Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

2019

Juvenile Detention Center Effects on Futures of At-Risk Youth

Jennifer Lynn Zitterkopf
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Jennifer L. Turner

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. Christopher Bass, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Victoria Latifses, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2019

Abstract

Juvenile Detention Center Effects on Futures of At-Risk Youth

by

Jennifer L. Turner

MS, Walden University, 2014

BS, University of Maryland University College, 2011

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2019

Abstract

Many juvenile offenders return to the justice system after serving their incarceration sentences. Detaining youth has a negative impact on their mental health, education, employment, and ability to secede from a criminogenic life course. Identifying detention center effects on youths' futures can provide further insight on why the current approach does not successfully deter youth from secondary delinquency. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore future effects on incarcerated youth. A qualitative research design using a phenomenological paradigm was used to investigate study constructs. Labeling and social learning theories served as theoretical frameworks. Labeling theory was used to describe impact on youth after they receive a label of juvenile delinquent. Conceptualization on learned criminal behaviors in incarceration environments was made using social learning theory. Data was collected from personnel directly involved with juvenile incarceration, release, and rehabilitation. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were used for data collection. Coding software, bracketing, and concept mapping were implemented for data analysis. Detention centers attribute to a decrease in abilities required for youth to become functioning society members. Implications for social change include enhancing knowledge for professionals working to rehabilitate juveniles in effort to increases ability for future success. Participants specifically noted a lack of collaboration and understanding on how to implement evidenced-based practices into juvenile offender rehabilitation. Collaboration between the JJS, detention center staff, parents, and community programs is necessary to address this social problem.

Juvenile Detention Center Effects on Futures of At-Risk Youth

by

Jennifer L. Turner

MS, Walden University, 2014

BS, University of Maryland University College, 2011

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

August 2019

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my daughter Caiden and my son Blaide. The two single most amazing people in the world. They inspire me and motivate me to achieve my best and accomplish all that is within my ability to give them the best life possible. My accomplishments are all for them.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

Juvenile offenders are not effectively being redirected from future criminal behavior when being sentenced to serve time in detention centers for punishment (Baglivio, Wolff, Jackowski, & Greenwald, 2017; Brown & Smith, 2017). Youth are experiencing persistent negative effects on their abilities for future success after being detained (Sattler, 2017). Detaining delinquent youth increases reoffending risks causing a negative influence on their futures (Brooks, Miller, Abebe, & Mulvey, 2018; Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018). Limited research exists on detention center factors correlated with decreasing youths' potential to have successful futures after incarceration (Brown & Smith, 2017).

Youth offenders, communities, and school systems may benefit from a Juvenile Justice System (JJS) better equipped to provide services which enhance delinquent youths' futures (Hay, Ladwig, & Campion, 2017). Communities and school systems will expend fewer resources if juveniles reenter communities with their rehabilitation needs met (Hay et al., 2017). Stakeholders, court officials, and mental health workers recognize the current JJS approach is not having desired results (Mears, 2017). More information is required for understanding JJS components responsible for decreasing detained youths' future success (Mears, 2017). Insight can be gained into how detention affects juvenile offenders' future success by conducting further research on this social concern (Mears, 2017).

The social phenomenon of detention centers disrupting youths' future success is presented with a brief investigative preview. Insight into negative effects of incarcerating youth including mental illness, behavioral disorders, and a decreased ability to phase out of delinquency will be provided in the background. Specific reasons extant in research for why

youth who experience incarceration are having disrupted futures are introduced. Research questions were developed with purpose of gaining insight on how experiences received during and after incarceration affect youths' ability to have successful futures. A phenomenological research paradigm was used to analyze professional personnel perceptions employed by juvenile incarceration facilities. Theoretical framework is established through labeling and social learning theories with applicability to criminological context.

Background

Problems are created from juvenile detention ineffectiveness not only in the JJS, but throughout individual communities (Hay et al., 2017). Juveniles who are incarcerated for their offending behaviors are likely to continue on a criminogenic path (Brown & Smith, 2017; DiClemente & Wingood, 2017). Youths' futures are disrupted when they experience incarceration by decreasing opportunities required to halt a criminogenic life course (Brown & Smith, 2017; Burfeind, Bartusch, & Hollist, 2018; Pechorro, Castro, Hoyle, & Simões, 2018). Negative effects incarceration has on youth may exacerbate mental health and behavioral problems which caused the juvenile to initially offend (Gottfredson, Kearley, Thornberry, Slothower, Devlin, & Fader, 2018; Hay et al., 2017; Simmons, Fine, Knowles, Frick, Steinberg, & Cauffman, 2018).

Placing youth in detention centers where their rehabilitation needs are not addressed can slow or interrupt natural processes required to age out of delinquency (Pyrooz, Gartner, & Smith, 2017; Simmons et al., 2018). Detention centers have become indistinguishable from adult prisons with overcrowded environments creating neglect, chaos, and violence (Makarios, Cullen, & Piquero, 2017). Gang mentality is fortified in detention centers where juveniles experience injuries comparable to those received in adult prisons (Mackarios et al., 2017; Pyrooz et al.,

2017). Incarcerated youth have significantly higher school dropout rates, lower economic success, and decreased employment opportunities when compared to youth who have not been incarcerated (Carter, 2019). Incarcerated youth have a decreased propensity for becoming functioning adults and societal members (Hay, Widdowson, Bates, Baglivio, Jackowski, & Greenwald, 2018).

A knowledge gap exists in the forensic psychology field on detention center factors responsible for disrupting youths' potential for future success (Decker & Marteache, 2017). There are limited research studies pointedly investigating incarceration effects on youths' futures (Decker & Marteache, 2017). Decrease in abilities required for future success after incarceration is explained through current research. Data were collected to create a more in-depth understanding on components directly affecting youths' potential for becoming functioning adults and societal members. Identifying factors within the JJS related to disrupting offending youths' futures is paramount for developing a more effective, treatment-focused system with capability to address needs while enhancing future success (Hovey, Zolkoski, & Bullock, 2017). Detention centers used as punishment for delinquent youth will be extensively investigated by identifying etiology, continuity, and long-term effects.

Problem Statement

Incarcerating juvenile offenders can disrupt their ability to have successful futures (Brown & Smith, 2017; Burfeind, Bartusch, & Hollist, 2018). The JJS is challenged with releasing at-risk youth back into their communities without effectively addressing their rehabilitation needs (Baglivio et al., 2017). Decrease in juvenile's potential for future success after being detained is a growing concern (Baglivio et al., 2017; Burfeind et al., 2018). Juvenile justice officials and stakeholders recognize crime is not being reduced by current detention

center structuring (Shoemaker, 2017). There is not adequate research on how detention centers may negatively affect incarcerated youths' futures (Shoemaker, 2017). Incarcerating youth has a negative effect on employment and educational opportunities (Baglivio et al., 2017; Nguyen, Loughran, Paternoster, Fagan, & Piquero, 2017).

Detaining youth in detention centers reduces their average employment earnings compared to non-incarcerated youth (Baglivio et al., 2017). Employers and educational gatekeepers are less likely to hire youth after incarceration (Baglivio et al., 2017). Emotional distress combined with experiences youth have throughout incarceration may exacerbate preexisting mental and behavioral disorders (Sugie & Turney, 2017). Incarceration can also lead to emotional and behavioral disturbances affecting juveniles' abilities in halting a criminal path (Hancock, 2017).

Purpose of the Study

A qualitative phenomenological approach was used to investigate the phenomenon of detention centers decreasing youth offenders' future success. Negative impacts detention centers have on juvenile offender's futures was the central focus of research. Intent was to describe perspectives and experiences from participants involved in juvenile incarceration processes within context of specific futuristic factors. Specific future components investigated were education, employment, rehabilitation of mental illnesses, and halting a criminal life-course. Applicability of labeling and social learning was used to conceptualize data and theory for thematic conclusions.

Primary objective was to gain an in-depth understanding on how detention centers disrupt youths' ability for having successful futures. Experiences in detention centers presented a focus on how youths' futures are affected. Inquiries exploring why juveniles engage in subsequent

delinquency after serving sentences were made. Explanations on detention center factors which may contribute to identified success components were collected from interviews. Direct statements made by participants experiencing phenomenon under investigation are used as a primary research method to explore study purpose.

Research Questions

Central Research Question: How would personnel involved in the incarceration process of juvenile offenders describe incarceration effects on youths' future success?

Sub Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success?

Sub Research Question 2 – What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration?

Theoretical Framework

Labeling theory (LT) and social learning theory (SLT) were used as theoretical framework. LT was first introduced into sociology discipline through Becker's work in the 1960s (Becker, 1974). LT was developed to explain how experiences affect the way people perceive themselves, which often clashes with social norms and their aptitude (De Coster & Lutz, 2018; Kroska, Lee, & Carr, 2017). According to LT, youth can begin identifying themselves as criminals when they experience incarceration (Shoemaker, 2018). Criminal behavior among youth may increase after serving in a detention center because this experience attenuates their life course (Shoemaker, 2018). When youth are incarcerated, value identification processes occur, causing labels to be adopted and fortified (Lee, Tajima, Herrenkohl, & Hong, 2017). Definitions become personalized while behavioral codes which violate laws become more

prominent (Lee et al., 2017). Behaviors begin to be accepted as norms because detention centers become a conduit in forming a criminal identity (Shoemaker, 2018).

Bandura (1977) was one of the first proponents of SLT and agreed with tenets of classical conditioning and operant conditioning. Bandura (1977) claimed there are additional factors which account for learned behaviors. Youth engage in offending behavior after establishment of associations with others who have conventional sodality to delinquent propensity (Chouhy et al., 2017). Youth who experience longer sentences in detention have an increase in opportunities to form a criminal identity (Shoemaker, 2018). They will also have more opportunities to establish delinquent behavioral codes and relations with delinquent peers (Chouhy et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2018).

Nature of the Study

A qualitative research paradigm was used for exploring participant opinions, feelings, and perceptions on conduits related to negative incarceration effects on youths' futures. A researcher can obtain a rich, detailed picture to generate an understanding for why people act in certain ways when using a qualitative research paradigm (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Qualitative researchers explore participant variables in their natural settings where they commonly occur (Smith, 2017). A phenomenological design was used to investigate and understand social-psychological processes. Concentration focused on direct experience constructs without using a pre-given framework.

Many researchers investigating incarceration effects use quantitative studies for testing incarceration variables, such as recidivism rates, employment rates, high school dropout rates, and mental illness statistics. Approach strength lies within offering testable results, showing cause and effect, and statistics which allow for empirical evidenced-based findings. Quantitative

approaches do not offer in-depth explanations on why detention centers can impact delinquent youths' future success and what specific abilities and opportunities are affected. Applying a qualitative investigation with a phenomenological design is beneficial in understanding what future components are specifically altered after being incarcerated in a juvenile detention center. Specific elements affected by incarceration are categorized for research process.

Key concepts related to future elements affected by incarceration were used as the basis for the investigation. Four primary future components which are negatively affected by detention centers were established: education, employment, mental health, and ability to prevent subsequent delinquency. Educational success involves returning to high school and becoming eligible for entering into a college or trade school. Employment relates to any form of job opportunity resulting in paid wages. Mental illness rehabilitation is conceptualized as successful treatment so the disorder no longer significantly affects a juvenile's abilities for functioning in society. Abilities necessary to prevent future offending behavior involve a range of decreased risk factors such as successfully obtaining education, employment, and mental illness treatment.

Data were collected to examine why detaining youth in detention centers can decrease potential for future success. Along with gathering data from previous research to inform this study and conceptualize results, data were collected on routine, day-to-day organizational operations involved in youth incarceration processes. Administrative data are often routine, comprehensive and collected over long periods of time, which may assist in detecting changes or identifying underlying patterns explaining participant perceptions (Smith, 2017).

Research setting is juvenile detention centers and reentry programs. Settings were chosen if they can provide at least 8 to 15 professional personnel who have direct experience with detaining juvenile offenders. Program administrators were introduced to the study and

explanation for why their facility is desired was provided. Target population is professional personnel involved with youth offender incarceration processes. These personnel often re-arrest the same juveniles in communities they serve, and are involved in a juvenile's life for extended time periods.

Sampling frame included caseworkers, mental health professionals, community reentry counselors, correction officers, and probation officers. Participants had at least three years direct experience with judicial processes regarding incarcerating juveniles and aftercare services. Letters were provided to participants by their program directors and managers. An explanation on the study's purpose, procedures, type of information to be collected and contact information was provided. Preliminary questions were asked to confirm exclusion and inclusion criteria after an appropriate amount of responses are received. Purposeful sampling strategies were implemented, and convenience sampling was utilized to gather data on study constructs available during data collection.

Data collection techniques included person-to person, semi-structured interviews. Participants explained phenomenon in their terms as they experienced it through open-ended, interview questions presented in conversational format. Analytic strategies involved bracketing for delineating units of meaning and for qualitative data explication. NVivo coding was employed for identifying repetitive themes and events, as well as reduced data to a manageable format. Concept mapping was used to demonstrate underlying themes and patterns discovered in data as final data analysis strategy. A concept map is a beneficial tool for framing a research project, reducing qualitative data, analyzing interconnections, and presenting context embedded in framework on a schematic spreadsheet (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Definitions

Operational definitions of terms related to this study are provided for a consensus of meaning.

At-risk youth: An at-risk youth is someone who is less likely to transition into adulthood successfully (Pechorro, Castro, Hoyle, & Simões, 2018). At-risk youth will be conceptualized as youth possessing factors directly related to lack of abilities for avoiding criminal engagement, achieving academic success, and becoming financially independent (Pechorro et al., 2018).

Detention: A form of locked custody for youth who have been arrested and are in pretrial or who have been sentenced (Menon & Cheung, 2018). Some youth in detention are there because they fail probation or parole conditions, or they may be waiting in detention before their final disposition of sentencing to a community program or juvenile correctional facility (Menon & Cheung, 2018).

Evidenced-based treatment: Evidenced-based treatment includes interventions which have been ranked on a continuum, ranging from those without supporting evidence to science-based or research-based practices (Haney-Caron, Esposito-Smythers, Tolou-Shams, Lowery, & Brown, 2019). Evidenced-based treatment was used in this study for describing rehabilitation strategies which have been scientifically proven to successfully treat at-risk youths' needs and prevent further criminal engagement.

Informal labels: Informal labels occur when an individual or group of people apply a label to someone without having the official or professional authority for distinguishing between deviant and non-deviant behaviors (Lee et al., 2017). Informal labels will be used to describe how juveniles began forming identities based on how society and peers view them.

Formal labeling: Formal labeling occurs when an individual comes into contact with correctional officers and court authorities and they are officially labeled as an offender or societal deviant (Lee et al., 2017). Formal labeling was used for investigating how official labels given by justice system authorities form a deviant self-concept causing a juvenile to act according to their label.

Scared straight mentality: An approach for dealing with juvenile offenders with the goal of deterring youth by using swift, harsh punishment to scare delinquent youth from engaging in future offending behaviors (Allen et al., 2015). The scared straight mentality was investigated to explain the JJS's current approach.

Self-efficacy: A person's beliefs about his or her capabilities to produce a desired outcome (Cox, Kochol, & Hedlund, 2018). For this study, self-efficacy applies to juvenile offenders' belief regarding their own ability for becoming successful society members and deter from a criminal life course.

What works approach: The *what works approach* is used to describe varying interventions which different states and justice departments are implementing based on views on the best approaches to deter juveniles from a criminal life course (Long, Sullivan, Wooldredge, Pompoco, & Lugo, 2018)**.** The *what works approach* will be used to describe extensive variation existing in the JJS. The *what works approach* is also a movement from the *nothing works* view, which remains among some court officials, policy makers, and stakeholders (Long, 2018).

Assumptions

Assumptions were acknowledged to support this qualitative study's purpose and conclusions. It is assumed professionals involved with the juvenile court system represent the population of JJS personnel who have direct experience with juvenile offender incarceration

processes. Participants honestly disclosed accurate accounts based on their experience with study constructs and answered open-ended interview questions to the best of their knowledge. Assumptions were based on stories and views participants can share. Accurate interview transcript coding was made possible through NVivo coding software.

Professional personnel working in the judicial court system were asked to volunteer if they believe they have enough experience with detention center effects on youth offenders' futures. Participants were 7 volunteers who meet inclusion and exclusion criteria, which provided enough data to conceptualize central phenomenon under study and related constructs. Eight participants met criteria and were willing to participate in the study. One participant had to cancel their interview due to a family illness. Eight to fifteen participants for a qualitative study are generally sufficient for providing enough data to formulate phenomenal understanding in qualitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Personal bias was identified and accounted for. Precautions were taken to keep personal views and opinions separate from research data to improve study reliability.

Scope and Delimitations

Education, employment, mental well-being, and ability to prevent future offending behaviors are all negatively affected by juvenile detention (Baglivio et al., 2017; Carter, 2019). Antisocial behavior persistence and severity can be increased by early initiation into the JJS (Hay, Widdowson, Bates, Baglivio, Jackowski, Greenwald, 2018). One-third of detained youth experience mental health problems after being released (Logan-Greene, Tennyson, Nurius, & Borja, 2017). Poor mental health, depression, suicide ideation, and self-harm often became prevalent after youth experience confinement in detention centers (Russell et al., 2017). Educational researchers have found approximately forty percent of youth returning to school

after serving detention sentences have learning disabilities and problems directly affecting their ability to finish their education (Sinclair, Unruh, Clark, & Waintrup, 2017).

Youth who have been incarcerated have a reduction in employment earnings compared to youth who have not been detained (Baglivio et al., 2017; Carter, 2019). Incarcerated youth have a decreased ability to successfully enter into and remain in the workforce (Carter, 2019). Self-labeling and peer associations formed during incarceration have an impact on at-risk youths' ability to age out of delinquency (Shoemaker, 2018). Youths' ability to become functioning society members and halt their delinquent behavior before adulthood is decreased when they are incarcerated (Kazemian & Farrington, 2018; LaCourse, Listwan, Reid, & Hartman, 2019; Logan-Greene et al., 2017).

Limited research exists on conduits related to how youths' futures are impacted after being detained in a detention center (Decker & Marteache, 2017). Research gaps exist on specific detention center elements which cause a decreased propensity for future success among at-risk youth (Hovey et al., 2017). Population under investigation was juvenile offenders who are considered at-risk youth and have served time in a detention center. Data on youth who are involved in the JJS and received punishment consequences not including incarceration in a detention center was excluded from the study.

Data were gathered on youth who have not desisted from the system after release but remained involved in the JJS through parole officers, school and community reentry services, court-mandated mental health treatment, and other rehabilitation services. Interviews were conducted with participants who are currently employed by the JJS or involved in aftercare treatment. Study participants met following criteria: current JJS employment, direct experience with detaining youth in detention centers, an understanding on how incarceration impacts

youths' futures, and willingness to participate in the research study. Participants who did not have direct experience working with juveniles for at least three years were excluded.

Deterrence theory is being used to rationalize current JJS decisions (Lee & McCrary, 2017). According to deterrence theory, criminal behavior is a result of rational choice theory where cost/risk benefit rationalizations and calculations are made (Kumm, Maggin, Brown, & Talbott, 2019). Deterrence theory is the foundation for the belief that swift, certain punishment appropriate to the offense deters crime (Kumm et al., 2019). Juveniles who have received harsh punishment should be deterred from reoffending (Shoemaker, 2018). Juveniles should make associations between their behavior and undesired consequences from experiencing longer incarceral stays (Shoemaker, 2018).

Deterrence theory stemmed from the *get tough* era and sentencing punishments juveniles currently receive (Lee & McCrary, 2017). Deterrence theory was not used to guide the study because recently researchers have demonstrated harsh punishment in the form of incarceration does not provide desired effects. Youth cannot be held accountable for their crimes the same as adults because they are not able to process cause and effect efficiently while in incarceration (Kumm et al., 2019; Shoemaker, 2018). When youth experience incarceration self-identification as a criminal can occur creating a labeling effect (Shoemaker, 2018).

Social control theory (SCT) was considered to guide the research process. Criminal behavior among youth is believed to be learned behaviors occurring during strong social bonds and interactions with others (Kumm et al., 2019). SLT was chosen instead because not all youth form strong social bonds while incarcerated or after release. Some youth isolate themselves from social groups, which may perpetuate delinquent behaviors (Yeager, 2017). SLT encompasses

behaviors learned from all social interactions, without specification to strong social bonds, peers, or social interaction types (Shoemaker, 2018).

Transferability was enhanced by providing thorough descriptions on background and research context on the central phenomenon being investigated. Assumptions were identified, which allows for result transferability to a different context. Broad claims were not made from results. Other researchers are invited to make connections between constituents from other studies and their experience. Transferability was ensured by providing rich descriptions on research settings and surrounding environments. Through sample variation future research opportunities can occur where sample populations are different (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Acknowledging study limitations will increase result quality and applicability to real-world settings (Smith, 2017).

Researchers can increase qualitative research dependability by conceptualizing potential mistakes, carelessness, and bias likely to occur throughout the research process (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Identifying potential mistakes in data collection methods, such as in interview questions and data analysis procedures, can lead to a more credible and dependable study. Logic behind every research choice was presented. Consistency and alignment audits were conducted by a research team and research activities were continuously reviewed. Methods for obtaining informed consent are presented. Scholars can establish credibility and ethical responsibility by demonstrating their participants were aware of study conditions, such as study purpose and procedures (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Scholars must justify their method choice and overreaching research paradigm to ensure dependability (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Information on dependability is provided in Chapter 3. Participant selection strategies are explained, along with descriptions on those who either

chose not to participate or were excluded based on study criteria. Understanding human behavior from informant perspectives and data interpretation through participant perceptions is the locus of investigation. A quantitative design would not be appropriate because this study was not concerned with discovering numbers and facts about the social phenomena and did not contain a fixed measurable reality.

Study limitations were further decreased by describing analytical approaches and theoretically justifying them. Descriptions on how researchers have used other approaches are provided. Dependability was increased by accounting for how themes and concepts were derived. Emergent issues arising during research process was accounted for and not limited to predeterminations, such as issues or concerns raised by participants. Potential bias was addressed by presenting clear and in-depth data interpretation techniques allowing readers to understand relationships between data and research findings. Raw data were described with labeling, using pseudonyms, and direct quotes from interviews. Findings were aligned with existing literature.

Limitations

Participant experiences with disrespectful or uncooperative juveniles, prejudices related to criminals receiving what they deserve, and the *nothing really works* mentality may have interfered with study conclusions. Additional limitations may include the interviewees' inability to process their experiences and portray accurate representations based on their perceptions in an interview format. Some participants may not have been able to articulate and portray in-depth explanations for their views on experiences they had with phenomenon under study. Participants may have been reticent to share views on their experiences, which can make it challenging to extricate enough information for useable interview data.

Some participants were employed by the JJS, and may be dedicated to improving the system. Participants were asked to describe negative impact and ineffectiveness of a system they work for, which may have caused bias to arise during interviews. Sample size and phenomenological research nature may limit study results from being generalized to other settings. Potential bias concerns also arise in data analysis for phenomenological studies because the researcher determines data meaning by identifying themes and patterns (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Significance

Results may contribute to existing research by revealing how employees who work directly with juvenile offenders perceive detention centers to negatively impact at-risk youths' futures. Positive social change may occur by providing opportunities for future studies. Enhanced insight can be gained by broadening scholars' understanding on how juvenile detention centers can decrease youths' ability to have successful futures. Professionals involved with arresting, sentencing, and releasing juveniles want more effective rehabilitation strategies to redirect offending youths' life course. New knowledge on juvenile justice reform and consequences for using incarceration as a form of punishment is offered in this study. Further insight into better approaches to juvenile delinquency may be presented in the results.

Cycles of subsequent delinquency and increased probability for a criminal life course may be lessened when applying new ideas developed through scholarly research. Delinquent youth generally follow patterns of offending behavior which can be predicted by exposure to certain environments and situations (Shoemaker, 2018). Enlightenment on best approaches for treating juveniles may be gained through researching these patterns and specific environmental conduits linked to continual criminal engagement. A significant gap still exists on ineffectiveness

of juvenile detention centers. It is not fully understood why the current approach is not having desired effects on recidivism prevention. Researchers investigating specific detention center facets may assist in filling this gap and lead to a reform in the JJS. When juvenile's needs are viewed as individually unique and potential harm for sentencing to a detention center ais understood more evidenced based treatment programs may be implemented.

Summary

Detention center ineffectiveness at preventing juvenile recidivism has been a concern in the United States for the past few decades (Baglivio et al., 2017). It is not fully understood why this sanctioned punishment approach is not having desired results of the *scared straight* ideology. Youth are continually experiencing negative effects after experiencing incarceration in a detention center. It has been concluded from research that education, employment, mental health, and future criminal behavior are predominating factors most affected by detention center experiences. After youth are incarcerated in detention, their reoffending risk increases to a rate higher than when they first entered the JJS. Youths' futures are greatly impacted by the detention experience and their potential for future success becomes greatly limited. Mental illnesses and behavioral problems are often exacerbated during incarceration. Challenges youth face after detention can be too significant as they try reentering into their communities, school systems, and workforce.

LT and SLT were used as the theoretical framework for conceptualizing the influence detention centers have on youth. According to LT, youth experience a change in identity when they are labeled as a juvenile offender. This identity change causes a change in their self-concept, and they begin acting according to this belief. SLT is also an important theory for understanding detention center effects on youth. Youth are susceptible to their environments

where behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs are learned and fortified. Detention centers are environments where criminal behaviors are encouraged causing youth to become further embedded into a criminal life course.

Specific constraints faced by youth offenders who have served time in a detention center were pointedly investigated. Concepts developed from detention center effects on juvenile's futures were categorized into specific thematic meanings. A phenomenological research paradigm guided the study. Study participants were personnel who have worked with juvenile offenders and are knowledgeable on experiences youth have with incarceration. Knowledge from this study may be applied to develop a strategic framework for program planners and policy makers approaching this social dilemma with a more effective and sustainable mitigation design. Extensive examination on current research studies which have identified youth factors specifically affected by detention centers is provided in Chapter 2.

Conceptualization on specific youth elements affected by incarceration occurred through research study categorization and key concept separation. Understanding into how the current JJS became what it is today is provided by briefly highlighting its role and history. Validity for theoretical framework is established by investigating labeling and social learning theories in up-to-date research studies where they have been tested against study constructs. Research approach is discussed with references to validity for research methods.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Abilities required for youth to have successful futures can be disrupted by incarceration (Baglivio et al., 2016; Brown & Smith, 2017). The purpose of this study was to gain an in-depth understanding on how youths' future abilities and opportunities are negatively affected by detention centers. At-risk youth continue to engage in criminal and antisocial behaviors despite harsh punishment of incarceration. The JJS has been unable to effectively provide rehabilitation which addresses this population's needs (Gottfredson, Kearley, Thornberry, Slothower, Devlin, & Fader, 2018; Kumm et al., 2019; Sattler, 2017). Youths' reoffending risks are increased when they do not acquire skills necessary for successful futures after being detained (Baglivio et al., 2016; Hay et al., 2017). The general public, stakeholders, and professionals involved in the JJS are increasingly concerned with unnecessary interruptions in juvenile's future success (Kempf-Leonard, 2017). There is limited knowledge on JJS components responsible for generating negative effects on at-risk youth (Mears, 2017).

In the remainder of Chapter 2, a comprehensive review regarding labeling and social learning theory is concisely analyzed within criminological context, including implicit juvenile future success aspects. Multifaceted factors of an increased risk for recidivism and a criminal life course (Backman, Laajasalo, Jokela, & Aronen, 2018), difficulty finding employment (Denver, Siwach, & Bushway, 2017), loss of opportunities and abilities to finish an education (Aizer & Currie, 2017; Lehmann, 2017), and a higher rate of mental and behavioral problems (Wibbelink, Hoeve, Stams, & Oort, 2017) are investigated and explained using current research. A phenomenological paradigm was used for exploring research studies regarding detention center conduits which have shown to be responsible for a decrease in future success after youth

experience incarceration. Detention center experiences are used to investigate perspectives for why youth may be significantly impaired in ability for successful futures after incarceration (Baglivio et al., 2017). Future opportunities affected by incarceration are categorized and made evident based on future success components specifically altered.

Literature Search Strategy

Research and applicable support references were collected through the World Wide Web. The Walden University Library provided access to the databases used, including ProQuest Criminal Justice, Academic Search Complete, JSTOR, PsycINFO, and EBSCOhost. Additional searches include commercial search engines, such as Google Scholar, U.S. Department of Justice, and National Juvenile Justice Network. Search terms included *effects of juvenile detention centers, impact of incarcerating youth, incarceration disrupting futures of youth, juvenile detention centers and rehabilitation, impact of detaining at-risk youth, labeling theory and juvenile detention, social learning theory and juvenile delinquency, placement punishment and futures of youth, juvenile corrections/detention, youth detention, juvenile corrections/detention effectiveness, juvenile corrections/detention statistics, juvenile detention reform, juvenile corrections/detention trends, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile recidivism.*

Theoretical Foundation

Labeling Theory

LT was developed for researchers to increase their understanding for how people can create a personal view based on experiences they have (Kavish, 2017). Labels can be incorporated into a person's self-concept, and an individual's self-concept influences how they act (Shoemaker, 2018). Youth can form a criminal identity when they are placed in detention centers (Shoemaker, 2018). Criminal behavior among youth may escalate after incarceration

because this experience extenuates their life course (Shoemaker, 2018). Youth ascribe to value identification processes in which labels are endorsed or fortified when they are incarcerated in detention centers (Kroska et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). Behavioral patterns are adopted as norms because detention centers become a conduit for forming a criminal identity (Kroska et al., 2017; Saydjari et al., 2017).

LT was first introduced to psychology discipline through the work of Becker (1974), and was used for understanding when and why children or adolescents are deviant. Children who are told they are deviant or *bad* may believe they are, creating a self-concept which can cause deviant behaviors (Becker, 1974). LT can be used in a criminal context through symbolic interactions and self-concept development (Becker, 1974). Labeling can take form during childhood when self-concept construction occurs based on their perceptions of experiences with others (Abrah, 2019). Individuals who are labeled begin to adjust and deal with given labels (Abrah, 2019). Exposure to certain conditions can spawn involvement in crime and acceptance of deviant behavior (Becker, 1974; Shoemaker, 2018).

Formal labels given by court officials such as juvenile offender or societal deviant can increase subsequent recidivism risk (Bouchard & Wong, 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). Individual identity transformation can occur during arrest and judicial processing (Wang & Weatherburn, 2018). When formal labels are received by the criminal justice system a criminal or deviant self-concept can be created (De Coster & Lutz, 2018; Lee et al., 2017). Formal labels may indirectly affect subsequent delinquency by restricting access to legitimate opportunities as youth enter into adulthood (Wang & Weatherburn, 2018). When a formal label is applied to youth, their future success is affected more significantly than when formal labels are withheld (Augustyn & Loughran, 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). Youth who receive a conviction resulting in a criminal label

of a juvenile offender or deviant are more likely to recidivate than individuals who have formal adjudication withheld (Kroska et al., 2016). Involvement in deviant social networks is increased after formal labeling is applied to a youth offender (Ang, Huan, Li, & Chan, 2018; Augustyn & Loughran, 2017; Shoemaker, 2018).

Arresting and prosecuting processes may lead to informal label development or negative self-labeling (Ang et al., 2018). Police intervention during adolescence can significantly affect criminal and noncriminal outcomes later in life (Ang et al., 2018; Bates & Swan, 2017; Zapolski, Banks, Lau, & Aalsma, 2018). Further deviant behaviors are likely to increase when a self-concept is redefined as deviant (Ang et al., 2018). Youths' social networks are affected by formal criminal intervention increasing probability of becoming involved in deviant social groups (Ang et al., 2018; Zapolski et al., 2018). Deviancy is interpreted by society within some stereotype. Societal reactions can encourage youth towards behavior which will conform to a stereotype (Bates & Swan, 2017).

Informal labeling experiences with society, family, and peers may create conversion in individual identity (Lee et al., 2017). Informal labeling such as gang member, may impact juvenile justice dispositions. Judicial processing instead of diversion programs are more commonly recommended for known gang members (Caudill, Diamond, Karas, & DeLisi, 2017). Once embedded in the judicial system, incarceration recommendations for labeled gang members are more likely to occur than for non-gang members (Caudill et al., 2017). Gang members are incarcerated an average of 15 days longer than non-gang members (Caudill et al., 2017). Subsequent delinquency is largely affected by detention sentencing through further exposing youth to the criminal medium of deviant peer groups and gang affiliation (Walters, 2018).

Labeling can indirectly lead to increased participation in socially deviant groups through exclusion from conventional peer groups (Walters, 2018). When juveniles are labeled they are more likely to be ostracized from conventional social networks, resulting in movement into deviant groups (Kroska et al., 2017; Walters, 2018). Negative beliefs in communities may direct youth to avoid peers involved with the JJS to prevent social stigma by association (Kroska et al., 2017). Mistrust and fear among peer groups and community members are created from negative stereotypes initiated through official labeling by the JJS (Kroska et al., 2017; Walters, 2018). Delinquent peer groups can provide refuge from social ostracism, as well as mutual rationalizations and opportunities which encourage offending behavior (De Coster & Lutz, 2018).

Exclusion from mainstream social life often occurs when youth are labeled by the JJS causing movement into criminal social networks (Shoemaker, 2018). Subsequent involvement in serious delinquency is increased with JJS intervention as it plays a mediator role for deviant networks (Lee et al., 2017). Youth tend to be embedded in deviant social groups through peer rejection, thereby increasing criminal propensity (Lee et al., 2017). JJS labeling plays a role in delinquency subsistence during adolescence (Walters, 2018). When youth receive deliquent labeling a change in identity and self-concept may occur as they experience restricted access to conventional opportunities and social networks (Kroska et al., 2017). Secondary deviance is unlikely to occur unless an individual associates with others who encourage and epitomize criminalization (Kroska et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2018).

When labels such as juvenile offender are cast onto youth they may withdraw from conformity as they perceive rejection from society (Kroska et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2017).Youth then reject what has rejected them and began to seek out groups and social support from

nonjudgmental subcultures (Han, Lee, & Park, 2017).Youth labeled as a juvenile offender or society deviant become part of a subculture which condones criminal behavior (Han et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). Deviant social groups are created as labeled youth move towards social activities and environments conducive for offending behaviors (Han et al., 2017).

Influences from peer groups and a disinterest in societal conformity evoked from rejection experiences largely impacts transition to adulthood (Lee et al., 2017). Transition into adulthood is generally driven by an understanding of social identity and conformity (Lee et al., 2017). Long-term implications may occur when youth transition into adulthood with a criminal label. Many barriers and challenges arise with stigmatization and self-identity transformation (De Coster & Lutz, 2018). Youth begin feeling obligated to act in particular ways and take on assumed roles derived from a criminal identity (De Coster & Lutz, 2018). Youths' newly acquired status becomes a part of who they are and what others expect from them (De Coster & Lutz, 2018; Lee et al., 2017). It is unclear what types of experiences or treatment are most successful at redirecting youth from holding onto a criminal identity as they enter into adulthood (Lee et al., 2017).

Direct causality between formal labels given by the JJS and future criminal engagement exist (Shoemaker, 2017). Altered self-concept occurring from formal or informal labeling may have a more prominent impact on subsequent delinquency than any other controls (Shoemaker, 2017). There is strong relationship between self-identification and criminal engagement which can be mediated through peer influence (Walters, 2018; Walters, 2019). Social and peer influence largely affect deviant behavior involvement (Walters, 2019). If youth do not identify themselves as a societal deviant or criminal, peer influence may have limited impact on their behavior (Walters, 2018).

LT theory is understood as a general theory of crime because it accounts for self-identity transformation which occurs after youth experience labeling (Kras, Dmello, Meyer, Butterfield, & Rudes, 2019). Official labeling from the justice system is a component of the *get tough* era in efforts to scare youth away from criminal acts (Kras et al., 2019). Formal labels are becoming largely unsupported as an effective method to deter youth from crime (Cox et al., 2017; Kras et al., 2019). There are many unforeseen consequences of giving youth official labels from the justice system. Withholding automatic labeling has shown to be an effective strategy for deterring youth from crime (Cox, Allen, & Hanser, 2017).

Serious challenges are presented for youth trying to be successful in society with an offender label (Moore & Tangney, 2017). Youth find themselves ineligible to enter into academic institutions, acquire student loans, participate in conventional activities and social groups, and find employment (Lee et al., 2017). These obstacles may present challenges too great for successfully transitioning out of a criminal life-course (Lee et al., 2017). Self-identity transformation into a deviant status weakens abilities for conformity and becoming independent, productive members of society (Cox et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2017; Moore & Tangney, 2017; Walters, 2018).

Social Learning Theory

Why a person chooses to participate in criminal behavior can be conceptualized using SLT making it a general theory of crime (Chouhy et al., 2017). Observed behavior resulting in continuous reciprocal interaction between an individual and their environment is the essence of SLT first proposed by Bandura (1977). Behavior and attitudes are modeled through observational learning which forms ideas for how an individual should perform certain behaviors (Bandura, 1977). These behaviors become coded as norms and later serve as a guide for how an

individual is to behave (Bandura, 1977). SLT is used to explain why people engage in certain behaviors despite noncompliance with desired social norms (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017).

Criminal behavior is developed through a conditioned learning process in which youth internalize behavioral codes as either desirable or undesirable (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017). When youth are exposed to behavioral codes which violate laws, they are at a higher risk for reoffending (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). SLT is a criminal theory used for exploring interactive effects on theory and psychopathy of juvenile delinquency (Chouhy et al., 2017). Juveniles who have longer sentences will have more exposure to criminal behavioral codes and associations with delinquent peers (Carson, Wiley, & Esbensen, 2017; Nicholson & Higgins, 2017). Individuals are more likely to participate in criminal or deviant behavior when they differentially associate with others who commit criminal behavior and espouse definitions favorable to it (Carson et al., 2017).

Differential association and differential reinforcement are reinforced in detention centers (Chouhy et al., 2017). Antisocial behavior and criminal psychopathy begin to be viewed as desirable and a general acceptance of attitudes and behaviors occurs (Shoemaker, 2018). Placing youth offenders with non-violent, low-level offenses in detention centers with high-level, violent offenders causes an emergence of new behaviors in non-violent offenders (Chouhy et al., 2017). Imitating actions and behaviors of peers often becomes a need for survival in order to have protection and acceptance in detention centers (Barrett & Katsiyannis, 2017; Reid, Richards, Loughran, & Mulvey, 2017). Youth are being exposed to behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes during a crucial developmental period, which can set precedence for a criminal life path (Jensen, 2017; Reid et al., 2017). The longer sentence juveniles have in a detention center, the more they are

exposed to the behavioral norms of this social environment (Barrett & Katsiyannis, 2017; Chouhy et al., 2017; Reid et al., 2017).

Criminal traits learned during incarceration can become permanent modifications of youth behaviors carried on into adulthood (Shepherd, Spivak, Borschmann, Kinner, & Hachtel, 2018). When youth are placed in detention centers they are reinforced for a life of crime as their beliefs and attitudes become favorable to criminal behavior (Shepherd et al., 2018). SLT is a reliable predictor for certain criminal behaviors. Substance use can increase to severe participation in drug and alcohol abuse among previously incarcerated adolescents (Brooks, Miller, Abebe, & Mulvey, 2018; Connolly & Kavish, 2018). Youth in the JJS have significantly higher rates of substance abuse than the general population (Walters, 2019; Welty et al., 2017). Juveniles are more likely to engage in secondary deviance which involves violent criminal behavior after they experience incarceration (Chouhy et al., 2017).

When youth interact with peers who have experience with particular types of offending behavior they gain new criminal knowledge (Chouhy et al., 2017). Increase in criminal acts is generated from newly acquired criminal knowledge provided by peers (Chouhy et al., 2017). Expansion of criminal networks is provided through access to youth with more severe criminal offenses in detention centers (Chouhy et al., 2017; Shoemaker, 2018). Social bonds being formed from the criminal underworld which detention centers present may continue after youth are released from incarceration (Barrett & Katsiyannis, 2017). Youth being released then enter into a criminal social network where organized crime becomes part of their social activities (Barrett & Katsiyannis, 2017).

During adolescence individuals are most susceptible to peer influence. During this stage they are most likely to model behaviors of others (Shoemaker, 2017). Peer associations are

thought to be the most predominant factor in perpetual delinquent behavior among youth (Han, 2018). The strongest predictor of offending behavior is association with delinquent social and friend groups (Han, 2018; Walters, 2018). Specific factors which can be directly correlated to criminal behavior include number of deviant friends, amount of time spent with delinquent peers, and strength of attachment and bonds (Walters, 2018).

Modeling of behaviors creates social bonds which then transform into social groups (Shoemaker, 2018). Naturally individuals fall into leadership and follower social roles (Shoemaker, 2018). Official or unofficial gangs are created which leads to more serious organized crime (Tolle, 2017). Gang membership has a strong correlation with more serious criminal behavior such as violence, drug use and selling, and theft (Jensen, 2017; Tolle, 2017). Youth who belong to a gang have an increased risk of recidivism (Jensen, 2017). Gang members have poor rehabilitation outcomes and often recidivate within one year after being released from detention (Jensen, 2017; Tolle, 2017).

Becoming a gang member during incarceration or after release promotes more severe criminal behavior regardless of previous delinquency seriousness or frequency (Bishop et al., 2017). Group processes become behavioral norms and are coded into an individual's self-concept as favorable and desirable behaviors which are reinforced though gang interaction (Bishop et al., 2017). Gang memberships then acts as a social reinforcer encouraging deviant behavior as certain behaviors are rewarded (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017). Fear of rejection or disapproval from gang members becomes a powerful motivator to continual on a criminal path (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017).

SLT, as a general theory of crime, can be used to explain why individuals participate in crime and deviance (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2018). Juveniles commit crimes when they have direct

contact with others who indirectly or directly teach them how to commit offending behaviors. Criminal peer associations and provision of an environment with more opportunities to learn criminal and offending behavior occurs in detention centers (Lilly et al., 2018). Juveniles often learn criminal behaviors which are more severe than offenses which first brought them into the JJS (Shoemaker, 2018).

Literature Review

Role of the Juvenile Justice System

The JJS is a system for those under the age of 18 who commit status delinquency and criminal offenses. The primary role of the JJS is to initiate deterrence factors for juvenile offenders from entering into criminal court and experiencing destructive punishment (Decker & Marteache, 2017). The original function of the JJS was to view every juvenile offender as a child or adolescent in need of assistance in his or her family, school system, neighborhood, or individual mental and behavioral health needs (Kratcoski, 2017). Previously the JJS would commonly identify a breach in the family system in order to address these needs (Decker & Marteache, 2017).

Incarceration for punishment was normally not considered in the beginning roots of the JJS (Decker & Marteache, 2017). When an adolescent offender first entered the justice system there was not a focus on the offensive act. Focus was on risk factors which brought him or her before the court (Ehrhard-Dietzel, Barton, & Hickey, 2017). There has been a shift from this original role as court professionals, law enforcement, and others involved in the JJS have lost touch with the original purpose. Today, the JJS is an overcrowded system with limited personnel who understand components needed for successful rehabilitation and a treatment-based system

(Decker & Marteache, 2017; Ehrhard-Dietzel et al., 2017). The current JJS does not possess significant differences from adult criminal courts (Kratcoski, 2017).

Punishment without evaluating individual rehabilitation and treatment needs is becoming a common JJS practice (Decker et al., 2017; Ehrhard-Dietzel et al., 2017; Kratcoski, 2017). Harsh punishment and incarceration are most likely outcomes of juvenile delinquency, becoming the most prevalent practices to deter youth offenders (Kratcoski, 2017). High numbers of juveniles are sentenced and incarcerated in detention centers without having their mental and behavioral health needs evaluated or treated (Na, Kyoung-Sae, Cho, & Seo Eun, 2019). Currently, the JJS focuses on protecting society with efforts to keep juveniles off the streets and out of school systems (Na et al., 2019).

Elements of Youth's Futures Affected by Detention Centers

Employment. Incarceration can cut off opportunities and prospects for stable employment and job stability, which can lead to later engagement in criminal acts (Carter, 2019). Risk factors are perpetuated after youth are detained in detention centers causing a decrease in successful future probability (Carter, 2019). Criminal convictions make youth especially prone to subsequent delinquency, leading to adult unemployment (Carter, 2019; Sharlein, 2018). Employment is critical for survival and for becoming a successful member of society (Visher, Lattimore, Barrick, & Tueller, 2017). Youth who have been incarcerated have been deprived of socialization processes and life skill development preventing them from successfully entering into the job market (Sharlein, 2018; Visher et al., 2017). Legitimate employment opportunities are a critical criminal desistance predictor while unemployment is an important consideration for measuring social costs of crime (Adams, Chen, & Chapman, 2017).

Incarceration, regardless of the offense, reduces human capital accession (Adams et al., 2017). Conviction and incarceration have a permanent impact on legal earnings (Terry & Abrams, 2017). Youth who have been incarcerated have lower chances of finding employment (Griffith et al., 2017). Unstable employment and higher welfare dependence characterizes delinquent youth as they enter into adulthood (Griffith et al., 2017). Youth in minority, poverty stricken neighborhoods began committing more serious crimes for economic gain, causing judges to place more severe sanctioning on juveniles (Donnelly, 2017). These crimes initially provide short-term gains which are alluring prospects at the time (Terry & Abrams, 2017). Separation from legitimate labor markets and erosion of social capital for employment prospects are consequences which follow economic based crimes (Donnelly, 2017).

Participation in income-producing criminal acts resulting in JJS involvement keep youth out of school and force them to disregard educational goals (Heynen, Van der Helm, Wissink, Stams, & Moonen, 2018; Western, Braga, & Kohl, 2017). Court appearances resulting in detention remove youth from potential employment referral networks they might have had before being placed in detention (Heynen et al., 2018). Community-based crime networks isolate them from employment opportunities (Heynen et al., 2018; Western et al., 2017). Limited employment and educational referral contacts are likely to increase unemployment probability (Baglivio et al., 2017). Detention sentencing integrates youth into criminal connections instead of referral networks for legitimate employment (Western et al., 2017).

Incarcerating youth has immediate and long-term negative effects on future employment opportunities. Involvement in the JJS reduces the employment rate individuals have over a lifetime. Incarcerating youth between the ages of 16 to 25 reduced employment over the next decade by twenty to thirty percent (Kim & Lee, 2018). Youth who spent some time incarcerated

in a detention facility experienced four factors related to employment: decreased job opportunities, lower wages, more likely to receive welfare, and an increase in needs-based criminal activity (Kim & Lee, 2018). Individuals with a criminal record may be regulated to inconsistent labor-markets with low-wages, and temporary or seasonal work (Baglivio et al., 2017). Individuals incarcerated as youth are seven times more likely to experience regular unemployment periods and be dependent on welfare (Baglivio et al., 2017).

Female youth offenders may be more significantly affected than male offenders (Brooks, Miller, Abebe, & Mulvey, 2018). Education lapses can be so substantial reenrollment in school is too great of a challenge causing a significant decrease in workforce readiness (Brooks et al., 2018; Young et al., 2017). Educational and vocational training programs in correction facilities are often inadequately resourced, and do not enhance ability to find employment (Jennings, Maldonado-Molina, Fenimore, Piquero, Bird, & Canino, 2018). Females are often additionally disadvantaged with training made available for them compared to male juveniles who are offered a broader range of vocational training and certification programs during and after detention (Jennings et al., 2018; Western et al., 2017). Female, youth offenders also face significantly more challenges when trying to find non-educationally based work such as manual labor jobs after incarceration (Young et al., 2017).

Lack of opportunities and support systems substantially increase the risk for juveniles to reoffend (Baur, Hall, Daniels, Buckley, & Anderson, 2017; Chin, 2017). Limited legal protection against employment discrimination for ex-offenders makes it difficult to counterbalance barriers in finding employment (Baur et al., 2017). A criminal record established in adolescence can cause employment barriers such as stigmatization, meetings with parole and probation officers, drug testing, and mandatory treatment services which often take place during the day (Baur et al.,

2017; Chin, 2017). Attending these meetings may result in job loss. Employers may be quick to cast aside an already risky hire asking for time off for attending court-mandatory drug testing, probation check-ins, and counseling (Denver et al., 2017).

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) encourages employers to consider individual cases, past offense severity, and length of time since release, but without legal enforcement these considerations are rarely practiced (Denver et al., 2017). Most previously incarcerated youth lack adequate education for their age, or any marketable skills (Kim & Lee, 2018). Youth offenders can be discriminated against while trying to develop a skill set before even entering into the workforce (Carter, 2019; Kim, & Lee, 2018). Prescreening for credentialing or licensing opportunities often prevent ex-offenders from acquiring certain skills which would increase their employment potential (Carter, 2019).

Ex-offenders face stigma in their search for work, and information about their criminal histories is often a requirement on job applications. Working-class males with conviction records are uniquely disadvantaged in finding and maintaining employment (Carter, 2019). Arrest records can have negative effects on employment as much as 8 to 12 years later (Carter, 2019; Sharlein, 2018). Employers are often unwilling to give an ex-offender an opportunity for employment without considering the type of offense or changes the juvenile might have made (Green, 2016). Many professions do not permit the hiring of formally convicted offenders (Denver, Siwach, & Bushway, 2017; Green, 2016). Employers often view juvenile offenders as a bad investment, unreliable, and untrustworthy (Green, 2016).

Incarcerating youth can encourage criminal capital while at the same time reduce social capital (Augustyn & Loughran, 2017; Carter, 2019). Incarcerating juveniles during their high school years is notably relevant in decreased ability to acquire legitimate employment (Nguyen,

Loughran, Paternoster, Fagan, & Piquero, 2017). Incarcerating youth lowers social capital through creating a barrier to pro-social networks (Farrington et al., 2018). When youth offenders return to their communities they re-integrate into environmental challenges which deter them from becoming productive members of society (Farrington et al., 2018; Nguyen et al., 2017). Many youth offenders are not prepared when they realize their expectations of returning to their previous life is not realistic (Farrington et al., 2018).

Detaining youth in detention centers forces a temporary time out from education (Augustyn & Loughran, 2017; Nguyen et al., 2017). A sustained period away from education erodes habits and skills necessary for completing a high school education preventing adequate accumulation of qualifying assets for employment (Carter, 2019). The longer youth are detained in detention centers the greater challenges are for them to acquire job skills. Youth who receive long-term sentencing experience a more detrimental impact on curriculum achievement and job skill acquisition (Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018). Incarceration is most adverse for employment prospects for those already disadvantaged (Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018).

Criminal records also prevent participation in public assistance, creating further inception into poverty and the criminal underworld (Grommon, 2017). Becoming ineligible for public housing becomes an even larger hurdle for obtaining employment (Grommon, 2017). Employers are unlikely to hire a future employee without identification and provision of an address (Baur et al., 2017). Employers subjective for casting aside applicants with a criminal record evokes ex-offender to search for capital gain outside of sanctioned job markets (Carter, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2017). When employers complete background checks criminal records elicit a labeling effect (Baur et al., 2017; Green, 2016). Assumptive, undesirable personal characteristics such as untrustworthiness, violence, or lack of a value system may be given to the applicant (Griffith,

Griffith, Young, & Young, 2017). This labeling effect often prevents applicants with a criminal record from making it to the interview stage of the hiring process (Griffith et al., 2017; Visher et al., 2017).

Criminal record labeling effects can result in employment exclusion. Employers are unlikely to hire an individual after viewing a record which shows involvement with the justice system causing significant employment consequences (Pham et al., 2017; Sharlein, 2018). With the availability of criminal records for employers there is now a greater threat to employment opportunities with even brief involvement with the JJS (Pham et al., 2017). Youth wanting to put their contact with the JJS behind them can be faced with their past each time they apply for employment (Pham et al., 2017; Visher et al., 2017). Federal, state, and institutional laws and regulations restrict hiring of employers with a criminal record (Carter, 2019). These laws create compelling limits and exclusions for a wide range of employment opportunities (Pham et al., 2017). Employers often do not consider rehabilitation, and the labeling effect continues on without regard to the possibility of change (Carter, 2019).

Exacerbation of mental illnesses, behavioral problems, and substance abuse following incarceration reduces job readiness, making them incapable of functioning in an employment setting (Darakai et al., 2017). Youth offenders with an exacerbation or onset of mental health problems after experiencing incarceration are frequently excluded from employment opportunities (Darakai et al., 2017; Gunnison & Helfgott, 2017). Mental illnesses signal to employers potential candidates cannot perform adequately for the job (Batastini, Bolaños, Morgan, & Mitchell, 2017). Mental illnesses causing behavioral problems may prevent offenders from keeping a job once hired (Batastini et al., 2017). Behavioral problems developed during or after incarceration such as anger, low coping skills, or violent reactions to conflict will most

likely result in employment termination (Batastini et al., 2017; Darakai et al., 2017; Gunnison & Helfgott, 2017).

After youth serve time in detention centers, this experience lowers their abilities to acquire educational and job-readiness skills (Newton et al., 2016). The deficit in skills is often too great for youth to recover from after they are released and enter into adulthood (Newton et al., 2016). Previously incarcerated youth are then less motivated in overcoming challenges of entering into the job market (Bowen, Nhan, & Polzer, 2017). As young adults transition to independence, it is necessary they are equipped with skills required for maintaining employment (Bowen et al., 2017).

Education. Education programs for youth in the JJS are poorly implemented and do not successfully prevent significant challenges youth face when trying to return to school after incarceration (Griffith et al., 2017; Hirsch, Dierkhising, & Herz, 2018; Lemert, 2017). Over forty percent of incarcerated youth who were receiving education services while being detained did not return to school after being released (Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018). Police intervention in the form of arrest and contact decreases high school graduation likelihood by over seventy percent (Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018). High school completion represents a critical marker for youth transitioning into adulthood (Eren & Mocan, 2017).

When delays in education occur, future educational trajectories are altered (Eren & Mocan, 2017). Many educational disadvantages occur from detaining youth in detention centers which create challenges too great for youth to overcome (Sinclair et al., 2017). Weak bonds to school associations exacerbate problem behaviors affecting school completion, such as truancy and dropping out (Eren & Mocan, 2017; Siegal & Welshe, 2016; Sinclair et al., 2017).

Alienation and weakened attachment with academic systems are likely to occur after arrest (Eren & Mocan, 2017).

Criminal justice sanctions produce educational challenges which foster school dropout and hinder college attainment (Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Arrest is correlated with a decrease in high school completion (Newton et al., 2018; Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Primary reasons why principles and school gatekeepers exclude criminally involved students are for truancy accountability rates, test scores, and graduation statistics (Newton, Day, Giles, Wodak, Graffam, & Baldry, 2018; Payne & Welch, 2018). Type of offense is not a predicting factor for determining high school completion (Schubert, Mulvey, Hawes, & Davis, 2018). Juveniles receiving incarceration is a reliable predictor for not completing high school (Eren & Mocan, 2017; Schubert, Mulvey, Hawes, & Davis, 2018; Takahashi & Evans, 2017).

Educational consequences of sentencing youth offenders to incarceration in a detention center have a dramatic impact on high school dropout, lower grades, and lower attendance (Newton et al., 2018; Rocque, Jennings, Piquero, Ozkan, & Farrington, 2017; Sinclair et al., 2017). Ability for finishing high school after spending time in a detention center often makes challenges of returning to high school and graduating too immense for youth to overcome (Godfrey, Cox, Alker & Shore, 2017; Newton et al., 2018; Rodriguez, 2018). Among these challenges is the fear or reality of being treated differently when returning to school following incarceration (Moore & Tangney, 2017). They may experience social stigma from teachers and peers causing them to fall behind, dropout, or not go back all together (Moore & Tangney, 2017).

Negative educational consequences from arrest and incarceration can continue beyond high school. Youth who graduate from high school with an arrest record can have transcripts marred from poor attendance during adjudicative processes, in turn affecting their grades

(Franklin, 2017; Newton, 2018). Marks on their transcripts can limit youths' ability to compete for college admission and financial aid. Similarly, social support loss can render college attainment an unrealistic goal (Franklin, 2017; Schubert et al., 2018). Institutional policies for college enrollment which deny educational benefits to ex-offenders create further barriers for youth offenders to obtain an education (Schubert et al., 2018). Youth drop out of school and do not attend college after arrest based on a belief that benefits of education are not possible with a criminal record (Newton et al., 2018).

Educational success factors being impacted with official sanctioning from the JJS can be explained through the LT (Augustyn & Loughran, 2017; Newton et al., 2018). Official labeling given by the JJS can cause students to experience acceptance refusal through exclusionary policies in educational systems (Augustyn & Loughran, 2017). Incarceration effects are based on selection bias when trying to enter into educational institutions (Bowser et al., 2018). Stigmatization and embarrassment often is the result when youth try reintegrating into the school system because they appear to be less intelligent and are often older than their class peers (Bowser et al., 2018). After these negative experiences, youth began to lose value in pursuing education attainment (Bowser et al., 2018).

Youth who have had involvement with the JJS show statistically significantly lower levels of education and literacy skills (Schubert et al., 2018). Education is crucial in obtaining employment as most employers will not higher an individual older than eighteen without a high school diploma (Schubert et al., 2018). High school completion is correlated with a decrease in recidivism for those youth who do overcome challenges of returning to high school (Payne & Welch, 2018). Youth sentenced to incarceration for the same offenses as youth not sentenced to incarceration have a significant decrease in the probability of finishing high school compared

with youth not placed in detention centers (Newton, Day, Giles, Wodak, Graffam, & Baldry, 2018; Payne & Welch, 2018).

Mental and behavioral health problems. Juvenile detention centers have a detrimental impact on youths' mental health. Most youth involved in the JJS have diagnosable mental health and substance use disorders (Na et al., 2019). Up to thirty percent of mental disorders among incarcerated youth are so severe they lead to functional impairments preventing youth from becoming functional and independent society members (Wibbelink et al., 2017). Juvenile justice staff supervising youth in juvenile probation, detention, and correctional settings often have limited knowledge on how to address delinquent youths' needs (Wibbelink et al., 2017).

Mental health problems have a strong relationship with delinquent behaviors (Fite, Pederson, & DiPierro, 2018; Yoder, Whitaker & Quinn, 2017). Youth who are involved in the JJS have consistently higher incidence of mental health disorders compared to the general population (Farina, Holzer, DeLisi, & Vaughn, 2018). Fifty to seventy percent of youth who have experienced judicial processing meet criteria for a diagnosable mental disorder (Farina et al., 2018). Certain types of mental disorders are more common among the juvenile offender population indicating some mental disorders may be precursors for delinquent behaviors (Ahonen, Loeber, & Brent, 2017; Farina et al., 2018). Offenses related to aggression and impulsivity are more commonly associated with specific types of mental disorders (Ahonen, Loeber, & Brent, 2017).

Mental disorders commonly diagnosed in juveniles include affective disorders, anxiety disorders, posttraumatic stress syndrome (PTSD), impulse control related disorders, and attention-deficit disorders (Shulman, Bechtold, Kelly, & Cauffman, 2018; Wibbelink et al., 2017). Many youth offenders also have mental illnesses related to behavioral disorders including

disruptive behavior, conduct, and oppositional defiant disorders (Haw, 2017). Conduct disorders, mood disorders, and substance abuse are the most frequent diagnosis given to youth involved with the JJS (Haw, 2017; Shulman et al., 2018). Youth offenders diagnosed with mood disorders are at an increased risk for behaviors of anger, aggression, hostility, and irritability (Kolp, Hershberger, Sanders, Um, Aalsma, & Cyders, 2018). Behaviors exhibited from these disorders often are the cause of offenses related to assault and violence (Kolp et al., 2018). Detention centers elicit an environment where these behaviors are encouraged and fostered (Shoemaker, 2018).

Irritability and aggression are frequently related to mood disorders such as depression and anxiety (Mroczkowski, McReynolds, Fisher, & Wasserman, 2018). These behaviors increase potential for imploring negative responses from others consequently creating risk for engaging in aggressive behavior resulting in arrest (Haw, 2017; Mroczkowski et al., 2018). Exacerbation in mood disorders which caused juveniles to initially enter into the JJS often occurs during incarceration (Shoemaker, 2018). Youth with disruptive behavior disorders demonstrate more physical aggression than youth without behavioral disorders (Bates & Swan, 2017). Youth are at an even greater risk of offending behavior related to physical aggression with comorbidity of attention-deficit and behavior disorders (Bates & Swan, 2017). There is also a strong relationship between substance use disorder and juvenile delinquency (Grucza et al., 2018).

There is inadequate formal training to help professionals involved with juveniles understand their mental health and behavioral problems when entering into the JJS (Jennings et al., 2018). There is also insufficient understanding on how mental disorders among delinquent youth impact their ability to rehabilitate (Dembo et al., 2018; Fite et al., 2018; Jennings et al., 2018). Detention center staff often resort to excessive punitive or ineffective strategies which

can worsen a youth's mental health (Dembo et al., 2018). Incarcerated youth with mental disorders can lead correctional staff to become overwhelmed resulting in job stress, burnout, and high employee turnover rates (Fite et al., 2018).

There is a lack of consistency for how to approach mental health issues among the juvenile offender population (Hovey, Zolkoski, Bullock, 2017). Finding the best models to effectively rehabilitate and treat juvenile offenders with co-morbid mental and behavioral problems is complicated (Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018). The JJS is faced with many challenges for addressing this issue causing many juveniles with mental illnesses left undiagnosed and untreated (Hovey et al., 2017; Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018). Correctional staff may contribute to mental illness exacerbation through more severe punishment such as solitary confinement when addressing behaviors stemming from mental disorders (Siegel & Kinscherff, 2018).

Two-thirds of incarcerated youth meet criteria for having a mental disorder, a statistic twice as high as the general youth population (Wibbelink et al., 2017). Mental illness prevalence among detained youth is multifaceted because juvenile detention centers have become a dumping ground for youth with mental health and behavioral disorders (Wibbelink et al., 2017). Trauma associated with arrest and incarceration process has an impact on youths' mental health (Wibbelink et al., 2017). Mental illness prevalence among juvenile offenders is due to environments generated in the nation's detention centers (Shoemaker, 2018). Detention center overcrowding has created a breeding ground for violence and chaos negatively affecting mental health (Shoemaker, 2018).

Juvenile offenders' mental health may become worse in detention. One-third of incarcerated youth diagnosed with depression had depressive symptom onset began after they were incarcerated (Mathur, Griller Clark, LaCroix, & Short, 2018). Transition into incarceration

itself is partially responsible for observed increase of mental illness in detention centers (Farina, Holzer, DeLisi, & Vaughn, 2018). Poor mental health exacerbated from detention conditions generate higher rates of depression, suicide idealization, and self-harm (Mathur, Griller Clark, LaCroix, & Short, 2018). The combination of mental health disorders youth bring into detention, conjoined with institutionalization factors, places incarcerated youth at increased suicidal risks (Mathur et al., 2018; Farina, Holzer, DeLisi, & Vaughn, 2018).

More than forty five percent of male juveniles and nearly thirty percent of female juveniles have one or more psychiatric disorder after incarcerated for up to five years (DiClemente & Wingood, 2017). Many psychiatric disorders persist in youth after detention (Jennings et al., 2018). Substance use disorders are the most common and most likely to persist (DiClemente & Wingood, 2017). Males have higher prevalence rates for substance use disorders over time, and females have higher rates for depression over time (McCormick, Peterson-Badali, & Skilling, 2017). When juveniles first enter into detention, more than sixty percent of juvenile detainees meet diagnostic criteria for one or more psychiatric disorders (McCormick et al., 2017).

Youth in incarceration experience double to four times the suicide rate compared with youth in communities (Na et al., 2019; Ruchkin, Koposov, Koyanagi, & Stickley, 2017). Twenty four percent of detained youth have had suicidal ideations over a 7-day period while incarcerated, with thirty four percent suffering from a significant clinical level of depression during incarceration (Na et al., 2019). The most commonly diagnosed mental health concerns during and after incarceration are depression, suicide ideation, and self-harm (McCormick, Peterson-Badali, & Skilling, 2017). Detaining youth places them at an increased self-harm risk,

and correctional staff may respond to suicidal behaviors and threats in ways which endanger youth further (McCormick et al., 2017).

A significant increase in suicidal thought and behavior prevalence, posttraumatic stress disorder, functional impairment, and diagnosed psychiatric disorders occurs during and after youth experienced incarceration (Forsyth, Dick, Chen, Biggar Jr, Forsyth, & Burstein, 2018). An estimated 36,800 of the 61, 423 youth held in U.S. correctional facilities each day have one or more psychiatric disorder (Forsyth et al., 2018). Psychiatric disorders persist as they become young adults occurring from continual exposure to numerous risk factors (Grucza et al., 2018).

Youth often experience impairments in their decision making and their ability to process cause and effect (Forsyth et al., 2018). Many youth in the JJS have experienced significant trauma before or during incarceration (Forsyth et al., 2018). Untreated PTSD symptoms can lead to social isolation, loss of appropriate functioning, inadequate abilities for forming relationships, and substance abuse (Modrowski, Bennett, Chaplo, & Kerig, 2017). PTSD is often a secondary mental health problem or diagnosed alongside other mental disorders commonly found in delinquent youth (Haney-Caron, Esposito-Smythers, Tolou-Shams, Lowery, & Brown, 2019; Modrowski et al., 2017).

A substantial proportion of delinquent youth continue to have disorders as they enter into adulthood (Grucza et al., 2018; Haney-Caron et al., 2019). Many youth continue to struggle five years after detention, and nearly fifty percent of males and nearly thirty percent of females had one or more psychiatric disorder up to five years after incarceration (Haney-Caron et al., 2019). Substance use and disruptive behavior disorders continued to be the most common disorders. For many delinquent youth, externalizing disorders are not limited to adolescence (Grucza et al., 2018). Disorders such as conduct disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder which

show up in youths' outward behavior, often continue into adulthood (Haney-Caron, Esposito-Smythers, Tolou-Shams, Lowery, & Brown, 2019).

 Future criminogenic life-course. Many juvenile offenders continue to engage in delinquent behavior after serving time in detention centers. Incarceration and detainment even for minor delinquency can have lasting ramifications for youths' future behavior and opportunities (Kumm et al., 2019). Incarcerating youth may interrupt and delay normal patterns for aging out of delinquency because detention disrupts their natural involvements with families, school, and work (Kumm et al., 2019; Wibbelink et al., 2017). Data from over 90,000 juveniles who had come before a juvenile court in a U.S. urban county found juvenile incarceration was positively correlated with recidivism (Bouffard, Cooper, & Bergseth, 2017). Those incarcerated as a juvenile are sixty percent more likely to enter adult prison later in life compared with those who came before the juvenile court without experiencing incarceration (Bouffard et al., 2017).

 Juvenile recidivism is likely to occur when incarceration takes place between ages of 15 and 18 (Hester, Roberts, Frase, & Mitchell, 2018). Incarceration in adolescence may lead to an end in high school education affecting youth's ability to age out of delinquency (Hester et al., 2018; Sugie & Turnery, 2017). The younger youth are incarcerated, the greater disadvantages and challenges they experience (Newton, 2018). Decreased education levels, income, and self-control, with increased conduct disorder levels, violence, and mental illness are correlated with sentencing young juveniles to detention (Backman, Laajasalo, Jokela, & Aronen, 2018; Newton, 2018; Schubert, Mulvey, Hawes, & Davis, 2018; Shannon, & Hess, 2018). Youth who are detained for minimal offenses who show no threat to public safety are at an increased recidivism risk after they experience incarceration (Dufour, Villeneuve, & Lafortune, 2018).

Detaining youth for low-level offenses which do not oppose a threat to society is a common JJS practice (Dufour et al., 2018; Villeneuve & Lafortune, 2018). Detaining youth for failure to appear in court increases official recidivism scores (Dufour et al., 2018). Many youth are re-detained for higher level offenses after serving detention sentences for low level offenses (Bouffard et al., 2017; Dufour et al., 2018). Low-risk youth who experience detention are likely to cross over into the high-risk youth category (Bouffard et al., 2017). The JJS no longer executes a social welfare model for the youth offender population. They practice punitive punishment as a crime control model for delinquent youth (Shoemaker, 2018).

Juveniles are incarcerated at a higher rate than adult offenders even though they are not responsible for the majority of serious crimes in the United States (Shannon & Hess, 2018). Incarcerating youth is not an effective deterrent factor for future offending behavior among the juvenile population (Shannon & Hess, 2018; Sharlein & Engstrom, 2018). Detaining youth only increases risk for future offending behaviors (Sharlein & Engstrom, 2018). The longer sentences juveniles have, the more they experience isolation from legitimate educational and employment opportunities increasing risk for establishment in criminal networks (Na, 2017).

There are distinct features of juvenile detention centers which increase risk for future offending behavior (Esposito, Lee, Hicken, Porter, & Herting, 2017; Jennings et al., 2018). Differences in judicial processing and severity of punishment are correlated with recidivism risks (Raaijmakers, ELoughran, de Keijser, Nieuwbeerta, & Dirkzwager, 2017). More severe sanctions result in subsequent delinquency persistence (Raaijmakers et al., 2017). Juveniles with similar demographics including socioeconomic class, race, ethnicity, single parent homes, and type of offense who are placed in detention do not show decrease in recidivism compared to those who received other forms of punishment (Kempf-Leonard, 2017). Youth with low level

offenses are more likely to engage in more serious reoffending behavior after incarceration (Esposito et al., 2017; Raaijmakers et al., 2017).

Type of offense youth commit is not a reliable predictor for recidivism (Jennings et al., 2018). Recidivism rates are contingent on long-term sentencing resulting in out-of-home and out-of-school placement (Kempf-Leonard, 2017). Longer stays in juvenile detention facilities do not decrease subsequent delinquency (Baglivio et al., 2018; Jennings et al., 2018; Kempf-Leonard, 2017). Secondary offending probability is increased the longer incarceral stays youth have (Neubauer & Fradella, 2018). Secondary deviance is twice as high for youth who have received detention center sanctioning (Neubauer & Fradella, 2018). Alternative sanctions such as community-based treatment coupled with surveillance programs are correlated with a decrease in recidivism compared with youth sentenced to incarceration (Takahashi & Evans, 2017).

Once released from detention youth are often placed in situations and environments which further entrench them into antisocial peer groups (Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Youth under JJS supervision such as parole, court mandated treatment, and drug testing continue to be limited in forming relationships with pro-social, positive peer groups (Cox, Kochol, & Hedlund, 2018). Transition from detention to their communities is generally lacking in support systems and rehabilitative treatment (Cox et al., 2018; Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Challenges faced during reentry can be too great for youth to gain necessary skills for becoming independently successful (Baglivio et al., 2017).

Based on the *get tough* era and current JJS procedures sentencing length should be based on the severity of the crime (Farrington et al., 2018; Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018; Sundt et al., 2017). Offenders are thought to be specifically deterred from future criminal behavior after experiencing the unpleasantness of incarceration sentencing equivalent to their offense

(Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018). Time spent in incarceration is directly correlated to an increase in recidivism rates (Farrington et al., 2018; Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018; Sundt et al., 2017). Harsh punishment of longer detention sentences does not result in lowering recidivism risks (Baglivio et al., 2017; Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018). The more time youth spend in detention centers they are exposed to more criminal behavior and creeds (Shoemaker, 2018).

Offenders are at an increase risk of future criminal behavior after experiencing the psychologically destructive nature of incarceration coupled with an increase in criminal identity and exposure (Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018). Detention centers should no longer be viewed as institutions expected to stop future criminal behavior (Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Excess use of using detention centers as the primary type of punishment for juvenile offenders has colossal expenses and consequences on communities, school systems, and families (Sundt et al., 2017). Detention centers should no longer be used with the expectation future criminal behavior among youth will be deterred (Baglivio et al., 2017; Rodriguez & Turanovic, 2018).

Summary and Conclusions

Placing youth in detention centers has more detrimental effects on their rehabilitation than any other form of sanctioning. Community based treatment programs are more affective at redirecting delinquent youths' life-course. Severe punishment of placing youth in long-term incarceration does not result in future offending prevention. Other forms of rehabilitation are proven to be more effective at redirecting you from a criminogenic path. Researchers question whether performance measures well enough against theoretical purpose to make current JJS practices acceptable. It is important to note roles of police, courts, and correctional officers in criminal career development among youth. Police officers have more contact with delinquent

youth than any other personnel involved in the JJS becoming system gatekeepers (Wang & Weatherburn, 2018).

Time spent in detention centers creates a network of other factors which result in subsequent reoffending. Juveniles are not provided protections allotted to adults nor the care and treatment postulated for adolescents. Incarceration does not deter subsequent delinquency among youth. Imprisoning juveniles is not reducing crime or increasing public safety. Ascertaining if the JJS holds true to its original purpose and value is a difficult determination. States appear to agree with criminal delinquency case designation, but there are variations in how state juvenile court systems implement rehabilitation programs and best practices for juvenile offender treatment.

Traditionally, the JJS functioned under a rehabilitative philosophy with practices focusing on addressing juveniles' individual needs. Care was taken to increase proclivity for at-risk youth to have successful futures by sealing or expunging juvenile court records. Previous provisions allowed offending youth who had been successfully rehabilitated to clear their records so they could be treated as if they had never engaged in offending acts. As state legislatures began stressing punishment and retribution over rehabilitation, many states changed their laws concerning confidentiality in juvenile courts. Changes occurring in law and policy in the 1980s and 1990s changed JJS practices. Currently, practices aimed to minimize stigma attached with court involvement and promote rehabilitation goals are scarce. Laws for transferring juveniles to adult criminal court have become more lenient, and blended sentences in which youth can enter into adult prisons erode rationale for a separate juvenile justice system.

The JJS maintains belief most juveniles are amenable to treatment and rehabilitation. Policies implemented in the *get tough* and *scared straight* movements have caused a purpose

shift. The changes in law and policy led to a flood of juveniles being detained in detention centers, resulting in overcrowding. Correctional officers, mental health workers, and other personnel involved in the JJS have become overloaded and can no longer provide services which address each individual juvenile's treatment and rehabilitation needs. The JJS should be concerned with indentifying individual family and mental health needs of each juvenile offender entering into judicial sanctioning. A treatment program specifically addressing individualistic needs should be implemented.

JJS involvement prevents juveniles from employment and contacts which preserve legitimate occupational careers. Criminal embeddedness affects juvenile's ability to find stable employment. This embeddedness is compounded with residual consequences occurring after being officially labeled as a criminal offender, especially in distressed community settings in which few jobs are available. Severe and long-term problems with future employment are a result of incarcerating youth in detention centers, leaving ex-offenders with few economic alternatives to crime.

Detained juveniles have higher rates of mental health problems, suicide ideation, and have poorer educational outcomes compared to non-incarcerated youth. Being placed in secure detention disrupts youths' ability to age out of delinquency. Youth are at an increased risk for receiving future formal processing and more severe punitive sanctions after entering into the JJS for minor offenses. Initial contact with the JJS, even when arrest results in acquittal and not a criminal conviction, limits future employment and educational opportunities. Researchers have confirmed psychiatric disorders are more common in adolescents in detention than among adolescents in the general population. Mental illnesses are exacerbated in detention centers and subsequent crime is often a result.

Youth face particular challenges after released back into their communities. Obstacles can be too great for youth to become self-sufficient in improving their situation and changing their life-course. It is critical the JJS provides reentry services with access to community resources necessary for juveniles to become independently sufficient and engage in pro-social lives. Unfortunately the gap in research is to extant for understanding what specific challenges youth face after detention. There is not enough research conducted on the most evidenced-based treatment for juvenile offenders during and after incarceration to adequately ensure their needs are being met.

Lapses in coordination of care between the JJS, treatment programs, and community resources makes rehabilitation treatment for delinquent youth even more challenging. There are limited protective networks youth can utilize as they transition back into their communities. Service systems are not equipped to continue care as youth transition into young adults. Many support services and protective networks are no longer available after youth turn eighteen. Augmenting these challenges treatment and service outcome data is rarely shared between states and even communities making it difficult to understand which treatment interventions are most effective.

Numerous collateral consequences erupt from detaining youth in detention centers. Barriers which hinder education, employment, mental illness recovery, and abilities required for halting a criminogenic life-course are distinct to juvenile offender incarceration. Life-long barriers can be the result of receiving a criminal record beginning in adolescence. Access to legitimate opportunities conversely limits abilities for detained youth transitioning out of a crime-free lifestyle. Barriers stemming from criminal records include rejection for housing, employment, and education as most applications for these resources ask for criminal record

declaration. Declination of these resources puts youth with a criminal record at increased risk of continual criminal engagement which often progresses into more serious crimes.

A need for change in the JJS has been documented conveying urgency for new investigations to assist in demonstrating ineffectiveness of incarcerating juveniles. Adding further insight to existing research may assist in providing more understanding into effects of detention centers on future success. Insight can be gained on the phenomenon under study by exploring perceptions of those directly involved in juvenile incarceration. Understanding on ineffectiveness of current JJS practices may be made possible through further research on this important social concern. Researching subsequent delinquency for youth receiving long-term sentencing and a decrease in recidivism for youth placed in community-based treatment programs is paramount for social change.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to gain an in-depth understanding on how detaining youth in detention centers affects their abilities for having successful futures. Rationale and application for chosen research tradition was defined within context of the study's central phenomenon. Researcher's role was etic, observing participants in their natural settings while simultaneously conducting interviews. Interviews were coded for meaning followed with data interpretation and analysis.

Presented in chapter 3 are methodological procedures on purposeful sampling, semi-structured interviewing, and multiple coding strategies such as concept mapping for displaying data. Credibility for chosen research techniques is demonstrated through previous research using similar research methods. Trustworthiness is established through providing an explanation on how each concern is addressed. Ethical dilemmas are accounted for by following procedures and responsibilities proven to decrease ethical concerns. Biases are addressed through identification and explanation of bias reduction strategies.

Research Design and Rationale

Central Research Question: How would personnel involved in the incarceration process of juvenile offenders describe incarceration effects on youths' future success?

Sub Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success?

Sub Research Question 2 – What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration?

The central phenomenon under study is the failure of juvenile detention centers to effectively deter delinquent youth from a future criminal path. Detaining youth through implementing incarceration as a punishment does not successfully prevent youth from secondary deviance (Kumm et al., 2019; Russell et al., 2017; Thornberry, 2018). Experiences youth have while being detained create further entrenchment into the JJS (Forsyth, Dick, Chen, Biggar Jr, Forsyth, & Burstein, 2018). Decreased opportunities for successful futures are generated from challenges youth face when being detained (Na, Kyoung-Sae, Cho, Seo Eun, 2019; Russell et al., 2017). Effects on youths' ability to reintegrate back into their communities, school systems, and employment prospects will be specifically investigated. Mental and behavioral problems will also be explored, along with youths' ability to age out of delinquency after incarceration in a detention center.

A qualitative, phenomenological approach was used to investigate phenomenon under study. Phenomenological researchers focus on examining and describing lived experience of a phenomenon. Phenomenological research is a qualitative analysis of narrative data using varying analytic methods (Errastibarrondo, Jordán, Díez Del Corral, & Arantzamendi, 2018). Phenomenological research uses participant perceptions described from a lived phenomenal experience as a method for data collection (Errastibarrondo et al., 2018). Research methods are generally nondirective with data being collected and analyzed through emergent strategies (Errastibarrondo et al., 2018). Phenomenological researchers seek to describe rather than explain starting from a perspective without hypotheses or preconceptions (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

A phenomenological approach is appropriate because this study was designed to unearth unnoticed or overlooked issues about a discovered phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Errastibarrondo et al., 2018). Phenomenology can be used to reveal meanings which appear

hidden while identifying phenomena impact instead of making inferences. Ways in which detention centers can affect youths' futures and specific aspects inflicted with incarceration were investigated. Phenomenological methods are effectual at highlighting experiences and perceptions from participant perspectives while challenging formative or normative assumptions (Errastibarrondo et al., 2018). Practical theory is established through interpretive dimension of phenomenological research which allows it to inform, support, or challenge policy and action (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

The goal of phenomenology is to develop an understanding of a phenomenon through human experience (Vagle, 2018). Data on real-life experiences of people working directly with youth offender incarceration processes were gathered to better understand the phenomenon being investigated. Rich descriptions of phenomena as it occurs in real-life settings can be provided through participant perceptions (Vagle, 2018). Objective is to understand a person's experiences rather than providing causal explanations. Phenomenological research process does not break down human experience being studied. Instead, rich descriptions and interpretations describing meaning is gained from human experience (Errastibarrondo et al., 2018). Phenomenological study approach is appropriate for gathering data regarding professionals' perceptions who are involved with incarcerating youth. Qualitative traditions of phenomenology provide an opportunity to interview participants who have shared experience with detention centers' negative effects on youths' future success. A greater understanding of study constructs can be acquired through a phenomenological approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Role of the Researcher

Researchers are a human instrument for data collection in qualitative research. Qualitative researchers need to understand and describe aspects of self, such as biases,

assumptions, expectations, and experiences which might interfere with his or her ability to collect and interpret data (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). In phenomenological research, it is useful for the researcher to keep a research journal explicating personal reactions and reflections. The researcher assumed an etic role and viewed phenomena as an outsider working as an objective viewer. The researcher asked probing questions precipitating an understanding of phenomena, then listened to build a picture based upon participants' ideas and perceptions. Action research also took place during interview processes.

Self-reports from direct participant interactions were used to provide insight on other relevant data sources and types (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). A variety of data gathering sources related to study constructs were implemented as the researcher saw fit according to environment and situations which arose. Researcher's purpose under a phenomenological approach is to illuminate research constructs, identify phenomena, and understand how they are perceived by people in a situation (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The researcher gathers rich information and knowledge through inductive, qualitative methods of interview questions and participant observation (Vagle, 2018).

Assumptions based on personal experience can influence data collection, analysis, and conclusions. It is imperative preconceived ideas about study outcomes and results are identified. This was accomplished with clear, detailed descriptions of data collection techniques with explanations on how and why conclusions were reached. Researcher reflexivity is a strategy which is implemented to decrease researcher bias in the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Vagle, 2018). Personal beliefs and biases were identified and then bracketed throughout research process to prevent influencing data collection and findings.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

Population being examined was professionals involved in juvenile offender incarceration processes, and who volunteered for the study. Sample contained probation officers, court officials, and mental health workers. Purposeful sampling strategies were implemented while using convenience sampling to gather data on study constructs available during data collection. Purposeful sampling is a technique used in qualitative research for identifying information-rich cases to discover most beneficial uses of limited resources (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Purposeful sampling strategies involve identifying and selecting participants especially knowledgeable about or experienced with a phenomenon of interest (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Availability and willingness to participate was considered when selecting participants (Gibbs, 2018).

Ability to communicate experiences in an articulate, expressive, and reflective manner is an important attribute which make data collection more accurate and attainable (Gibbs, 2018). Participants were selected if they had direct experience with processes of detaining youth offenders for more than three years. Participants also understood experiences required to provide views and perceptions on study constructs. Participants identified their level and amount of experience, as well as their willingness to participate. Participating employers identified their employees who had experience working with juvenile offenders for three or more years. Criteria for participant selection included the following attributes: participants who are directly involved in detaining and rehabilitation process of juvenile offenders for at least three years, willingness to participate in a series of one-on-one interviews, and availability within the timeframe of

scheduling interviews. Participant criteria were determined from self-disclosures and employment record review or inquiries made with participant employers.

A sample of seven participants was used for this qualitative study. The guiding cut-off point for participant number in qualitative research should be concluded based on study construct saturation (Gibbs, 2018). Although there is little rigor for justifying a precise sample size in phenomenological research, eight to fifteen participants generally allow a qualitative researcher to reach saturation and gather enough data to conclude findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). As the study progresses, the researcher needs to determine if study construct saturation has been met in interviews or if more interviews need to be conducted (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The most efficient strategy for determining appropriate sample size for a phenomenological study is ensuring adequate and quality data have been collected to support the study (Gibbs, 2018). At this point, appropriate sample size can officially be determined (Gibbs, 2018).

Procedures for identifying participants involved corresponding with gatekeepers and personal, such as managers and program directors providing services for detained juveniles. After permission was gained to use desired recruitment facilities, gatekeepers and administrators notified potential participants. Directors and managers overseeing potential participants were solicited to inform their employees about the study. A total of eight participants contacted me through their managers and supervisors to set up a time for interviews. This form of participant recruitment provided an adequate number of participants to reach research saturation and no further recruitment was necessary.

Instrumentation

In-depth, person-to person interviews were used to collect data. Interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions in a conversational format. Participants can explain

phenomenon in their terms as they experienced it in semi-structured interviews (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Semi-structured interviewing is a data collection technique using person-to-person interchange with the goal of extracting information from predetermined questions (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). Semi-structured interviews unfold in a conversation format, offering participants a chance to explore issues they feel are important (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). Interviews were audio-taped on a digital recording device to ensure all interview data were collected.

During interview process, the researcher engaged in action research to further identify relevant sources and datum types. Further insight may be gained through self-reports on knowledge and attitudes throughout the research process along with direct interaction with participants and research setting (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Olsen, 2016). Archived data at research settings, such as juvenile re-arrest records were viewed for a possible datum source to better understand phenomenon under study.

Connections and interpretations for how meaning has been derived from data were made. Semi-structured interviewing has been proven to be useful in making the underlying research frame visible (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). The researcher's phenomenological purpose is to be subjective and not an impartial observer (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). Researchers are able to gather an interpretive dimension on phenomenological research when using semi-structured interviewing (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Semi-structured interviewing can be used as a basis for practical theory allowing data to inform, support, or challenge current phenomenological views (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Recruitment Procedures

Data were collected in Chattanooga, TN from the Hamilton County Juvenile Justice Center and after care services. Data were collected at two different times, after the first data collection took place, another follow-up data collection time was set 2 to 3 weeks later. An initial interview was conducted with each participant to first investigate the phenomenon. Subsequent interviews were scheduled as indicated to clarify and elaborate on content from prior interviews to ensure topic saturation. Each interview was audio tape-recorded and took twenty to thirty minutes. After interviews concluded, they were transcribed for analysis.

Recruitment issues were grouped into three categories: (a) working with gatekeepers trusted by participants, (b) accessing participants, and (c) obtaining consent from participants. During informed consent process participants were made aware of risks and benefits for participating in the study. Time during informed consent procedures was allotted to answer participant questions about the study. Participants were informed they would be notified for scheduling a follow-up interview to ensure accuracy and discuss any discrepancies or misunderstandings in interview data. After interview completion, participants were informed they were no longer needed as a participant and information they provided will be used for ongoing data analysis until the study is completed.

Data Analysis Plan

Face-to-face, semi-structured interviews were conducted as the primary data source. Transcripts were used as data sources to gain insight into participants' views. Transcripts also were used to discover how participants constructed meaningful concepts on the phenomenon. As in most semi-structured interviews being conducted under a phenomenological paradigm, open-ended questions were asked allowing participants to provide their perspectives on the

phenomenon being investigated. Common in most phenomenological studies, this study includes interview transcripts, coding data into themes, and making conclusions based on theme categories. The first step in data collection in a phenomenological study is being aware of experiences, words, and assumptions regarding factors being scrutinized for the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Judgments during data collection, reviewing, and analyzing were suspended.

Guided interview questions, found in Appendix A, focused interviews on study's purpose. Interview questions were used as a guide to keep interviewees focused on topic, while engaging participants in conversational dialogue. Data collection and analysis were simultaneous and proceeded in this format (a) managing data, (b) reading and memoing data, (c) describing, classifying, and interpreting data, and (d) representing or visualizing data. One-on-one interviews were audio tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Only direct quotations were used for coding to prevent changes in word usage from interfering with results. Data organization and display were made possible through NVivo coding software. Transcriptions were coded in NVivo to discover patterns, relationships, and themes. Explanations for what caused an effect can be accomplished through the process of finding themes within interview transcripts (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). NVivo coding software is a tool for bringing language-based meanings to the forefront (Houghton et al., 2017). NVivo coding can create computer-generated categories for themes and patterns which can be missed by novice researchers (Houghton et al., 2017).

Data analysis was conducted in four phases: bracketing, clustering, coding, and concept mapping. Bracketing is used to delineate units of meaning which is a critical phase for explicating data (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Common patterns can be extracted and isolated from research data using bracketing (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Units of meaning were applied for identification of underlying themes which was accomplished through clustering. Coding was

employed to identify themes and events which kept repeating themselves. Coding was beneficial in reducing data to a manageable form and categorical delineation. When using coding strategies the researcher must maintain a clear and close attention to word meanings during research and data analysis (Moser & Korstjens, 2018).

A qualitative researcher can employ concept mapping to assist with methodological challenges of qualitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Identifying overarching themes requires the researcher to identify interconnections between concepts. A concept map was created from coded data to demonstrate these interconnections. A concept map is used for framing the research, reducing qualitative data, analyzing themes and interconnections, and presenting findings (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). When employing concept mapping, a researcher can create a schematic spreadsheet representing connections in data and supporting the context embedded in the framework (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018).

Issues of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Several strategies were employed to check study validity and make inferences about the sample. Member checking, peer reviewers, rich descriptions of interview content, researcher reflexivity, and direct quotes were used to ensure credibility. A peer reviewer is someone familiar with the research paradigm, phenomenon under study, and methodology with enough research experience to sufficiently audit research methods (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Member checking is a technique for establishing credibility which involves taking data and interpretations back to participants so they can confirm narrative account credibility (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). The first step for member checking is to have participants determine transcript accuracy (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). The second step of member checking is asking interviewees to

review the final report for accuracy (Merriam & Grenier, 2019). Direct quotes from participants were checked for accuracy before being included in the report.

Participants were asked if themes or categories made sense, whether they were developed with sufficient evidence, and whether the overall account was realistic and accurate. In turn, participants' comments were incorporated into the final narrative, intentionally including discrepant cases. Participants added credibility by having a chance to react to both data and final narrative. A qualitative inquirer may use study participants to help establish their account validity during data collection phases (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Peer reviewers also increased credibility of this study by having experience with all research methods being used. Two professors from Walden University, as well as a research team, provided support and a continual review of research process, methods and interpretations.

Reviewers were external and provided written feedback. A research project's credibility is enhanced from reviewers not affiliated with the project (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Direct interviewee quotations and descriptions were included. Readers can understand the account is credible and make decisions about finding applicability through provision of research details. Validity procedures were enhanced through providing self-disclosures of assumptions, beliefs, and biases, which is the process whereby the researcher reports on personal beliefs, values, and preconceptions. Researchers should acknowledge and describe their beliefs and biases early in the research process using bracketing to suspend biases as study proceeds (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Readers can then understand the researcher's position and receive clarification on potential biases which may have affected research (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Triangulation was used to strengthen this study with cross verifying information from multiple sources. Data source triangulation was verified through using evidence from different

data sources, such as documents, public records, primary and secondary research, and researcher observations. Methodology triangulation increased credibility by combining multiple methods to gather data including interviews, document review, and conducting interviews at different times and places. Theory triangulation was also implemented with using more than one theoretical approach to interpret and support data.

Researchers can use multiple information sources to give more insight to the phenomenon when employing triangulation in data sources, methodology, and theory (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2017). Triangulation also is used to discover inadequacies and inconsistencies in one datum source, provide a more comprehensive information review, and add assurance data is supported by multiple information sources and research (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2017). When a researcher can complement his or her research using data through multiple sources, credibility is increased (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). After research question saturation was determined, and member checking and peer review was satisfied, interviews were concluded. Saturation occurred after enough data was collected from triangulation of data sources to form conclusions.

Transferability

Transferability occurred from noting research situation details and methods. It is essential for a researcher to provide a detailed research method description, setting, and situation for ensuring transferability and deeming a study more credible (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). Fieldwork context was documented, allowing readers to decide whether research environment is similar to another situation with which he or she is familiar, and whether findings can be applied to other settings. Sample participant selection is also large and varied enough for transferring findings to other situations allowing for generalizations.

Participant selection was not restricted to specific experiences of juvenile arrest and rehabilitation processes. Participants had varying involvement with youth offenders including probation, sentencing, case managing, and mental health treatment. Research methods and data analysis techniques were supported in other studies using a phenomenological paradigm allowing researchers to determine effectiveness and credibility. Rich descriptions of research methods offer information as to how repeatable similar studies may be. Research setting was not unique to a community, system, facility, or situation. Transferability in research is increased when studies are less specific and unique to a research setting (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Dependability

Consistency and repeatability in research findings is reported in detail throughout each research process so readers can understand how conclusions were reached. Dependability can be improved with repetitive observations or questionings on the same event (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Interview questioning took place at two different times to make sure there are not any weak points in the first recording. Dependability also was improved through triangulation methods ensuring any limitations for one approach to data collection and analysis is supported by using alternate supporting methods. Logic for selecting participants, research setting, interview questions, and data gathering and analysis strategies is explained using previously supported research methods.

Consistency throughout the research process is demonstrated, making results more dependable. A dependability audit in which independent auditors review research activities was used for ensuring research meets dependability standards. An audit strategy is also a key technique for establishing confirmability and an external auditor to follow the natural progress of research events (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). An external auditor must be able to understand

connections in all research process aspects and how and why decisions were made (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). Research was audited by experienced researchers learned on all research methods being implemented.

Confirmability

Research findings were supported through collected data and not based on assumptions. Researcher bias and predispositions were identified and steps were taken for ensuring results are based on participant experiences related to the phenomenon under investigation. Confirmability was established through precise demonstration on how each methodological decision and conclusion was made. Data outcomes were confirmed and corroborated by other research auditors.

Documentation of checking and rechecking data occurred during entire research process. An in-depth, comprehensive search for instances which contradict earlier findings was implemented to ensure all research processes were based on previous, empirical research. Explanations for why particular research methods were favored when others could have been used are provided. Preliminary theories which were not borne from data are discussed and used to conceptualize results and findings.

Intracorder Reliability

Consistency in researcher coding is maintained using NVivo coding software. Scholars can use NVivo to prevent researcher preferences when creating themes and patterns in data and for coding data with consistency and precision (Sattler, 2017). Code-recode procedures throughout data analysis occurred. Two different data coding times at least two weeks apart assists in identifying discrepancies in initial coding, and coding skills can be enhanced when completed in phases (Sattler, 2017).

Intracoder reliability can also be achieved using an independent coder or researcher to review data content and coding schemes (Sattler, 2017). Coding reliability was checked with other researchers by visualizing raw data and having understanding of where thematic codes originated from. The researcher also implemented content analysis throughout coding procedures. Continual content analysis resulting in a systematic examination on a data sample produces patterns and meanings which other research reviewers can conclude (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Ethical Procedures

Several required protection measures for participants and population involved took place to ensure ethical standards are upheld. First, the URR ensured integrity maintenance and research quality, as well as university research standards. An institutional review board (IRB) number assigned to this study was used to demonstrate compliance with Walden University and U.S. federal regulations and ethical standards. Agreements for gaining access to participants, data, and consent forms were obtained and signed, and are available for review. Juvenile corrections director provided access to participants after IRB approval was received.

Ethical considerations included anonymity, confidentiality, informed consent, researchers' potential impact on participants, and conducting data on a vulnerable population. The principle of no harm to participants was considered, and potential harms which might be inflicted on participants were identified. Researchers are responsible for protecting all participants in a study from potentially harmful consequences (Forrester & Sullivan, 2018). Several strategies proven to protect personal information, such as secure data storage methods, identifier component removal, biographical details amendments, and pseudonyms applicable to individual names, places, and organizations were implemented (Forrester &

Sullivan, 2018). Documented consent in a written, signed, and witnessed form was obtained and secured. The researcher's role was defined and described to participants, and personal relationships with participants were avoided.

Research process is guided by principles of respect for human subjects, autonomy, justice, and beneficence (American Psychological Association, 2016). Participant rights, including their right to be informed about the study, right to freely decide to participant in the study, and right to withdraw at any time were recognized. These principles are honored as a negation of trust and integrity through informed consent. Autonomy was honored by allowing participants to exercise their rights as autonomous persons to voluntarily accept or refuse to participate in the study. Beneficence was ensured by doing well for others and preventing harm throughout the study.

Principle of justice application in qualitative research studies is demonstrated through recognizing participant vulnerability and his or her contributions to the study (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2017). Human subject use has become prevalent in criminal justice research, which presents ethical concerns regarding civil rights of vulnerable parties (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2017). Researchers maintain potentially dangerous influence over participants due to their knowledge and perceived authority (King, Horrocks, & Brooks, 2018). Ensuring true comprehension and voluntary consent is more laborious when conducting research on participants involved in the justice system (King et al., 2018). Ethical considerations regarding informed consent in criminal justice research are unique as punishment and treatment are often linked (King et al., 2018; Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2017).

Researchers are ethically obligated to protect their data so it may not be used against participants in legal proceedings. Confidentiality is vital to ensuring criminological study

accuracy (Jennings & González, 2019). Contrarily, subjects may misrepresent themselves during the course of a particular study in an attempt to improve their image for justice administrators (Jennings & González, 2019). This conflict is further exacerbated from limited definitive outcome assessments, which makes it difficult for researchers to present a realistic appraisal of risks and benefits (Jennings & González, 2019).

Strategies were implemented to help ensure these potential ethical dilemmas did not arise. Consent was legitimately obtained through provision of research process explanation and descriptions of potential discomforts, risks, and expected benefits. Consent forms disclosed advantageous alternative procedures, offered answers to procedural questions, and informed participants they are free to withdraw from the study at will. Participants were provided full disclosure and information on research study's purpose, information collected risks, benefits, and study procedures.

A written and oral confirmation was obtained from participants ensuring they understand their participation is strictly voluntary and no penalty would result from refusal. Understanding they can withdraw at any time during the study was ensured. A checklist was used to ensure all necessary points were addressed in informed consent process. Participants were assured only the researcher and research review team will have access to collected data. Data are stored on password-protected computer files and internet uploads.

Summary

This study took place at the JJS in Chattanooga, TN in the United States and a mental health and behavioral health treatment facility. Population included participants at designated JJS establishments who have experienced first-hand accounts on how detaining youth can impact their future success. First study phase occurred in detention centers, where the study was

introduced to potential participants by facility administrators informing their employers on study topic and data collection methods. Eligibility criteria for participant selection includes professional personnel currently employed by the JJS and aftercare treatment services with at least three years of experience and who volunteered for the study.

During interviews, participants were asked a series of open-ended questions for determining incarcerating youth components which potentially impact their ability to have successful futures. A series of interviews were conducted for interviewees to explain further why they responded in a certain way, clarify answers, and ensure they had opportunities for discussing in-depth their experiences with phenomenon under study. Many questions pertain to participant attitudes, feelings, emotions, values, and JSS expectations when incarcerating youth. From interview transcripts, a coding approach was applied to ascertain themes. From these themes, conclusions were generated to answer research questions.

Chapter 3 included a method discussion for this study and a rationale for selecting chosen phenomenological paradigm. Sampling frame and recruitment strategies were explained. Trustworthiness standards this study follows and incorporates into all aspects of research process were highlighted. Assurances which were employed for study quality and ethical integrity were reviewed. Reliable sources of information for data collection were JJS employees and professionals who work with rehabilitating juvenile offenders.

Primary data collection method was participant interviewing and secondary sources including document review, field notes, and facility records. A detailed and rich description of chosen research setting and demographics is presented in Chapter 4. Further understanding for the research process is outlined through detailed explanation for data collection procedures used including participant number and how topic saturation was reached. Readers will be allowed to

conceptualize how findings were concluded through a rich data description made possible

through NVivo coding software and concept mapping represented in tables.

Section 4: Results

Introduction

Disruption in youth offender's futures can occur after experiencing incarceration. Youth are disadvantaged from detention conduits leading to unsuccessful futures (Newton et al., 2018; Takahashi & Evans, 2017). Research purpose was to explore perceptions on decrease in youths' abilities required for future success components after incarceration. Specific factors investigated are education, employment, mental and behavioral health, and future criminogenic conduct. Data will be gathered from participant perceptions, current research, and re-arrest records. The qualitative research study was conducted using a phenomenological research paradigm. Data were obtained through in-depth interviews then transcribed using NVivo coding software for analyses. Research questions are as follows: Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success? Research Question 2 – What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration?

Key findings made from participant perceptions on youths' futures being disrupted after detentions are presented in Chapter 4. Relevant interview data is transcribed followed by coding with direct quote representation. Study replication is made possible with a detailed description on research setting and demographics. Conditions and biases which may have influenced research are acknowledged. Theme discovery occurs as emerging patterns unfold throughout data analyses. Credibility is demonstrated using ethical guidelines governing qualitative research shown in previous research studies. Results are conferred while each research question is addressed with presenting data to support findings. Data themes extradited from NVivo coding followed are represented using bracketing techniques. Concept mapping is used to display data in a schematic, understandable spreadsheet and transformed into tables. Conclusions may be

understood with a comprehensive data analysis description on how research study process was undertaken.

Setting

Notification for approval to conduct research was received from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Walden University. Walden University IRB approval number is 09-28-18-0295474. Proposed study was approved by committee chair, methods committee member, and university research reviewer (URR) from Walden University. A letter was written to Hamilton Juvenile Detention Center in Chattanooga, Tennessee. An introductory email was sent to program administrators responsible for making research decisions at their facility requesting permission for recruiting participants. Permission to conduct research using one-on-one interviews with professional personnel involved in juvenile incarceration and rehabilitation processes was granted.

Participant selection was determined using self-disclosure for meeting all criteria. Criterion required at least three years of experience with rehabilitating juvenile offenders and an understanding on how youths' futures are impacted by incarceration. Pseudonyms were selected to ensure confidentiality before interviews began. Interviews were personalized and identifiers were created with chosen pseudonyms. Pseudonyms were then coded using participant numbers and labeled as P1 through P8 to ensure anonymity. Direct quotations were referenced through participant number coding. Using direct quotations adds quality to qualitative research, as readers can visualize participant's words and language (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Participants were involved with juvenile arrest, incarceration, and rehabilitation. All participates were employed or contracted to provide after care services by Hamilton County

Juvenile Justice Center in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Professionals working for the JJS in Hamilton County are a small sample which represents the larger population of those working with juvenile offenders. Participant demographics were not considered during selection process as phenomenological research does not accentuate this need. During data collection process, no personal or facility conditions which may have influenced participants were recognized.

Demographics

Participants had varying educational and training levels ranging from certificate programs, which characterized probation and correction officers to advanced degrees. All participants involved in juvenile treatment and rehabilitation had an education ranging from associates degrees to doctorate degrees. Varying nationalities existed among participants with three participants being Caucasian Americans and four African Americans. Religious beliefs and affiliations were not noted as they did not appear to be relevant. Table 1 lists each participant's pseudonym, applied code, participant demographics, and years experience they have had working with rehabilitating juvenile offenders.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Code	Pseudonym	Gender	Ethnicity	Years of Experience	Role
P1	Tom	Male	African American	5	Probation Officer
P2	Tim	Male	African American	21	House Arrest Officer
P3	Ben	Male	African American	8	Juvenile Court Director
P4	Kim	Female	Caucasian	12	Placement Services Director
P5	John	Male	Caucasian	18	Mental Health Counselor
P6	Pam	Female	Caucasian	3	Case Manager
P7	Jan	Female	African American	4	Case Manager

Data Collection

Sample Selection

Study participants were seven professionals employed by Hamilton County Juvenile

Detention Center or contracted through the JJS for aftercare treatment services including

school reentry programs. Each participant has been involved in juvenile offender incarceration

and rehabilitation processes for at least three years. Process for obtaining participant sample

involved asking program administrators if flyers could be distributed with intent to solicit

volunteers who met study criteria. Employers were asked to make contact if they were a study

candidate and wished to be a participant. Twelve employees made contact via e-mail and

phone of which seven participated in interviews. Four employees did not meet study criteria,

declined after hearing more details about the study, or had a conflict with setting up interviews.

A total of seven participants were interviewed from which all data used in this study

was collected. Semi-structured interviews occurring in a conversational format while being

recorded on a tape-recorder were conducted for 20 to 30 minutes. Interviews took place in an

office or conference room where privacy was maintained. Only the researcher and interviewee

were present during interviews. All interviews were conducted and recorded as planned with

the only exception being one rescheduled interview due to a participant having some family

matters. Secondary interviews were scheduled approximately two weeks after first interview to

discuss any misunderstandings or discrepancies if necessary.

Data collection methods described in Chapter 3 which did not appear to provide enough

usable data was facility records on juveniles after they were released from detention. Sufficient

data on juveniles which had returned to detention for subsequent delinquency existed. Records

on juveniles which had not returned to the facility for examining data on factors such as

returning to school, obtaining employment, and mental health records were limited. Permission was gained to review case worker records involved with after care services for the JJS.

Data Analysis

Potential participants were informed about the study and invited to participate. First phase was to analyze responses from volunteers who made contact acknowledging they had experience in juvenile offender rehabilitation for at least three years. Eight participants involved in the JJS with some form of employment met criteria and were willing to participate. Criterion sampling was used as it involved selecting cases which met some predetermined criterion. Criterion sampling was useful for identifying participants with most experience and knowledge on study constructs.

Second phase ensued using semi-structured interviews in conversational format Interview transcripts were broken down into manageable sections by sorting them for types, sequences, patterns, and word classes. Next data analysis stage involved bringing similar categories together into broader themes. Interviews included guided interview question sets delineated into categories (see Appendix A). Each participant answered all interview questions with the last question open for participants to share any further information which was not accounted for in predetermined interview questions. Interviews concluded once interview question saturation was achieved.

Data analysis followed qualitative research methodology, particularly of phenomenological research defined by Creswell and Creswell (2017). Data analysis occurred after interview completion. Interview transcriptions were reviewed for coding and cogent statements or phrases about how participants experienced phenomenon were identified. Microsoft Word was used to prepare documents, organize, and reorganize data. After verbatim

transcripts were generated, coding was completed using NVivo software. Transcription analysis determined content while delineating patterns. A variety of codes emerged involving participant perceptions on increased risk for juveniles returning to detention and factors impacting future success.

Code lists were developed including detention characteristics affecting youths' futures and disruptions in specific abilities for youth to reintegrate into their communities successfully. Each quotation was highlighted in different colors then labeled with corresponding code words. Themes emerged from data after coding was completed. Repeated codes were found across interviews becoming constituents for thematic representation. Direct participant quotes were extracted forming themes, allowing participants' words to stand out. Direct quotations from interviewees' descriptions are included in the final report. Purpose for including these descriptions is to produce a feeling readers have heard participant words on study constructs (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

When theme discovery was completed interpretations discovered within transcriptions were used to explain noted effects and provide research problem answers (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). During data analysis member-checking was used by asking participants to review their transcriptions allowing for additional comments and editing. Follow-up interviews were provided if requested by participants who desired to revise or elaborate on information they provided in their first interview. Any discrepant or unique findings were also reviewed and analyzed. All discrepancies were accounted for at follow-up interviews.

Interviews took place at convenient times for participants in a closed room without any outside interference. Secluded areas gave participants an opportunity to speak freely without others hearing their responses. Interviews were audio tape-recorded for easier transcription

during data analysis. Taking notes was used as a strategy to highlight important, interesting findings or word choices beneficial for interpreting and understanding data. Interviews were transcribed with codes to discover patterns, themes, and relationships. Necessary revisions or editing were completed after participants were asked to review their interview transcripts to ensure accuracy.

Transcription analysis was conducted as each interview concluded. Two critical themes appeared: participant's recall on what caused juveniles to continue engaging in criminal behaviors and their perceptions on what factors prevent juveniles from having successful futures after incarceration. Guided interview questions, found in Appendix A, focused interviews on investigative purpose keeping interviews on topic. Free responses were encouraged in a natural conversational tone through interview question wording. Dialogue during interviews included related questions with a free exchange of ideas. Themes emerged from these interviews, as well as discrepant and nonconforming findings, meaning only one participant discussed an idea.

Setting aside personal experiences, biases, and preconceived notions about research topic was achieved through bracketing. Previous research findings and theories about research topic were set aside until data analysis. Bracketing techniques suspend judgment allowing for the researcher to focus on analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Two bracketing forms were applied: data analysis and finding evolvement. Data analysis was applied by identifying relevant data while temporarily setting aside preconceived knowledge and ideas on study constructs (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Conclusions evolved through hermeneutically revisiting findings while revising evolved comprehension (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Labels were included in coding procedures for classifying and assigning meaning to information. Text organization followed with guided pattern discovery was made possible through NVivo coding software. Initial coding started with generating numerous codes used for identifying related data without regard to category variety. As data segments were assigned several repeating ideas began to appear making thematic connections. Codes related to research questions emerged from data. Codes were as follows: lived experiences which caused a reduction in youth offenders' future success such as lower educational levels and economical success, decreased ability to age out of delinquency, and increased mental health and behavioral problems.

Codes were identified using exact quotes removed from interview transcripts. Each code word was highlighted in different colors then labeled with a corresponding code word. Coding procedures reduced information into categories resulting in critical theme sets which helped to answer research questions. All participants admitted they had experienced some level of a *decreased functioning and success in future lives of juveniles* they had been involved with. Suggesting decrease in success is associated with mental and behavioral problem exacerbation, societal ostracism and stereotyping, and further encroachment into a criminal lifestyle.

An explanation for what caused an effect occurred in themes and patterns within transcriptions, as well as provides answers to research problem (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Themes appearing in interviews were compared to published literature. The researcher discovered theoretical findings similar to research settings and circumstances described by other authors. Patterns began to appear including carceral experiences resulting in a reduction in abilities required for successful futures. Limited access to resources and knowledge on strategies which could be applied to reduce detention center consequences was also noted. Participants

reported counseling, reintegration programs, enhanced learning environments, and decreasing negative stereotypes in teachers and employer's attitudes were ways to reduce negative impact detention has on youths' futures. All participants reported current programs are limited in skills and resources necessary to include these rehabilitation components.

Final data analysis involved putting bracketed themes and patterns into a concept map for visual connections to appear in data. Participants repeatedly shared their recognition with detention center effects on juveniles' futures as a result of pedagogical practice. Participants related they had seen juveniles have negative experiences. Incarceration experiences contributed to a decrease in abilities required for future success. A visual interpretation presented in a schematic spreadsheet is provided to demonstrate data connections.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Research study paradigm held a constructivist, interpretive position. Data analysis was created from pluralistic, interpretive, and contextualized perspectives eliciting study validity. Member checking, peer reviewing, and using direct quotes from participants assisted in ensuring data collection discrepancies did not occur. Interviewing continued until research question saturation and member checking was satisfied. Raw data were placed into logical, meaningful categories then examined holistically during each data collection phase. Participation was based on participant willingness and a belief they had perception from real life experiences on study constructs. Participant criteria were ensured through self-disclosure after making initial contact with researcher.

All participant questions were answered before consent forms were signed and a hard copy was provided for their records. Interviews were then scheduled at participant's

convenience. Interviews were recorded to ensure all data could be transcribed accurately. Interview transcript analysis involved using a coding system to identify common themes and patterns. Different views on detention centers negatively impacting youths' futures were brought to the forefront through NVivo coding software meeting validity and reliability standards. Conclusions were drawn from data analysis while referring to empirical research literature for contextual theories.

Ensuring congruence with reliable research methods, all data collections and analysis techniques were previously used in research. Explicit descriptions on data extraction assist in providing a trustworthy, robust study (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Qualitative research is criticized for lacking transparency on analytical processes, which can hinder reader's ability to critically appraise study findings. Progress from data units, coding, and thematic development is illustrated in tables allowing for readers to visualize finding credibility. Documenting movement from data units to final themes also allows for data analysis transparency in a trustworthy study (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Understanding how themes were developed is an essential component for demonstrating finding credibility (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Transferability

Strategies not originally described in Chapter 3 which were useful for increasing transferability during data collection were implemented. Interviews became less restricted to specific questions, rather were guided and redirected by the researcher in real interview time. Allowing interviews to unfold as researcher sees necessary while interviewees disclose new information provides opportunity for discretion on most relevant data (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Triangulation and member checks were also implemented allowing for research technique applicability to other settings.

Interview questions were quickly revised as new information emerged. Research methods can also be more easily transferred to other research studies with interview question imprecision (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Participants had varying demographics such as age, marital status, nationality, and education levels allowing for more generalizability to other settings. Transferability was also addressed used purposeful sampling. Specific participant information was considered for sample characteristics directly related to research questions.

Dependability

Findings are consistent and repeatable with collected raw data establishing dependability. Dependability was increased by ensuring data was only understood within production context. Descriptions on analytical approaches using previous research methods shown to be repeated in numerous studies also increased study dependability. Discrepancies were rectified after other researchers reviewed analytic procedures. Data is theoretically justified using direct quotes from research questions.

Dependability was further established by having other researchers conduct an external audit. Other researchers would arrive at similar findings and interpretations if they were to review collected raw data. External audit involved a researcher review data collection and analysis as an outsider. This technique assists in confirming accuracy of research methods and findings are supported by collected data (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Follow-up interviews were scheduled approximately two weeks after initial interviews allowing participants to correct any erroneous interpretations in data collection.

Confirmability

Study confirmability was elucidated through presenting an adequate account on how findings were produced. Description on how themes and concepts were derived from data is

included allowing for readers to confirm conclusions. Data analysis was not limited to anticipated themes and issues which researcher thought were relevant, all emergent themes were considered. Negative and deviant cases which did not fit with central interpretation were not just dismissed but outlined to assist in establishing confirmability.

Findings were grounded in interviewee's responses. Illustrative quotes are presented for demonstrating compiled raw data. Sufficient data allows readers to see relationships between data and data interpretation (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Explanations on how quotes were chosen and labeled are provided. Participant emotions, tone, and nonverbal communication were also noted during interviews to provide further insight into interview responses.

Results

Broad initial themes were formed by extracted data units using line-by-line coding. Coded categories are demonstrated in Tables 2 and 3. Final theme development and overarching concepts are presented in Table 4. First direct quotes from interview transcripts were categorized based on emergent themes. Participant responses were categorized under research question 1 or 2.

Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success? Guided interview questions and statements which prompted discussion for this question were as follows:

1) How do you perceive mental and behavioral health needs of juvenile offenders being addressed in detention centers?

2) Do you feel as though mental health problems among the juvenile population complicate or disrupt effectiveness of incarceration for the purpose of rehabilitation?

3) How often do you believe juveniles return to detention because they did not have their mental and behavioral health addressed (i.e. anger management problems, compulsive or impulsive behavior problems, substance abuse/addiction, anxiety causing irritability and increased risk for physical altercations, PTSD causing deficiency in coping skills, abusive home environments, conduct disorder, mood dysregulation disorder, depression, etc.)?

4) How are substance abuse/addiction and suicide risk addressed for youth in a detention center?

5) Is there a routine assessment for mental/behavioral health needs when youth enter in the juvenile justice system?

6) When juveniles are released are there aftercare services set up for them or are you aware of resources that they can utilize to help reintegrate into their school systems and communities effectively?

Research Question 2 - What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration? Guided interview questions related to this research question included the following:

7) To what extent does serving time in a juvenile detention center disrupt youths' ability to complete high school, find future employment, prevent future criminal behavior, and successfully rehabilitate from behavior and mental health problems?

8) How effective is detaining youth in a detention center at preventing recidivism (returning to the justice system) and redirecting a criminal life course?

9) Describe experiences juveniles have while in detention which negatively impact their abilities for future success after release?

10) Describe the effects of juvenile offender labeling such as social stereotyping in schools and employment opportunities?

11) Thank you for all the valuable information you have provided, is there anything else you would like to add?

Table 2 includes number of participants which believe detention centers are necessary for safety, identifying needs, keeping youth from returning to criminal home environments, and enforcing education and treatment compliance.

Table 2

Detention Center Necessity and Benefits

Themes	Number of Reponses
Community Safety	8
Family Safety	8
Individual Safety	8
Needs Identification	5
Service Connection	8
Treatment Compliance	3
Criminal Home Removal	8
Finishing high school	3

Table 3 includes a summary of reported detention experiences which have the greatest effect on reducing youths' ability to have successful futures after being detained. Exposure to criminal behaviors and mentality which may be worse offenses than youth offenders were originally charged with. Youth can be exposed to gang members and joining gangs based on

encounters made while being detained. For example being arrested for drug possession and being exposed to youth offenders who are involved in gangs and have committed murder or robbery.

Table 3

Reduction in Ability for Successful Futures

Theme	Number of Responses
Exposure to criminal mentality and behaviors	8
Exposure to gang activity and members	7
Education disruption and failure	7
Exacerbation of mental and behavior problems	8
Changes in self-identity and motivation	5
Engaging in reoffending behaviors	5

A breakdown of specific detention factors which affect study constructs and total number of responses from participant groups is demonstrated in Table 3. The greatest effect was further exposure to criminal mentality and behaviors. Gang exposure is common in juvenile detention centers and youth offenders are often solicited to join. Participants also noted situations and circumstances of being arrested and detained can exacerbate mental health symptoms. Attitudes towards personal ability can be altered causing youth offenders to lose motivation to finish high school or believe they can have a different life.

Table 4

Detention Center and Community Reintegration Service Implementation

Theme	Number of Responses
Education completion services	4
Rehabilitation treatment in detention center	4
Aftercare mental and behavior services	4
Case management services	4

Table 4 summarizes findings concerning participants who perceive services for youth offenders are being implemented in detention centers and after release. Participants who worked in the juvenile detention center were aware of their program components designed for providing detained youth opportunities to continue their education, receive rehabilitation treatment, and be set up with after care services for case management and mental and behavioral health. Participants working outside of the detention center including case workers and professional counselors all noted detention centers are not equipped to provide adequate rehabilitation treatment and do not have a system which ensures youth are following through with services they were referred to.

There is inadequate collaboration and understanding on what services are most successful at rehabilitating youth offenders and ensuring high school completion. Participants working with youth outside of the detention center also noted their efforts in providing services in the detention center and already have them linked to their comprehensive program which addresses all need areas. Collaboration deficiencies and understanding on importance of

identifying needs before youth are released was expressed. Detention center staff are aware of services youth offenders have opportunity to utilize. They also pointed out their program for education compliance is up to parents and caregivers to bring them their school work. Youth can be given the knowledge and shown what needs to be done, but they cannot make them follow through.

Only one participant explained how detention centers could help some youth offenders revaluate their lives by discussing how being arrested and detained may be the only way youth offenders will open their eyes and force them to change the life course they are on. This participant also noted for some youth detention could be a good thing if they view it the right way. Research literature does exist on this concept and shows for some youth being arrested and detained can be such a stressful, traumatic experience they refrain from further offense (Sullivan & Lugo, 2018). Unfortunately research and statistics show this is not the usual and most common result of arresting and detaining youth offenders (Sullivan & Lugo, 2018).

Summary

Collaboration between detention center and rehabilitation programs coupled with knowledge deficiencies on understanding which detention center facets must be implemented had the greatest impact on detention center ineffectiveness. Participant response examples indicated compelling effect for why detention centers are not successfully rehabilitating juveniles after arrest. JJS staff used as participants in this study all indicated a strong willingness and desire to put their best efforts into a program designed for rehabilitation and not punishment. Inferred in data there is not a program within the JJS used for this study which has the staff and procedures to ensure all needs are being addressed. Participants from

detention center and rehabilitation treatment programs repeatedly acclaimed they wanted a way to ensure youth offenders are getting what they need.

All participants noted limitations in ability to ensure and even enforce youth to engage in educational and treatment services. Congruent with literature there remains a problem in approach. Participants were not able to distinguish specific reasons for why youth are detained and not utilizing services even though programs exist in the community. Participant responses call for consideration to what alternatives can be provided for incarcerated and at-risk youth. Current policies and protocols in detention centers which support at-risk youth and their families fall short. Limitations on resources and training for what is really needed for successful rehabilitation have led to poor outcomes. Examples of participant responses indicated powerful effect of detention center staff, case workers, and mental health professionals are willing to help ensure juveniles rehabilitation and educational needs are being met.

Two participants working at a mental health facility reported putting their best efforts into collaborating with the juvenile detention center for permission to go to the facility and have enroll them in services before they are released. Participants noted after continual efforts, this initiation fell short and collaboration with the detention was not established. Participants indicated plans and policies to assist in identifying and addressing educational and rehabilitation needs. Further questioning revealed paltriness in collaboration between reentry professionals outside of the detention center and not being present at the detention center for assessments and evaluations. Limited ability to enforce juveniles in complying with educational and rehabilitation services and parents not following through with court mandated treatment was found to have a significant effect on successful future reduction.

Repeated explanations from detention center and treatment program staff demonstrated attempts to ensure all youth offenders' needs are being addressed. Understanding on evidenced based practices proven to work which incorporates a collaborative approach with communities, detention centers, and rehabilitation treatment programs is inadequately understood. Juveniles are being referred as much as being provided a name and a place to go for further rehabilitation treatment for mental and behavioral health. Juveniles and their families are provided with instructions on how to complete their school work so they do not fall behind. Often this is as for as their rehabilitation and education needs are addressed. There is not follow through or collaboration necessary for incorporating all detention center and rehabilitation service facets to connect all the pieces.

Instruction clarity and being able to see how all rehabilitation needs may be addressed through a step-by-step process has shown to be a necessary facet. An evidenced-based rehabilitation treatment approach for the youth offender population must indicate factors necessary for a collaborative approach which ensures all treatment needs will be addressed. All participants noted there is a deficiency in needs identification, follow through, and compliance with services even if detention centers personal put their best efforts into rehabilitation. Every interviewee also acclaimed arrest and detention may exacerbate mental illness, expose youth to further criminal behavior and gangs, and disrupt their education. Most participants pointed out it is not their juvenile records which prevent them from being successful in employment is it their academic record. Two participants explained how confidence, motivation, and self-esteem are greatly impacted by becoming labeled a juvenile delinquent making it almost impossible for finding desire and motivation to finish high school.

Participant (P6) explained her best efforts to develop and implement a program delineated Mental Health Court in which all punishment and sentencing is only related to their mental health and rehabilitation needs. This program would include court enforced compliance. It was her experience which correlates with other research indicating a deficiency lies within a collaboration and an understanding of evidenced based practice implementation required for successful rehabilitation. Based on all participant responses the underlying problem is inadequate understanding and collaboration on rehabilitation components which address all needs in a systematic, methodological approach.

Interviews provided participants with opportunity to recall experiences, discuss their attitudes towards how juveniles' rehabilitation needs are addressed, and describe subsequent factors which may affect at-risk youths' futures. Interviews incorporated broad open-ended questions allowing for participants to freely respond. The researcher was able to gather sufficient data using meaningful participant descriptions. Data was collected during 30 to 40 minute interviews held in a private office or a private conference room. Tape recorder was used to capture all interview data and then transcribed within 24 hours. Interviewees had opportunity to ensure accuracy and make any necessary clarifications. Transcriptions were processed several times using NVivo coding for coding synthesizing and data summarization.

Section 5 contains discussion on all conclusions made from findings based on data found in participant interviews. Connections made within this study and other research are connoted. Implications and recommendations for further study are made. Findings are precisely summarized annotating key concepts extracted from data. Chapter 5 conclusions comprise development process and clarification of concepts using participant words. Quotation examples are used for conceptualization and understanding interpretations. Final conclusions

are made and presented through thematic conclusions in relation to current research and

theoretical framework used to guide this study.

Chapter 5

Introduction

Disruption in youths' futures after incarceration was investigated through JJS employee perceptions working directly with juvenile rehabilitation processes. Seven participants meeting all criterions agreed to participate. The qualitative, phenomenological study was conducted to gain insight into specific future components affected by detention. Research methods included one-on-one, focused interviews which were then transcribed to determine emergent themes. Participants were granted opportunity to completely share their perceptions encompassing detention center effects on at-risk youths' futures. Second interviews were conducted for clarifying any misinterpretations and add to data gained in the first interview. Participants reviewed interview transcripts to assure their perspectives were fully discussed and understood. Participants were given opportunity to make any changes or corrections as they reviewed transcripts. Interviews concluded when participant satisfaction was achieved and data analysis indicated research question saturation.

Reliance on the JJS to meet youth offender's needs with mental and behavioral disorders has increased in the past decade (Chouhy et al., 2017; Dufour et al., 2018; Ehrhard-Dietzel et al., 2017). Considerable variation exists in research on juvenile detention center rehabilitation effectiveness and success at preventing future criminal behavior. Evidenced based treatment programs which specifically address youth offenders' needs with intent to increase future success ability are limited in research. All participants noted a lack of collaboration and understanding on how to connect youth offenders to rehabilitation resources, enforce educational and treatment compliance, parental assistance in facilitating requirements, and identifying and addressing needs.

A study overview reviewing participant selection processes and data collection is presented in Chapter 5. Research methods are compared to other credible research studies demonstrating method quality and applicability. Findings are summarized along with data interpretation as they relate to research questions. Social change implications and recommendations for result dissemination highlight possibilities for future directions on rehabilitating juvenile offenders. This section will conclude with a summarizing discussion on overreaching themes and findings.

Interpretation of the Finings

In Hamilton County Tennessee approximately 1000 juvenile offenders are arrested and detained in a detention center every year. Many juveniles are released with court mandated rehabilitation requirements. Reports in Hamilton County are congruent with national databases providing data on juvenile success rates after released from incarceration. Researchers have studied relationship between detention centers used as punishment and recidivism rates. Specific future components affected by incarceration are limited in existing research. There is also a research gap on detention center facets which can be used to explain presented negative effects. The following research questions guided this study: Central Research Question: How would personnel involved in the incarceration process of juvenile offenders describe incarceration effects on youths' future success? Sub Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success? Sub Research Question 2 – What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration?

Youth punishment has centered on a need to scare juvenile offenders straight stemming from belief swift, harsh punishment prevents a criminogenic life-course (Brown & Smith, 2018). Theoretical framework was based on social learning and labeling theory premises. Belief in personal identity and potential to be successful serves as powerful motivation to overcome

disincentives for prosperity (Abate & Venta, 2018). Declination in motivation to overcome

obstacles for procuring successful futures occurs when beliefs on personal abilities become

altered through labeling youth as offenders or delinquents (Abate & Venta, 2018; Taylor,

Mulvey, Russell, & Terpstra, 2018). Incarcerated youth are exposed to social interactions

cultivating further criminal behavior and creed (Bishop et al., 2017).

A phenomenological study approach was appropriate for gathering accurate data on

lived experiences of professional personnel working directly with incarcerated youth.

Phenomenology study involves recalling lived experiences to gain full data descriptions for

insightful analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Focusing on essence of similar experience

shared by a particular group allows for pedagogical understanding (Hanson, Ju, & Tong,

2018). Using phenomenological approach researchers can subjectively gain data through semi-

structured, open-ended question interviewing (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Hanson et al.,

2018). Research objective was to investigate juvenile detention factors correlated with a

decline in future success.

Approximately fifteen employees were informed through flyer distribution. Eligibility

criteria included three years of experience with juvenile offender incarceration processes and

willingness to participate in the study. Employees who met participant criteria were asked to

contact the researcher. Eleven potential candidates responded demonstrating interest and eight

participants enrolled in the study. During interviews participants conferred their perceptions on

detention experiences affecting youths' future success.

Participants were interviewed using guided questions focusing discussion on research

problem and each interview was typed into a document using verbatim wordage (see Appendix

B). Participants were provided with opportunity to freely provide their perspectives through

research question design. Transcriptions were made from tape recordings as each interview concluded. Interviews were approximately thirty minutes and included member checking as participants reviewed transcripts to ensure accuracy. Follow-up interviews were conducted two weeks after initial interviews to rectify any discrepancies and provide elaboration if necessary. When research question saturation occurred and participants were satisfied with transcript content interviews concluded. Interview transcript data was then entered into NVivo coding software for analysis. Themes emerging as patterns during analysis were put into representative categories.

Significant quotes from interviews revealed categorical wording along with any coded subcategories. Common elements became apparent as actual participant quotes were included to ensure interview content quality. Interview transcripts were read carefully as codes were applied independently. Thematic representation from coded interview transcripts became transparent. Coded data was then bracketed for presentation in a concept map to visualize all themes and patterns on one spreadsheet.

Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success? Research Question 1 inquired about experiences related to detention centers having an impact on youth offenders' futures. All participants reported having some level of experience with youths' abilities for future success being altered by incarceration. Repeatedly participants shared challenges youth face after being detained in a detention center supported in research literature.

Participants working directly in the juvenile detention center noted certain skills incarcerated youth develop. Many youth exhibit an increase in violence, aggression, gang collaboration and affiliation, manipulation, and finding ways to gain possession of coveted items

and contraband in a detention facility. These skills develop based on instinctual survival needs unique to detention center environments (McCuish, Lussier, & Corrado, 2018). Incarcerated youth are put into a dangerous environment where they may continually be bullied, harassed, and assaulted (McCuish et al., 2018). Learning to fight for protection and have comradery with others who will protect them becomes a basic survival need making this type of skill development their only option for survival (McCuish et al., 2018). After juveniles are released from detention, their skill set continues to be utilized in society abetted by limited positive social skills.

Detention sentencing integrates youth into criminal connections instead of referral networks for legitimate employment (Western et al., 2017). Participants' working directly in the detention center reported youth's future employment is not affected by incarceration because it does not go on their record. Responses related to specific detention factors participants perceived as future disruptions were distinctly noted. Incarcerated youth have been deprived of socialization processes and life skill development preventing them from successfully entering into the job market (Sharlein, 2018; Visher et al., 2017). Participants working in treatment facilities outside of the detention center all reported they believe detaining youth affects their future employment as teenagers and as they enter into adulthood. Three participants reported after incarceration youth offender's education is significant disrupted. They lose motivation and ability for obtaining education and skills required to enter into the job market. These participants also noted youth no longer can have legitimate opportunity for securing school reentry and academic placement after incarceration.

Exacerbation of mental illnesses, behavioral problems, and substance abuse following incarceration reduces job readiness, making them incapable of functioning in an employment

setting (Darakai et al., 2017). Participants noted detention can cause continual mental health problems and if treatment is not received it may be impossible for them to become functioning well enough to be employed. Five participants noted how detention can increase likelihood for a criminal life-course because of how much it disrupts education and development. All participants were aware of how detention centers may foster economic gain criminality and gang affiliation. Court appearances resulting in detention remove youth from potential employment and referral networks they might have had before being placed in detention (Heynen, Van der Helm, Wissink, Stams, & Moonen, 2018). Community-based crime networks isolate them from employment opportunities (Heynen et al., 2018; Western et al., 2017). Limited employment and educational referral contacts are likely to increase unemployment probability (Heynen et al., 2018).

Education programs for youth in the JJS are poorly implemented and do not successfully prevent significant challenges youth face when trying to return to school after incarceration (Griffith et al., 2017; Hirsch, Dierkhising, & Herz, 2018; Lemert, 2017). All participants reported having steps in place to ensure education is continued while youth are being detained. Information on specific components on how education compliance is enforced or ensured was not available from participants. All participants noted knowledge of parents needing to get school work from teachers at their schools and continually speak with their teachers to keep up with assignments. Five participants stated parents do not usually do this and there is not a system in place which can enforce educational compliance or ensure this is being done.

Ability for finishing high school after spending time in a detention center often makes challenges of returning to high school and graduating too immense for youth to overcome (Godfrey, Cox, Alker & Shore, 2017; Newton et al., 2018; Rodriguez, 2018). Four participants

noted after being detained youth are often so far behind they do not think it is possible to get caught up. Examples were provided by participants of witnessing students trying to catch up and get back on track with their school work, but they gave up after not having the help and resources they needed. Teachers and schools often are not willing to take the time and provide resources needed for assisting delinquent youth who have been detained in returning to school and catching up on their school work.

All participants were able to provide examples from personal accounts where they have witnessed how incarcerating youth can have a detrimental impact on youths' mental health. Participant examples included situations in which arresting and incarcerating processes exacerbated mental illnesses. All participants noted personal observations on how arrest and incarceration can cause or increase depression, anxiety, mood disorders, and cause youth to act out in violence if their mental illness impairs their ability for understanding their situation.

Most youth involved in the JJS have diagnosable mental health and substance use disorders (Na et al., 2019). Mental health disorders particularly affected by the incarceration process include paranoid schizophrenia, depression, anxiety, IDMD (intermittent disruptive mood disorder), conduct disorder, and suicide ideation (Na et al., 2019). Youth offenders diagnosed with mood disorders are at an increased risk for behaviors of anger, aggression, hostility, and irritability (Kolp, Hershberger, Sanders, Um, Aalsma, & Cyders, 2018). Behaviors exhibited from these disorders often are the cause of offenses related to assault and violence (Kolp et al., 2018). Detention centers elicit an environment where these behaviors are encouraged and fostered (Shoemaker, 2018).

Research Question 2 - What factors are related to changes in future success

components after incarceration? Research Question 2 uncovered specific experiences youth have correlated with unique challenges they face after release. Interviewees identified four factors: altered personal beliefs directly affecting self-efficacy, symptom increase of emotional and behavioral disorders, adoption of a criminal identity, and labeling effects by academic institutions and employers. Experiences which may affect personal beliefs and identities were revealed in further questioning. Participant 6 stated "I've seen a decrease in motivation among youth after they are arrested and detained; they stop believing in themselves and accept who they are as a delinquent youth". Participants also noted identification and acceptance of a criminal self-identity may cause youth offenders to only feel comfortable associating with other offenders who they can relate to.

Incarcerating youth may interrupt and delay normal patterns for aging out of delinquency because detention disrupts their natural involvements with families, school, and work. (Kumm et al., 2019; Wibbelink et al., 2017). Youth offenders who are incarcerated as are sixty percent more likely to enter adult prison later in life compared with those who came before the juvenile court without experiencing incarceration (Bouffard et al., 2017). All participants reported juvenile offenders may be exposed to youth who have committed crimes worse than the offense they are being charged with along with gang affiliation, drug use, and violence while being detained.

Participants were aware of how labels can cause youth offenders to relate to criminal networks. Only three participants appeared to have an in-depth understanding and awareness of lasting affects detention can have on youth as they enter into adulthood. Three participants reported being incarcerated and labeled as a juvenile delinquent often causes the juvenile to believe "they are now a criminal and there is not another option for them". Four participants

were aware of the change in identity which can occur and how it affects their motivation and ability to be redirected out of a criminal life course. Two participants either believed detaining youth offenders most often prevents them from continuing on a criminal path or stated by one participant "as they enter into adulthood being a criminal is going to be their choice with or without being detained as a juvenile".

Limitations of the Study

Participant experiences with disrespectful or uncooperative juveniles, prejudices related to criminals receiving what they deserve, and the "nothing really works" mentality may have interfered with study conclusions. Ability to process experiences and portray accurate representations on perceptions using an interview format may have been limited among some participants. All participants may not have been able to articulate and portray in-depth explanations for their views on experiences they had with phenomenon under study. Participants may have been reticent to share views on their experiences in which negative outcomes occurred. Participants may be dedicated to system improvement. A study where they were asked to describe negative impacts and ineffectiveness of a system they work for may have caused bias during interviews.

Sample size and phenomenological research nature may limit results from being generalized to other settings. Dependability may also be questioned when considering logic for participant selection and events observed. There is insufficient research to determine complete accuracy with using selected population and research questions. Researcher experiences and knowledge may have caused bias emergence in interview question wording and data analysis in an attempt to demonstrate detention center's negative impact in best possible way. Researcher

determines data meaning by identifying themes and patterns in phenomenological research, which may create potential bias concerns in data analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

Recommendations

This research study was limited to only seven participants. It would be beneficial to consider future studies including a larger participant number or to repeat the study multiple times with new participant groups. Study methodology would be easily replicated with other participant samples working in the JJS. A need for further research to investigate negative outcomes of harsh punishment for youth offenders is prompted with this research. Possibilities for ulterior forms of punishment which address juvenile rehabilitation may be considered with further research. Consideration to youth's home environment and neighborhoods which predispose them to criminal nature may be made for future rehabilitation directions.

Detaining youth then releasing them back to the same environment without treatment needs being addressed procures further investigation to demonstrate current practice ineffectiveness. While current JJS practices may be implemented with purpose to break criminogenic cycles in the United States, this study did not determine them to elicit intended effects. Considerable evidence showing rehabilitation programs which do not include incarceration deliver a more collaborative, effective approach (Cox et al., 2018; DiClemente & Wingood, 2017; Dufour et al., 2018). More research is needed to promote further insight into social change reform on punishment of juvenile offenders.

Non-incarceral rehabilitation sentencing addressing each individual's complex needs may be more successful at redirecting a criminal life course. Considerations need to be made on how complexity of experiences, family, and social interactions predispose youth to criminal behavior. Collaborative treatment with schools, communities, and the JJS is needed for a holistic approach

which addresses all treatment components. Further study is needed to determine rehabilitation program effectiveness for youth. Strategies with specific intent to decrease recidivism risk by addressing risk factors need to be understood and implemented.

Participants noted individualized treatment plans identifying rehabilitation needs reduced recidivism. Research emphasis needs to be placed on rehabilitation and not punishment. Collaboration between the JJS, school systems, community programs, and families is a key factor in addressing at-risk youths' rehabilitation needs. When all treatment areas are addressed through collaborative programs at-risk youth can be redirected from a crimnogenic life course. Youth can then overcome challenges preventing them from having successful futures. Challenges depriving youth of successful futures may be overcome by redirecting the JJS from a punishment based system to rehabilitation. The JJS needs a high-quality, evidenced-based system. A system in which all JJS staff understand components which correlate with an increase in future success factors instead of decreasing them. A program developed and implemented with these facets may assist in alleviating the social problem of youth offenders continuing on a criminal life-course after receiving detention as punishment.

Implications

Research on the current JJS system decreasing propensity for adolescents to become functioning societal members can no longer be avoided. Positive social change may be promoted with contributing current research to related topics broadening knowledge needed for reform. Negative effect perpetuation caused by juvenile detention needs further investigation for a change in policies to promote a holistic, rehabilitation approach void of harsh punishment. Rehabilitation strategies leading to a decrease in a criminal life-course while promoting future

success have been identified. Collaborative juvenile offender treatment programs have multifaceted benefits for communities, school systems, and on an individual level for juveniles.

Implications for social change include enhancing knowledge for professionals working to rehabilitate juveniles in a way which increases their ability for future success. Further social change implications include awareness on how detention centers disrupt future success. Increased knowledge may evoke policy makers and personnel working with juveniles to implement strategies which eliminate a decrease in identified future success components. Decreasing challenges youth offenders face coupled with strategy implementation addressing all risk areas could potentially increase youths' abilities to obtain education, employment, and compliance with mental or behavioral health treatment. Offending risk will be greatly decreased after all these factors are addressed.

Those working with juvenile incarceration and rehabilitation may gain from this research through understanding a need for permanent malady to overcome presented negative effects on future success. Initiative for professionals involved in juvenile offender processes to evaluate current practices may be promoted by study participant's perceptions. Participants noted youth offender's ability to overcome negative effects was due to connections made with teachers, after school programs, and individualized mental health treatment. All participants perceived collaborative strategies among communities may be an underlying solution for increasing future success rates among the incarcerated juvenile population.

Conclusion

A phenomenological approach was used to examine the phenomenon of youths' futures being disrupted after experiencing incarceration. Detention centers lacking effectiveness at preventing recidivism among the juvenile offender population continues to plague policy

makers and court officials with repercussions on communities. Research purpose was to gain further insight and understanding on professional employee's perceptions working directly with youth incarceration. Research specifically investigated future success components affected by detaining youth in detention. Successful strategies which lead to recidivism reduction among juveniles were also noted.

Data was collected using one-on-one, face-to-face interviews which were then transcribed using NVivo coding software. Findings were drawn from coded interview transcripts. As themes emerged in coding, patterns were delineated and represented in a concept map. Interviews were checked for accuracy ensuring study quality. Examining JJS employee perceptions led to findings suggesting specific future components impacted by detention centers. Study results revealed detention centers attribute to a decrease in abilities required for youth to become functioning society members. A decrease in abilities required for high school completion, obtaining employment, compliance with mental health treatment, and criminal conduct prevention were themes discovered in interview coding.

All participants had experience with repeat offenders, noting they see many of the same juveniles rearrested. Many participants reported when juveniles receive resources and assistance they need to continue with their education and rehabilitation treatment needs they likely will not return to detention. Correlated with current literature higher recidivism rates occur when punishing delinquent youth with incarceration. Alternate sanctions which fall away from the "get tough' era for juvenile offenders and address all rehabilitation needs may be the most effective strategy for deterring reoffending.

More research is needed to continually investigate and compare rates for which juveniles recidivate after incarceration and those who are sentenced to rehabilitative,

community programs. Continual research may produce enough evidence to evoke policy makers and community leaders to acknowledge incarcerating youth offenders is not producing desired effects for public safety and decreasing crime. Detention centers lacking effectiveness at preventing recidivism among the juvenile offender population continues to plague policy makers and court officials with repercussions on communities.

Examining JJS employee perceptions led to findings suggesting specific future components impacted by detention centers. Study results revealed detention centers attribute to a decrease in abilities required for youth to become functioning society members. A decrease in abilities required for high school completion, obtaining employment, compliance with mental health treatment, and criminal conduct prevention were themes discovered in interview coding. Factors which specifically contribute to all or one of the identified future success components cannot be completely identified. There is a comprehensive, multifaceted system wide disconnection which contributes to decrease in future success among incarcerated youth offenders.

This social problem is not at a community, county, or even state level of the Juvenile Justice System. Inherent in every participant interview, JJS employees want to help and increase effectiveness of a system they work for. All participants noted it is a lack of collaboration and understanding on best-practice implementation. Focus needs to be on community-based programs to fulfill the intended purpose of juvenile rehabilitation and diversion. Collaboration between the JJS, detention center staff, parents, schools, and community programs is necessary to address this social problem.

Participants reported direct negative effects on mental and behavioral health, education, future employment, and ability to halt criminality. Inconsistent with research literature,

detention centers were found not to be geared towards punishment. All participants noted the detention center in their community strives to create rehabilitation based approaches which are not punitive in nature. New ideas are needed with an understanding on how all youth hold the potential when they are healthy and supported. Solutions acclaimed in research appear to be readily accessible and researchers have proven evidenced based practices exist at the community and instructional levels to ensure new futures for at-risk youth. The problem appears to lie within understanding and collaboration of evidenced-based and best practice implementation. Consideration to unique amplitudes and specific juvenile needs is the beginning for implementing a theoretically designed program coherent with evidenced-based research.

Solutions to increasing juvenile future success rates are multifarious and require further investigation. Effectively reducing disruptions in future success caused by detention centers requires further research with findings applicable to JJS policies. Evidenced based strategies indentified in this study may dramatically decrease negative impact on future success components. Most participants suggested a need for the JJS to provide a supportive program which diminishes challenges when youth enter back into communities and school systems. Positive teacher and employer attitudes void of stereotyping can increase opportunity for successful reentry.

Other identified strategies include positive beliefs from all personnel involved in juvenile's ability to succeed. Direct application in the JJS should include provision of motivational activities with an understanding on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Instilling belief they can be successful while proving succinct direction and steps to follow for overcoming challenges may be key for increasing success rates. Teachers, school

administrators, and community officials need to become more informed on current research showing a need to increase participation in professional rehabilitation development opportunities for the juvenile population.

Study findings could support community leaders and professional organizations with recommendations for instruction in schools to assist juveniles in overcoming academic challenges. Educational leaders need to recognize implications for allowing challenges to continue which directly hinder youth offenders from reentering back into school systems. People are fearful of juveniles and may believe youth offenders are a lost cause. Negative views increase challenges which may seem to overwhelming for youth to put forth any effort. High school completion and entry into the workforce provides self worth and a change in identity required for future success and preventing recidivism. Doors are closed to opportunities causing youth offenders to resort to antisocial behaviors.

Youth need to finish high school and acquire some level of technical skills for successful employment. Youth who do no finish high school show a lack of basic communication, reading and writing skills most employers require. Assisting juveniles in overcoming unique challenges specific to their needs may increase workforce ready and competent employees leading to increase future success rates. The more successful youth offenders become the more likely they are to abstain from a criminal life-course as they begin to value independent, successful living. Contribution to society in turn creates positive social change.

References

Abrah, P. B. (2019). Labeling theory and life stories of juvenile delinquents transitioning into adulthood. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative criminology*, *63*(2), 179-197. doi:10.1177/0306624X18787303

Adams, E. B., Chen, E. Y., & Chapman, R. (2017). Erasing the mark of a criminal past: Ex-offenders' expectations and experiences with record clearance. *Punishment & Society*, *19*(1), 23-52. doi:10.1177/1462474516645688

Ahonen, L., Loeber, R., & Brent, D. A. (2017). The association between serious mental health problems and violence: Some common assumptions and misconceptions. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. doi:10.1177/1524838017726423

Aizer, A., & Currie, J. (2017). Lead and juvenile delinquency: New evidence from linked birth, school and juvenile detention records. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, w23392. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w23392

Ang, R. P., Huan, V. S., Li, X., & Chan, W. T. (2018). Functions of aggression and delinquency: The moderating role of parent criminality and friends' gang membership. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(22), 3531-3550. doi:10.1177/0886260516636066

American Psychological Association. (2016). *The publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. New York, NY: Perdue Owl.

Augustyn, M. B., & Loughran, T. A. (2017). Juvenile waiver as a mechanism of social stratification: A focus on human capital. *Criminology*, *55*(2), 405-437. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12136

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

Baglivio, M. T., Wolff, K. T., Jackowski, K., & Greenwald, M. A. (2017). A multilevel examination of risk/need change scores, community context, and successful reentry of committed juvenile offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *15*(1), 38-61. doi:10.1177/1541204015596052

Baglivio, M. T., Wolff, K. T., Piquero, A. R., DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. G. (2018). The effects of changes in dynamic risk on reoffending among serious juvenile offenders returning from residential placement. *Justice Quarterly*, *35*(3), 443-476. doi:10.1080/07418825.2017.1317013

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barrett, D. E., & Katsiyannis, A. (2017). The Clemson Juvenile Delinquency Project: Major findings from a multi-agency study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *26*(8), 1-9. doi:10.1007/s10826-017-0714-8

Batastini, A. B., Bolaños, A. D., Morgan, R. D., & Mitchell, S. M. (2017). Bias in hiring applicants with mental illness and criminal justice involvement: A follow-up study with employers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *44*(6), 777-795. doi:10.1177/0093854817693663

Bates, K. A., & Swan, R. S. (2017). *Juvenile delinquency in a diverse society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Baur, J. E., Hall, A. V., Daniels, S. R., Buckley, M. R., & Anderson, H. J. (2017). Beyond banning the box: A conceptual model of the stigmatization of ex-offenders in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, *8*(1), 1-102.

doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.08.002

Becker, H. S. (1974). *Labelling theory reconsidered. Deviance and social control.* London, UK: Tavistock.

Bishop, A. S., Hill, K. G., Gilman, A. B., Howell, J. C., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (2017). Developmental pathways of youth gang membership: A structural test of the social development model. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *40*(3), 1-22. doi:10.1080/0735648X.2017.1329781

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2018). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bowser, D., Henry, B. F., Wasserman, G. A., Knight, D., Gardner, S., Krupka, K., ... & Robertson, A. (2018). Comparison of the overlap between juvenile justice processing and behavioral health screening, assessment and referral. *Journal of Applied Juvenile Justice Services*, 97. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

Bouchard, J., & Wong, J. S. (2017). Examining the effects of intensive supervision and aftercare programs for at-risk youth: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *4*(17), 36-39. doi:0306624X17690449.

Bouffard, J., Cooper, M., & Bergseth, K. (2017). The effectiveness of various restorative justice interventions on recidivism outcomes among juvenile offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice 15*(4), 465-480. doi:1541204016647428.

Bowen, K. N., Nhan, J., & Polzer, K. (2017). Comparing ex-offenders who use and decline job readiness training. *Corrections*, 1-12. doi:10.1080/23774657.2017.1399094

Brown, E., & Smith, A. (2017). Challenging mass incarceration in the City of Care: Punishment,

community, and residential placement. *Theoretical Criminology, 13*, 592–610. doi:1362480616683794.

Burfeind, J., Bartusch, D. J., & Hollist, D. R. (2018). *Juvenile justice: An Introduction to process, practice, and research*. United Kingdon: Routledge.

Carson, D. C., Wiley, S. A., & Esbensen, F. A. (2017). Differentiating between delinquent groups and gangs: moving beyond offending consequences. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *40*(3), 1-19. doi:10.1080/0735648X.2017.1338148

Carter, A. (2019). The consequences of adolescent delinquent behavior for adult employment outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *48*(1), 17-29. doi:10.1007/s10964-018-0934-2

Caudill, J. W., Diamond, B., Karas, S., & DeLisi, M. (2017). Decoupling the labeling tradition: Exploring gang affiliation and the application of law. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 15*(4), 343-358. doi:10.1177/1541204016689492

Chouhy, C., Hochstetler, S. T., & Cullen, F. T. (2017). Social concern and delinquency: an empirical assessment of a novel theory. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(1), 94-117. doi:10.1080/01639625.2016.1196949

Cox, S. M., Allen, J. M., & Hanser, R. D. (2017). *Juvenile justice: A guide to theory, policy, and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cox, S. M., Kochol, P., & Hedlund, J. (2018). The exploration of risk and protective score differences across juvenile offending career types and their effects on recidivism. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *16*(1), 77-96. doi:10.1177/1541204016678439

Connolly, E. J., & Kavish, N. (2018). The causal relationship between childhood adversity and developmental trajectories of delinquency: A consideration of genetic and environmental

confounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1-13. doi:10.1007/s10964-018-0960-0

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darakai, A., Darakai, A., Day, A., Day, A., Graffam, J., & Graffam, J. (2017). Public attitudes towards the employment of ex-offenders with a disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities and Offending Behaviour*, *8*(1), 3-12. doi:10.1108/JIDOB-11-2016-0021

Decker, S. H., & Marteache, N. (2017). *International handbook of juvenile justice*. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

De Coster, S., & Lutz, J. (2018). Reconsidering labels and primary deviance: False appraisals, reflected appraisals, and delinquency onset. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *55*(5), 609-648. doi:10.1177/0022427818771437

Dembo, R., Faber, J., Cristiano, J., Wareham, J., Krupa, J. M., Schmeidler, J., & Terminello, A. (2018). Family problems, mental health and trauma experiences of justice-involved youth. *Medical Research Archives*, *6*(1). doi:10.18103/mra.v6i1.1677

Denver, M., Siwach, G., & Bushway, S. D. (2017). A new look at the employment and recidivism relationship through the lens of a criminal background check. *Criminology*, *55*(1), 174-204. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12130

DiClemente, R. J., & Wingood, G. M. (2017). Changing risk trajectories and health outcomes for vulnerable adolescents: reclaiming the future. *Pediatrics*, e20163557. Retrieved from http://pediatrics.aappublications.org

Donnelly, E. A. (2017). The disproportionate minority contact mandate: An examination of its impacts on juvenile justice processing outcomes (1997-2011). *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *28*(4), 347-369. doi:10.1177/0887403415585139

Dufour, I., Villeneuve, M. P., & Lafortune, D. (2018). Does the "last chance" sentence work? Ten years of failures and successes under a juvenile intermediate sanction in Canada. *Punishment & Society*, *20*(5), 539-561. doi:10.1257/aer.20161503

Ehrhard-Dietzel, S., Barton, M. S., & Hickey, D. A. (2017). Implementation and outcomes of an innovative front end juvenile justice reform initiative. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *34*(3), 223-234. doi:10.1007/s10560-016-0457-1

Eren, O., & Mocan, N. (2017). Juvenile punishment, high school graduation and adult Crime: Evidence from idiosyncratic judge harshness. *National Bureau of Economic Research. w23573.* Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w23573

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

Esposito, M. H., Lee, H., Hicken, M. T., Porter, L. C., & Herting, J. R. (2017). The consequences of contact with the criminal justice system for health in the transition to adulthood. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, *8*(1), 57-74. doi:10.14301/llcs.v8i1.405

Farina, A. S., Holzer, K. J., DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. G. (2018). Childhood trauma and psychopathic features among juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(14), 4359-4380. doi:10.1177/0306624X18766491

Farrington, D. P., Lösel, F., Boruch, R. F., Gottfredson, D. C., Mazerolle, L., Sherman, L. W., & Weisburd, D. (2018). Advancing knowledge about replication in criminology. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1-24. doi:10.1007/s11292-018-9337-3

Fite, P. J., Pederson, C., & DiPierro, M. (2018). Individual risk factors associated with increased levels of restricted housing among detained youth. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, *35*(2), 139-154. doi:10.1080/0886571X.2018.1467812

Forrester, M. A., & Sullivan, C. (Eds.). (2018). *Doing qualitative research in psychology: A practical guide*. Los Angelas, CA: Sage Publications Limited.

Forsyth, C. J., Dick, S. J., Chen, J., Biggar Jr, R. W., Forsyth, Y. A., & Burstein, K. (2018). Social psychological risk factors, delinquency and age of onset. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *31*(2), 178-191. doi:10.1080/1478601X.2018.1435618

Franklin, T. W. (2017). Sentencing outcomes in US district courts: Can offenders' educational attainment guard against prevalent criminal stereotypes? *Crime & Delinquency*, *63*(2), 137-165. doi:10.1177/0011128715570627

Gibbs, G. R. (2018). *Analyzing qualitative data* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Godfrey, B., Cox, P., Alker, Z., & Shore, H. (2017). *Young criminal lives: Life courses and life chances from 1850*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Gottfredson, D. C., Kearley, B., Thornberry, T. P., Slothower, M., Devlin, D., & Fader, J. J. (2018). Scaling-up evidence-based programs using a public funding stream: A randomized trial of Functional Family Therapy for court-involved youth. *Prevention Science*, *19*(7), 939-953. doi:10.1007/s11121-018-0936-z

Griffith, J. N., Griffith, J. N., Young, N. C. J., & Young, N. C. J. (2017). Hiring ex-offenders? The case of Ban the Box. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *36*(6), 501-518. doi:10.1108/EDI-04-2017-0066

Grommon, E. (2017). Public perceptions and housing assistance for reentrants. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *16*(3), 827-833. doi:10.1111/1745-9133.12324

Grucza, R. A., Krueger, R. F., Agrawal, A., Plunk, A. D., Krauss, M. J., Bongu, J., ... & Bierut, L. J. (2018). Declines in prevalence of adolescent substance use disorders and delinquent behaviors in the USA: a unitary trend?. *Psychological Medicine*, *48*(9), 1494-1503. doi:10.1017/S0033291717002999

Gunnison, E., & Helfgott, J. B. (2017). Critical keys to successful offender reentry: Getting a handle on substance abuse and mental health problems. *The Qualitative Report*, *22*(8), 2152-2172. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss8/5/

Han, S., Lee, J., & Park, K. G. (2017). The impact of extracurricular activities participation on youth delinquent behaviors: an instrumental variables approach. *Journal of Adolescence, 58*, 84-95. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.05.006

Hancock, K. (2017). Facility operations and juvenile recidivism. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, *6*(1), 1-14. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com

Haney-Caron, E., Esposito-Smythers, C., Tolou-Shams, M., Lowery, A., & Brown, L. K. (2019). Mental health symptoms and delinquency among court-involved youth referred for treatment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *98*, 312-318. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.01.008

Haw, C. (2017). *Mood disorders: Forensic psychiatry.* London, England: Hodder Arnold.

Hay, C., Ladwig, S., & Campion, B. (2017). Tracing the rise of evidence-based juvenile justice in Florida. *Victims & Offenders*, *37*(6), 1-24. doi:10.1080/15564886.2017.1289995

Hay, C., Widdowson, A. O., Bates, M., Baglivio, M. T., Jackowski, K., & Greenwald, M. A. (2018). Predicting recidivism among released juvenile offenders in Florida: An evaluation of the Residential Positive Achievement Change Tool. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *16*(1), 97-116. doi:10.1177/1541204016660161

Hirsch, R. A., Dierkhising, C. B., & Herz, D. C. (2018). Educational risk, recidivism, and service access among youth involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *85*, 72-80. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.001

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

Heynen, E. J. E., Van der Helm, G. H. P., Wissink, I. B., Stams, G. J. J. M., & Moonen, X. M. H. (2018). "I don't care about what you want!" The relation between juvenile delinquents' responses to social problem situations and empathy in secure juvenile institutions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(9), 1412-1426. doi:10.1177/0886260515618212

Houghton, C., Murphy, K., Meehan, B., Thomas, J., Brooker, D., & Casey, D. (2017). From screening to synthesis: Using NVivo to enhance transparency in qualitative evidence synthesis. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *26*(6), 873-881. doi:10.1111/jocn.13443

Hovey, K. A., Zolkoski, S. M., & Bullock, L. M. (2017). Mental health and the Juvenile Justice System: Issues related to treatment and rehabilitation. *World Journal of Education*, *7*(3), 1-13. doi:10.5430/wje.v7n3p1

Jennings, W. G., & González, J. M. R. (2019). *Criminological and criminal justice research methods*. Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Wolters Kluwer.

Jennings, W. G., Maldonado-Molina, M., Fenimore, D. M., Piquero, A. R., Bird, H., & Canino, G. (2018). The linkage between mental health, delinquency, and trajectories of delinquency: Results from the Boricua Youth Study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*.

doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.08.003

Jensen, G. (2017). *Social learning theory and the explanation of crime*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Kazemian, L., & Farrington, D. P. (2018). Advancing knowledge about residual criminal careers: A follow-up to age 56 from the Cambridge study in delinquent development. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *57*, 1-10. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.03.001

Kempf-Leonard, K. (2017). *The criminology of criminal law*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kim, J., & Lee, Y. (2018). Does it take a school? Revisiting the influence of first arrest on subsequent delinquency and educational attainment in a tolerant educational background. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, doi:10.1177/0022427818801053

Kratcoski, P. C. (2017). *Correctional counseling and treatment*. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

King, N., Horrocks, C., & Brooks, J. (2018). *Interviews in qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications Limited.

Kolp, H. M., Hershberger, A. R., Sanders, J., Um, M., Aalsma, M., & Cyders, M. A. (2018). Conduct disorder symptoms and illicit drug use in juvenile justice involved youth: The reciprocal relationship between positive illicit drug-use attitudes and illicit drug use. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *53*(8), 1252-1259. doi:10.1080/10826084.2017.1402058

Kras, K. R., Dmello, J. R., Meyer, K. S., Butterfield, A. E., & Rudes, D. S. (2019). Attitudes toward punishment, organizational commitment, and cynicism: A multilevel analysis of staff responses in a juvenile justice agency. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *46*(3), 475-491. doi:10.1177/0093854818810857

Kroska, A., Lee, J. D., & Carr, N. T. (2017). Juvenile delinquency and self-sentiments: Exploring a labeling theory proposition. *Social Science Quarterly, 98*(1), 73-88. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12307

Kumm, S., Maggin, D., Brown, C., & Talbott, E. (2019). A meta-analytic review of mental health interventions targeting youth with internalizing disorders in juvenile justice facilities. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 1-22. doi:10.1080/0886571X.2018.1560716

LaCourse, A., Listwan, S. J., Reid, S., & Hartman, J. L. (2019). Recidivism and reentry: The role of individual coping styles. *Crime & Delinquency*, *65*(1), 46-68. doi:10.1177/0011128718790497

Lee, D. S., & McCrary, J. (2017). The deterrence effect of prison: Dynamic theory and evidence. In *Regression Discontinuity Designs: Theory and Applications* (pp. 73-146). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Lee, J. S., Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., & Hong, S. (2017). Effects of formal and informal deviant labels in adolescence on crime in adulthood. *Social Work Research, 41*(2), 97-110. doi:10.1108/S0731-905320170000038005

Lehmann, V. (2017). The prison library: A vital link to education, rehabilitation, and recreation. *Education Libraries*, *24*(1), 5-10. doi:10.26443/el.v24i1.150

Lemert, E. (2017). *The juvenile court system: Social action and legal change*. London, England: Routledge.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2018). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Logan-Greene, P., Tennyson, R. L., Nurius, P. S., & Borja, S. (2017). Adverse childhood

experiences, coping resources, and mental health problems among court-involved youth. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *46*(6), 923-946. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.030

Long, J. S., Sullivan, C., Wooldredge, J., Pompoco, A., & Lugo, M. (2018). Matching needs to services: Prison treatment program allocations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, doi:10.1177/0093854818807952

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

Mathur, S. R., Griller Clark, H., LaCroix, L., & Short, J. (2018). Research-based practices for reintegrating students with emotional and behavioral disorders from the juvenile justice system. *Beyond Behavior*, *27*(1), 28-36. doi:10.1177/1074295617728508

McCormick, S., Peterson-Badali, M., & Skilling, T. A. (2017). The role of mental health and specific responsivity in juvenile justice rehabilitation. *Law and Human Behavior*, *41*(1), 55-67. doi:10.1037/lhb0000228

McCuish, E., Lussier, P., & Corrado, R. (2018). Incarceration as a turning point? The impact of custody experiences and identity change on community reentry. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, *4*(4), 427-448. doi: 10.1007/s40865-018-0088-7

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

Mears, D. P. (2017). Assessing the effectiveness of juvenile justice reforms. *Law and Policy*,

22(2), 175-202. doi:10.1111/1467-9930.00090

Merriam, S. B., & Grenier, R. S. (Eds.). (2019). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Modrowski, C. A., Bennett, D. C., Chaplo, S. D., & Kerig, P. K. (2017). Screening for PTSD among detained adolescents: Implications of the changes in the DSM–5. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 9*(1), 10-17. doi:10.1037/tra0000156

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 post–release 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

Mroczkowski, M. M., McReynolds, L. S., Fisher, P., & Wasserman, G. A. (2018). Disruptive mood dysregulation disorder in juvenile justice. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *46*(3), 329-338. doi:10.29158/JAAPL.003767-18

Na, K. S., & Cho, S. E. (2019). Prevalence of Mental disorders among juvenile offenders: Systematic review and meta-Analysis, *3321503*. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=3321503

Neubauer, D. W., & Fradella, H. F. (2018). *America's courts and the criminal justice system*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Newton, D., Day, A., Giles, M., Wodak, J., Graffam, J., & Baldry, E. (2018). The impact of vocational education and training programs on recidivism: A systematic review of current

experimental evidence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(1), 187-207. doi:10.1177/0306624X16645083

Na, C. (2017). The consequences of school dropout among serious adolescent offenders: More offending? More arrest? Both? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *54*(1), 78-110. doi:10.1177/0022427816664118

Newton, D., Day, A., Giles, M., Wodak, J., Graffam, J., & Baldry, E. (2018). The impact of vocational education and training programs on recidivism: A systematic review of current experimental evidence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(1), 187-207. doi:10.1177/0306624X16645083

Nguyen, H., Loughran, T. A., Paternoster, R., Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. (2017). Institutional placement and illegal earnings: Examining the crime school hypothesis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *33*(2), 207-235. doi:10.1007/s10940-016-9291-z

Nicholson, J., & Higgins, G. E. (2017). *Preventing crime and violence*. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

Payne, A. A., & Welch, K. (2018). The effect of school conditions on the use of restorative justice in schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*(2), 224-240. doi:10.1177/1541204016681414

Pechorro, P., Castro, A., Hoyle, R. H., & Simões, M. R. (2018). The brief sensation-seeking scale: Latent structure, reliability, and validity from a sample of youths at-risk for delinquency. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice*, *18*(2), 99-113. doi:10.1080/24732850.2018.1435073

Pham, Y. K., Unruh, D. K., Waintrup, M., Sinclair, J., Johnson, M. D., & Alverson, C. Y. (2017). Taking responsibility: Preparing young offenders to handle disclosure on the

job. *Beyond Behavior*, *26*(1), 36-41. doi:10.1177/1074295617694409

Pyrooz, D. C., Gartner, N., & Smith, M. (2017). Consequences of incarceration for gang membership: A longitudinal study of serious offenders in Philadelphia and Phoenix. *Criminology*, *55*(2), 273-306. doi:10.1111/1745-9125.12135

Raaijmakers, E. A., Loughran, T. A., de Keijser, J. W., Nieuwbeerta, P., & Dirkzwager, A. J. (2017). Exploring the relationship between subjectively experienced severity of imprisonment and recidivism: A neglected element in testing deterrence theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *54*(1), 3-28. doi:10.1177/0022427816660588

Reid, J. A., Richards, T. N., Loughran, T. A., & Mulvey, E. P. (2017). The relationships among exposure to violence, psychological distress, and gun carrying among male adolescents found guilty of serious legal offenses: A longitudinal cohort study exposure to violence, psychological distress, and gun carrying. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *166*(6), 412-418. doi:10.7326/M16-1648

Rocque, M., Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., Ozkan, T., & Farrington, D. P. (2017). The importance of school attendance: Findings from the Cambridge study in delinquent development on the life-course effects of truancy. *Crime & Delinquency*, *63*(5), 592-612. doi:10.1177/0011128716660520

Rodriguez, N. (2018). Expanding the evidence base in criminology and criminal justice: Barriers and opportunities to bridging research and practice. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, *1*(1), 1-14. doi:10.1080/24751979.2018.1477525

Ruchkin, V., Koposov, R. A., Koyanagi, A., & Stickley, A. (2017). Suicidal behavior in juvenile delinquents: the role of ADHD and other comorbid psychiatric disorders. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *48*(5), 691-698. doi:10.1007/s10578-016-0693-9

Russell, J. D., Marsee, M. A., & Ryals Jr, J. S. (2017). Identifying mental health issues in

   detained youth: Testing the structure and invariance of the Massachusetts Youth

   Screening Inventory–Version 2 (MAYSI-2). *Psychological Assessment*, *29*(6), 720-726.

   doi:10.1037/pas0000410

Sattler, A. L. (2017). Treating youths in the juvenile justice system. *Pediatric Clinics of North*

   America, *64*(2), 451-462. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2016.11.012

Schubert, C. A., Mulvey, E. P., Hawes, S. W., & Davis, M. (2018). Educational and employment

   patterns in serious adolescent offenders with mental health disorders: The importance of

   educational attainment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 45*(11), 1660-1687.

   doi:10.1177/0093854818784330

Shannon, C. R., & Hess, R. S. (2018). Out but in: Exploring juvenile reentry through

   Photovoice. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 1-14.

   doi:10.1080/21683603.2017.1356774

Sharlein, J. (2018). Beyond recidivism: Investigating comparative educational and employment

   outcomes for adolescents in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. *Crime &*

   Delinquency, *64*(1), 26-52. doi:10.1177/0011128716678193

Sharlein, J., & Engstrom, M. (2018). Neighborhood disproportion in juvenile justice

   contact. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *69*(4), 25-41. doi:10.1111/jfcj.12119

Shepherd, S., Spivak, B., Borschmann, R., Kinner, S. A., & Hachtel, H. (2018). Correlates of

   self-harm and suicide attempts in justice-involved young people. *PLoS One*, *13*(2).

   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0193172

Shoemaker, D. J. (2018). *Theories of delinquency: An examination of explanations of delinquent*

   behavior. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Shoemaker, D. J. (2017). *Juvenile delinquency*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Shulman, E. P., Bechtold, J., Kelly, E. L., & Cauffman, E. (2018). Mental health screening in juvenile justice settings: Evaluating the utility of the massachusetts youth screening instrument, Version 2. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *29*(8), 849-872. doi:10.1177/0887403416650250

Simmons, C., Fine, A., Knowles, A., Frick, P. J., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2018). The relation between callous-unemotional traits, psychosocial maturity, and delinquent behavior among justice-involved youth. *Child Development*. doi:10.1111/cdev.13176

Siegel, D. M., & Kinscherff, R. (2018). Recording routine forensic mental health evaluations should be a standard of practice in the 21st century. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *36*(3), 373-389. doi:10.1002/bsl.2349

Sinclair, J. S., Unruh, D. K., Griller Clark, H., & Waintrup, M. G. (2017). School personnel perceptions of youth with disabilities returning to high school from the juvenile justice system. *The Journal of Special Education*, *51*(2), 95-105. doi:10.1177/0022466916676089

Smith, J. A. (2017). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sugie, N. F., & Turney, K. (2017). Beyond Incarceration: Criminal justice contact and mental health. *American Sociological Review*, *82*(4), 719-743. doi:10.1177/0003122417713188

Sullivan, C. J., & Lugo, M. (2018). Criminological Theory and Deterrence. In *Deterrence, Choice, and Crime, Volume 23* (pp. 117-146). United Kingdom: Routledge.

Sundt, J., Schwaeble, K., & Cullen, C. (2017). Good governance, political experiences, and public support for mandatory sentencing: Evidence from a progressive US state.

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/14672

Takahashi, Y., & Evans, L. T. (2017). An application of machine learning for predicting rearrests: Significant predictors for juveniles. *Race and Social Problems*, 1-11. doi:10.1007/s12552-017-9219-8

Terry, D., & Abrams, L. S. (2017). Dangers, diversions, and decisions: the process of criminal desistance among formerly incarcerated young men. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *61*(7), 727-750. doi:10.1177/0306624X15602704

Thornberry, T. (2018). *Developmental theories of crime and delinquency*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Tolle, H. (2017). Gang affiliation as a measure of social structure in social structure social learning theory. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(8), 870-878. doi:10.1080/01639625.2016.1206712

Vagle, M. D. (2018). *Crafting phenomenological research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Visher, C. A., Lattimore, P. K., Barrick, K., & Tueller, S. (2017). Evaluating the long-term effects of prisoner reentry services on recidivism: What types of services matter?. *Justice Quarterly, 34*(1), 136-165. doi:10.1080/07418825.2015.1115539

Walters, G. D. (2018). Callous-unemotional traits and moral disengagement as antecedents to the peer influence effect: moderation or mediation?. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 41*(3), 259-275. doi:10.1080/0735648X.2017.1284688

Walters, G. D. (2018). Peers, Parents, and proactive criminal thinking: Comparing additive and interactive effects in mid-to late-adolescents. *Deviant Behavior, 39*(7), 868-877. doi:10.1080/01639625.2017.1335530

Walters, G. D. (2019). Gang Influence: Mediating the gang–delinquency relationship with

proactive criminal thinking. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*.
doi:10.1177/0093854819831741

Wang, J. J., & Weatherburn, D. (2018). Are police cautions a soft option? Reoffending among juveniles cautioned or referred to court. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. doi:10.1177/0004865818794235

Welty, L. J., Hershfield, J. A., Abram, K. M., Han, H., Byck, G. R., & Teplin, L. A. (2017). Trajectories of substance use disorder in youth after detention: A 12-year longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *56*(2), 140-148. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2016.10.018

Western, B., Braga, A., & Kohl, R. (2017). A longitudinal survey of newly-released prisoners: Methods and design of the Boston reentry study. *Fed. Probation*, *81*(1), 32-38. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1701544114

Wibbelink, C. J., Hoeve, M., Stams, G. J. J., & Oort, F. J. (2017). A meta-analysis of the association between mental disorders and juvenile recidivism. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *33*, 78-90. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.005

Willig, C., & Stainton-Rogers, W. (2017). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yeager, D. S. (2017). Social and emotional learning programs for adolescents. *The Future of Children*, *27*(1), 73-94. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/44219022

Yoder, J. R., Whitaker, K., & Quinn, C. R. (2017). Perceptions of recidivism among incarcerated youth: The relationship between exposure to childhood trauma, mental health status, and the protective effect of mental health services in juvenile justice settings. *Advances in Social Work*, *18*(1), 250-269. Retrieved from https://advancesinsocialwork.iupui.edu

Young, J. T., Cumming, C., Dooren, K., Lennox, N. G., Alati, R., Spittal, M. J., ... & Kinner, S.

    A. (2017). Intellectual disability and patient activation after release from prison: A

    prospective cohort study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. *61*(10), 939-956.

    doi:10.1111/jir.12349

Zapolski, T. C., Banks, D. E., Lau, K. S., & Aalsma, M. C. (2018). Perceived police injustice,

    moral disengagement, and aggression among juvenile offenders: utilizing the general

    strain theory model. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *49*(2), 290-297.

    doi:10.1007/s10578-017-0750-z

Appendix A

Central Research Question: How would personnel involved in the incarceration process of juvenile offenders describe incarceration effects on youths' future success?

Sub Research Question 1 - How does the incarceration experience impact youths' abilities required for future success?

Guided interview questions and statements which prompted discussion for this question were as follows:

12) How do you perceive mental and behavioral health needs of juvenile offenders being addressed in detention centers?

13) Do you feel as though mental health problems among the juvenile population complicate or disrupt the effectiveness of incarceration for the purpose of rehabilitation?

14) How often do you believe juveniles return to detention because they did not have their mental and behavioral health addressed (i.e. anger management problems, compulsive or impulsive behavior problems, substance abuse/addiction, anxiety causing irritability and increased risk for physical altercations, PTSD causing lack of coping skills, abusive home environments, conduct disorder, mood dysregulation disorder, depression, etc.)?

15) How are substance abuse/addiction and suicide risk addressed for youth in a detention center?

16) Is there a routine assessment for mental/behavioral health needs when youth enter in the juvenile justice system?

17) When juveniles are released are there aftercare services set up for them or are you aware of resources that they can utilize to help reintegrate into their school systems and communities effectively?

Sub Research Question 2 – What factors are related to changes in future success components after incarceration? Guided interview questions related to this research question included the following:

18) To what extent does serving time in a juvenile detention center disrupt youths' ability to complete high school, find future employment, prevent future criminal behavior, and successfully rehabilitate from behavior and mental health problems?

19) How effective is detaining youth in a detention center at preventing recidivism (returning to the justice system) and redirecting a criminal life course?

20) Describe experiences juveniles have while in detention which negatively impact their abilities for future success after release?

21) Describe the effects of juvenile offender labeling such as social stereotyping in schools and employment opportunities?

22) Thank you for all the valuable information you have provided, is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix B

Participant 1

1) Detention centers are necessary for the safety of the community and the individual safety of the juvenile. By entering into the JJS personnel can identify what the youth needs.
2) A lot of juveniles held in unit are usually held with serious offense like assault and murder, best for child to remain in detention center.
3) Probation officer – juvenile justice component of DCS continues to reoffend then they are committed to a secured facility and enter into DCS. Mental health component poses a problem to be able to accurately treat and rehabilitate juveniles. Mental health problems can prevent youth from being successful with probation and cannot follow the rules of probation terms. Try to refer out to mental health services for the mental health component of probation terms.
4) Case by case situation, certain population of youth, repeat offenders continually come back to court. Try to figure out what mental health, behavioral, or issues in home environment not being addressed causing youth to reoffend. Component for kids to understand that some things they just have to overcome. Some things they have to overcome on their own and mental health services cannot address all individual needs. Trying to figure exactly what the issues are for every juvenile is almost impossible.
5) Young man diagnosed with ADHD, taking medicine, being raised by adopted mother, doing things that made impossible to not violate probation. Probation officer had to file to be detained. Put up a fight when he was turned in because mental health could not allow him to process why he was having a consequence and went ballistic during arrest. Picked up more charges based of trying to detain him. Because of mental health issues was discharged from mental health court because of drug addiction. Had to get his mental health needs addressed first then deal with addiction treatment and rehabilitation.
6) 6 month probation term completely done with court and probation. If in DCS actually has an aftercare services such as group home or house arrest, or detention facility.
7) Juvenile court system designed to keep what happens as a juvenile does not affect them as an adult, "adjudicated delinquent" protects youth from going on record. Can go through diversion program which expunges record. Aftercare services continue education as part of their mandated requirements and education is provided while on house arrest. Designed to for their situation to stay as normal as possible unless there are issues and concerns.
8) Police that youth cannot spend more than 30 days in detention facility.
9) Their system is not for punishment it is to ensure community and youth is safe and to indentify needs. Example: put in detention to get him off of meth and protect him from using meth and giving it to others. Not the best option, but is an immediate solution for protection but not for rehabilitation which occurs after they are put back into the communities with probation and court mandated services and follow ups.

Participant 2

1) Yes, because some youth need to be detained for safety issues. Example had a juvenile commit murder, so at the end of the day its about the safety of the community and the safety of the youth. Detaining youth gives the court an opportunity to identify needs and come up with a safety plan. First priority is to treat and rehabilitate and not lock them up and throw away the key. Seeing things among the juvenile population that have never been seen before since youth are getting access to guns. "you don't have to be afraid if you have a gun", kids going about things their own way to get what they want when they have a gun. No longer street fights to solve problems and issues, its gun play now with people being shot and dying. Kids are dying at a young age and not having the opportunity to learn from their mistakes. Kids say "you don't understand my situation" Have to a have a place to put youth committing heinous offenses. Safety of the youth themselves, (might get killed for what they did, or start fights that end in them dying). Very necessary to detain.

2) Juvenile offender do not spend enough time in detention centers to identify their needs and get them the help the need. Go back home to no structure and criminal environments. If they stay in detention they can have structure and being taken away from environmental factors increasing risk of criminal behavior. Sometimes youth go back home to an environment that is even worse then when they left. "you are who you hang with" they go back to family and friends. Youth are not in JJS long enough to be "fixed" provided with resources to factors to increase change. "Can you give you all the knowledge, but I cannot make you think. I can give you everything you to hear in order to be successful, but you have to decide to do it" Kids are dying before they get a chance. Going back home to poverty that fosters crime. Youth with 3rd grade reading levels "how are they going to be successful? Better chance of learning to read in JJS. When they get desperate they do dumb stuff. Are not taught things they should be taught because they are to busy learning to survive. Their means of providing maybe go out and steal something so they can sale it for things they need like shelter and clothes. Set aside money for bail and expect to get caught. "If I'm hungry and uneducated, I'm dangerous" Its going to get worse. You don't have to be afraid of me until I have a gun. Trying to get popular and attention: Go out and kill someone. "Two biggest things is anger and abandonment" Do your homework, what is society doing for people acting out: Building more prisons and privatizing them. 2nd thing is theirs digging more holes because more people are dying. Wants the juveniles not just to hear him but to see what he is telling them. Losing youth at a rate that has never been seen. Example: Youth shoot someone consumed with anger because his father is an abled body man in town, but refusing to put the time in to see him and spend time with him. What did I do to this guy to make him

not want to put time in with me? Consumed with anger and the person he shoots is not against the person he shoots, but at his daddy. Example: Are you angry? Are you at peace or are you in pieces? Im Fd up. Your at the edge of a cliff and your doing a balancing act and if you keep making these choices your going to fall the cliff. Prison or the graveyard. Say: I should have listened to…..   Keep acting out your going to be in a cell or a casket or you can be free, what do you choose? Don't have time to see cute little things to the kids. These kids they are dealing with have behavior and mental health issues but it is based on environmental factors because they go back home where there is not enough food and everyone is gang bangin. Doing drugs. How do we expect these youth to make it and change? Never seen so many youth kids dealing with mental health issues until recently after working with them for 21 years. Young man brought a gun to school and in order for you to get back into school is write a letter why you thought you needed to bring a gun into school. Letter could not be read because all he could do is write his name. Cannot read or write. How is this young man get a job unless someone will take a chance on him to teach him. Structure at state custody. No structure at home. Half the kids raise themselves. Grandmothers being 30 years old. Generation of kids growing up without being taught values and morals.

3) Future is not going to get any better. All they can do is utilize the service providers that can get out into the homes and try to identify needs of individual youths. Feel abandonment when they get detained because too often families do not have the resources to get them to visit them. JJ thank god for them, but they are not equipped to deal with the needs of at-risk youth entering into the system. Detention is like - Baby sitting, but something has to be done.   Schizophrenia youth with paranoia got released and was trying to walk out, officers told him he had to wait till his parents arrived, he flipped out and assaulted officers after getting scared and feeling paranoid. Thinking they are going to do something to him. Seriously assaulted them because he thought they were going to kill him. Challenge ahead of them.

4) Often return to JJS because they are not having their behavioral and mental health needs addressed. But it is often because families do not continue services and do not comply with services or do not utilize the resources given to them. Youth often cannot get to places to see counselors, doctors, and get their medicine and do not have the maturity of responsibility to keep track of appointments, medications, and getting to appointments.

5) Kids have so many traumas, JJS is not equipped to deal with them and youth's needs based on specific trauma reactions.

6) Level 2 facility or group home they already have their education set up for them and they do not have a choice but to attend and be compliant with high school education requirements. Provides structure and they are more likely to finish high school than when being placed back into their homes. They have structure and discipline, attention,

sometimes a lot of love: things they have never received before. The biggest thing is that they get attention, adult supervision.

7) Believe they are grown by the time they are teenagers and think" how is anyone going to tell me what to do" Ive been taking care of my little sister or brother since I was 7 years old". Kid missed 57 days of school says he is going to graduate. Was able to graduate because he was passed through without meeting requirements. Not being equipped because of being passed on to keep their numbers up. But a high school diploma will still help him along further in life to get a job. Still up to him what he chooses to do with his life. Don't get rehabilitated while in JJS because they are not there long enough. Get turned loose and go back to a situation that is worth than being in the detention or group home and then are more likely to reoffend.

8) Sometimes yes, because a lot of kids can click with the gangs or rival gangs. If they have beef out on the street they will with each other in detention. Officers know the kids coming in and can keep them separated. Detention center very necessary. Detention can help the youth more by providing opportunities they would not otherwise have. These kids are going to be exposed to criminal behavior through friends, families, and communities whether they are locked up or not. Yes detention centers can expose them to criminal behavior, but if they are have already committed crimes they have already been exposed to criminal environments at least in detention they have a chance to be motivated to try and take responsibility.

9) Structure and Discipline. Detention may be the only place they receive any form of these two things. Prevent gang initiation by killing someone, stop youth before they get that far. Steal, kill, and destroy.

Participant 3

1) Yes, it is a necessary component because they can get a handle on the child to be brought in to help them get what ever services they made need to enhance their chance of being successful.

2) Yes it does, in each phase it does, especially the communities. Remove child from community where they could no longer be a threat to themselves or their families. Once you have a child in the unit if the magistrate sees fit or a probation officer an assessment can be ordered for drugs and alcohol or a mental health assessment. At that point the child is in a stationary position so assessments can be performed and needs can be identified. As oppose to being in a home where the environment may not allow that.

3) They are being addressed well because a lot of things start coming out in court. Mothers or parents may say my child is doing this, this, and this. But they may not have a grasp on what mental health is. Some times mental health is looked down upon in the type of

communities we deal with. Parents are not willing do have the mental health needs addressed in some incidences a magistrate or judge can order for mental health and behavioral problems to be addressed and see what is found. Sometimes find out another adult in the family has mental issues. No one ever thought of having the child assessed, because they just live with it. So now once they get into the system it opens up many door because we have avenues we can go down to help the child that they did not know about.

4) Cant put a number on it. Repeat offenders to come back and normally it occurs because the parents or caregivers drop the ball and do not make sure the child follows through with the services and treatment they were supposed to and get their services rendered. They will start treatment but it will be to lengthy and child and families will stop going. Commit another crime before they finish treatment programs. Place child on house arrest and force child to get services.

5) Once incident come to mind, recently we had child who had an IEP in place, but they got a new principle and did not know how to deal with the child. Mental health issues exacerbated and at 11 years old he had to be brought into detention and at detention hearing

6) Once a child is obtained the school does not stop because they make sure their school is continued while being detained. But it is up to the parents to bring their books in from school, but most parents don't follow through with this. Finding future employment is not affected by this detention center because they are not convicted. Maybe affect military because they do check juvenile record. Coming into the JJS enhances their opportunity to be successfully rehabilitated. Even with the ones that get sentenced, for their own life it may not be the best thing for them, but it may be exactly what they need because they are uprooted from environments fostering criminal activity and now they have structure, are able to get their work done and finish high school because they do not have choice other than to get their school work done while being detained. When they are on house arrest the rules of house arrest include having to go to school. Forces parents to have accountability for their child's treatment and education.

7) Whether or not criminal behavior is increased in detention is very individually based. Because our facility is made to help them change and increase their changes of not reoffending. But if they are unwilling and seeking out ways to be criminal. They go back to homes that encourage criminal behavior. Short term facilities do not allow for enough time to have youth learn new behaviors and connect with peers.

Participant 4

1) Yes, short term facility is really good for house arrest and probation because it allows them to be able bring in the reins to start following some rules. Short term facility is

prejudication and the average length of stay is 2 days while needs are being identified before they are sentenced or tried as an adult.

2) Yes, especially for the community, the child themselves may need that time away like being involved in a gang. Threats made against them and they are safer in detention rather than in their communities. More safe place for the child.

3) Agree, I think that needs that may have not been addressed prior so when they come to court prevention services can be ordered by the judges, which allows the DCS to assess to see if there are mental/behavioral disorders. Then they can set up prevention services they can get a service provider such as outpatient treatment, care management and a holistic approach is taken. Which is really good because families will not know these services existed. Families will come to court saying their child is "just out of control" we don't understand what is going on. Judge can ask if child is on any medication and parents will say oh yeah she was but she stopped taking months ago because they thought they did not need it. Judge can order to return to mental health treatment and judge and make an order to be compliant with treatment.

4) Once the judge orders prevention services, but the court has to count on the family and parents to follow up with services for their child by making appointments and getting them to their appointments. Counting on family to do what they are supposed to. Address that they haven't when they come back to court if they are not getting their needs met.

5) We had a 14 year old in court with bipolar disorder and did not take meds for a week and acted out and the grandmother could not control her because she stopped taking medicine because she did not like how it made it her feel. Grandmother could not get her to take her medication. Judge ordered for her to go back to counselor. One they come to court then they can find out what is going on and what needs to be done to get things back on track for the child. But parents and caregivers have to make it happen.

6) Beginning tip of getting juveniles help because they are in pretrial. And house arrest and setting up services and depending on their success whether or not they are sentenced to actually being detained. Once sentenced to a detention center they go to school on the campus and they do not have a choice. Residential places increase their chances of finishing school compared to where they were living. When in detention they are in DCS custody after they could not be rehabilitated. JJS does help their ability to complete high school. Long term detention is the last ditch effort after predjudication in temporary holding juvenile detention center. We can only answer to questions to short term holding facility, not long term. The approach that this administration has taken increases chance of finishing education, and everything is geared to rehabilitation, and having their needs addressed before they have to be sentenced to a long term detention facility. Everyone in

the facility puts their best effort and tries really hard to rehabilitated juveniles before they end up in a long term detention facility.

Participant 5

1. Necessary evil, if there is a situation if there are significant charges. Prefer if there is a way for needs to be met outside of detention, is better for long term outcome for juvenile.

2. Yes, JJS plays a role in the safety of communities and families if juvenile is having behaviors that can cause harm to others or if they are so unstable they accrue additional problems without being g in a secure setting. Kids do better if given alternate placement than juvenile detention.

3. A lot of variation in how mental health and behavioral health are addressed. Some programs do treatment, other programs focus on just keeping them contained and is not a rehabilitation process focusing on treatment but only problem behaviors.

4. Yes, particular with youth there are a lot of mental health issues that contribute to legal issues in the first place. Most programs are not geared to addressing mental health needs and are more punitive nature.

5. All the time, youth return all the time because their mental health needs are not addressed, its like a revolving door until their mental health needs are addressed.

6. In particular kids that are having inappropriate sexual behaviors related to mental health needs related to their own abuse, housing them with other youth more likely to offend on someone else when placed in detention. Kids that have mental health needs where their ability to control impulses are low are more likely to engage in volatile behavior when in constrictive environment and pile up charges.

7. Unfortunately, it is on the family to pursue services and if they do not take the initiative to do that the youth do not get the help they need. Some youth have probation officer, when that happens it depends on officer to keep and prioritize youth to follow through with mental health care, but it is inconsistent with how probation officers make this happen.

8. Detention for youth is disastrous for education makes it really hard for them to advance and learn when they bounce around from home to detention, a lot of detention centers are not adequate to the regular school system. Holes in education that never get filled. Although juvenile record expunged, education record is not. Future employees will not know that they had legal charges, but they will notice their education lapses. They most likely will not be able to go to college. Underemployment causes them to be more likely to engage in criminal behavior.

9. Criminal behavior is fortified in detention, housing together a group of kids that feed off one another in terms of learning negative and more criminal behaviors. Increases networking with other criminals that can continue after being released. Alternate to safety other than detention.

10. It is interesting to me that with youth who are incarcerated for mental health reasons want mental health treatment and it is rare that youth will refuse it.

Participant 6

1) Detained being detained to a certain extant, have mixed feelings because it's a harsh stuff. But sometimes it is the only option to get control over the situation. Its not always human to put young kids in high school in detention for non-serious crimes.

2) Depending on how extreme the crime is if it is necessary to prevent them from causing anymore harm, then juvenile detention centers are necessary

3) Need services set up for them when they are released and having care managers checking up with them weekly is super important for rehabilitation and to decrease chances of reoffending. To keep them on track and having people to talk to like therapists and counselors or med management if they need medication for a mental disorder. The juvenile court does not usually enforce any follow through or actually have them enrolled in services to go to when they are released. Juveniles just get referred and then it is dropped.

4) Putting juvenile with mental health issues makes their symptoms completely worse. I have seen it multiple times, that mental symptoms get absolutely gets worse and jail should not be the options for people with mental health issues. It can make people take 5 steps back in their mental illnesses when incarcerated.

5) Often juveniles return to detention or are arrested again because they did not get their mental health treatment needs addressed. They need someone to push them along and keep them on track to redirect them away from offending behaviors and decisions. Follow through is very important.

6) Arrest and incarcerated process definitely makes mental illness worse, I've seen it multiple times.

7) Detention centers should already have a plan to be enrolled in services or why they are in detention enroll them in an aftercare treatment program that treats their mental health, behavioral health, medications, and school compliance. I personally tried to set up mental health court with the detention center or a service that let us enroll them into mental health counseling, medication management, and care management through mental health court for juveniles, but it just fell through. The detention center would not work with us

enough. We had a mental health counselor set up to go into the facility and address mental health needs based on referrals and enroll them in services setting up their appointments before they are released. But after about a month they stopped it and did not want this to continue. There was a lack of communication and the detention center staff did not understand the need. Any program like this completely fell through. There is not currently a system in the detention center that always identifies and addresses mental health treatment needs that specifically caused their offending behavior and most likely will continue to engage in criminal behavior without treatment and sets up aftercare services for them.

8) Once they are arrested they often drop out of high school, Ive seen very few people finish high school after they are arrested as a teenager. Effects their employment if they want to work during high school. Their self-esteem gets low and they think well "this is who I am" so I don't have a chance so I might as well not try. Being arrested as a juvenile sets them up for failure. There needs to be something else that happens other than being arrested and detained. They should be arrested then forced to comply with a comprehensive treatment program that addresses all their needs.

9) Criminal behavior is increased after being detained in a detention center. Makes their behavior worse. For every person I have seen go to jail, they have gone to jail several more times. Detaining juveniles does not stop them from reoffending. Probation officers should have that control over them to make sure they are being compliant with their rehabilitation services.

Participant 7

1) Yes and no, yes because sometimes they need that redirection and to keep them safe and off the streets to keep them away from things that they were into and maybe they can open their eyes and have the thought process that they need to reevaluate their life and try to get some help. But it can also make things worse because some of them will try to find anything to get into and find others to associate who are also engaging in criminal behavior. For some people it could be a good thing if they view it the right way. But for some they are going to try to seek out trouble and manipulate the system. It depends on the individual and what their insight is for why they are there and how they view detention is going to help them in the long run.

2) Yes detention is sometimes necessary for the safety of communities.

3) Once they are being detained it can make them things so much worse. But once they are in there they have people who are really there to help them. There are resources to help juveniles get back on track after they are released and helps get them compliant with their mental health treatment. However, sometimes juveniles with mental health disorders are getting identified and addressed, but many are missed. And often the juveniles do not

express or let anyone know their needs, because they themselves to not know what they need. When they get out of jail there are not enough resources set up, there is limited aftercare services set up for them for mental health treatment. Very important to keep up with consistent communication with mental health providers. They need consistent care set up with them especially therapy to identify specific mental and behavior health needs. In some situations if they are on house arrest they should set up in home therapy, but I am just not seeing these services really happening.

4) Very likely juveniles return to detention because of violating probation or were not compliant with mental health treatment and other rehabilitation services. So often they are not compliant with what they are supposed to do without being enrolled in comprehensive services. When thy are released they do not know how to do it on their own and can have anxiety because they are scared of not knowing what they need to do or how they can do it without families involved. That is why it is so important to have after care services set up immediately after jail. We need more of this happening in our county.

5) Being arrested can increase anxiety and other disorders. When they are given all the instructions and what they are supposed to do to keep them from going back to jail can feel overwhelming and overbearing for them and a lot to keep up with. They need help and a care manager. Feel like they cannot do it.

6) I am not aware of any aftercare services set up for juveniles when they are released. I wish I could see this happening more. Our facility is right down the road from the juvenile detention center and we have a whole team of child care managers that could take the juveniles being released. There just is a lack of support, we have mental health court set up for adults, but there just is not a program like this set up for the juveniles.

7) Some situations they are a good kid they are just around the wrong people. I had a juvenile and got arrested about a month ago with attempted murder. She missed a week of school while she was in the detention center and it was really hard for her to get back on track. They are supposed to have their school work being brought to them in the detention center or to the house when they are on house arrest. But this just does not happen often parents are not making sure they are keeping up with their school work. So they fall behind.

8) Highly likely they will be exposed to worse crimes then the ones they were arrested for. They want to do better but there is that aspect of seeing and exposed to all of these other things so I am going to try and see how far I can go with this or what I can get away way. It defiantly can have an affect after they are exposed to different behaviors of other juvenile offenders.