-being and family characteristics in Northern Taiwan. *Plos One*, 14(5), 1-13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0217777
- Child, S. T., & Lawton, L. (2019). Loneliness and social isolation among young and late middle-age adults: Associations with personal networks and social participation. *Aging & Mental Health*, 23(2), 196-204. doi:10.1080/13607863.2017.1399345
- Cho, M., Haight, W., Choi, W. S., Hong, S., & Piescher, K. (2019). A prospective, longitudinal study of risk factors for early onset of delinquency among maltreated youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 102, 222-230. doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.05.023

- Christian, C. A., Perko, V. L., Vanzhula, I. A., Tregarthen, J. P., Forbush, K. T., & Levinson, C. A. (2019). Supplemental material for eating disorder core symptoms and symptom pathways across developmental stages: A network analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1–15. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/abn0000477>
- CohenMiller, S. A., & Pate, E. P. (2019). A model for developing interdisciplinary research theoretical frameworks. *Qualitative Report*, 24(6), 1211-1226. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/>
- Collins, C. S., & Stockton, C. M. (2018). The central role of theory in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), 1-10. doi:10.1177/1609406918797475
- Comfort, M., Krieger, K. E., Landwehr, J., Mckay, T., Lindquist, C. H., Feinberg, R., Kennedy, E. K., Bir, A. (2018). Partnership after prison: Couple relationships during reentry. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 57(2), 188-205. doi:10.1080/10509674.2018.1441208
- Coppola, F. (2018). Valuing emotions in punishment: An argument for social rehabilitation with the aid of social and effective neuroscience. *Neuroethics*, 12(35), 1-18. doi:10.1007/s12152-018-9393-4
- Cuddeback, G. S., Grady, M., Wilson, A. B., Deinse, T. V., & Morrissey, J. P. (2019). Persons with severe mental illnesses and sex offenses: Recidivism after prison release. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(12), 2157–2170. doi:10.1177/0306624x19842994
- Cuevas, C., Wolff, K. T., & Baglivio, M. T. (2019). Dynamic risk factors and timing of

recidivism for youth in residential placement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 60, 154-166. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.10.003

- Cullen, F. T. (1994). Social support as an organizing concept for criminology: Presidential address to the academy of criminal justice sciences. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(4), 527-559. doi:10.1080/07418829400092421
- Daniel, B. K. (2019). What constitutes a good qualitative research study? Fundamental dimensions and indicators of rigour in qualitative research: The TACT framework. *European Conference on Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies; Kidmore End: 101-108, IX. Kidmore End: Academic Conferences International Limited*. 16-17. doi:10.34190/rm.19.113
- Danneel, S., Nelemans, S., Spithoven, A., Bastin, M., Bijttebier, P., Colpin, H., Wim Van Den, N., Leeuwen, K., Verschueren, K., & Goossens, L. (2019). Internalizing problems in adolescence: Linking loneliness, social anxiety symptoms, and depressive symptoms over time. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 47(10), 1691-1705. doi:10.1007/s10802-019-00539-0
- Davis, C., & Francois, S. (2019). Behind closed doors: Considering a triphasic traumatic incarceration experience. *Traumatology*, 1–12. doi:10.1037/trm0000227
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Conceptualizations of intrinsic motivation and self-determination. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, 11-40. doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7_2
- Dehart, D., & Iachini, A. L. (2019). Mental health & trauma among incarcerated persons: Development of a training curriculum for correctional officers. *American Journal*

- of Criminal Justice*, 44(3), 457-473. doi:10.1007/s12103-019-9473-y
- Demers, L. A., Handley, E. D., Hunt, R. H., Rogosch, F. A., Toth, S. L., Thomas, K. M., & Cicchetti, D. (2019). Childhood maltreatment disrupts brain-mediated pathways between adolescent maternal relationship quality and positive adult outcomes. *Child Maltreatment*, 1-11. doi:10.1177/1077559519847770
- Drake, E. K. (2018). The monetary benefits and costs of community supervision. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 34(1), 47-68. doi:10.1177/1043986217750425
- Duke, L. H. (2017). The importance of social ties in mental health. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*, 21(5), 264-270. doi:10.1108/mhsi-07-2017-0029
- Eichelsheim, V. I., Blokland, A., Meeus, W. H., & Branje, S. J. (2018). Adolescent delinquency and family conflict as precursors of romantic relationships in early adulthood. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(10), 1371-1401. doi:10.1177/0011128718781313
- Errastibarrondo, B., Jordán, J. A., Díez Del Corral, M. P., & Arantzamendi, M. (2018). Conducting phenomenological research: Rationalizing the methods and rigour of the phenomenology of practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(7), 1723-1734. doi:10.1111/jan.13569
- Eryilmaz, A. (2018). Self-Perceptions of young makes who were offenders and non-offenders: Positive and pathological self-images. *Bartın Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi: Bartın*, 7(2), 479-506. doi:10.14686/buefad.380384
- Estévez, A., Chávez-Vera, M. D., Momeñe, J., Olave, L., Vázquez, D., & Iruarrizaga, I. (2018). *El papel de la dependencia emocional en la relación entre el apego y la*

conducta impulsiva. Anales De Psicología, 34(3), 438-445.

doi:10.6018/analesps.34.3.313681

Fahmy, C., & Wallace, D. (2019). The influence of familial social support on physical health during reentry. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 46(12)*, 1738–1756.

doi:10.1177/0093854819870268

Fay, A. J., & Maner, J. K. (2018). Comfortably warm: A momentary lapse of reaffiliation after exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147(8)*, 1154-

1169. doi:10.1037/xge0000479

Flocco, S. F., Caruso, R., Barello, S., Nania, T., Simeone, S., & Dellafiore, F. (2020).

Exploring the lived experiences of pregnancy and early motherhood in Italian women with congenital heart disease: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *BMJ Open, 10(1)*, 1–9. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034588

Fortune, D., Arai, S. M., & Lyons, K. J. (2020). Relational possibilities for women

leaving prison: Renewed hope for inclusion and belonging. *Contemporary Justice Review, 23(1)*, 3–21. doi:10.1080/10282580.2019.1700367

Fuller, G. (2019). Young & lonely. *Community Practitioner; London, 92(2)*, 40-43.

Gardiner, C., Geldenhuys, G., & Gott, M. (2018). Interventions to reduce social isolation and loneliness among older people: An integrative review. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 26(2)*, 147–157. doi:10.1111/hsc.12367

Garwood, P. T., & Hassett, A. (2019). Service user involvement in cognitive behavioral therapy training: An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice, 14(3)*, 186-198.

doi:10.1108/jmhtep-02-2018-0014

- Gifford, B. (2019). Prison crime and the economics of incarceration. *Stanford Law Review*, 71(1), 71-135. Retrieved from ProQuest Central
- Goodey, S., Spuhler, B., & Bradford, K. (2019). Relationship education among incarcerated populations. *Marriage & Family Review*, 55(7), 651-666.
doi:10.1080/01494929.2019.1589615
- Gray, L. A. (2018). Lifers over tariff: Exploring psychological barriers to progression. *The Journal of Forensic Practice*, 20(2), 81-90. doi:10.1108/jfp-07-2017-0025
- Griffin, G. (2018). "It's not just a matter of speaking...": The vicissitudes of cross-cultural interviewing. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 18(2), 105-114.
doi:10.1108/qrj-d-17-00050
- Hancock, K. (2017). Facility operations and juvenile recidivism. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 6(1), 1-14. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251066.pdf>
- Harding, D. J., Morenoff, J. D., Nguyen, A. P., & Bushway, S. D. (2017). Short- and long-term effects of imprisonment on future felony convictions and prison admissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(42), 11103-11108. doi:10.1073/pnas.1701544114
- Hawkey, L. C., & Schumm, L. P. (2019). Examining the effects of loneliness on health using in-home panel studies with biomeasures: Benefits, challenges, and implications for the Evolutionary Theory of Loneliness. *Social Science & Medicine*, 223, 113-116. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.11.023
- Hayashi, P., Abib, G., & Hoppen, N. (2019). Validity in qualitative research: A

- processual approach. *Qualitative Report*, 24(1), 98-112. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/>
- Hecke, N. V., Vanderplasschen, W., Damme, L. V., & Vandeveldde, S. (2019). The bumpy road to change: A retrospective qualitative study on formerly detained adolescents' trajectories towards better lives. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 13(1), 1-15. doi:10.1186/s13034-019-0271-6
- Herman, J. W., & Sexton, J. S. (2017). Girls leaving detention: Perceptions of transition to home after incarceration. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 6(1), 33-47. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251066.pdf>
- Hester, R. (2019). Prior record and recidivism risk. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(3), 353-375. doi:10.1007/s12103-018-9460-8
- Hester, R., Roberts, J. V., Frase, R. S., & Mitchell, K. (2018). A measure of tolerance: Public attitudes on sentencing enhancements for old and juvenile prior records. *Corrections*, 3(2), 137-151. doi:10.1080/23774657.2017.1343105
- Holligan, C., & McLean, R. (2018). Criminal desistance narratives of young people in the west of Scotland: Understanding spirituality and criminogenic constraints. *Religions*, 9(6), 1-13. doi:10.3390/rel9060177
- Honegger, L. N., & Honegger, K. S. (2019). Criminogenic factors associated with noncompliance and rearrest of mental health court participants. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(9), 1276–1294. doi:10.1177/0093854819862010
- Howard, K., Katsos, N., & Gibson, J. (2019). Using interpretative phenomenological analysis in autism research. *Autism*, 23(7), 1871-1876.

doi:10.1177/1362361318823902

Jensen, T. M., & Lippold, M. A. (2018). Supplemental material for patterns of stepfamily relationship quality and adolescents' short-term and long-term adjustment.

Journal of Family Psychology, 32(8), 1130-1141. doi:10.1037/fam0000442.supp

Jin, C. C., Zhao, B. B., & Zou, H. (2019). Chinese delinquent and non-delinquent

juveniles: An exploration of the relations among interparental intimacy,

interparental conflict, filial piety and interpersonal adjustment. *Children and*

Youth Services Review, 103, 148-155. doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.05.042

Johnson, B. R., Pagano, M. E., Lee, M. T., & Post, S. G. (2018). Alone on the inside: The impact of social isolation and helping others on AOD use and criminal activity.

Youth & Society, 50(4), 529–550. doi:10.1177/0044118x15617400

Jolley, M. (2018). Rehabilitating prisoners: The place of basic life skills programmes.

Safer Communities, 17(1), 1-10. doi:10.1108/sc-02-2017-0009

Kennedy, T. D., Edmonds, W. A., Millen, D. H., & Detullio, D. (2018). Chronic juvenile offenders: Exploring risk factor models of recidivism. *Youth Violence and*

Juvenile Justice, 17(2), 174-193. doi:10.1177/1541204018770517

Knight, A., Maple, M., Shakeshaft, A., Shakehsaft, B., & Pearce, T. (2018). Improving the evidence base for services working with youth at-risk of involvement in the

criminal justice system: Developing a standardized program approach. *Health &*

Justice, 6(1), 1-9. doi:10.1186/s40352-018-0066-5

Lambdin, B. H., Comfort, M., Kral, A. H., & Lorvick, J. (2018). Accumulation of jail

incarceration and hardship, health status, and unmet health care need among

women who use drugs. *Womens Health Issues*, 28(5), 470-475.

doi:10.1016/j.whi.2018.05.005

Landman, C., Ncongwane, H. J., & Pieterse, T. (2019). Men serving long-term sentences in Zonderwater Correctional Centre, South Africa: Religious identity and behavioural change. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, 75(3), 1-11.

doi:10.4102/hts.v75i3.5274

Lapid, M. I., Clarke, B. L., & Wright, R. S. (2019). Institutional review boards: What clinician researchers need to know. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 94(3), 515-525.

doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.01.020

Larsson, V., Holmbom-Larsen, A., Torisson, G., Strandberg, E. L., & Londos, E. (2019).

Living with dementia with Lewy bodies: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *BMJ Open*, 9(1), 1-10. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024983

Lauterbach, A. A. (2018). Hermeneutic phenomenological interviewing: Going beyond semi-structured formats to help participants revisit experience. *Qualitative Report*, 23(11), 2883-2898. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/>

Leiber, M. J., & Fix, R. (2019). Reflections on the impact of race and ethnicity on juvenile court outcomes and efforts to enact change. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(4), 581-608. doi:10.1007/s12103-019-09479-3

Lemon, L. L., & Hayes, J. (2020). Enhancing trustworthiness of qualitative findings: Using Leximancer for qualitative data analysis triangulation. *The Qualitative Report*, 25(3), 604–614. Retrieved from Proquest Central

Lértora, I.,M., & Sullivan, J. M. (2019). The lived experiences of Chinese international

students preparing for the university-to-work transition: A phenomenological qualitative study. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(8), 1877-1896. Retrieved from Proquest Central

Lester, J. N., & Anders, A. D. (2018). Engaging ethics in postcritical ethnography: Troubling transparency, trustworthiness, and advocacy. *Qualitative Social Research*, 19(3), 1-20. doi:10.17169/fqs

Lim, M. H., Rodebaugh, T. L., Eres, R., Long, K. M., Penn, D. L., & Gleeson, J. F. M. (2019). A pilot digital intervention targeting loneliness in youth mental health. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10, 1-13. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00604

Lingard, L. (2019). Beyond the default colon: Effective use of quotes in qualitative research. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(6), 360–364. doi:10.1007/s40037-019-00550-7

Link, N. W., Ward, J. T., & Stansfield, R. (2019). Consequences of mental and physical health for reentry and recidivism: Toward a health-based model of desistance. *Criminology*, 57(3), 544-573. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12213

London, R., & Ingram, D. (2018). Social isolation in middle school. *School Community Journal*, 28(1), 107-127. Retrieved from <http://www.adi.org/journal/2018ss/LondonIngramSpring2018.pdf>

Lujan, M. J., & Fanniff, A. M. (2019). Justice for all: Trauma and the need for safety and fairness within juvenile justice facilities. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(1), 63-81. doi:10.1177/0093854818796060

Ma, C. M. (2019). The relationship between social support and life satisfaction among

Chinese and ethnic minority adolescents in Hong Kong: The mediating role of positive youth development. *Child Indicators Research*, 12(51), 1-21.

doi:10.1007/s12187-019-09638-2

Macleod, S., Reynolds, M. G., & Lehmann, H. (2018). The mitigating effect of repeated memory reactivations on forgetting. *Science of Learning*, 3(1), 1-8.

doi:10.1038/s41539-018-0025-x

Macrynika, N., Miranda, R., & Soffer, A. (2018). Social connectedness, stressful life events, and self-injurious thoughts and behaviors among young adults.

Comprehensive Psychiatry, 80, 140-149. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2017.09.008

Maes, M., Nelemans, S. A., Danneel, S., Fernández-Castilla, B., Van den Noortgate, W., Goossens, L., & Vanhalst, J. (2019). Supplemental material for loneliness and social anxiety across childhood and adolescence: Multilevel meta-analyses of cross-sectional and longitudinal associations. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(7), 1548-1565. doi:10.1037/dev0000719.supp

Makarios, M., Cullen, F. T., & Piquero, A. R. (2017). Adolescent criminal behavior, population heterogeneity, and cumulative disadvantage: Untangling the relationship between adolescent delinquency and negative outcomes in emerging adulthood. *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(6), 683-707.

doi:10.1177/0011128715572094

Malvaso, C. G., Delfabbro, P. H., Day, A., & Nobes, G. (2018). The maltreatment-violence link: Exploring the role of maltreatment experiences and other individual and social risk factors among young people who offend. *Journal of Criminal*

Justice, 55, 35-45. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.01.006

- Mant, J., Kirby, A., Cox, K. J., & Burke, A. (2018). Children's experiences of being diagnosed with cancer at the early stages of treatment; An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 24(1), 3-18. doi:10.1177/1359104518788400
- Marqua-Harries, L., Stewart, G., & Padayachee, V. (2019). Towards transforming a system: Re-thinking incarceration for youth (and beyond). *South African Crime Quarterly*, (68), 33-40. doi:10.17159/2413-3108/2019/v0n68a5632
- Martí, J., Albani, E., Ibáñez, A., & Cid, J. (2019). Personal networks and desistance from crime in young offenders. *European Journal of Criminology*, 1-12. doi:10.1177/1477370819842207
- Martin, K. E., Wood, L. J., Houghton, S., Carroll, A., & Hattie, J. (2014). 'I don't have the best life': A qualitative exploration of adolescent loneliness. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Behavior*, 2(5), 1-7. doi:10.4172/2375-4494.1000169
- Martín-María, N., Caballero, F. F., Miret, M., Tyrovolas, S., Haro, J. M., Ayuso-Mateos, J. L., & Chatterji, S. (2019). Differential impact of transient and chronic loneliness on health status. A longitudinal study. *Psychology & Health*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/08870446.2019.1632312
- Mbuthia, J. W., Kumar, M., Falkenström, F., Kuria, M. W., & Othieno, C. J. (2018). Attributions and private theories of mental illness among young adults seeking psychiatric treatment in Nairobi: An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 12(1), 1-15.

doi:10.1186/s13034-018-0229-0

McMahon, G., & Jump, D. (2018). Starting to stop: Young offenders' desistance from crime. *Youth Justice, 18*(1), 3-17. doi:10.1177/1473225417741223

Medrano, J. A., Ozkan, T., & Morris, R. (2017). Solitary confinement exposure and capital inmate misconduct. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*(4), 863-882. doi:10.1007/s12103-017-9389-3

Menon, S. E., & Cheung, M. (2018). Desistance-focused treatment and asset-based programming for juvenile offender reintegration: A review of research evidence. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 35*(5), 459-476. doi:10.1007/s10560-018-0542-8

Menon, J., & Kandasamy, A. (2018). Relapse prevention. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 60*(8), 473-478. doi:10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_36_18

Metcalfe, C., Baker, T., & Brady, C. M. (2019). Exploring the relationship between lasting, quality social bonds and intermittency in offending. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 44*(6), 892-912. doi:10.1007/s12103-019-09486-4

Mikytuck, A. M., & Woolard, J. L. (2019). Family contact in juvenile confinement facilities: Analysis of the likelihood of and barriers to contact. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 58*(5), 371-397. doi:10.1080/10509674.2019.1615600

Milledge, S. V., Cortese, S., Thompson, M., Mcewan, F., Rolt, M., Meyer, B., Sonuga-Barke, E., Eisenbarth, H. (2019). Peer relationships and prosocial behaviour differences across disruptive behaviours. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 28*(6), 781-793. doi:10.1007/s00787-018-1249-2

- Miller, T., & Vuolo, M. (2018). Examining the Antiascetic hypothesis through social control theory: Delinquency, religion, and reciprocity across the early life course. *Crime & Delinquency*, *64*(11), 1458-1488.
doi:10.1177/0011128717750393
- Mizel, M. L., & Abrams, L. S. (2017). What i'd tell my 16-year-old self: Criminal desistance, young adults, and psychosocial maturation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(10), 3038-3057.
doi:10.1177/0306624x17738064
- Moore, K. E., & Tangney, J. P. (2017). Managing the concealable stigma of criminal justice system involvement: A longitudinal examination of anticipated stigma, social withdrawal, and postrelease adjustment. *Journal of Social Issues*, *73*(2), 322-340. doi:10.1111/josi.12219
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice*, *24*(1), 9-18. doi:10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091
- Mowen, T. J., & Boman, J. H. (2017). A developmental perspective on reentry: Understanding the causes and consequences of family conflict and peer delinquency during adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *47*(2), 275-289. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0794-1
- Mowen, T. J., & Boman, J. H. (2018). The duality of the peer effect: The interplay between peer support and peer criminality on offending and substance use during reentry. *Crime & Delinquency*, *64*(8), 1094-1116.

doi:10.1177/0011128717740529

- Nghiêm-Phú, B. (2018). Correlation between tourists' perceptions/evaluations of destination attributes and their overall satisfactions: Observations of a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 19, 98-115. Retrieved from ProQuest Central
- Noon, E. J. (2018). Interpretive phenomenological analysis: An appropriate methodology for educational research? *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 6(1), 75-83. doi:10.14297/jpaap.v6i1.304
- O'Connor, C., & Joffe, H. (2020). Intercoder Reliability in Qualitative Research: Debates and Practical Guidelines. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1–13. doi:10.1177/1609406919899220
- Ou, Q. (2019). Research on perception diversity in intercultural communication -With Guasha treatment as a case study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(1), 82-88. doi:10.17507/tpls.0901.13
- Peart, A., Lewis, V., Barton, C., Brown, T., White, J., Gascard, D., & Russell, G. (2019). Providing person-centred care for people with multiple chronic conditions: Protocol for a qualitative study incorporating client and staff perspectives. *BMJ Open*, 9(10), 1-9. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030581
- Peltzer, K., & Pengpid, S. (2019). Loneliness correlates and associations with health variables in the general population in Indonesia. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 13(1), 1-11. doi:10.1186/s13033-019-0281-z
- Petters, D. D. (2019). The attachment control system and computational modeling:

Origins and prospects. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(2), 227-239.

doi:10.1037/dev0000647

Pettus-Davis, C., Doherty, E. E., Veeh, C., & Drymon, C. (2017). Deterioration of post incarceration social support for emerging adults. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(10), 1317-1339. doi:10.1177/0093854817721936

Piper, A., & Berle, D. (2019). The association between trauma experienced during incarceration and PTSD outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 30(5), 854–875.

doi:10.1080/14789949.2019.1639788

Pleggenkuhle, B. (2018). The financial cost of a criminal conviction: Context and consequences. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(1), 121–145.

doi:10.1177/0093854817734278

Porter, L. C., & Demarco, L. M. (2019). Beyond the dichotomy: Incarceration dosage and mental health*. *Criminology*, 57(1), 136-156. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12199

Provencher, A., & Conway, J. M. (2019). Health effects of family member incarceration in the United States: A meta-analysis and cost study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 103, 87-99. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.05.029

Purewal, R., Christley, R., Kordas, K., Joinson, C., Meints, K., Gee, N., & Westgarth, C. (2017). Companion animals and child/adolescent development: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(3), 1-25. doi:10.3390/ijerph14030234

Qualter, P., Vanhalst, J., Harris, R., Roekel, E. V., Lodder, G., Bangee, M., Verhagen, M.

- (2015). Loneliness across the life span. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 250-264. doi:10.1177/1745691615568999
- Ravenhill, J. P., & Visser, R. O. (2019). "I don't want to be seen as a screaming queen": An interpretative phenomenological analysis of gay men's masculine identities. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 20(3), 324-336. doi:10.1037/men0000163
- Reid, S. E. (2017). The curious case of loners: Social isolation and juvenile incarceration. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 22(1), 180-195. doi:10.1111/lcrp.12093
- Reising, K., Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Piquero, A. R. (2019). The impact of longitudinal offending trajectories on mental health: Lifetime consequences and intergenerational transfer. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 62, 16-22. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.04.003
- Ribeiro, O., Santos, A. J., Freitas, M., Rosado, A., & Rubin, K. H. (2019). Loneliness in adolescence: Confirmatory factor analysis of the relational provisions loneliness questionnaire (RPLQ) in a Portuguese sample. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 43(5), 457-465. doi:10.1177/0165025419850893
- Richard A., Rohrmann S., Vandeleur C. L., Schmid M., Barth J., Eichholzer M. (2017). Loneliness is adversely associated with physical and mental health and lifestyle factors: results from a Swiss national survey. *PLoS ONE*, 12(7), 1-18. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181442
- Roberts, K., Dowell, A., & Nie, J. (2019). Attempting rigour and replicability in thematic analysis of qualitative research data; a case study of codebook development. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1), 1-8. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0707-y

- Rocque, M., Beckley, A. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2019). Psychosocial maturation, race, and desistance from crime. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *48*(7), 1403-1417.
doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01029-8
- Rönkä, A. R., Taanila, A., Rautio, A., & Sunnari, V. (2018). Multidimensional and fluctuating experiences of loneliness from childhood to young adulthood in Northern Finland. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *35*, 87-102.
doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2018.01.003
- Roshaidai, S., & Arifin, M. (2018). Ethical considerations in qualitative study. *Ethical Considerations in Qualitative Study*, *1*(2), 30-33. Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328019725_Ethical_Considerations_in_Qualitative_Study
- Russell, D. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 20-40.
doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). Crime in the making. *Crime & Delinquency*, *39*(3), 396-396. doi:10.1177/0011128793039003010
- Sarı, E., & Arslantaş, H. (2019). The attitudes of high school adolescent toward crime and risk factors (tur). *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *22*(1), 71-82.
doi:10.5505/kpd.2018.81894
- Sariyska, R., Lachmann, B., Cheng, C., Gnisci, A., Sergi, I., Pace, A., Kaliszewska-Czeremska, K., Laconi, S., Zhong, S., Toraman, D., Geiger, M., & Montag, C. (2019). The motivation for Facebook use: Is it a matter of bonding or control over

- others? *Journal of Individual Differences*, 40(1), 26-35. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000273
- Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: Exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(4), 1893-1907. doi:10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8
- Sbarra, D. A. (2015). Taking stock of loneliness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 200-201. doi:10.1177/1745691615569603
- Semenza, D. C., & Link, N. W. (2019). How does reentry get under the skin? Cumulative reintegration barriers and health in a sample of recently incarcerated men. *Social Science & Medicine*, 243, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112618
- Shannon, C. R., & Hess, R. S. (2019). Out but in: Exploring juvenile reentry through photovoice. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 7(1), 28-41. doi:10.1080/21683603.2017.1356774
- Shepherd, S. M., Strand, S., Viljoen, J. L., & Daffern, M. (2018). Evaluating the utility of 'strength' items when assessing the risk of young offenders. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 29(4), 597-616. doi:10.1080/14789949.2018.1425474
- Shulman, S., Seiffge-Krenke, I., Ziv, I., & Tuval-Mashiach, R. (2019). Patterns of romantic pathways among 23-year olds and their adolescent antecedents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(7), 1390-1402. doi:10.1007/s10964-018-0951-1
- Silverman-Retana, O., Servan-Mori, E., Bertozzi, S. M., Orozco-Nuñez, E., Bautista-Arredondo, S., & Lopez-Ridaura, R. (2018). Prison environment and non-

communicable chronic disease modifiable risk factors: Length of incarceration trend analysis in Mexico City. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 72(4), 342-348. doi:10.1136/jech-2017-209843

Smet, S. D., Donder, L. D., Ryan, D., Regenmortel, S. V., Brosens, D., & Vandeveldel, S. (2017). Factors related to the quality of life of older prisoners. *Quality of Life Research*, 26(6), 1571-1585. doi:10.1007/s11136-017-1506-8

Smith, J. A. (1996). Beyond the divide between cognition and discourse: Using interpretative phenomenological analysis in health psychology. *Psychology & Health*, 11(2), 261-271. doi:10.1080/08870449608400256

Spithoven, A. W., Cacioppo, S., Goossens, L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2019). Genetic contributions to loneliness and their relevance to the evolutionary theory of loneliness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(3), 376-396. doi:10.1177/1745691618812684

Stodolska, M., Berdychevsky, L., & Shinew, K. J. (2019). Gangs and deviant leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 41(4), 278-293. doi:10.1080/01490400.2017.1329040

Sundaresh, R., Yi, Y., Roy, B., Riley, C., Wildeman, C., & Wang, E. A. (2020). Exposure to the US criminal legal system and well-being: A 2018 cross-sectional study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 110(1), 116-122. doi:10.2105/ajph.2019.305414

Tabashneck, S. (2018). "Raise the age" legislation: Developmentally tailored justice. *Criminal Justice*, 32(4), 13-19. Retrieved from <http://docplayer.net/76469602-D-raise-the-age-legislation-developmentally-tailored-justice-stephanie->

tabashneck.html

- Tambini, A., & Davachi, L. (2019). Awake reactivation of prior experiences consolidates memories and biases cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(10), 876–890. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2019.07.008
- Taylor, M., & Spang, T. (2017). “I’d prefer an applicant who doesn’t have a delinquency history”: Delinquents in the labor market. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 6(1), 67-81. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/251066.pdf>
- Teike, D., & Sneed, K. J. (2018). Building and restoring relationships using the art of invitation: An exploratory phenomenological study. *Social Work and Christianity*, 45(4), 3-21. Retrieved from https://www.nacsw.org/Publications/SWC/SWC45_4Sample.pdf
- Thomas, V., & Azmitia, M. (2019). Motivation matters: Development and validation of the Motivation for Solitude Scale: Short Form (MSS-SF). *Journal of Adolescence*, 70, 33-42. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.11.004
- Thurairajah, K. (2019). Uncloaking the researcher: Boundaries in qualitative research. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 15(1), 132-147. doi:10.18778/1733-8077.15.1.06
- Toman, E. L., Cochran, J. C., & Cochran, J. K. (2018). Jailhouse blues? The adverse effects of pretrial detention for prison social order. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(3), 316-339. doi:10.1177/0093854817753018
- Tomova, L., Tye, K., & Saxe, R. (2019). The neuroscience of unmet social needs. *Social Neuroscience*, 1–11. doi:10.1080/17470919.2019.1694580
- Tracey, D., & Hanham, J. (2017). Applying positive psychology to illuminate the needs

of adolescent males transitioning out of juvenile detention. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(1), 64-79.

doi:10.1177/0306624x15591242

Troutman, B. (2018). A more just system of juvenile justice: Creating a new standard of accountability for juveniles in Illinois. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 108(1), 197-221. Retrieved from <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu>

Umar, A., Ameh, C. A., Muriithi, F., & Mathai, M. (2019). Early warning systems in obstetrics: A systematic literature review. *Plos One*, 14(5), 1-15.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0217864

Valan, L., Sundin, K., Kristiansen, L., & Jong, M. (2018). Child health nurses' experiences and opinions of parent internet use. *Early Child Development and Care*, 188(12), 1738-1749. doi:10.1080/03004430.2017.1278697

Valentine, C. L., Restivo, E., & Wright, K. (2019). Prolonged isolation as a predictor of mental health for waived juveniles. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 58(4), 352-369. doi:10.1080/10509674.2019.1596188

Valera, P., & Boyas, J. F. (2019). Perceived social ties and mental health among formerly incarcerated men in New York City. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(10), 1843-1860.

doi:10.1177/0306624x19832239

Vanhalst, J., Luyckx, K., Petegem, S. V., & Soenens, B. (2018). The detrimental effects of adolescents' chronic loneliness on motivation and emotion regulation in social situations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(1), 162-176.

doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0686-4

- Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S., & Young, T. (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: Systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *18*(1), 1-18. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7
- Villanueva, L., Valero-Moreno, S., Cuervo, K., & Prado-Gascó, V. J. (2019). Sociodemographic variables, risk factors, and protective factors contributing to youth recidivism. *Psicothema*, *13*(2), 128-133. doi:10.7334/psicothema2018.257
- Vrijisen, J. N., Dainer-Best, J., Witcraft, S. M., Papini, S., Hertel, P., Beevers, C. G., Becker, E. S., Smits, J. A. J. (2018). Effect of cognitive bias modification-memory on depressive symptoms and autobiographical memory bias: Two independent studies in high-ruminating and dysphoric samples. *Cognition and Emotion*, *33*(2), 288–304. doi:10.1080/02699931.2018.1450225
- Walker, S., Higgs, P., Stoové, M., & Wilson, M. (2018). Narratives of young men with injecting drug use histories leaving adult prison. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(12), 3681-3707.
doi:10.1177/0306624x17747829
- Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., Ma, R., & Johnson, S. (2018). Associations between loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, *18*(1), 1-16.
doi:10.1186/s12888-018-1736-5
- Weller, S. C., Vickers, B., Bernard, H. R., Blackburn, A. M., Borgatti, S., Gravlee, C. C.,

- & Johnson, J. C. (2018). Open-ended interview questions and saturation. *Plos One*, *13*(6), 1-18. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198606
- Widdowson, A. O., Jacobsen, W. C., Siennick, S. E., & Warren, P. Y. (2020). Together despite the odds: Explaining racial and ethnic heterogeneity in union dissolution after incarceration. *Criminology*, *58*(1), 129–155. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12232
- Wildeman, C., & Wang, E. A. (2017). Mass incarceration, public health, and widening inequality in the USA. *The Lancet*, *389*(10077), 1464-1474. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(17)30259-3
- Williams, S. E., & Braun, B. (2019). Loneliness and social isolation—A private problem, a public issue. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, *111*(1), 7-14. doi:10.14307/jfcs111.1.7
- Wolff-Michael, R., & Unger, H. (2018). Current perspectives on research ethics in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Research*, *19*(3), 1-12. doi:10.17169/fqs-19.3.3155
- Yan, J., Feng, X., & Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2018). Longitudinal associations between parent-child relationships in middle childhood and child-perceived loneliness. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *32*(6), 841-847. doi:10.1037/fam0000446
- Yavuzer, Y., Albayrak, G., & Kılıçarslan, S. (2018). Relationships amongst aggression, self-theory, loneliness, and depression in emerging adults. *Psychological Reports*, *122*(4), 1235-1258. doi:10.1177/0033294118784866
- Yoder, J. R., Hodge, A. I., Ruch, D., & Dillard, R. (2018). Effects of childhood polyvictimization on victimization in juvenile correctional facilities: The

mediating role of trauma symptomatology. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 17(2), 129-153. doi:10.1177/1541204018757038

Ypsilanti, A. (2018). Lonely but avoidant—The unfortunate juxtaposition of loneliness and self-disgust. *Palgrave Communications*, 4(1), 1-4. doi:10.1057/s41599-018-0198-1

Yu, L., & Chan, K. L. (2019). Moderating effects of personal strengths in the relationship between juvenile victimization and delinquent behaviors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 93, 79-90. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.04.019

Appendix A: Recruitment Advertisements

Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated Juveniles

Lead Researcher: Amy Jozan

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Amy Jozan, who is a doctoral student at Walden University, under the direction of Dr. Sandra Caramela-Miller. Amy is recruiting participants for a research study about young adults who have experienced incarceration lasting one year or more, while under the age of 18, to participate in the study. This study may help us to better understand and describe ways that length of youth incarceration may impact loneliness, prosocial relationships, and how collective phenomena impact living a crime-free lifestyle.

You are eligible to participate in this study if you are at least 18 to 29 years of age, have been released for no longer than 5 years, fluent in English, literate, have at least a fifth-grade reading level, not requiring a legal guardian, have not been suicidal within the last 30 days, have not had a bipolar manic episode within the last 30 days, and are willing to consent to audio recorded interview or Skype Instant Messaging interviews. Participants with one or multiple preexisting mental health diagnoses should be mentally stable for at least 30 days to avoid harm. Eligible participants with preexisting substance abuse disorders should have a minimum of 30 days sobriety.

The study will take place through Skype (audio-recorded call or instant messaging), on the phone, or in-person in a private room at a local library. Your participation will last up to 1 hour and follow-up can take an additional 20 minutes to verify interpretation of results.

As part of participating, you will be asked to undergo an audio recorded interview regarding your experience.

If you participate, you will receive a \$25 Visa Gift Card.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact Amy Jozan.

Appendix B: List of Search Terms and Databases

1. Databases utilized in the literature search: Criminal Justice Database, ProQuest Central, PsycARTICLES, Thoreau Multi-Database, Google Scholar, Sage Journal, and EBSCOhost
2. Search Engines operated to locate scholarly works: Walden University Library, the World Wide Web, Google, and Yahoo commercial search engines.
3. Key Terms and combinations used in all specified databases: *loneliness, postrelease challenges, recidivism, juveniles, delinquency, incarceration, prosocial relationships, long-term incarceration, social isolation, social relationships and desistance, childhood loneliness and criminal behavior, relationships and child development, relationships and adult outcomes, relationships and criminal behavior, attachment theory*
4. Terms used and specific to the Criminal Justice Database: *creation of juvenile justice, risk factors for recidivism, juveniles with mental health problems in detention centers, incarcerated youth and rates of trauma.*
5. Terms specific to Thoreau Multi-Database without study parameters for dates: *motivation theory, mental health care, female crime, protective factors for crime, social control theory, informal social control by Sampson and Laub, relationship adjustment, social learning theory.*
6. Boolean operators used to combine terms for searches: and, or, not.
7. Study parameters: peer reviewed, full text, published between 2017 and 2019

Appendix C: Consent to Audio Record

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (AUDIOTAPE)

Consent Form for Audio taping and Transcribing Interviews

Study Title: Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated Juveniles

Researcher: Amy Jozan, Walden University, Under the Direction of Dr. Sandra Caramela-Miller

This study involves the audio taping of your interview with Amy Jozan. Neither your name nor any other identifying information will be associated with the audiotape or the transcript. Only the research team will be able to listen to the tapes.

The tapes will be transcribed by the Amy Jozan and erased once the transcriptions are checked for accuracy. Transcripts of your interview will be reproduced in whole or in part for use in presentations or written products that result from this study. Neither your name nor any other identifying information (such as your voice) will be used in presentations or in written products resulting from the study.

Immediately following the interview, you will be given the opportunity to have the tape erased if you wish to withdraw your consent to taping or participation in this study.

By signing this form you are consenting to:

- having your interview taped;
- to having the tape transcribed;
- use of the written transcript in presentations and written products.

This consent for taping is effective five years from the date signed. On or before that date, the tapes will be destroyed.

Participant's Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix D: Consent to Advertise

Amy Jozan

Date

Dear Owner(s) of Public Space,

I am requesting permission for placing an advertisement flyer to conduct the study entitled Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated Juveniles. Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion.

The organization's responsibility would include placing a flyer to advertise for voluntary recruitment in a doctoral study. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time or take down the flyer(s). I will not be naming your organization in the published doctoral project report.

If you agree to these terms please read the provided letter, fill in the appropriate information, and you may provide consent via electronic signature (typed name, email, or identifying information) or handwritten signature. Please note that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the student's supervising faculty/staff without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Letter of Cooperation from a Research Partner

Community Research Partner Name
Contact Information

Date

Dear Amy Jozan,

Based on my review of your research proposal, I give permission for you to conduct the study entitled Loneliness, Prosocial Relationships, and Recidivism in Long-Term Incarcerated Juveniles within the Insert Name of Community Partner. As part of this study, I authorize you to place flyers (put specific location). Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion.

We understand that our organization's responsibilities include placing flyers or advertisements at (location). We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change.

I understand that the student will not be naming our organization in the published doctoral project report.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting and that this plan complies with the organization's policies.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the student's supervising faculty/staff without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Sincerely,
Authorization Official
Contact Information

Appendix E: Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

You are invited to take part in a research study about length of youth incarceration, loneliness, prosocial relationships, and living crime-free. This study is being conducted by a researcher named Amy Jozan, who is a doctoral student at Walden University, under the direction of Dr. Sandra Caramela-Miller. Amy invites young adults (ages 18 to 29) who have experienced incarceration lasting one year or more, while under the age of 18, to participate in the study. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to explore and describe ways that length of youth incarceration may impact loneliness, prosocial relationships, and how collective phenomena impact living a crime-free lifestyle.

Procedures

1. Respond to the advertisement with the listed contact information. Informed consent will be provided, and eligibility requirements will be discussed. A scheduled interview based on preference formatting will be scheduled (Skype audio recorded interview, recorded telephone interview, face-to-face recorded interview, or Skype messenger). This should take no longer than 20 minutes of your time and allows additional time for any questions.
2. Informed consent copy will be sent based on your preference.
3. Interview confirmation will be sent 48 hours prior to the scheduled interview. Confirming or rescheduling can take up to 5 minutes of your time.
4. A scheduled interview based on preference formatting can proceed. Informed consent will be communicated prior to the administration of recorded interview. You will be debriefed and have an opportunity to ask questions following the interview. Follow-up preferences will be discussed. The interview process may take 40 to 60 minutes of your time. You will receive a \$25 Visa Gift Card directly following the completed interview.
5. Follow up communication based on your preference and may take an additional 10 to 20 minutes of your time. This will allow for your verification of results.
6. A 1-2 page summary of results can be sent to you via email or postal mail prior to deleting contact information.

Here are some sample questions

1. Describe how you view your quality of social relationships postrelease.
2. Describe any challenges with relationships during reentry.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

This study is voluntary. You are free to accept or turn down the invitation. No one at Walden University or any relevant consenting locations will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to be in the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time. Please note that not all volunteers will be contacted to take part. The researcher will follow up with all volunteers to let them know whether or not they were selected for the study.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as fatigue, stress or becoming upset. Being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or wellbeing.

The study's potential benefits may result in effective reentry service planning and rehabilitation programming. Results may be used to recommend effective programming and policy for appropriate sanctioning practices.

Payment

There is a \$25 Visa Gift Card for participating in this research.

Privacy

Reports coming out of this study will not share the identities of individual participants. Details that might identify participants, such as the location of the study, will not be shared. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purpose outside of this research project. Data will be kept secure by storage in password protected computers and replacing identifiable details of information with pseudonyms. Organization names, participant names, and other pieces of identifiable information will be removed or altered with alias information to protect participant anonymity. Participants will be made aware that only researcher and the team have data access. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Limits to Confidentiality

Confidentiality limits should be noted such as the mandated reporting of potential danger to self and others. Past or current crimes will not be reported.

Contacts and Questions

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via Google phone number or email. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call the Research Participant Advocate at my university. Walden University's approval number for this study is 02-07-20-0658940 and it expires on February 6th, 2021.

For online research or when consent is done via e-mail, use: Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Obtaining Your Consent

If you feel you understand the study well enough to make a decision about it, please indicate your consent by:

For face to face research that is not anonymous, use: signing below.

For when consent is obtained via e-mail, use: replying to this email with the words, "I consent."

Printed Name of Participant

Date of consent

Participant's Signature

Researcher's Signature

Appendix F: Interview Protocol

Screening Tool

1. How long were you incarcerated while under 18 years old?
2. Have you been released from incarceration more than 5 years?
3. How old are you now?
4. Are you fluent in English?
5. Do you have a fifth-grade reading level or higher?
6. Do you require a legal guardian?
7. Have you been suicidal within the last 30 days?
8. Have you had a bipolar manic episode within the last 30 days?
9. If you have a substance use disorder, have you been sober for at least 30 days?
10. Do you feel comfortable with discussing your experience with returning to the community after incarceration?
11. Do you feel comfortable with explaining how incarceration may have impacted your relationships?
12. Do you feel comfortable with talking about possible challenges related to the ability to avoid crime?
13. Do you feel comfortable with discussing any experiences of loneliness related to your experience?
14. May I view a copy of either a state issued identification card, an official birth certificate, passport, or driver's license through Skype, face-to-face (if applicable), or send a copy through postal mail, to verify that you are over 18 years old?
15. Are you comfortable with doing an audio recorded interview or Skype instant messenger interview?

Interview Protocol

RQ1: How does the lived experience of loneliness in young adults, who as juveniles underwent a lengthy incarceration, impact prosocial relationship formation postrelease?

1. Tell me about any meaningful social relationships while you were in prison. Can you give me an example? Was there anyone else?
2. And now that you are out of prison, what kinds of social relationships have you connected with?
 1. Can you give me an example of someone who you feel a strong bond. Tell me about that relationship. Are there any others?
 2. Tell me about the times when you were in prison as a young person, and you felt lonely. What was that like?
 3. Do you remember a particularly hard or sad moment? Can you tell me about that time?
 4. Was that a common experience? Tell me about the other times you felt like that.
 5. What did you do when you had those feelings? Can you give me an example? Was there something else you did or said or thought about?

6. The loneliness you felt in prison – is there anything like it now that you are out of prison? Can you give me an example?

RQ2: How does the lived experience of postrelease relationships in young adults formerly incarcerated as juveniles inform the ability to desist criminality?

7. What can you tell me about the meaning of social relations now that you are out of prison?
8. Think of one of your closest friends here now – What makes this relationship important to you. Are there others who are important to you as well?
9. How do you see your connections with people here in relation to staying clean and out of prison?
10. Can you describe any challenges with relationships after you were released?
11. How has your feelings of relating or feeling connected to others changed since being released?
12. What can you tell me about any challenges in getting assistance in order to readjust once you were released?
13. Can you describe any challenges or worries you have about adjusting to life after being released?
14. Can you tell me about any problems or temptation you have experienced with being involved in illegal behavior (or violating community supervision terms if applicable)?
15. How have you been able to overcome any challenges with being involved or tempted by illegal behavior?
16. What types of resources or support do you think would be helpful for adjustment after being released?
17. Thank you for your time. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me?

Appendix G: Procedural Checklist

Procedural Checklist

1. Obtain permissions for advertising at a public space (see Consent if applicable):
2. Obtain permissions for advertising on online support/advocacy groups:
3. Voluntary Response Details (document date, time, medium):
4. Was Consent provided at initial contact (how was consent provided and obtained):
5. Screening at initial consent:
6. If questionable, how was age verified (face-to-face or postal mail):
7. Scheduled interview, preference of medium, preference for confirmation (Date, time, preference for medium, preference for receiving informed consent copy):
8. When and how was informed consent copy sent:
9. When and how confirmation was sent (list any responses or lack of response):
10. Was an interview rescheduled:
11. Did Consent get communicated prior to interview administration?
12. When/how did interview take place and how long did it take (starting from discussing informed consent, conducting the interview, debriefing, establishing follow-up preference, and ending with postal mail or email preferences for summary of results)?
13. Were participants debriefed (explain study purpose and answer questions)?
14. Did participant receive a \$25 Visa Gift Card?
15. Was follow-up preference established (write details for follow-up preference):
16. Was follow-up established (details):
17. What was the result of follow-up (were results verified or altered)?
18. Was a 1-2-page summary of results sent to participants?
19. Any additional concerns brought up in the process (including participant withdrawal or reportable events)?
20. If applicable, were any events reported to the IRB within one week? What was the resolution?