

REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES IN JUVENILE DETENTION:
INVOKING MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES TO EXPLORE IMPLEMENTATION

BY

ANGELA L. WALDEN

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2015

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Nicole E. Allen, Chair
Professor Jennifer C. Greene
Professor Helen Neville
Associate Professor Mark Aber
Associate Professor Michael Kral, Wayne State University

ABSTRACT

The dual purpose of the juvenile justice system is to protect community members and deter minors from engaging in criminal behavior. Thus, one perennial challenge faced by this system is “balancing” punishment and rehabilitation. Notably, research exploring the utility of rehabilitation with juvenile justice-involved youth is often focused on particular interventions or treatment modalities. However, the focus on implementing programs is only one component of rehabilitation practice. This study contributes to a growing body of literature documenting rehabilitative practices in the context of service providers’ daily routine. Specifically, this study examined rehabilitative practices in a juvenile detention via an ethnographic case study cast in a mixed methods framework to address the following research questions: a) In what form and to what extent are rehabilitative practices implemented in juvenile detention? and b) What processes and factors are associated with the implementation (or lack thereof) of rehabilitative practices? In response to the first question, this study found evidence of four primary forms of rehabilitative practices in the context of staff members’ everyday activities: a) promotion of detained youths’ emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) the orientation of detained youth to the culture of the justice system to promote youths’ success in this system, and d) investment in youth that extended beyond detention. Further, these practices were observed across four critical contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) in staff members’ contact with formerly detained youth living in the community. Findings related to the second question revealed an overarching tension between rehabilitation and punishment evident within each factor of interest: Staff members who exhibited a more contextually based understanding of youths’ involvement

in the juvenile justice system generally exhibited a rehabilitative orientation and were observed engaging in rehabilitative practices more often. Not surprisingly, organizational factors were found to operate in unique and interconnected ways. This study provides empirical support for the assertion that the implementation of rehabilitative practices is possible in the context of detention staff members' routine practices and provides important information about the factors that may shape implementation in a detention setting.

For Louise Tidwell, Glenn Marquardt, Thomas Turner, and Benjamin Hidalgo

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the detention staff, supervisors, superintendent, and detained youth who made this project possible. I have truly enjoyed getting to know and learning from each of you. Thank you all for giving your time so freely and for making me feel like a welcome guest in your setting. I thank Nicole Allen, a fearless leader, patient advisor, steady advocate, woman warrior, and all-around fantastic human being. It is impossible to quantify the tremendous amount of professional and personal growth that I have experienced as a result of your guidance. To the members of my committee, thank you for your thoughtful questions, comments, and feedback. It has been a pleasure to work with each of you. Your time and efforts have shaped this study in so many ways; thank you for pushing me to refine my thinking and attend carefully to the details. Thank you to my fellow clinical-community graduate cohort. Shara Davis, thank you for your friendship through the years and continued support from afar. Eishita Manjrekar, thank you for helping me to remember how to let go of things that do not matter and focus on moving forward. Luis Flores, thank you for ensuring that my graduate school experience never lacked adventure and a hand to hold. Sima Finy, thank you for filling our lives with music and glitter. Ida Coronado-Salusky, I am sure that I will never meet a more organized and caring office mate; thank you for listening to and supporting me. Jenika McDavitt, thank you for demonstrating what it means to be brave and follow your heart. Further, my gratitude extends to Shabnam Javdani, a fantastic colleague and true friend; I hope you always know how much I care for you and have grown as a result of our friendship. To Sadie Larsen, who is always up for an adventure, thank you for your kind words and support; we will certainly be life-long friends. Thanks to Mike Niznikiewicz, for the limitless positive energy and friendship, Liz Trawick for adding silliness and style to my life, and Suvarna Menon for always

having a friendly and encouraging smile at the ready. Thanks to many others in the program who have made my graduate school experience memorable, including Alice Huang, Nathan Todd, Miatta Echetebe, and Jonathan Bystrynski. I owe many thanks to the undergraduate researchers who assisted me with literature review tasks and transcription: Angela Ramiro, Ryann Morrison, Mei Yang, and Tatiana Smith. Additionally, my journey through graduate school would have been impossible without the support of friends and family. I would like to thank Amanda Valente, Jennifer Whitehead, Jimmy Witcosky, and Jesse Vinyard, whose friendships began in childhood and have extended across multiple decades and thousands of miles. I also owe so much to my older sister and best friend, Ginger Turner, who blazed the trail to college and graduate school and constantly reminds me to believe in myself. To my parents, Terreca and Alex Lindsay, your love and support is immeasurable; thank you for instilling in me a strong work ethic and for encouraging me to aim high. To my husband, Sean May, who is the best thing that ever happened to me, thank you for always encouraging me to keep going and knowing when I need a break from work, a good laugh, a listening ear, or a stiff drink.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: ABOUT THE SETTING	11
CHAPTER 3: RELATIONSHIPS MATTER: THE EMERGENCE OF REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES IN JUVENILE DETENTION.....	19
CHAPTER 4: FACTORS SHAPING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES IN JUVENILE DETENTION.....	75
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	124
REFERENCES.....	132
TABLES	145
APPENDIX A: OBSERVATIONAL DATA POTENTIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	148
APPENDIX B: OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTE PROTOCOL.....	150
APPENDIX C: TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE YOUTH SURVEY	151
APPENDIX D: STAFF SURVEY ITEMS	154
APPENDIX E: COLOR-BLIND RACIAL ATTITUDES SCALE (COBRAS) STAFF SURVEY	156

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The juvenile justice system has expanded greatly in scope and structure since the first laws calling for a separate justice system for minors were enacted in the late 19th century and implemented nationally approximately 80 years ago (Schultz, 1973). The structure of the juvenile justice system mirrors the adult system in a variety of ways and includes law enforcement (e.g., police), short- and long-term detainment facilities (juvenile detention and juvenile prison, respectively), and court and probation services. Since its inception, the juvenile justice system has evolved in a variety of ways, simultaneously affecting and affected by policy and societal opinions of delinquency, including the causes and optimal solutions for addressing needs and consequences with youth who are accused of breaking the law. The dual purpose of this system is to protect community members and deter individuals from engaging in criminal behavior. Thus, is it not surprising that perennial challenge faced by this system is balancing punishment and rehabilitation (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010).

Recent statistics demonstrate that youth are being arrested and detained at high rates and that there is a “revolving door” pattern of re-arrest. Approximately 1.9 million youth are arrested annually (Puzzanchera & Adams, 2011), and over 81,000 youth reside in juvenile detainment facilities (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 2010). Further, many juvenile justice-involved youth report having multiple contacts with this system (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Concerns about causes of and effective interventions for juvenile delinquency have led to the creation of an evolving set of policies and interventions intended to solve the problem of delinquency.

Currently, punitive policies remain in effect and the use of ineffective “common sense” interventions, based on popular perceptions of crime and criminal behavior rather than data-driven evidence, persists (Gendreau, Smith, & Theriault, 2009). Indeed, these policies have had widespread negative effects across the juvenile justice system. For example, as a result of such policies, the number of juvenile cases transferred to adult court has increased (Bishop, 2000). Adult convictions, as opposed to juvenile records, are not sealed and may be accessed through public record searches. The effects of a minor’s adult criminal conviction becoming part of their permanent record may be life-long, serving as a source of stigma and potential hindrance for success (e.g., obtaining employment).

Over the past several decades, the system has evolved from the “get tough” policies and practices of the 1960s through the 1990s to a growing focus on rehabilitative interventions for youth who engage in delinquent behavior (Lipsey et al., 2010; Piquero, Cullen, Unnever, Piquero, & Gordon, 2010). Concurrently, public discourse has paralleled policy to some extent. For example, “get tough” policies were mirrored by warnings issued in mainstream media of the developing problem of youth “super-predators” (Dilulio, 1995). Such “predators” were predicted to be younger and more violent than ever before. However, opinions that delinquent youth were becoming increasingly violent and should be considered “lost causes” with regard to intervention are not supported by research. Indeed, juvenile arrests have demonstrated a declining trend since the late 1990s, thus dispelling the myth of the “super-predator” (e.g., Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; Puzzanchera & Adams, 2011), and there is an expanding body of research (that unfortunately moves at a slower pace than policy change) highlighting a growing understanding that rehabilitative intervention strategies are more effective when compared to punitive strategies (e.g., Lipsey, 2009).

While punitive practices remain ubiquitous, there is a strong case to be made for engaging and broadly disseminating rehabilitative approaches. Individual-level characteristics, such as emotion dysregulation, have been identified as contributing factors for delinquency risk (Grigorenko, 2012). Aspects of community-level factors, such as neighborhoods, schools, and family and peer relationships have also been associated with delinquency risk (Grigorenko, 2012) and may serve as targets for effective intervention (Javdani & Allen, 2014). Further, estimates indicate a substantial overlap between delinquency and mental health issues.

Prevalence estimates of mental health disorders among incarcerated adolescents indicate that 65% - 70% meet diagnostic criteria for at least one disorder and that a higher percentage of girls (80%) are at risk than boys (67%; Schufelt & Coccozza, 2006). In response to mounting evidence of the overlap between delinquency and mental health needs and a growing recognition that punitive interventions are ineffective, researchers in criminal and juvenile justice fields have called for the implementation of evidence-based rehabilitative programming (e.g., Gendreau, Smith, & Theriault, 2009). Lipsey's (2009) meta-analysis revealed that juvenile justice interventions across contexts that are associated with reduced recidivism were characterized as having a "therapeutic orientation" (versus, for example, punitive), targeting high-risk youth, and a high quality implementation. Indeed, interventions employing "scare them straight" tactics showed no positive effects or actually increased recidivism. Importantly, there is evidence that juvenile justice-involved youth have a desire to engage in interventions that will help them gain valuable life skills to support success upon their release, despite the general lack of such programming in detention settings (Ashkar & Kenny, 2008).

Rehabilitative Practices

Rehabilitation, as it pertains to juvenile justice, generally refers to interventions that aim to build juveniles' competencies and/or skills in order to decrease the likelihood of recidivism (OJJDP, 1999). Specific outcomes of interest ultimately include reduced recidivism, ideally achieved through, for example, increased emotion and impulse regulation (e.g., Nelson-Gray et al., 2006; Trupin, Stewart, Beach, & Boesky, 2002) and independent living skills (Javdani & Allen, 2014). Rehabilitation is generally presented in juxtaposition to punitive practices, and these are often viewed as mutually exclusive (Dunlap & Roush, 1995). However, there is evidence that juvenile justice solutions are viewed, by corrections workers (Bazemore & Dickerson, 1994) and the general public (Cullen, Golden, & Cullen, 1983), through a combination of rehabilitative and punitive lenses.

There are multiple ways to understand rehabilitative practices. Rehabilitation, as it pertains to juvenile justice, has generally been conceptualized and studied in the form of specific intervention models or programs. Reviews and evaluations of the effectiveness of rehabilitative programming targeting delinquency have examined, for example, cognitive-behavioral therapy (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005; Lipsey, Champam, & Landenberger, 2001), boot camps (MacKenzie, Wilson, & Kider, 2001), family therapy (Latimer, 2001), and restorative justice (Bergseth & Bouffard, 2007; Bergseth & Bouffard, 2012; Nugent, Williams, & Umbreit, 2003) interventions. Importantly, Lipsey's (2009) meta-analysis included an examination of multiple types of intervention models and programs located in particular philosophies of intervention (i.e., deterrence, surveillance, discipline, restorative, counseling/therapy, skill building, multiple coordinating services). Lipsey's findings distilled three broad features that characterize effective interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth. Specifically, interventions were more

effective when they embodied a “therapeutic” orientation (versus control or coercion strategies), targeted high-risk youth, and were implemented with high quality. Importantly, findings from this meta-analysis indicated that effective interventions were not context specific, and could therefore be implemented in correctional settings and, theoretically, in the context of routine practice.

In recent years, researchers have turned their attention to infusing rehabilitation throughout the general climate in residential treatment settings, including those housing juvenile justice-involved youth. The growing body of scholarship on trauma-informed care (TIC; e.g., Bloom et al., 2003; Rovard, McCorkle, & Abramovitz, 2005), a rehabilitative approach that is growing in popularity and empirical support (e.g., Kos et al., 2008; Azeem, Aujla, Rammerth, Binsfield, & Jones, 2011; Maikoetter, 2011), serves as an exemplar of routine practice as intervention. TIC, at its core, is based on the recognition that experiences and effects of trauma are widespread, trauma affects both providers and consumers in the human service system, and service providers will inevitably come into contact with trauma survivors in their daily work (Harris & Fallot, 2001; Fallot & Harris, 2009). Indeed, this may be particularly salient for correctional staff working in juvenile justice settings, given that trauma experiences are prevalent among juvenile justice-involved youth (e.g., Conseur, Rivara, & Emanuel, 1997). Ideally, TIC is infused throughout the setting rather than delivered as a packaged intervention, creating an overriding climate that translates into a set of practices that staff at all levels engage as a normal part of their work with each other and their target population for service delivery. Importantly, research in other service-delivery settings targeting populations the experience trauma, such as domestic violence, suggests that *how* services are delivered (i.e., environment, interactions with

service-providing staff) should be considered alongside the nature of the services delivered (e.g., Stenius & Veysey, 2005).

The present study examined the implementation of rehabilitative practices as part of juvenile detention staff members' routine practices. Though the literature on rehabilitation interventions has contributed greatly to our understanding of "what works," correctional settings may lack the capacity to implement packaged treatments (e.g., Shelton, Sampl, Kesten, Zhang, & Trestman, 2009). Though findings from research documenting rehabilitative interventions in the context of routine practices are promising, there are relatively few empirical examples in the extant literature, particularly in the context of juvenile corrections. Thus, the present study stands to contribute to this growing body of scholarship. Specifically, this study aimed to illuminate the nature of the implementation of rehabilitation in the context of short-term juvenile detention staff members' routine practices (i.e., in the day-to-day practices of staff) and the factors affecting implementation (i.e., individual and setting level factors that shape such practices).

Implementation of Rehabilitative Practices

Implementation of innovations is a challenging and multi-faceted process that relies on a combination of individual and setting factors that create an environment that supports successful implementation (e.g., Klein & Sorra, 1996; Rogers, 2003). Indeed, even the most well designed intervention can be ineffective if not implemented well. The documentation of widespread dissemination and implementation of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention settings has yet to occur. A setting in which such dissemination must occur – juvenile detention – may pose significant challenges to successful implementation, especially given ongoing tensions between punishment and rehabilitation in this system.

Juvenile justice-involved youth are likely to have contact with multiple individuals in this system (e.g., police, attorneys, judges, probation officers). Short-term detention may be a particularly important part of the juvenile justice system, as a large number of justice-involved youth pass through this setting; detention houses youth following their arrest, while their cases are processed through the court, as they serve a sentence, and as they await transfer to another setting. Because detention is staffed around the clock, and staff members are in constant contact with youth throughout their stay, detained youths' experiences with the juvenile justice system may rest predominantly in their interactions with detention center staff. Indeed, correctional officers themselves may be important change agents in juvenile justice (Matthew & Hubbard, 2007). Examinations of the officer-youth relationship in probation/parole contexts highlight the relationship between a positive relationship and decreased recidivism (e.g., Vidal, Oudekerk, Reppucci, & Woolard, 2015). Further, there is evidence that detention staff members are receptive to integrating rehabilitative practices into their work. For example, Marsh and Evans (2006) examined correctional staff members' responses to youths' disruptive behavior. They found that staff who had received training in therapeutic solutions (e.g., anger management, family counseling, life skills development) assigned less severe consequences to youths' disruptive behavior compared to correctional staff who had not received such training.

As key members of juvenile detention settings, correctional staff are responsible for implementing setting policies and practices in their daily work. Thus, the successful implementation of rehabilitative practices throughout the setting relies on juvenile detention staff members' infusion of such practices into their daily interactions with youth. Yet, the success of innovation often relies on the degree to which settings have created a climate for implementation characterized by support for the desired change (e.g., adequate resources, consistent policies) and

the relative fit between staff members' values and attitudes with the innovation (e.g., Allen et al., 2012; Klein & Sorra, 1996). Thus, implementation in this setting is influenced by individual, such as staff members' values and attitudes, and setting-level conditions (i.e., leadership, climate, and culture).

Leadership is often implicated in the effectiveness of implementing change (e.g., Aarons, 2006; Aarons & Sommerfeld, 2012; Michaelis, Stegmair, & Sonntag, 2009), as leaders shape the setting in important ways through creating and enforcing policies and procedures. At the same time, unilateral decision-making has been identified as a common “stumbling block” for successful implementation (Klein & Knight, 2005), thus highlighting the importance of staff voice in the setting. Leadership is also viewed as interactional; it can be exerted by all members of the setting, to varying degrees, rather than by one or a small number of administrators (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Thus, staff members may shape the setting themselves through exerting informal leadership (e.g., seniority, key opinion leaders).

Organizational settings are also often understood in light of *climate* and *culture*. Climate refers to the structural realities of an organization that make it possible for members to effectively perform in their roles (e.g., James & Jones 1974). Culture refers to shared norms, values, and practices represented among members (or a subset of members) in an organization (e.g., Schein, 1990). Notably, there is empirical support for the assertion that climate and culture are distinct (Glisson & James, 2002), though organizational literature has often conflated the two (Denison, 1996). While highly interrelated, the current study proceeded with an eye toward both given that each offers a unique lens.

Implementation research suggests that the organizational climate will facilitate or hinder implementation success (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Klein & Knight, 2005). An organizational climate

that supports the implementation of rehabilitation practices would include adequate training, support, and facilities for staff. Thus, climate reflects the tangible supports, resource, policies, and protocols that are in place to encourage or discourage rehabilitative practices. Organizational culture is learned, passed on to new members through socialization, and has the ability to evolve through natural or guided processes (Schein, 1990); organizational culture shapes the social and technical aspects of implementation (Hemmelgarn, Glissel, & James. 2006). Indeed, staff members' relationships with one another shape the shared culture and stand to influence implementation (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Detention centers, like any other types of organization, have bounded rules and norms that govern the behavior of members in the setting and may also shape the culture. Despite the protocols in place (i.e., climate) staffs' interpretation and application of these may differ in practice and may be affected by their relationships with one another (i.e., culture).

The present study was concerned with exploring the nature of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention and the factors shaping these practices. Despite a growing understanding of “what works” with regard to delinquency and the recent push toward rehabilitative interventions, little is known about the extent to which these settings can support the implementation of practices that align with rehabilitative aims in the context of routine practices. Indeed, implementation of innovations is a challenging and multi-faceted process (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Rogers, 2003). This study is an ethnographic case study that aimed to address two overarching research questions: a) In what form and to what extent are rehabilitative practices implemented in juvenile detention? and b) What processes and factors are associated with the implementation (or lack thereof) of rehabilitative practices? To address these questions, this study examined: a) staff engagement in rehabilitative practices, b) detained youths' perceptions of the extent to

which staff engage in rehabilitative practices, c) staff attitudes and values as related to the implementation of rehabilitative practices, and d) the organizational conditions associated with the implementation of rehabilitative practices (i.e., leadership, climate, culture). This study engaged distinct perspectives (i.e., detention center staff, detained youth, the researcher) within a mixed methods framework to explore implementation. Findings include an illustration of implementation, emphasizing core areas of agreement and conflict among the different data sources, and concludes with research and practice suggestions in light of these findings.

CHAPTER 2

ABOUT THE SETTING

Precise information about the setting (e.g., location, number of staff, age of facility) is not provided in an effort to obscure the identity of the setting. In some areas of the description, approximated information has been included to provide the reader with enough details to adequately contextualize the setting.

Members

This study was set in a juvenile detention center (henceforth referred to as detention) in a mid-sized Midwestern community that provides county-wide services and, occasionally, detained youth from neighboring counties. Juvenile detention was established in this county approximately 40 years ago, and the detention facility has beds for less than 50 youth. At the time of the study, the maximum capacity of detention was somewhat lower than the number of beds given the facility's funding and staffing. Detention staff included a superintendent and about 50 staff members (i.e., supervisors, line staff, and part-time transportation and master control operators). Detention staff were diverse with regard to gender and tenure. Approximately half of line officers and most supervising staff were female and staff tenure ranged from a few months to over 30 years of employment in the setting or justice system. Although there is some diversity with regard to race/ethnicity, the majority of detention staff were White/European American. In contrast, youth of color, particularly Black/African American youth were disproportionately represented in this detention facility at the time this study took place, mirroring national patterns of disproportionate rates of incarcerated youth of color (OJJDP, 2009).

Staff had regular and constant contact with youth throughout the day. Line staff officers were divided into shift teams. At least one supervisor was assigned to each shift. Shift membership was generally fixed, but subject to change, due to staff turnover and periodic changes in shift membership. Generally, line officers on the day shift had more contact with youth as their shifts overlapped with the majority of youths' waking hours. Day shift staff members accompanied youth, who were generally divided into groups based on school level and other factors (e.g., co-respondents are separated when possible) to school and any after-school groups occurring in the setting. Day staff also served youth each of their daily meals and accompanied them to court. Line officers on the evening shift accompanied youth during evening activities and provided youth with their evening snack, additional recreation time, and evening shower time. Evening shift staff also led nightly groups with the youth. In these groups, youth set weekly behavior goals and staff provided youth with feedback about their behavior based on information provided by day shift staff. Once youth were in their rooms for the evening, evening shift staff completed reports for each youth to be presented at court to the judge overseeing the youth's case, managed files, and completed other necessary tasks (e.g., laundry). Youth were brought to detention for potential detainment at any time, day or night, so all staff conducted necessary intake activities as needed.

Maintaining physical safety was an important priority in the setting. Youth and staff movements were under constant surveillance. A centrally located area, often referred to in correctional settings as "master control," The master control operator was the "eye in the sky," due to their access to all camera feeds and intercoms located inside and outside of the building. The master control operator is responsible for letting staff and approved visitors into the building, and through any secure doors (which is nearly every door in the building, except for those within

the administration area). The master control operator's job also included answering and directing phone calls. The master control operator, line staff, supervisors, and administrators communicated with one another using walkie-talkies. At times, master control operators were asked to listen in on day rooms or youths' individual rooms when it was suspected that youth were engaging in rule-breaking behavior (e.g., having unmonitored conversation with one another) or being disruptive (e.g., rapping loudly, yelling, banging on the door on furniture).

There were many resources for youth imbedded in the day-to-day operations of the setting. Though not included in the present study, the setting included full-time teachers and several part-time physical and mental health service providers (i.e., mental health professional, nurses, doctor) that were accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week when they are not physically at detention. Although these individuals were expected to abide by detention policies and procedures, they were not detention employees and were supervised by outside agencies. Detention also had on-going relationships with community service providers, community-based organizations, and university-affiliated groups. A number of individuals and groups provided regular services in the setting on a volunteer basis. At the time of this study, detention hosted about a dozen outside service providers and groups that provided the following types of services: religious (e.g., optional weekly church services), therapeutic (e.g., therapy and skills groups), recreational/art (e.g., gardening, writing), and mentoring. Generally, community service providers working with particular youth (e.g., social workers, mentors, advocates) were also allowed to continue these services in detention while the youth was detained. Permission was determined on a case-by-case basis and with the approval of a supervisor or the superintendent.

Structure

The secure area of detention accounts for the majority of space in the detention building and included all living spaces (e.g., housing, recreation, school) utilized by the youth throughout their detainment. The housing area was divided into several day rooms, each with at least one metal table and a few stools bolted to the floor; some day rooms also had a television mounted to the wall. Each day room also contained a bathroom area with a shower and metal toilet and sink. Youth who acquired certain privileges as a result of staff members' evaluations of their behavior were allowed more time in the day room, where they could, at the discretion of staff, watch television, work on homework, write letters, draw, or work on a puzzle or other quiet activity. Day rooms were divided into two levels of individual rooms, with a metal and concrete staircase connecting the two levels. When possible, youth occupied only rooms on the lower level.

Much of the secure area included a large open space that connected other parts of the secure area, including housing and other living areas, and included a staff desk, often used by staff to complete documentation tasks or other paperwork, monitor youths' phone calls, and debrief with other staff members and supervisors. This room connected to the intake area, through which youth entered and exited the building (i.e., at intake, for court appearances, and for outside medical/health appointments). Whenever youth entered the detention building, they were patted down. At intake, all items were removed from the youths' pockets during the pat down and retained, with their clothing and shoes, until release. Detained youth were patted down when returning from court/outside appointments to check for contraband. The intake area included a private restroom with a shower (where staff perform a strip search before youth shower privately and change into the detention uniform), fingerprinting and mug shot area, holding rooms (each containing a bed, sink, and toilet), and an interview area where staff

conducted intake interviews, completed paperwork, and oriented youth to the setting via verbal and written explanations of detention rules and procedures.

Staff spent relatively little time during their shift outside of the secure housing area of the building. Supervising staff and the superintendent occupied offices located in the administrative area of detention. This area also included reception, shared staff computer stations, a conference room, staff lockers and a break room. Most staff did not leave the building during their shift for meal breaks, as a minimum number of staff were required in the building at all times. Thus, the break room served a primary location where staff would unwind, watch television, or talk with one another socially when not on the clock.

Daily Routine

Detained youth adhered to a predictable routine throughout their stay. During the week, they wake up at the same time each morning, attend school, and participate in recreation time, group activities facilitated by volunteer community service providers, and an evening staff-led group in which they set weekly behavior goals and receive feedback from staff and other detained youth about their behavior for the day. Other aspects of their day, including meal times, snacks, hygiene, phone calls/visits, and “lights out” were also scheduled at consistent times. Weekends also ran on a relatively set schedule, though the content of the day could be more flexible given that youth did not attend school or court on these days. Youth who earned enough points (awarded daily by staff based on the youths’ behavior and adherence to detention rules) could participate in privileges, such as movie nights, and purchase special snack items (e.g., ramen noodle, snack cakes, fruit snacks) from the commissary. In addition to scheduled daily activities, staff members transported youth to and from court for hearings and to appointments in

the community (i.e., medical, mental health) as needed. Finally, youth were allowed to regularly share phone calls and in-person visits with approved family and service providers.

Orientation to Rehabilitative Aims and Practices

An understanding of the history and current orientation of juvenile detention in this study came from several interviews with the detention superintendent, whose experience working in the setting spans over a decade, a review of written documents (e.g., newspaper articles collected by staff and spanning approximately four decades), and codified policies (e.g., mission statement). Over a decade ago, a partnership between detention and an academic researcher (not this researcher) was forged with the goal of increasing the detention setting's understanding of and response to detained youth. Specifically, this relationship was initiated by detention due to concerns about an observed pattern of difficulties managing youths' behavior while detained. More effective responses were sought to minimize the number of youth "on lockdown" (i.e., youth who were confined to their rooms for large amounts of time due to safety risk concerns), a proportion of the population of detained youth who, at that time that, staff members perceived as increasing in number.

The partnership between detention and research yielded several changes in practice. Primary among them was the inclusion of trauma screenings as part of general intake procedures. Detention purchased a trauma screening tool commonly used in other human service fields, and brought in a team to provide training in administering and interpreting the tool. Staff members' engagement in these systematic screenings helped them make decisions and take more effective actions with regard to youths' risk for self-harm and need for services. This change in practice also provided a common framework for staff to communicate with one another about the youths' needs. The partnership also included an evaluation component, conducted by the partnering

researcher, and feedback to the setting about the effectiveness of their use of the screening tool. At the time this study took place, this screening was still part of normal detention procedures and newly hired staff received training in the screening tool as part of their required orientation to the setting.

The stated values, mission, and vision of detention were also in alignment with a rehabilitative aim. These statements were displayed in the administration area of the building, where staff and visiting service providers can view them. Of particular note, these statements indicated that the purpose of detention was to provide a “safe and caring environment” with aims of guiding youth “toward productive and lawful lives” and enhancing “community safety and well-being.” The setting’s statements evidenced an orientation toward seeing youths’ potential; youth were described as “our greatest natural resource and represent our collective future.” Further, these statements specified some particular avenues for achieving these aims, such as implementing effective programming and recognizing that “the always-present potential for change can only be realized through the building of positive relationships.” Detention was also part of local efforts to develop a community service system, which supported a rehabilitative, such as trauma-informed care, learning collaborative and trainings that included representatives from detention. Thus, detention was one among many local settings working on the incorporation of rehabilitative care. It is reasonable to expect that that the setting had *adopted* such practices, yet the nature of and shaping forces affecting *implementation* remain questions of interest. These are generally distinct steps in a dissemination process. Adoption reflects the intention to incorporate new practices, procedures, policies or philosophies – often as reflected in the endorsement of leadership (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Rogers, 2003). Implementation reflects the

process of moving from adoption to action (Klein & Sorra, 1996). This involves the broad diffusion of the desired innovation to all levels from the front line to senior administrators.

CHAPTER 3

RELATIONSHIPS MATTER: THE EMERGENCE OF REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES IN JUVENILE DETENTION

Approximately 81,000 youth reside in juvenile detainment facilities (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 2010) and 1.9 million youth are arrested annually (Puzzanchera & Adams, 2011). Further, a majority of juvenile justice-involved youth report having multiple contacts with this system (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Concerns about causes of and effective interventions for delinquency have led to the creation of an evolving set of policies and programs. Over the past several decades, the system has evolved from the “get tough” policies and practices to a growing focus on rehabilitative interventions for youth who engage in delinquent behavior (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver 2010; Piquero, Cullen, Unnever, Piquero, & Gordon, 2010).

In response to the growing recognition that punitive interventions are ineffective, researchers in criminal and juvenile justice fields have called for the implementation of evidence-based rehabilitative programming with juvenile justice-involved youth (e.g., Gendreau, Smith, & Theriault, 2009). Rehabilitation generally refers to intervention practices that aim to build juveniles’ competencies and/or skills to decrease the likelihood of recidivism (OJJDP, 1999). The extent to which the goal of rehabilitation has been achieved can be measured by outcomes of interest, such as decreased recidivism, increased emotional or social skills (e.g., Nelson-Gray et al., 2006; Trupin, Stewart, Beach, & Boesky, 2002), and independent living skills (Javdani & Allen, 2014). At the same time, rehabilitation consists of particular processes. Interventions with a “therapeutic orientation,” targeting high-risk youth, and characterized by

high quality implementation have been associated with reduced recidivism across juvenile justice contexts (Lipsey, 2009).

Notably, research exploring the utility of rehabilitation with juvenile justice-involved youth is often focused on particular interventions or treatment modalities. For example, in their meta-analysis examining the effectiveness of family treatment in reducing recidivism among juvenile justice-involved youth, Latimer (2001) found that youths' participation in family treatments, when compared to control groups, was associated with decreased recidivism. More recently, Lipsey's (2009) meta-analysis found that programs, regardless of whether they were "name brand" model programs or general, had the greatest impact on recidivism when they were characterized by high quality implementation. Lipsey (2009) speculated that meaningful effects on recidivism may be achieved via service providers' routine practices. However, Lipsey (2009) noted that the current average "routine" practice in any given setting may be less than optimal. This assertion was made in light of findings from a previous meta-analysis by Lipsey (1999), which found generally promising though smaller, and quite variable, effect sizes of "practical programs" (typically created and implemented in "real world" conditions) compared to larger effect sizes of packaged program interventions (typically created and implemented under highly controlled conditions). Lipsey asserted that the average effect size of the "practical programs" may be misleading given that these programs varied in quality of design and implementation more so than their packaged counterparts. Notably, neither of Lipsey's meta-analyses (1999; 2009) articulated specific examples of rehabilitation in the context of routine practices.

The growing literature on trauma-informed care (TIC), one approach to rehabilitation that is infused in institutional settings (e.g., Azeem, Aujla, Rammerth, Binsfield, & Jones, 2011; Bloom, Bennington-Davis, Farragher, McCorkle, Nice-Martini, & Wellbank, 2003), provides

some useful examples. TIC, at its core, is based on the recognition that experiences and effects of trauma are widespread, trauma affects both providers and consumers in the human service system, and service providers will inevitably come into contact with trauma survivors in their daily work (Harris & Fallot, 2001; Fallot & Harris, 2009). Indeed, this may be particularly salient for correctional staff working in juvenile justice settings, given that trauma experiences are prevalent among juvenile justice-involved youth (e.g., Conseur, Rivara, & Emanuel, 1997). As illustrated by Bloom and colleagues (2003), trauma-informed rehabilitative practices may be present in the contexts of service intake (e.g., providing an explanation of policies and procedures up front; getting to know the client's history and potential triggers) and delivery (e.g., decreased use of physical restraint; involving clients in planning their treatment). Though this literature provides some insight into the nature of rehabilitation infused in settings, such practices have yet to be empirically examined in juvenile correctional settings. Thus, questions about implementation are relevant for examinations of rehabilitation, particularly when included as part of routine practices, which have been studied less frequently compared to packaged programs or intervention models.

Further, despite a growing understanding of “what works” with regard to interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth, research that examines rehabilitation in short-term juvenile detention, particularly in the context of day-to-day practices, is underrepresented in this body of literature. Notably, the day-to-day practices in a service-delivery setting are important targets of inquiry, as they may serve as particularly important contexts for effective intervention; *how* service providers interact with service recipients should be considered alongside the nature of the services delivered (e.g., Stenius & Veysey, 2005).

Juvenile detention is an important context for study given its role in the juvenile justice system. Detention facilities are often a first-stop, though not necessarily the last or only stop, for juvenile justice-involved youth. A general purpose of detention is to serve as a secure holding location for youth while their cases are processed through the court system, though youth move in and out of detention through a variety of avenues. Detainment periods in detention are typically brief, though youth may be housed for longer periods of time depending on a variety of circumstances. Youth facing adult charges, for example, may be housed longer as adult court cases tend to move slower compared to juvenile court. Youth may also be sentenced to detention per the order of a judge (e.g., probation violation) or may stay in detention while awaiting transfer to another correctional facility. Finally, youth brought in by law enforcement who do not meet criteria for detainment, as determined by detention staff, are released to their guardians without completing intake (i.e., “catch and release”). Youth detained in juvenile detention facilities represent a spectrum of offenses, from truancy to murder, as well as general involvement in the juvenile justice system. Thus, detention centers serve as a critical context for intervention given the nature and size of the youth population that come into contact with these settings.

Though juvenile justice intervention effectiveness literature has most often focused on the delivery of specific treatment programs, correctional officers’ actions may be important avenues for intervention delivery with juvenile justice-involved youth (Matthew & Hubbard, 2007). Indeed, there is growing empirical research highlighting the importance of parole/probation officer and youth relationships in both adult (e.g., Kennealy, Skeem, Manchak, & Eno Loudon, 2012) and juvenile (e.g., Vidal, Oudekerk, Reppucci, & Woolard, 2015) corrections literature. For example, the extent to which female parolees’ assessments of their

interpersonal relationship with their parole officer were positive was related to decreased recidivism in the absence of strong parental support (Vidal et al., 2015). Officer-youth relationships may also play an important role in juvenile detainment settings. Marsh and Evans (2009) conducted a multi-site study of detained youths' opinions about their relationships with staff in long-term juvenile detainment settings. They found that youths' perceived quality of these relationships were positively related to youths' perceptions of their own future success. Given the evidence to support the importance of officer-youth relationships in parole/probation contexts and long-term juvenile detainment, it is reasonable to suspect that staff in short-term juvenile detention may also be important agents of change. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that, under the right conditions, routine practice (i.e., detention staff members' daily interactions with youth) may be an effective avenue of intervention with delinquent youth.

Thus, one important and understudied avenue for the implementation of rehabilitation in juvenile detention may be through routine interactions between detention staff and detained youth. Although juvenile justice-involved youth are likely to have contact with multiple individuals in this system (e.g., police, attorneys, judges, probation officers), detained youths' experience of this system may rest predominantly in their interactions with detention center staff, who are in contact with youth around the clock. Indeed, interactions between staff members and detained youth constitute a large proportion of staff members' routine practices (e.g., responding to youth in distress, explaining detention or juvenile justice policies and procedures to detained youth), though the extent to which these can be characterized as rehabilitative has yet to be explored. In the current study, we defined rehabilitative practices as actions taken by staff, embedded within setting protocols and procedures, that promoted a rehabilitative aim (i.e., detained youths' competencies and/or skills that will support their ability to succeed as members

of the community). For example, staff members are required to conduct routine checks to ensure that youth are physically safe. This procedure requires that the staff walk the housing area and physically visit each room, using an electronic wand to indicate, for example, if the youth is in or out of their room and their general activities (e.g., sleeping). Staff members may extend this mandated procedure, for example, if they use this time to support (e.g., engaging in empathic listening, instructing or encouraging the youth to employ emotion regulation skills) a youth who is visibly upset about a recent experience in court (e.g., judge sentenced youth to several months at a state juvenile correctional facility).

Perhaps unique to juvenile corrections, the nature of relationships between staff and youth are not completely unlike those between a child and caregiver (e.g., Guarino-Ghezzi & Tirrell, 2008). The experiences and views of detained youth and detention center staff may diverge in meaningful ways (e.g., Davidson-Arad, 2005). Thus, there may be important differences between staff members' and youths' perceived realities. For example, youth may be more discerning in their perceptions of staff members' warmth and involvement. In contrast, staff may perceive that youths' experiences are relatively consistent across staff (Guarino-Ghezzi & Tirrell, 2008). Importantly for this study, the input of youth consumers from these settings is lacking in the extant literature. Detained youth may be reliable resources of information about the setting (Mulvey, Schubert, & Odgers, 2010), and, most critically, the voices of these youth should be included in research given that they are the targets of services. The inclusion of youth perspectives in research can be an empowering experience that is counter to experiences they have had in the context of a system that can be experienced as invalidating and silencing (Tilton, 2013). The inclusion of youths' perspectives can offer an important counter-narrative to staffs' self-reported and observed engagement in rehabilitative practices. Thus, this study included

detained youth as participants in order to understand their perspectives of interactions with staff and the extent to which they perceive these in alignment with a rehabilitative aim.

This study addressed gaps in the literature by examining the emergence of rehabilitative practices in detention in order to characterize the nature of such practices and the contexts in which they emerge as part of staff members' routine practices in the setting. Specifically, this study focused on the emergence of rehabilitative practices within interactions between detention staff members and detained youth. Toward this aim, the present study explored the nature of implementation via engagement in an ethnographic case study cast in a mixed methods framework.

Method

Setting

This study was set in a juvenile detention center (henceforth referred to as detention) in a mid-sized Midwestern community that served the county and, occasionally, detained youth from neighboring counties. Precise information about the setting (e.g., location, number of staff, age of facility) was not provided here in an effort to obscure the identity of the setting. Approximate numbers and information has been included to provide the reader with enough details to adequately contextualize the setting.

Juvenile detention was established in this county approximately 40 years ago, and the detention facility has beds for less than 50 youth. At the time of the study, the maximum capacity of detention was somewhat lower than the number of beds given the facility's funding and staffing. Detention staff included a superintendent and about 50 staff members (i.e., supervisors, line staff, and part-time transportation and master control operators). Detention staff were diverse with regard to gender and tenure. Approximately half of line officers and most supervising staff

were female and staff tenure ranged from a few months to over 30 years of employment in the setting or justice system. Although there is some diversity with regard to race/ethnicity, the majority of detention staff were White/European American. In contrast, youth of color, particularly Black/African American youth were disproportionately represented in this detention facility at the time this study took place, mirroring national patterns of disproportionate rates of incarcerated youth of color (OJJDP, 2009).

Staff had regular and constant contact with youth throughout the day. Line staff officers were divided into shift teams. At least one supervisor was assigned to each shift. Shift membership was generally fixed, but subject to change, due to staff turnover and periodic changes in shift membership. Generally, line officers on the day shift had more contact with youth as their shifts overlapped with the majority of youths' waking hours. Day shift staff members accompanied youth, who were generally divided into groups based on school level and other factors (e.g., co-respondents are separated when possible) to school and any after-school groups occurring in the setting. Day staff also served youth each of their daily meals and accompanied them to court. Line officers on the evening shift accompanied youth during evening activities and provided youth with their evening snack, additional recreation time, and evening shower time. Evening shift staff also led nightly groups with the youth. In these groups, youth set weekly behavior goals and staff provided youth with feedback about their behavior based on information provided by day shift staff. Once youth were in their rooms for the evening, evening shift staff completed reports for each youth to be presented at court to the judge overseeing the youth's case, managed files, and completed other necessary tasks (e.g., laundry). Youth were brought to detention for potential detainment at any time, day or night, so all staff conducted necessary intake activities as needed.

Maintaining physical safety was an important priority in the setting. Youth and staff movements were under constant surveillance. A centrally located area, often referred to in correctional settings as “master control,” housed staff members who monitored the setting around the clock. The master control operator was the “eye in the sky,” due to their access to all camera feeds and intercoms located inside and outside of the building. The master control operator was responsible for letting staff and approved visitors into the building, and through any secure doors (which is nearly every door in the building, except for those within the administration area). The master control operator’s job also included answering and directing phone calls. The master control operator, line staff, supervisors, and administrators communicated with one another using walkie-talkies. At times, master control operators were asked to listen in on day rooms or youths’ individual rooms when it was suspected that youth were engaging in rule-breaking behavior (e.g., having unmonitored conversation with one another) or being disruptive (e.g., rapping loudly, yelling, banging on the door on furniture).

Importantly, the setting demonstrated the commitment to a rehabilitative aim and implementing rehabilitative practices, reflected in the setting’s values, mission, and vision statements. Specific actions also served as evidence of this commitment. For example, a partnership initiated by detention with an academic researcher (not this researcher) was forged over a decade ago with the goal of increasing the detention setting’s understanding of and response to disruptive detained youth. The partnership between detention and research yielded several changes in practice. Primary among them was the inclusion of trauma screenings as part of general intake procedures. Staff members’ engagement in these systematic screenings helped them make decisions and take more effective actions with regard to youths’ risk for self-harm and need for services. This change in practice also provided a common framework for staff to

communicate with one another about the youths' needs (e.g., mental health assessment or treatment). The partnership also included an evaluation component, conducted by the partnering researcher, and feedback to the setting about the effectiveness of their use of the screening tool to assist them in their continued implementation. At the time this study took place, this screening was still part of normal detention procedures and newly hired staff received training in the screening tool as part of their required orientation to the setting.

Data Sources and Measures

This study employed multiple data sources to examine the nature of rehabilitative practices infused in detention staff members' daily routine: ethnographic observations of staff members and survey data collected from currently detained youth.

Staff observations. Observational data collection included the researchers' observations of staff as they interacted with one another and youth in the setting and informal conversations and/or interviews with staff members. Observations of staff focused on capturing their interactions with youth and locating these interactions in context. Conversations/interviews with staff members were generally open-ended and unstructured and focused on staff members' reports about their own behavior, including their engagement in rehabilitative practices (e.g., *"What do you do to help youth feel safe?"*), and their understanding of how their own attitudes and values (e.g., *"For youth in detention, what approach to intervention do you think is most appropriate?"*) and setting-level factors (i.e., leadership, climate, and culture; e.g., *"How do other staff on your shift affect the work that you do?"*) affect their work. The researcher spent over 220 hours in the setting, which included time planning the study in collaboration with detention supervisors and the superintendent and in-person observations collected as research data. The researcher engaged in data collection activities over the course of approximately one

year, alternating her observation schedule to spend time with each shift. Observations were not scheduled in advance, though the researcher would often call the detention center at least an hour in advance to make sure that the supervisor on duty knew to expect the researcher. On rare occasions, that researcher would be asked to reschedule if, for example, the setting was particularly short-staffed that day or had received a high number of new intakes.

The researcher's role and purpose was known to all detention staff and detained youth present in the setting at the time of each observation. The researcher was granted access to all facets of detention operations within the secure area, and accompanied willing staff as they went about their normal work. The researcher did not accompany staff outside of the detention setting (e.g., to/from court). The researcher always asked for explicit permission to accompany any individual staff as they went about their work. The researcher engaged in one-on-one and group conversations with staff when possible. Recording devices of any kind, including cellular phones and computers, were not allowed in the secured area of the detention center, where line staff performed nearly all of their work and where detained youth were housed. Supervising staff members had offices in the administration area, though supervisors also spent much of their time working alongside line staff in the secure area of detention. The researcher carried a notepad at all times and was allowed to jot hand-written notes, including direct quotes.

Given that youth were in the presence of or observable (via video cameras and intercoms throughout the setting) by staff at all times, their privacy could not be guaranteed. Thus, youth were not explicit targets of the observations conducted throughout this study. That is, the researcher would observe staff and youth when they interacted with one another, and information about the interaction was recorded in observational field notes, but the researcher did not approach youth, as part of the process of collecting observational data, to elicit information about

their experiences or follow-up with youth about any observed interactions with staff members. Additionally, youth who were identified by staff members as wards of the state were excluded entirely from this study (i.e., the researcher would avoid viewing interactions between these youth and staff and did not include information about interactions between these youth and staff in field notes).

All members of the setting, including youth, were provided with informed consent/assent and reminded periodically and when necessary that they may opt to have information about their observed behaviors/statements excluded from observational data and that they may request that the researcher leave their immediate area at any time. Thus, staff always had the option to request that they not be observed or that their comments not be recorded or used in the research process (at all or at a particular time); youth always had the option of asking the researcher to leave the room and/or not include their interactions with staff in the study. In total, approximately 40 detention staff members, supervisors, and outside community service providers were present and included as potential participants in this study. Participating staff varied with regard to, for example, how often they allowed the researcher to observe them at work. Throughout the duration of the observations, 121 youth were assented and included as potential participants in this study. Notably, a very small number of staff refused to participate in any part of the study. The researcher did not pursue opportunities to observe or speak with these staff members and did not include the staff members' actions or comments in field notes. Staff and youth were not provided with monetary compensation for their time.

Following each observation, field notes were written by the researcher or audio recorded and transcribed. Field notes were structured to attend to two purposes: (a) provide a summary of the activities and conversations that occurred during the observation, including the context in

which the activities occurred, and (b) to reflect and organize content as representative of rehabilitative practices (or not) as possible “bins” for organizing observations (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Finally, detention staff and supervisors who participated in this study, and who were employed at the time of the researcher’s departure from the setting, were invited, via private email, to complete a brief online exit survey. The setting posed challenging logistical barriers (e.g., lack of privacy in the setting, staff members’ inability to leave the secure area for extended periods of time) that prohibited in-person member checking, an activity that qualitative researchers engage in to promote the accuracy of the researcher’s representation of the participants’ perspectives (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Thus, this survey was intended to provide staff members with an opportunity to provide final feedback about the researcher’s domains of interest in lieu of in-person member checking. The survey consisted of ten open-ended items. Five items invited staff to share their perceptions about and examples of ways that staff members’ actions generally promote a rehabilitative aim. Four items invited staff to comment on their perceptions of how their personal beliefs and values, staff culture, organizational climate, and leadership affect how they do their work. A final question invited staff to provide any additional information that they believe the researcher should know or understand about the detention setting. Participants could choose to respond or skip any question on the survey and could complete the survey at their own pace. A total of 11 staff members returned a survey via the secure online survey hosting website, SurveyMonkey. All surveys with at least one completed question were retained and used as research data. Ten returned surveys included at least one complete item; one survey was not included in this study as it did not include any completed items. Survey participants were offered a gift card in the amount of five dollars for their

participation in this portion of the study. To receive their gift card, participants were asked to choose from one of four retailers and enter their preferred method for receiving their gift card (i.e., by U.S. mail at the address of their choosing, in-person delivery by the researcher) in provided fields within the online survey document. Participants were informed that they would need to submit this information with their surveys in order to receive a gift card. Four participants partially completed the survey, and one participant provided their consent but did not complete any part of the survey. None of these five participants selected a gift card and none provided instructions for receiving their gift card. Thus, these participants did not receive a gift card.

Youth survey. In addition to observations of staff members' interactions with one another and with youth, detained youth were invited to complete a survey that assessed their perceptions of staff members' actions. This survey was created while observation data collection was in progress, in the second half of the approximately year-long duration of the data collection effort for this study. Thus, survey items were informed by the researcher's emerging understanding of practices in the setting. In addition, survey items were created to map onto trauma-informed care (TIC) principles (i.e., safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, empowerment; Falloot & Harris, 2009), one particular kind of rehabilitative framework.

This survey included sixteen items assessing youths' perceptions of staff members' engagement in actions consistent with trauma-informed care (TIC) principles (i.e., safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, empowerment; Falloot & Harris, 2009). Responses to survey items (e.g., "*Staff explain how things work at the [detention center] and why they work that way.*") were scored as frequencies (0 = Never to 5 = Always). The survey also contained three demographic items in order to obtain information about youths' self-reported race, age, and

gender. Finally, one open-ended item invited youth to share anything else that they wanted the researcher to know about their experience in the setting.

In light of our qualitative findings, we re-categorized youth survey items (sorting them into categories that, at face value, reflected themes from qualitative data). Three survey items were created with the explicit intent of mapping on to the construct of emotional safety (e.g., *“Staff are calm and act like they care about me when I am upset”*; Chronbach’s alpha = .79). Emotional safety is one aspect of safety, a key facet of multiple TIC frameworks (Fallot & Harris, 2009; Hopper et al., 2010), and an emergent rehabilitative practice in our qualitative data. Although none of the survey items were written with the intent of mapping on to this rehabilitative practice, one item (written to map onto a TIC principle, trustworthiness; Fallot & Harris, 2009) reflects youths’ perceptions of how staff members may protect their right to confidentiality (i.e., *“I believe that staff keep my information private –they don’t talk about me with people outside of the [detention center] and court system”*). Four survey items (e.g., *Staff let me ask questions about how things work at the [detention center]”*; Cronbach’s alpha = .81) examined youths’ perceptions of staff members’ practices provide youth with information and encouraging skills that maximize the likelihood of release (e.g., connecting youths’ behavior in detention to receiving a positive court report) and community success (e.g., securing a job, mentoring other youth). Four survey items (Cronbach’s alpha = .72) assessed youths’ perceptions of staff members’ investment beyond the detention setting. Two items (e.g., *“Staff care about what happens to me while I am at the [detention center] and after I leave”*) were representative of staff members’ interest in youth beyond the detention setting, while the other two items (e.g., *“Staff care about what I want and what my goals are”*) reflect how staff members *feel* about youth that may support their investment beyond detention. Finally, four

items did not fit conceptually within the rehabilitative practices that emerged in our observations. Three items (e.g., “*Staff let me choose who I want to help me*”; Cronbach’s alpha = .71) assessed youths’ ability to make choices in the setting and staff members’ perceptions that youth are equipped to make their own choices. One additional item regarding dependability was also not captured well by any of the observed rehabilitative domains (i.e., “*Staff do what they say they are going to do*”).

The average length of detainment in the setting was approximately 21 days. To ensure that youth participants had an opportunity to experience the setting, youth who had been detained for at least 10 days, and who were not ward of the state, were invited to participate in the survey. Youth who were invited to complete the survey were provided with an informed assent describing the nature and purpose of the survey. Although detention staff members were aware of which youth were being invited to complete the survey, the assent process and survey completion took place in a closed contact visit room. Although staff members were not physically present, the entry door to the closed contact visit room had a small window that would allow staff members walking by visual access to the room. Additionally, like all other secure areas of the setting, this room contained a video camera and intercom, both of which were accessible to the master control operator. To ensure youth’s privacy, detention leaders communicated to staff that they were not to engage in visual or audio monitoring of the contact visit room, except in case of an emergency. Occasionally, youth were detained for one to several months. These youth were invited to complete the survey at multiple time points (i.e., at least three weeks apart). However, due to diminishing sample size across time points, the present study used data collected at youths’ first participation time point.

Detained youth could not be provided directly with monetary compensation for their participation. The researcher donated \$5.00 worth of supplies/equipment to the detention center for each youth who participated (and for each subsequent participation for those youth who were invited to participate more than once). Youth were provided with an opportunity to vote for their preference for particular supplies/equipment at the end of the survey. The categories of supplies/equipment reflected in the survey document were suggested to the researcher by detention staff and detained youth and approved by the detention superintendent. Perceptual data collected from youth provide information that spoke to their experiences of the setting and their interactions with staff, as they aligned (or not) with rehabilitative practices cast in a trauma-informed care framework.

In total, twenty-eight youth completed at least one survey, which was included as data in the present study. African American youth were represented by the majority of the sample (75% (N = 21). Most participants were male (78%, N = 22) and, on average, 15 years old (Range: 12 – 17). A majority of participants (N = 21) provided a written response to the open-ended item at the end of the survey (i.e., *“Please use the space below to write anything you want me to know about your experience at the [detention center]”*).

Data Analysis

Transcribed field notes were analyzed using NVivo (version 10 for Macintosh) qualitative data analysis software. Multiple strategies were employed throughout the process of coding. First, field notes were reviewed and staff member’s observed interactions with youth, one another, and the researcher were coded as instances characterized as aligned or misaligned with rehabilitative aims. To further generate emerging codes and alternative interpretations of data and themes, the researcher engaged in peer debriefing. This occurred with team members

who transcribed the audio files into written field notes but who were not involved in the data collection process and with an additional team member who supervised the research process but was not directly involved in data collection or transcription.

To promote rigor throughout the research process and resulting interpretation of the data, the researcher invoked classic qualitative validity criteria, which parallels traditional quantitative validity criteria (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Specifically, credibility (internal validity) was advanced via the researcher's long-term engagement in the setting, persistent observation (i.e., the researcher's immersion in the setting to understand context and culture), peer debriefing, negative case analysis, member checks (via open-ended survey completed by staff once data collection was complete), and progressive subjectivity (via field notes recorded after each observation). Transferability (external validity) was advanced through the researcher's engagement in "thick description" of the observed instances of themes to locate them in context, thus allowing the reader to judge the transferability of findings to other settings. Finally, dependability (reliability) was facilitated through the researcher's tracking and accounting for, throughout the research process, shifts in the themes and interpretations and rationale for these decisions.

Survey data collected from youth were analyzed to uncover patterns or trends in youths' perceptions of their interactions with staff members; the small sample size limited our ability to engage in quantitative analyses beyond a descriptive level. Trends uncovered in the survey data were examined in light of the findings from qualitative data to explore the extent to which youths' survey responses supported qualitative results and to highlight ways in which youths' perceptions and staff members' observed actions may align (or not). As "consumers" in the setting, youths' perspectives offer important insights into their experience of staff members'

practices. Thus, these perceptual data are an important, as they illuminate youths' own lived experience of the setting.

The current study was interested in exploring rehabilitative practices through a mixed methods framework and hinged on two primary assumptions. First, this study assumed, in line with a post-positivist stance (e.g., Ponterotto, 2005), the presence of observable patterns in staff members' interactions with youth that could be understood and categorized as rehabilitative practices. Further, a goal of this stance is that understanding the phenomenon of interest (i.e., rehabilitative practices) results in an increased ability to predict or control it (i.e., more successful implementation of these practices). Second, this study assumed that multiple realities are evident in this study (i.e., staff members, detained youth, the researcher), which provided valuable information about the construct of interest, rehabilitative practices. Though this study aimed to uncover and describe the nature of rehabilitative practices in the setting, this was achieved through the researcher's immersion in the setting and efforts to understand these practices in context, both of the setting itself and of the lived experiences of members in the setting. We believe that these two assumptions work together to enrich findings related to rehabilitative practices in the setting. Within the socially constructed realities in the setting, patterns of behaviors and beliefs emerged that collectively evidence the presence of rehabilitative practices with the understanding that not all members would necessarily agree nor experience these practices in the same way. Though qualitative findings were primary in this study, quantitative findings carried legitimate weight, as these findings provide an important perspective that may support qualitative findings or hint at future areas of exploration via divergent findings. Qualitative and quantitative findings promoted the pursuit of mixed methods purposes of *complementarity* (Greene, 1989; 2007). Findings from qualitative and quantitative

methods employed in this study were integrated in order to deepen and broaden our understanding of rehabilitative practices in the setting, and the convergence or divergence of findings was welcome (e.g., Greene, 2007).

The resulting interpretation is based on the emergent themes grounded in observational data, supported a theory of rehabilitative practices that emerged in the context of genuine relationships forged between staff members and detained youth.

Results

Youth were in constant contact with staff (i.e., line staff, supervisors, superintendent) throughout their detainment, as staff members were required to be in the physical presence of youth at all times, with few exceptions (i.e., when youth were alone in their rooms or a day room). Indeed, even when youth were not in the constant physical presence of staff, they were monitored via video/and or audio by a staff member in the master control room, who had video and/or audio access to all secured areas of detention. Additionally, staff members were required to perform in-person checks around the clock, including when youth were sleeping, every 15 minutes. These checks required that staff members visit every single day room and individual room. Therefore, even youth who were in their rooms or a dayroom would have been in regular contact with staff throughout the day. Additionally, youth relied on staff to provide for their basic needs and required permission or oversight to engage in typical everyday activities (e.g., recreation, phone calls), as youths' movement and freedom in the setting was restricted via physical structures (e.g., detainment in secure, electronically monitored rooms) and detention rules (e.g., staff accompany youth from one room to another, youth must get permission to leave their seat).

Staff accompanied detained youth to all scheduled activities (e.g., school, court appearances, recreation, evening groups) throughout the day. Primarily, this was to ensure physical safety (e.g., minimize the potential for physical altercations between youth). Additionally, youths' verbal interactions were a particular focus of staff monitoring given that many detained youth were still being processed through the court. Talking about their cases could increase the likelihood that youth may make self-incriminating statements, which staff members may be obligated to report to the court. Thus, staff generally engaged in efforts (e.g., verbal redirection/reminders) to deter youth from revealing personal information. It is largely through these daily activities, which were generally embedded within codified setting procedures and policies, that detention staff members inserted their own style and approaches in their interactions with youth.

The promotion of a rehabilitative aim is often promoted via programmatic efforts, such as policies and procedures. However, in the present study, observation data analysis efforts attended carefully to staff/youth interactions to examine the emergence of rehabilitative practices and the lack thereof in the context of staff members' daily interactions with youth. Thus, the focus in this study was on actions taken by staff, which were generally embedded within mandated setting procedures or protocol, that promoted a rehabilitative aim (i.e., detained youths' competencies and/or skills that will support their ability to succeed as members of the community). For example, staff members are required to orient youth to detention center rules and procedures at intake, a policy that in and of itself is supportive of a rehabilitative aim. The extent to which the interaction was coded and understood in this study as an action that supports rehabilitation was located in the staff members' demonstrated agency. For example, staff members may respond in a variety of ways to a youth who questions why particular rules are in place in the setting. The

resulting interaction between the staff and youth would be coded as rehabilitative if, for example, the staff member responded by validating the youths' perspective and providing a thorough explanation of the rules. The interaction would not be coded as rehabilitative and would be understood as counter to a rehabilitative aim if, for example, the staff member refused to respond to the youth or outright dismissed the youths' questions.

The most salient overarching finding is that rehabilitative practices were most evident in this study when staff connected with youth on a personal level. Thus, it was in the broad context of genuine relationships, which were observed to extend beyond youths' detainment in the setting, that rehabilitative actions were present in routine practices in the setting. Further, it is worth noting that the researcher observed rehabilitative practices in action often; Analyses of observation data indicated that rehabilitative practices took the following four forms: a) promotion of detained youths' emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) promotion of youths' successful navigation of detention, and d) extended relationships with youth. Further, these practices were observed across four critical detention contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) after youth returned to the community. The first two contexts involved direct interactions between staff and currently detained youth. Staff-only contexts included spaces outside of staff members' contact with youth, though still inside the detention setting, where staff engaged in actions that effected (or had the potential to effect) detained youths' experiences. Finally, some staff members continued to interact with youth after they had returned to the community. Defining characteristics of each practice and salient examples, as they occurred across critical contexts, are presented below in turn. Additionally, observed instances in which staff members' actions

were not rehabilitative, that is, missed opportunities for engaging in rehabilitative practices, were explored. Finally, youth survey responses were examined in light of findings from the observation data as a complementary perspective. See Table 1 for a summary of emergent rehabilitative practices and the critical contexts in which they emerged; Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for youth survey item responses.

Rehabilitative Practice: Promoting Youths' Emotional Safety

Practices that promoted emotional safety were characterized by staff members' recognition and validation of youths' emotions and experiences that were incorporated into their understanding of and response to youth. Examples of staff members' engagement in practices that promoted youths' emotional safety were observed across three critical contexts (i.e., staff-led group activities, routine contact between staff and individual youth, and among staff outside of their contact with youth in staff-only spaces).

Practices that promoted emotional safety were evident in staff-led group activities. During the staff-led evening group, for example, youth received feedback about their behavior and suggestions for improvement from staff members and other detained youth. Staff members exhibited differing personal styles when running the groups, and emotional safety emerged when staff members encouraged youth to focus on what they were doing well, in terms of their behavior, in addition to what they could improve. Importantly, in the context of providing suggestions for improving behavior, these staff emphasized their belief that the youth was capable of good behavior. These staff would say things like, "*I know you'll do better tomorrow,*" and often coupled these statements with a discussion intended to help youth brainstorm future behavior. These interactions were critical because they fostered a climate in which youth could safely discuss behavior infractions and focus on the future. Creating this kind of environment

may be particularly important in juvenile detention settings, where youth may be inclined to perceive themselves in a negative way. Notably, youth were observed throughout the study either referring to themselves, or stating their belief that others see them, as “*criminals*” or “*thugs*.” Thus, staff members’ communicated beliefs about youths’ ability to “do better tomorrow” may serve as an important counter-narrative to youths’ internalized beliefs about themselves.

Staff members’ engagement in practices that promote youths’ emotional safety were also observed in the context of routine contact between staff and youth. A salient example of this practice emerged when a youth approached a staff member in the detention library to inquire about his ability to participate in recreation that day. Prior to detainment, this youth sustained an injury for which he was still required to wear an arm brace. The youth asked to speak with this staff member in order to negotiate his attendance and participation in recreation. Once the staff member had listened to the youth’s request, he began his response by validating the youth’s experience; he told him he could understand that sitting out during recreation was not fun. He explained to the youth that he could not, due to detention center policies, let the youth participate in recreation until he had seen and been cleared by a doctor. The youth was visibly dissatisfied with the staff member’s response; he requested that the staff member call his guardian, who would surely give him permission to participate in recreation. The staff member and the youth went back and forth on these two points for a few minutes. As this was happening, the staff member remained calm and visibly engaged with the youth (e.g., leaned forward, made eye contact, nodded) and repeated and explained, in a variety of different ways, his reasons for denying participation. Finally, the staff member offered an alternative solution; the youth could attend recreation, but he could not participate. The youth considered this solution with a look of disappointment. The staff member acknowledged his feelings, saying, “*I know this isn’t the*

answer you wanted.” The youth agreed that going but not participating was better than not going at all. The staff member ended the conversation by telling the youth the exact date that he would see the doctor and reminding him that this would be the earliest that he would be cleared for participation in recreation.

The above example is characterized as promoting emotional safety because the staff member treated the youths’ emotions and concerns and important and communicated and incorporated his understanding of the youths’ perspective throughout the response. Indeed, emotional safety may be a particularly important element of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention given the relationships between experiences of trauma and engagement in delinquency (e.g., Conseur, Rivara, & Emanuel, 1997) and the growing evidence to support the effectiveness of trauma-informed care (e.g., Kos et al., 2008; Azeem, Aujla, Rammerth, Binsfield, & Jones, 2011; Maikoetter, 2011), of which emotional safety is a key component (e.g., Fallot & Harris, 2009; Hopper, Bassuk, & Olivet, 2010). Importantly, staff members’ engagement in practices that promoted youths’ emotional safety, such as the example above, are understood as rehabilitative because they model emotion regulation skills and create a space for staff and youth to build relationships characterized by emotional support and trust.

Additionally, emotional safety commonly emerged in staff members’ reported understanding of youths’ disruptive or rule-breaking behaviors and subsequent response based on this. Many staff described these types of behaviors in terms of youths’ experience with recent upsetting events (e.g., rough day in court, argument with guardian during a phone call), rather than viewing the behavior as located solely within the youth. Upon returning from court, for example, a youth who had just received word that he would be charged as an adult lashed out at a staff member when she approached him in dayroom to talk about what had happened in court. In

response to being approached by the staff member, the youth angrily paced the dayroom and cursed at her loudly. When probed about the incident, the staff member attributed his behavior to his emotional state given the news from court rather than viewing it as a personal attack. Generally, explanations of youths' behavior rooted in their experiences, such as an upsetting event or previous trauma, translated into actions that promoted emotional safety within one-on-one interactions with youth. In this example, the staff member did not radio for assistance because she believed that continuing to interact with the youth with the aim of de-escalating his behavior would be the most appropriate course of action. Notably, immediately following the incident, the staff member did not shy away from opportunities to continue to interact with the youth while he sat in the dayroom, which facilitated his eventual gesture (i.e., apology) to repair their relationship. This staff member's actions served as a model for behavior and provided a safe context for the youth to practice self-regulation skills (e.g., by explaining the consequences of behavior, helping youth think about more effective ways to respond) and repair damaged relationships. Other observed examples of practices that promoted emotional safety in situations where staff responded to youths' disruptive behaviors were characterized by staff members respecting youths' known preferences for particular staff and knowing how to structure their approach to communicating with a youth based on an understanding of what had worked well in the past.

Staff members' efforts to engage youth one-on-one, particularly those who appeared to be struggling to adjust to detention, further demonstrated how the promotion of emotional safety emerged in the setting. A number of staff took an interest in activities that youth enjoyed and used this mutual interest as a way to form connections with them (e.g., rapping with youth, discussing sports, encouraging youth to write or draw). For example, a number of staff members

made great efforts to read newly donated books before putting them in the detention library. These staff members were often observed chatting with youth about the books they were reading. In particular, one staff member made a point to chat with youth throughout the evening as she made her rounds for mandated room checks. As she got to know the youth and the books each of them enjoyed, she began making suggestions for other books to read and plans for future book-related discussions. Importantly, these interactions provided opportunities for building rapport and sometimes paved the way for more personal discussions with youth about their concerns or feelings. These examples demonstrated that the content of staff members' discussions with youth did not necessarily need to focus on issues related to their detainment or their cases to build positive and caring relationships between youth and staff. In fact, these interactions may have served the purpose of allowing youth to figure out if they could trust staff before sharing sensitive information and may have been necessary to "grease the wheels" for future interactions.

Staff members' efforts to promote emotional safety for youth in the setting also emerged in staff-only contexts. Staff members often talked openly, with one another and the researcher, about their perceptions of discomforts and difficulties associated with detainment. Staff generally reported their recognition that living conditions in detention were uncomfortable, from the hard beds that youth sleep on, to their general lack of privacy, unappetizing meals, and lack of access to preferred hygiene items. In response to this, a number of staff members took steps to make the setting more comfortable for youth. For example, staff members collected and recycled soda cans from the break room in order to use the money to purchase new pieces of recreation equipment (e.g., basketballs, volleyballs). Other staff bought and donated special hygiene items, such as brand-name lotions and hair care products, available to youth through earned behavior points. On occasion, staff members donated items to the commissary that youth could purchase

with earned behavior tokens. Finally, noticing that youth regularly requested hot sauce during meals, a decision was made to keep hot sauce as a pantry staple and available to youth during meal times. Although these actions occurred outside of staff members' contact with youth, they served to promote emotional safety in important ways. Specifically, staff members' collective efforts evidence a culture (i.e., shared norms, values, and practices represented among members (or a subset of members) in an organization; Schein, 1990) that is supportive of rehabilitation. Importantly, culture shapes the social and technical aspects of implementation (Hemmelgarn, Glissel, & James. 2006). Thus, staff members' shared understanding of the discomforts and difficulties inherent in detainment settings and values and norms around having empathy for youth while detained may support their efforts to provide youth with items that make them feel more comfortable.

Notably, though the rehabilitative practices articulated in this study were distinct from one another, and presented as such for the sake of clarity, multiple categories of rehabilitative practices were observed within single interactions. This was particularly evident with regard to emotional safety, which was observed across more contexts compared to other practices. Emotional safety may therefore be considered to be an overarching practice that can enhance or promote the employment of other rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention. Not surprisingly, emotional safety figures as a prominent dimension of trauma-informed care practices, a form of rehabilitative practice that is infused in institutional settings including residential care settings (e.g., Bloom et al., 2003).

Rehabilitative Practice: Rights-based Information and Explanations

We define rights-based information and explanations as staff members' actions that promoted detained youths' knowledge or their legal rights, inside and outside of detention, and

applied understanding of these. Examples of this practice were observed across staff-led group activities and routine contact between individual youth and staff.

Staff members' engagement in the provision of rights-based information and explanations were most often observed during staff-led groups, particularly the evening group. Illustrative of this practice, two staff members who were leading an evening group took it upon themselves to provide a thorough explanation the structure and function of the juvenile justice system. To help youth understand the structure of each component of the system, one staff member listed her supervisors in the detention setting by name and continued to build outward to other juvenile justice system settings, providing the names and titles of additional key players in each (e.g., judges). Though some of these names were well known to detained youth present in the group, particularly those with a history of juvenile justice involvement, these youth as a whole were generally unaware of the function and associated boundaries of these individuals' roles. In light of the youths' lack of knowledge, both staff members took turns explaining how roles (e.g., correctional, probation, and police officers) were distinct. One staff member extended the discussion to the youths' current context of detention, framing the rules and boundaries that govern his role as a staff member (i.e., correctional officer) in terms of the detained youths' rights. He stated his opinion of the importance of rights, saying, *"It's not a small thing to take away your freedom."* Further, he provided an explanation of how staff are held accountable for following legal mandates related to detained youths' care. Importantly, he used concrete illustrations that youth could relate to (e.g., youths' rights to recreation time and adequate meals and snacks) and connected these to detention policies. He explained that refusing to provide youth with adequate recreation time for example, in addition to a violation of youths' rights, was

against detention rules and would result in disciplinary action against him, including possible termination from his job.

As the above example illustrates, some staff members took an active interest in promoting youths' awareness of their rights and how the justice system operates. Imparting this knowledge to youth may be important for a few key reasons. First, rights-based information and explanations demystify the juvenile justice system by providing youth with knowledge about how the system operates and the nature of their rights (or lack thereof) as detainees. In practice, staff members' engagement in rights-based information and explanations was observed to facilitate youths' increased understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and boundaries of key members of the juvenile justice system (e.g., correctional staff, police, judges) and the boundaries of their own rights and agency as minors and as detainees. Together, these may present youth with another lens through which to view and understand their experiences. Further, staff members' engagement in rights-based information and explanations may also increase youths' ability to understand and articulate appropriate expectations (including potential violations of their rights) of juvenile justice system setting operations and the actions of individuals (e.g., detention staff) within this system. In other words, youth may gain a better sense of when their rights are being violated and who in their local system may be in a position to address their concerns. Further, rights-based explanations may assist youth in making decisions that support their success once released. For example, staff members were observed explaining to a group of youth that their juvenile records were sealed and that this information is private for a reason. By providing youth with this information and encouraging them to remember this when applying for jobs (i.e., to not report juvenile convictions), youth became

more aware of their rights and able to use this information in a meaningful way to support their ability to gain employment.

Rights-based information and explanations were also observed in the context of staff members' routine contact with individual youth, including formal interactions with youth, such as during intake activities. As part of the intake process, staff members must notify youths' guardians of their detainment. During an observation of the intake process, a staff member informed a youth of her obligation to notify his parents of his detainment. When the youth provided separate contact information for his mother and father, the staff member asked the youth about his preference for which parent to call. The youth reported that he did not want to speak with his mother, and the staff member honored the youths' request to call his father instead. At this time, the staff member also paused her intake activities to inform the youth of his right to refuse to make or accept phone calls with his mother or anyone else, even if they are on his approved contact list. Further, she informed him that he may change his mind at any time about who to refuse or accept calls from. Because the youths' father could not be reached, the staff member informed the youth of her need to call his mother, stated the reason why the youths' parent needed to be contacted (i.e., because the youth is a minor), and asked the youth if he understood and was okay with this. Notably, by checking in with the youth about his preference and again when the staff member had to call the youths' mother, this example also illustrates a staff members' engagement in action that promoted the youths' autonomy and decision-making.

The example above is a particularly useful illustration of how rights-based explanations can promote youths' ability to make more informed choices in the context of detainment. Though detention may not represent a youths' first contact with the justice system (e.g., arrest often precedes detainment), intake may be a particularly important context for rights-based

information and explanations, as this is the first introduction that youth have to the detention setting and early in their involvement in the larger juvenile justice system. Knowing the boundaries of their rights while detained may help youth adjust to the setting by promoting realistic expectations up front about what they will and will not be able to do during their stay. Indeed, empirically supported interventions aimed at reducing oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behaviors in children and adolescents, such as Parent Management Training (Kazdin, 2005), emphasize the necessity of communicating behavior expectations and limits in advance (“prompts;” “setting behavior”) to support youths’ ability to develop and enact expected behaviors. Thus, communicating detained youths’ rights and limits of those rights provides youth with a better understanding of what will be deemed acceptable behavior in the setting, which, in turn, may support youths’ success in the setting (i.e., curb disruptive behavior). Rights-based information is all the more important for this population given that, by and large, youth included as part of observations in this study were observed to report a lack of information about their rights, in and out of detention.

Rehabilitative Practice: Promoting Successful Navigation of Detention

We defined practices that promoted youths’ successful navigation of detention center in terms of actions that aimed to teach youth how to do what was necessary to maximize their likelihood of release from detention and success in the community. Examples of staff members’ engagement in practices that promoted youths’ successful navigation of the juvenile justice setting were observed in the context of staff-led group activities.

Within staff-led group activities, these practices often emerged in evening groups in response to youths’ perceptions of their grades and staff members’ guidance in helping youth set weekly behavior goals. Evening shift staff provided youth with feedback about their behavior,

which included a numerical grade for each of four periods throughout the day. Importantly, feedback and grades were determined and recorded by day shift staff. Because of this, discrepancies between the feedback and grades that youth thought they deserved and what they were actually given were difficult and often impossible for evening shift to resolve. Evening staff varied with regard to whether they allowed youth to voice their thoughts about their feedback or grades. In instances where staff allowed youth to voice their opinions about their grades, they often encouraged youth to focus on doing what they needed to do in order to maximize their chances of receiving a good behavior report for court, regardless of whether this seemed “*fair*” or not. For example, when a youth voiced his concern that particular staff members gave him lower grades because they dislike him, the group leader probed for information about the interactions that resulted in the youths’ low grade. In doing so, the youth stated that he “*talked back*” to staff when he became upset about something they said to him. The group leader encouraged the youth to think about how his behavior report will look when he goes to court. Acknowledging that he may believe it is unfair that he should ignore the staff members’ comments, the group leader reminded him that staff are ultimately in charge and grades are at their discretion. The group leader pointed out that the youth is unlikely to win a disagreement with staff. Therefore, the youth’s best course of action would be to focus on what is effective rather than what is fair. Though the staff member did not provide the youth with specific suggestions for how to handle his feelings, by encouraging him to focus on behavior that had the potential to get him out of detention as fast as possible, the staff member was encouraging the youth to use emotion regulation skills to manage his behavior in the setting. Indeed, the notion that the youth should accept the situation for what it is and try to let go of emotions that prevent him from being effective is akin to the idea of “*radical acceptance*,” a skill that is incorporated in models of

therapy that aim to increase planful problem solving and emotions regulations (e.g., Dialectical Behavior Therapy; see Linehan, 1993; Miller, Rathus, & Linehan, 2007).

Additionally, in the context of staff-led group activities, staff members stated their hopes and beliefs related to youths' future success. During an observed evening group, the staff member leading the group filled the few remaining minutes by inviting youth to share information about something they are personally interested in (e.g., a hobby or favorite celebrity). The staff member listened to each youth's response, and then guided them toward sharing their goals for the future. The staff member connected these goals (e.g., owning a fleet of expensive cars) to youths' ability to successfully stay out of trouble, stay in school, and get a good job. This staff shared her hope that at least one of these youth would go to college and come back to work in the detention center as a line staff member. Initially, the youth balked at this suggestion. The staff member persisted, explaining her opinion that youth would benefit from a role model with lived experience of the justice system and that detention staff make a living wage with benefits, which could really help them if they have a family. As previously discussed, staff members' communicated hope for and belief in youths' future success may provide important counter narratives to youths' negative perceptions of themselves and how others may view them (e.g., "*thugs*"). As this example illustrates, some staff members recognized the utility in youths' experiences of the juvenile justice system and reflected this to youth in terms of potential skills and strengths that could facilitate their ability to relate to and mentor juvenile-justice involved youth in the future.

Rehabilitative Practice: Extended Relationships with Youth

This practice was characterized by staff members' genuine concern with and efforts to facilitate contact and relationships with youth the extended after youth had been released from

detention. Examples of staff members' engagement in practices that evidenced their concern for maintaining relationships with youth beyond the setting were observed in staff-only spaces and in the context of interactions between staff and youth living in the local community.

Observations of staff members' activities outside of their interactions with detained youth demonstrated that staff work together to keep in touch with youth who have been released and support youths' success in the community. Staff members reported taking up collections with their own money to send care packages to youth who were moved to a group home or foster care placement, and they openly shared their concern about these youths' whereabouts and their frustrations surrounding institutional barriers (e.g., agencies only allowing youth to have contact with family members) that impeded their ability to sustain long-term ties to the youth.

A number of detention staff members remained in contact with formerly detained youth. These youth, some of whom are now adults, sometimes called the detention center to say hello and provide updates about their lives; one staff member reported that the detention center receives, on average, about two to three calls per week from formerly detained youth. When these calls were observed, the phone was regularly passed around between multiple staff, who eagerly waited for their turn to say hello and catch up with youth. Of note, multiple staff discussed using their free time to serve as mentors or social supports for youth. A number of staff members were observed discussing their plans to spend time with youth, such as going to the movies or attending youths' sporting events.

Notably, staff members who remained in contact with youth differed greatly with regard to their stated opinions about delinquency and rehabilitation and their observed implementation of rehabilitative practices. Detention staff, on the whole, reported that they generally cared about the youth they work with at some level, though they differed with regard to their understanding

of the causes and optimal solutions for delinquency. Thus, the actions of staff members suggested that they willingly shift their role from “correctional officer” to mentor in their interactions with formerly detained youth, or perhaps that they viewed mentorship as part of their role as a staff members all along. Indeed, several staff members reported in the exit survey their belief that their role as a staff member is to be a mentor for the youth they come into contact with (e.g., *“I think that what many of them need is a stable parent type figure that they can respect, and that is how I try to be.”*). As this study did not involve observations of staff members interacting with formerly detained youth outside of the detention center, beyond staff members’ self-reports and observed phone calls between staff and formerly detained youth, we cannot characterize staff members’ in-person interactions.

Importantly, sustained relationships with youth were viewed by a number of staff members as rewarding, though sometimes frustrating, and certainly not without personal cost. By connecting with youth, staff members opened themselves to hope for the youths’ futures as well as the possibility of disappointment and heartbreak, often repeatedly for those youth who re-entered the justice system. Staff members’ hope was evident in their interactions with formerly detained youth who called the detention facility to catch up and in their descriptions of surprise run-ins with youth in the community. At the same time, staff members expressed a range and sometimes mixture of emotions in response to a youths’ return to the detention center. Sometimes, staff members expressed sadness or disappointment, particularly when they perceived that the youth possessed some set of skills or characteristics that “should” have contributed to his or her success in the community. At other times, staff expressed anger upon a youth’s return. For example, a number of staff members, including those who were observed to be high implementers of rehabilitative practices in their daily routines, reported feeling angry

when a likeable youth returned to detention facing a very serious adult charge. These staff expressed being upset that they had invested so much of their time in this particular youth; the youth was viewed as someone who had a chance and blew it. Other times, staff members expressed hopelessness. A number of staff had been around long enough to see generations of families cycle through the juvenile justice system. Some staff members viewed the entry or re-entry of these youth, as well as youth who returned often, as inevitable. Finally, staff members were often aware of youths' histories or ongoing experiences of victimization. Staff members sometimes breathed sighs of relief at the sight of some returning youth; being in detention was viewed as one of the few or only places where these youth were guaranteed safety from physical harm.

Missed Opportunities: The Absence of Rehabilitative Practices

Although rehabilitative practices were evident in a variety of contexts, these practices were not consistently implemented across staff members. Importantly, negative case analyses of observation data highlighted a number of missed opportunities in which staff were observed engaging in activities that did not promote a rehabilitative aim. Illustrations of some key missed opportunities, which highlighted potential targets for intervention or training with staff, are discussed below.

Although observations conducted during the evening staff-led groups yielded a number of exemplars of implementation, these groups also served as a context in which important examples of missed opportunities (i.e., implementation failure) were evident. First, some staff members were not open to engaging youth in discussions beyond the bare minimum required to provide them with their grades for the day and/or select weekly goals. In these instances, staff may have opted to shut down, for example, discussions about youths' grades that could have

served as opportunities for staff to teach or model skills for youth. Second, the nature of the grade sheets themselves may have contributed to observed missed opportunities. Several staff members, across day and evening shifts, expressed frustration about the inconsistency of feedback provided on youths' daily grade sheets. In particular, staff indicated that these sheets were often characterized by a lack of feedback. Detailed grade sheets were important because they affected the extent to which evening shift staff could relay specific feedback and suggestions for improving behavior. Vague comments, such as "*good work*," gave evening shift staff relatively little to build upon when helping youth generate ideas for improving behavior or earning more points. Finally, in some instances, youth reported that they were never redirected by staff for a certain behavior (e.g., talking to another youth without permission) and therefore believed that being marked down by the same staff member was unfair. Because staff members were not always consistent in their enforcement of rules (as observed by the researcher and corroborated by staff members' comments in the exit survey), such as youth talking to one another, youth may have been less clear about behavior expectations. In the absence of explicit reminders about the rules or redirection from staff, youth may have mistakenly perceived that their behavior was sanctioned, thus leading to potential confusion and negative perceptions of their relationships with some staff. These missed opportunities could be attributed to a number of factors, though individual staff members' attitudes may have played a role. Indeed, some staff members reported beliefs that detained youth were incapable of making positive change and/or that rehabilitation is ineffective or inappropriate for detention. Importantly, beliefs oriented toward a punitive stance may contribute to staff members' decrease commitment to the setting (Lambert, Hogan, Barton, Jiang, & Baker, 2010), which, in this case, may translate into decreased willingness to provide detailed and specific feedback for youth. Other meaningful

factors, such as staff members' time to complete grade sheets and communication across shifts, may have also affected staff members' ability to spend time writing feedback.

Additionally, staff members' orientation to physical safety as a primary concern may be at least partially responsible for some observed missed opportunities. Given that a main purpose of detention is to provide safe and secure housing for youth while they are processed through the court, the promotion of physical safety for youth and staff is evident in the physical structure of detention as well as the policies and procedures. Indeed, physical safety is viewed as central, for example, to trauma-informed care (e.g., Falloot & Harris, 2009), one framework for conceptualizing rehabilitative practices. However, important trade-offs resulted from this encompassing focus on reducing physical safety risks for staff and youth in detention. For example, mandatory strip searches that occurred at every youth's intake may be viewed by staff as promoting physical safety by ensuring that youth do not bring in objects to the setting that could be used to harm themselves or someone else and by serving as a point of potential identification of youth who show physical signs of abuse or neglect. However, this practice may feel overly invasive for youth and potentially triggering, particularly for youth who have experienced abuse or who may not understand the purpose of the search. Practices such as these may be non-negotiable. Therefore, staff members' may need to engage rehabilitative practices, such as a rights-based explanation for the purpose and steps involved in the search, coupled with actions that promote emotional safety, such as discussing the search with youth in an empathic way and/or providing returning youth with the option of choosing a same-sex staff member on duty with whom they are most comfortable to make the process feel as safe as possible.

Finally, while many staff members were observed engaging in activities that communicated a genuine interest in detained youths' preferred activities and creative expressions,

this was not uniform across staff. Some interests were viewed as more appropriate or worthwhile compared to others. This was particularly clear, for example, when it came to youths' interest in rap music and stated aspirations to become a rapper. In some instances, staff members' responses were openly dismissive of youths' interest in making their own rap music. Follow ups with some of these staff indicated that supporting youths' interest in rap music was viewed as giving them false hope or condoning a lifestyle that glorified crime. Though research examining rap music has linked messages in rap music to negative outcomes (e.g., aggression and substance use; Chen, Miller, Grube, & Waiters, 2006), there is growing evidence to support the utility of rap music in therapeutic interventions (e.g., Gonzalez & Hayes, 2009) and social change efforts (e.g., Clay, 2006) with youth, particularly members of minority racial/ethnic groups. Staff members' negative response to youths' interest in rap music may reflect a lack of cultural understanding of rap as a legitimate form of expression. These staff members viewed rapping as the youths' chosen outlet for expression and focused on the utility of this. Thus, staff members' lack of interest in or attempts to understand youths' personal goals or hobbies was viewed as a missed opportunity. As previously discussed, staff members often focused their efforts to engage youth through discussions with youth about their personal interests or goals. For some youth and staff, these interactions allowed youth to build the foundation of their relationship on neutral or positive topics that could pave the way for future interactions that were more sensitive in nature.

Detained Youths' Perceptions

In addition to observational data, youth provided their perceptions of detention practices via survey. Given that detained youth are the targets of rehabilitative practices, and often excluded from research, their perceptions provide an important perspective on rehabilitative practices in this study. Thus, survey data was examined in light of findings from observational

data and these findings were integrated in pursuit of the mixed methods purpose of *complementarity* (Greene, 1989; Greene, 2007); that is, to extend and deepen our understanding of the nature of rehabilitative practices in the setting.

On the whole, youths' average responses indicated only moderate endorsement of their perceptions of rehabilitative practices in the setting as indicated by the 16 survey items. The average response for eight out of sixteen items indicated that youth perceived that staff members engaged in these practices between "Not very often" and "Sometimes" (where 2 = "Not very often" and 3 = "Sometimes" on a scale of 0 -5, where 0 = "Not at all/Never" and 5 = "Always"). Regarding the other eight items, the average response was higher, falling between "Sometimes" and "Most of the time" (where 3 = "Sometimes" and 4 = "Most of the time" on a scale of 0 -5, where 0 = "Not at all/Never" and 5 = "Always"). Of particular note, observed ranges in youths' responses and variability associated with each item suggested that youth were not uniform regarding their perceptions of the frequency of staff members' employment of rehabilitative practices (*SDs* were observed to range from 1.11 to 1.81). Particular practices, as they speak to observation data results and additional domains of interest are described in more detail below. Descriptive statistics for each survey item, organized relative to the rehabilitative domains with which they tap into, are presented in Table 2.

Emotional safety. Practices that promoted youths' emotional safety were characterized by staff members' recognition, validation, and incorporation of youths' emotions and experiences into their understanding of and responses to youth. Youths' average responses to these items that assessed emotional safety were at or slightly above the midpoint of the scale (i.e., between "Not very often" and "Sometimes" for two items, "Sometimes" for one item) and the responses represented the entire rating scale (0 – 5). Variability in youths' perceptions was

evident (*SDs* range: 1.39 – 1.79). A total of 12 youth provided responses to these items that were all above the midpoint of the scale (“3” or higher), twelve youths’ responses were a mixture of ratings above and below the midpoint of the scale, and four youth provided responses to all three items that were below the midpoint of the scale (“2” or lower). Youths’ open-ended responses provided some assistance in contextualizing their items responses. For example, one youth whose responses to emotional safety were all above the midpoint of the scale wrote, *“I think the staff here at the [detention center] are real, and they encourage me [a lot], to try and stay out of trouble and they really care about me. They also make sure I’m safe while I’m in here.”* Thus, some youth reported generally positive responses and high perceptions of the implementation of this rehabilitative practice. Conversely, some youth were less positive in their endorsement. Several of youths’ open-ended responses indicated a mixture of negative and positive experiences with staff. For example, one youth whose responses to these items were a mixture of below and above the midpoint of the scale wrote, *“Most staff members don’t really care and the ones that do are retiring in a couple years. [A]nyway the ones who don’t tell you they don’t [like you].”* Thus, complementary to findings from observation data, that staff members are not uniform in their engagement in practices that promote emotional safety, detained youth may be well attuned to which staff members they can and cannot rely upon for support.

Rights-based information/explanations. Although youths’ responses to items assessing this rehabilitative practice spanned the full range (0-5), the average response was above the midpoint of the scale ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.55$), with the average response falling between “Sometimes” and “Most of the time.” Though youths’ open-ended responses did not provide information that could contextualize their perceptions of this particular item. However, the variability indicates that some youth were more of less certain that staff members would protect

their information. Given that youth who were observed discussing their rights with staff members reported, by and large, a lack of knowledge, youth who responded to the survey may not be uniformly aware that staff members are bound by policy and law to keep youths' information private outside of the justice system. One potential interpretation of the responses to this item then, is that informing youth of their rights and staff members' boundaries may facilitate trust between youth and staff.

Successful navigation of detention. Youths' average responses to all four items in this scale were above the midpoint of the scale, falling between "Sometimes" and "Most of the time," and demonstrated variability (*SDs* range: 1.11 – 1.42), indicating a generally positive average perception that staff members' interactions with youth support youths' success that was not uniformly shared across youth. Most youth ($N = 17$) rated all items in this scale above the midpoint ("3" or higher), followed by a mixture of above and below the midpoint ($N = 10$), and only one youth rated all items below the midpoint of the scale ("2" or lower). Again, a number of youth demonstrated a mixture of positive and negative perceptions, as illustrated by this open-ended response from a youth who had rated all items in this scale above the midpoint, "*I think [staff member] gets attitude sometimes and he gives kids a bad report (grades). I think [staff member] is good. I like working with her. She keeps it real. She tries to help you get out of here.*" Thus, variability captured in these items may reflect a wholesale difference among youth regarding their experience with staff, while open-ended responses reveal that youth perceive some staff as helpful and others as not.

Extended relationships with youth. Youths' average responses to three of the four items in this scale fell at about the midpoint of the scale, between "Not very often" and "Sometimes." The average response to one item ("*Staff care about what happens to me while*

I'm at the [detention center] and after I leave") was slightly higher, above the midpoint of the scale, between "Sometimes" and "Most of the time" (SDs range for all items: 1.34-1.81). Thus, youths' responses were generally positive, though not overwhelmingly so. Most youths' responses (N = 17) included ratings above and below the midpoint of the scale. Fewer youth (N = 8) responded to each item with a rating above the midpoint of the scale ("3" or higher) and fewer (N = 3) responded to all items with a rating below the midpoint of the scale. None of the youths' open-ended responses provided additional information about this domain. Notably, staff members do not keep in contact with all youth post-detainment. Indeed, the youth with whom staff do keep in contact with may possess particular characteristics (e.g., likeability, perceived as well-behaved in detention) that separate them from youth who staff do not maintain contact with. Thus, youths' perceptions of the extent to which staff take an active interest in their lives and care about them post-detainment is an area that is worth additional exploration, particularly given that our observations do not allow us to characterize interactions between youth and staff that occurred outside of the detention setting or observe particular patterns in staff members' choices for who they keep in contact with.

Additional areas of interest. Four items did not fit conceptually within the rehabilitative practices that emerged in our observations. The content of these were examined to explore additional possible themes of interest that were not captured by observational data. Conceptually, these items point to two additional areas: choice and staff reliability.

Choice. Three items reflected youths' perceptions of their ability to make choices in the setting and staff members' perceptions that youth are equipped to make their own choices. Youths' responses, on average were approximately at the midpoint of the scale (between "Not very often" and "Sometime") for two items. Youths' average response to one item ("Staff

believe that I know how to make decisions for myself”) was slightly higher than the midpoint of the scale, between “Sometimes” and “Most of the time” (*SDs* range: 1.25 – 1.54). Again, within participant responses varied to some extent, and all potential ratings (0-5) were represented. Most youth (N = 15) responded to the three items with a combination of ratings above and below the midpoint of the scale. Several youth (N = 9) were more generous in their ratings and responded to all items with a rating above the midpoint of the scale (“3” or higher), and relatively few youth (N = 4) rated each item below the midpoint of the scale (“2” or lower). A few open-ended responses addressed youths’ perceptions of the restrictiveness of the setting. For example, one youth reported that *“The [detention center] is like bootcamp, it’s like they make sure you can’t do anything and [it’s] like a strict place [...]”* Other youth reported on specific instances in which they lack control, such deciding when to be in or out of their rooms or their inability to talk freely with other detained youth. Given the emphasis on restricting youths’ autonomy, including freedom in decision-making for the sake of staff members’ ability to maintain order and physical safety in the setting, it is possible that choice operated in very small and subtle ways that were missed by the researcher, and thus not captured as part of the observations that took place in the setting. Choice in the setting may also be subsumed into the proposed categories of rehabilitative practices. Indeed, though there were relatively few observed opportunities for youth to have choice in the setting, youth were often able to, for example, request to speak with particular staff members when they needed assistance or support. Because these instances often occurred in moments where youth were experiencing strong emotions and seeking staff members who they believed would support them, this and related examples of choice were understood as operating within and promoting a more general rehabilitative practice - emotional safety.

Staff dependability. Finally, one item was not captured well by any of the observed rehabilitative domains. This item touched on youths' perception of staff members' dependability (i.e., "*Staff do what they say they are going to do*"; $M = 2.75$, $SD = 1.11$). Youths' average response was at approximately the midpoint of the scale (between "Not very often" and "Sometimes"), and the full range of possible ratings (0-5) was represented. Youths' open-ended responses did not shed light on this particular item. It may be the case, as supported by observational findings, that the variability across staff with regard to their interaction style and actions created a generally inconsistent climate that could be reflected in youths' responses to this item. For example, one staff member may allow a youth to sit in a day room when she writes in her journal while another requires that she sit in her room. Thus, the youth may perceive that staff members, generally, do not do what they say they will do (i.e., let her sit in a preferred location while she journals). Many staff members reported throughout observation data collection that such inconsistencies are a source of frustration for them and for the youth. Thus, dependability (as perceived by youth) may be related to staff members' consistent implementation of practices, such as consequences and privileges, in the setting.

Discussion

Growing empirical evidence supports the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth (e.g., Lipsey, 1999; Lipsey, 2009). This study addressed critical gaps in the current literature by exploring and defining rehabilitative practices that are infused throughout the daily routine of detention staff members. Interactions between detained youth and detention staff were studied via the employment of ethnographic observations. Results of this study demonstrate the centrality of personal relationships between staff and detained youth in supporting four primary forms of rehabilitative practices: a) promotion of detained

youths' emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) promotion of youths' successful navigation of detention, and d) extended relationships with youth. Indeed, these practices were observed across four critical contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) after youth returned to the community.

The relationships between correctional staff and detained youth may serve as crucial points of intervention delivery. This study builds on previous research concerning the importance of officer-youth relationships in juvenile justice contexts (e.g., Marsh & Evans, 2009, Vidal et al., 2015). Previous research has demonstrated the utility of mentorship interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth (e.g., Keating, Tomishima, Foster, & Alessandri, 2002), thus staff members' efforts to create and sustain genuine relationships with currently and formerly detained youth may have positive effects. Notably, the value of genuine, positive, and supportive relationships between detention staff and detained youth may also be viewed in the context of existing literature explicating the importance of relationships in service delivery settings. For example, research in therapeutic settings suggests that positive relational bonds (therapeutic alliance) between therapists and clients with positive treatment outcomes (Flückiger, Del Re, Wampold, Symonds, & Horvath, 2012; Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000), and research findings within domestic violence service delivery highlight the importance of *how* services are delivered (Stenius & Veysey, 2005).

It is possible for juvenile correctional staff to incorporate rehabilitative practices into their daily work. Our study found that detention staff members at all levels (i.e., line staff, supervisors, and superintendent) and across all shifts implemented rehabilitative practices in their

interactions with one another and with youth. This study provides evidence to support Lipsey's (2009) theoretical suggestion that such rehabilitative interventions may be implemented as part of routine practices. Further, this study is among the first to examine rehabilitative practices delivered by correctional staff in short term juvenile detainment and adds to the growing literature documenting rehabilitative practices that are infused throughout the setting rather than delivered as a packaged intervention (e.g., Bloom et al., 2003). Indeed, increasing the number of "brand name" programs may not be an effective route to address delinquency (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010). Thus, future research is better served by understanding what works in particular settings. Short-term detention centers in particular may present unique implementation challenges due to the secure and restrictive nature of the setting and youths' relatively brief stays.

Detention staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices communicates important messages to youth about themselves and their experience. Our study found that, when staff members engaged in these practices, they communicated underlying beliefs about the importance of youths' feelings and experiences (emotional safety); the necessity of youths' rights to information about their legal rights (rights-based information/explanations), policies and procedures (successful navigation of detention), and structure and function of the justice system; the hope and belief that youth could "do better tomorrow" and lead successful lives (successful navigation of detention); and that youth are benefit from long-term relationships with staff (extended relationships with youth). Extant literature would suggest that supporting the delivery of these messages from detention staff to detained youth may support youths' positive outcomes. Indeed, youths' positive experiences of juvenile corrections settings (Schubert, Mulvey,

Loughran, & Losoya, 2012) and relationships with correctional staff (Marsh & Evans, 2008) may support their success in the community.

Notably, our observed rehabilitative practices in this study overlapped, to some extent, with trauma-informed care frameworks, which may provide evidence of some staff members' shift from punitive understandings and orientations (e.g., "what did you do?") toward a recognition of linkages between youths' experiences, particularly trauma (Conseur, Rivara, & Emanuel, 1997; Edwards, Holden, Felliti, & Anda, 2003), and behaviors (e.g., "what happened to you?"). Indeed, trauma-informed care is a dominant model for introducing rehabilitative practices into residential settings (e.g., Bloom et al., 2003). Namely, staff members' actions were sometimes characterized as promoting youths' emotional safety (alone and in conjunction with other rehabilitative practices), a critical element of trauma-informed care models of intervention (e.g., Fallot & Harris, 2009; Hopper et al., 2010). Other findings corresponded to facets of trauma-informed care domains, yet the observed rehabilitative practices in this study were, on the whole, not adequately captured via existing trauma-informed care frameworks. For example, Fallot and Harris (2009) emphasize empowerment. One could conceptualize providing youth with rights-based information and encouraging them to consider becoming mentors for juvenile justice-involved youth in the future as forms of empowerment. Yet, there appears to be value in articulating more distinct and precise categories (i.e., rights-based information and successful navigation of detention). Choice, another domain of trauma-informed care, emerged in minor ways, but it may be best understood as part of emotional safety (e.g., granting a distressed youths' request to speak with a particular staff member). In conducting our analyses, we could not adequately capture the data as reflected only in the broad domains of trauma-informed care. Thus,

while Fallot and Harris' (2009) trauma-informed care framework may be valid, it is important to build an empirical support for their and other rehabilitative models.

Further, although rehabilitative practices are evident in juvenile detention, these may operate in unique ways. Importantly, this study also found that structural and policy-created barriers in the setting sometimes challenged the extent to which rehabilitative practices could be implemented. In particular, the focus on physical safety in the setting translated into restrictions on youths' autonomy, decision-making, and movement and resulted in trade-offs, particularly regarding emotional safety, for example in the context of mandatory strip searches performed as part of the intake process. Thus, efforts to implement rehabilitative practices in detention may require careful planning and creative solutions that work within the confines of the setting.

Investment in forming and maintaining genuine relationships with detained youth has meaningful emotional consequences for detention staff members. We found that, while staff members were often excited to keep in touch with formerly detained youth, staff exhibited an array of emotions (e.g., anger, sadness, disappointment) in response to youths' repeated re-entry into the juvenile justice system. One challenge for sustaining staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices rests in their ability to cope effectively with these emotions to avoid burnout. Specifically, correctional staff members' engagement in depersonalization (i.e., emotionally distancing oneself from detainees), a dimension of burnout, has been associated with an increased support of punitive measures (Lambert, Hogan, Altheimer, Jiang, & Stevenson, 2008). Encouragingly, staff members' orientation may be malleable. When provided with training in therapeutic solutions (e.g., anger management, family counseling, life skills development), staff may exhibit a less punitive and more rehabilitative orientation in their work (Marsh & Evans, 2006). Thus, juvenile detention may need to be particularly vigilant in

providing adequate training and employing burnout prevention strategies in order to effectively support staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices.

The inclusion of detained youths' perspectives in research examining rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention is crucial for understanding implementation. Our findings demonstrate that, though there was variability among youths' perceptions of detention, a number of detained youth reported positive experiences with staff. This finding is heartening in light of youths' documented negative experiences inside juvenile corrections facilities (e.g., bullying, substance abuse, poor relationships with staff; Ashkar & Kenny, 2008). However, mixed perceptions regarding the extent to which detention staff implemented rehabilitative practices were also evident. This supported our qualitative finding that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of rehabilitative practices. Further, youths' open-ended responses suggested that they prefer particular staff over others, and a few of these responses indicated that youths' preferred staff members may have been more inclined to engage in rehabilitative practices. (e.g., *"I think [staff member] gets attitude sometimes and he gives kids a bad report (grades). I think [staff member] is good. I like working with her. She keeps it real. She tries to help you get out of here."*). Current literature suggests that detained youth, compared to correctional staff, may be more discerning in their perceptions of staff members' warmth and involvement (Guarino-Ghezzi & Tirrell, 2008). Though this study had too few open-ended responses to warrant any specific assertions about youths' preferences and this study did not compare staff members' and detained youths' perceptions, youths' reported preferences for staff in this study may highlight an important area for future research to explore.

Implementation is a challenging and complex process. Indeed, staff members were not observed engaging in rehabilitative practices to the same degree, and some (very few) staff

members were rarely observed engaging in any rehabilitative practices. Implementation science literature would suggest that number of individual (e.g., staff members' attitudes; Michaelis, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2009) and setting-level factors (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Klein and Knight, 2005; Allen, Larsen, Javdani, & Lehrner, 2012) may have affected implementation. For example, staff members' opinions about the youth and orientation to punishment may have decreased their willingness to implement rehabilitative practices. Specifically, some staff members reported reservations about youths' ability to lead successful lives upon their release or commented on the impossibility of rehabilitating youth. The short duration of youths' stays and perceptions that the youth were already set in their ways seemed to particularly contribute to staff members' perceptions of hopelessness and cynicism. Observed "missed opportunities" for engaging in rehabilitative practices may indicate critical points for training and intervention. For example, some staff reported opinions that rehabilitation efforts are ineffective because youth are incapable of change and/or because rehabilitation is impossible to achieve through detention. Staff members may be less likely to implement rehabilitative practices if they see no point in doing so. Thus, future research exploring rehabilitation in detention is needed in order to examine potential relationships between rehabilitative practices, as delivered via the relationships between staff and detained youth.

This study has some notable strengths. First, ethnographic methods were well suited to the aim of this study. Juvenile detention centers are a special kind of community – the population of detained youth is ever rotating and staff members are also not permanent residents, though they do spend a significant amount of time with detained youth. Indeed, ethnographic methods have an established history in institutional settings with the aim of understanding, broadly, how settings function (e.g., Schein, 1990; Smith, 2005). Observations of staff members with youth

allowed for an exploration of rehabilitative practices in context. Specifically, the researcher had the opportunity to witness interactions between youth and staff and follow up with staff to explore the staff members' understanding of the youth and reasons for engaging in particular actions. Second, this study is one of a growing number to include detained youths' perspectives as sources of data. The incorporation of youths' perspectives, in service of the mixed methods purpose of *complementarity*, was beneficial. Youths' responses supported our finding from qualitative data that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of rehabilitative practices. Further, patterns in their responses, particularly to open-ended questions where youth reported their preference for particular staff over others, suggested that future research may benefit from the inclusion of more in-depth explorations of the nuances of relationships between youth and staff.

As with all research endeavors, findings from this study are also limited in a number of ways. This study makes important additions to the literature by articulating rehabilitative practices infused through staff members' daily work in juvenile detention. However, a primary limitation of this study is that we did not explore specific outcomes that ideally result from the implementation of these practices (e.g., decreased recidivism). Thus, future research should explore the relationships between rehabilitative practices as part of staff members' daily routine and desired proximal (e.g., youth empowerment) and distal (e.g., decreased recidivism) outcomes. Additionally, this study found that staff members engaged in a variety of activities with formerly detained youth, and that this engagement was evident across staff, we did not observe interactions between staff and youth in the community as part of this study. Thus, questions remain regarding how staff members choose who to keep in touch with, the nature of their expectations within these relationships, and whether these relationships, on the whole,

support a rehabilitative aim. Additionally, our sample size of youth survey participants limited our ability to describe youths' perspectives beyond a descriptive level. Given that detained youth have been traditionally absent in literature examining juvenile corrections, and the emerging evidence that supports their perspectives as important sources for information, future research would benefit from the continued inclusion of youth perspectives to understand the implementation of rehabilitative practices in correctional settings. Further, this study did not attend to the factors that may shape the implementation of rehabilitative practices in important ways. Indeed, it is likely that staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices is related to a number of individual- and organizational-level factors that are worth exploring to further explain implementation. This study took place in a single setting, thus findings may not generalize to other detention settings. Namely, the detention setting operates as one part of a larger juvenile justice system; detention staff members at all levels operate within specific local (i.e., judges, law enforcement) and state- and national-level contexts that shape their work.

Finally, we find it necessary to note our recognition that the setting of interest in the present study, juvenile detention, is part of a larger system in which persons of color are disproportionately represented (e.g., Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; OJJDP, 2009; Puzzanchera & Adams, 2009) and is often critiqued for employing racially biased policies and practices (e.g., Albonetti & Hepburn, 1996; Leiber & Mack, 2003). Though the present study explores an institutional response in juvenile detention that aims to support rehabilitation, we recognize that much more work is needed in order to affect large-scale systems change in juvenile justice. Still, it is reasonable to assume that the juvenile justice system, and juvenile detention, will remain in existence for the foreseeable future. Therefore, research on practices in these settings that may improve detained youths' experiences, such as the rehabilitative practices articulated in the

present study, is worthwhile as it may support improved implementation and dissemination in juvenile detention.

Conclusion

Despite the growing evidence to support the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth, research examining rehabilitation, particularly in the context of correctional staffs' routine practices, is lacking. Detention facilities, which serve as a brief detainment location for a large proportion of juvenile justice-involved youth representing a wide range of offenses, are an important setting for intervention that is particularly absent in extant research literature. More than adult populations, incarcerated youth may rely on their relationships with staff members, who embody dual roles: caregiver and correctional officer. This study examined the nature of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention via observations of staff members engaged in routine practices. This study supports the emergence of four primary forms of rehabilitative practices in the context of staff members' everyday activities: a) promotion of detained youths' emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) the orientation of detained youth to the culture of the justice system to promote youths' success in this system, and d) relationships with youth that extended beyond detention. Further, these practices were observed across four critical contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) in staff members' contact with formerly detained youth living in the community. Notably, detained youth reported mixed opinions regarding the extent to which they perceived that staff members engaged in rehabilitative practices, which supports our qualitative finding that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of these practices. Implementation science literature would suggest that

implementation is affected by individual and setting level factors. Thus, implementation could have been influenced, for example, by staff members' beliefs about the effectiveness of rehabilitation and whether detained youth were capable of positive change, thus highlighting a potentially critical area for staff training and education efforts. Organizational level factors, such as leadership, climate, and culture, may also shape implementation in important ways. Thus, future research is needed to explore the influence of such factors on implementation.

CHAPTER 4

FACTORS SHAPING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REHABILITATIVE PRACTICES IN JUVENILE DETENTION

Despite an observed decline over the past two decades (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 2014), youth continue to be arrested at alarmingly high rates; recent estimates indicate that approximately 1.9 million youth are arrested annually (Puzzanchera & Adams, 2011). Further, juvenile justice-involved youth report having multiple contacts with this system (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006), highlight a “revolving door” pattern. The dual purpose of the juvenile justice system is to protect community members and deter minors from engaging in criminal behavior. Thus, one perennial challenge faced by this system is “balancing” punishment and rehabilitation. Over the past several decades the focus on implementation and evaluation of rehabilitative interventions for youth who engage in delinquent behavior has increased (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010; Piquero, Cullen, Unnever, Piquero, & Gordon, 2010) alongside growing evidence that punitive interventions are ineffective (e.g., Lipsey, 2009).

Researchers in criminal and juvenile justice fields have called for increased efforts to implement evidence-based rehabilitative programming with juvenile justice-involved youth, citing the continued problematic use of punitive interventions despite growing evidence to support rehabilitative interventions (e.g., Gendreau, Smith, & Theriault, 2009). Rehabilitation generally refers to intervention practices that aim to build juveniles’ competencies and/or skills to decrease the likelihood of recidivism (OJJDP, 1999) and is often linked to distal outcomes of interest, such as decreased recidivism, aided by youths’ increased emotional or social skills (e.g., Nelson-Gray et al., 2006; Trupin, Stewart, Beach, & Boesky, 2002) and independent living skills

(Javdani & Allen, 2014). Indeed, rehabilitation consists of particular processes. Interventions with a “therapeutic orientation,” targeting high-risk youth, and characterized by high quality implementation have been associated with reduced recidivism across juvenile justice contexts (Lipsey, 2009).

While rehabilitation is promising, the effectiveness of such interventions hinges on successful implementation. Notably, little is known about the extent to which short-term juvenile detention settings can support the implementation of rehabilitative practices, specifically with regard to the organizational conditions that shape implementation. Short-term juvenile detention is a particularly important context for intervention given that it is often one of the first settings in which juvenile justice involved youth are detained. Detainment in this setting can last from a few hours to over a year, depending on the circumstances (e.g., severity of charges, whether the case is transferred to adult court). Indeed, short-term detention settings also house youth with a wide range of offenses, from truancy to murder. Thus, short-term detention staff come into contact with a wide range of youth who represent a variety of levels of delinquency and other needs that have been linked with delinquency (e.g. trauma; Conser, Rivara, & Emanuel, 1997).

Indeed, implementation of innovations is a challenging and multi-faceted process that relies on a combination of individual- and setting-level factors to create an environment that supports successful implementation (e.g., Klein & Sorra, 1996; Rogers, 2003). In the case of detention, implementation and organizational change research would suggest that effective implementation is a function of: a) staffs’ individual attitudes (e.g., Michaelis, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2009) and b) conditions associated with the setting (e.g., Klein & Sorra, 1996; Klein and Knight, 2005; Allen, Larsen, Javdani, & Lehrner, 2012).

The present study builds on previous research that examined the nature of rehabilitative practices infused within juvenile detention staff members' daily interactions with detained youth (see chapter 3); the examination of everyday practices extends current rehabilitation research, which has often focused on specific intervention models/programs. Rehabilitative practices were defined in chapter three as actions taken by staff that, while embedded within policies and procedures, promoted a rehabilitative aim (i.e., detained youths' competencies and/or skills that will support their ability to succeed as members of the community). Results of this previous analysis demonstrated the centrality of relationships between youth and detention staff as an overarching context for the emergence of four primary forms of rehabilitative practices: a) promotion of detained youths' emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) promotion of youths' successful navigation of detention, and d) relationships with youth that extended beyond detention. Further, these practices were observed across four critical contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) in the community. Finally, a key observation from this study was that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of rehabilitative practices. Thus, the present study aimed to explicate the factors that shaped staff members' implementation of rehabilitative practices as part of their routine practices in detention.

As key members of juvenile detention settings, correctional staff members are responsible for implementing setting policies and practices in their daily work. Thus, the successful implementation of rehabilitative practices relies on juvenile detention staff members' incorporation of these into their work with youth on a daily basis. Importantly, staff members' also operate within the context of the detention center itself. Thus, implementation in this setting

cannot be understood without considering facets of this context. Drawing from implementation science literature, the extent to which staff engaged in implementation behavior was understood in the present study as potentially influenced by: a) individual values and attitudes and b) conditions for implementation (i.e., leadership, climate, and culture).

Staff Members' Values and Attitudes

The importance of individuals' values and attitudes as they relate to implementation effectiveness has been well documented in implementation science literature (e.g., Rogers, 2003). The extent to which the individuals responsible for implementation are receptive to change will affect the success of the implementation effort (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Klein & Knight, 2005). Proctor and colleagues (2010) conceptualize individual level values and attitudes as the extent to which individuals perceive the innovation as agreeable or appealing ("acceptability") and as a fit for the setting and/or target population ("appropriateness"). These dimensions are viewed as important regarding the extent to which those within a setting will ultimately "take up" an innovation in practice. Thus, the relative fit between staff members' values and attitudes with the innovation are viewed as proximal indicators of successful implementation as they are associated with implementation behavior (e.g., Allen et al., 2012; Klein & Sorra, 1996).

There is a substantial body of literature examining correctional staff members' attitudes and beliefs (e.g., Antonio & Young, 2011; Bazemore & Dicker, 1994; Gordon, 1999; Leiber, Schwarze, Mack, & Farnworth, 2002), which has generally focused on the extent to which staffs' attitudes and values can be characterized as punitive or rehabilitative. Notably, there is some evidence that juvenile corrections staff exhibit simultaneous orientations to punishment and rehabilitation (Bazemore & Dicker, 1994), which may affect staff in particular ways. More so than their adult counterparts, juvenile justice staff may experience a greater level of role

confusion or ambiguity given the potentially dual nature of their role (i.e., caretaker and correctional officer). However, it is encouraging to note that staff members' values and attitudes may be malleable. When provided with training in therapeutic solutions (e.g., anger management, family counseling, life skills development), juvenile corrections staff members have been observed to enact less severe (punitive) consequences for detained youths' behavior infractions (Marsh & Evans, 2006).

Staffs' attitudes and values may be particularly critical with regard to rehabilitation, as this mode of service delivery typically emphasizes an ecological and contextual understanding of delinquency. That is, rehabilitative practices generally assume that a variety of factors in a child's environment and experience have contributed to their incarceration and that meeting a child's social, emotional and behavioral needs may provide a critical avenue in the prevention of recidivism (e.g., trauma-informed care; Bloom et al., 2003). Extending this view, one might expect that staff members' endorsement of structural inequality may contribute to the perceived "acceptability" and "appropriateness" of rehabilitative practices.

Racism is a key facet of context that may be related to staff members' understanding of and responses to detained youth. The overrepresentation of youth of color, particularly African American youth, in the juvenile justices system (e.g., Puzzanchera & Adams, 2009; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006) and the adult criminal justice system (e.g., Alexander, 2012) is well documented. Further, empirical examinations support the existence of racial biases in this system. For example, Leiber and Mack's (2003) examination of outcomes (e.g., adjudication, diversion) indicated that racial biases might be more salient at intake into the juvenile justice system. Specifically, African American youth were less likely, compared to White youth, to be placed into diversion programs and more likely to have their cases referred for court proceedings or to

be released. While the tendency to release these youth may appear to be a more lenient response, it may be indicative of a belief that African American youth are less suitable for intervention (i.e., diversion; Albonetti & Hepburn, 1996).

Importantly, an emphasis on rehabilitation might be tied to holding a view of the larger social context of oppression (including racism) and limited opportunity structures as contributing to youth's detention. Particularly in light of the overrepresentation of youth of color in correctional settings, staff members' awareness of and beliefs about race provide one important lens through which to understand how they view and interact with detained youth. Racism can manifest in overt and conscious ways, as well as via unconscious biases or a lack of awareness of racism. The latter description of racism is perhaps best known as color-blind racial attitudes, "the belief that race should not and does not matter" (Neville, Roderick, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000; p. 60). Color-blind racial attitudes are problematic in the context of juvenile justice for several reasons. First, these beliefs fly in the face of the well-documented disproportionate representation of youth of color in this system relative to White youth (OJJDP, 2009; Puzzanchera & Adams, 2009; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Second, color-blind racial ideology ignores the reality that youth of color operate within an overarching context of systemic racism, that is woven into the fabric of our legal system (e.g., via policies that limit the rights of prisoners and individuals convicted of felony charges; Brewer & Heitzig, 2008) and limits the opportunities and access to resources available to youth of color. Thus, the overrepresentation of youth of color in juvenile justice settings, through a color-blind lens, ignores important contextual factors, such as bias in decision-making within the system (e.g., Leiber & Mack, 2003) and policy level decisions. Through a color-blind lens, one might believe, despite the

consistent documentation of inequality, that all youth who enter the juvenile justice system were equally likely to be arrested/detained and will be treated equally within and by this system.

Despite the important role that staff members' attitudes and beliefs about racism may play in shaping their engagement in rehabilitative practices, there is a paucity of research examining this relationship. Thus, this study included an examination of detention staff members' expressed color-blind racial attitudes as one dimension that may relate to their engagement in rehabilitative practices in meaningful ways. In sum, to examine staff attitudes and values the current study examined the following dimensions: a) an orientation to rehabilitation versus punishment; b) an orientation to the social context shaping opportunities for youth with particular attention to racial ideology.

Conditions for Implementation

A setting in which the dissemination of rehabilitative practices must occur – juvenile detention – may pose significant challenges to successful implementation, especially given the nature of physical structures, policies, and procedures that exist in the setting. Leadership, organizational climate, and organizational culture have been identified as critical shaping forces of implementation (e.g., Klein & Knight, 2005). Thus, the current study examined these constructs in order to understand conditions of implementation as they influence the implementation of rehabilitative practices in the detention setting.

Leadership. Leadership is often implicated in the effectiveness of implementing change (e.g., Aarons, 2006; Aarons & Sommerfeld, 2012; Michaelis, Stegmair, & Sonntag, 2009), as leaders shape the setting in important ways through creating and enforcing policies and procedures. Given the key role of leadership in shaping climate and culture, the present study examined how both formal and informal leadership in the setting is affects staff members'

implementation of rehabilitative practices in the setting with particular attention to: a) line staff members' relationships with setting leaders and b) actions taken by formal leaders in the setting.

Staff members' relationships with leaders. Though leadership is often understood as a "top down" process, leadership is also interactional; all members of the setting may exert influence to varying degrees (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Thus, detention staff play a key role in shaping implementation. One component of leadership that is particularly important to this study is the relationships between staff members and leaders in the setting. Specifically, the extent to which staff feel that they can bring concerns to leaders and the ability for staff members to shape the setting (e.g., via autonomy, participation in decision-making) may be key components that affect implementation. Having, "say" in decision-making may be important for promoting an effective implementation climate. Indeed, unilateral decision-making has been identified as a common "stumbling block" for successful implementation (Klein & Knight, 2005). With regard to correctional settings in particular, staff members' perceived autonomy and participation in decision-making in the setting has been associated with greater effectiveness in their work with inmates and higher job satisfaction (Wright, Saylor, Gilman, & Camp, 1997), as well as greater commitment to their setting and lower levels of job-related stress (Slate & Vogel, 1997; Wright et al., 1997).

Actions of formal leaders. Juvenile detention superintendents serve as leaders of their settings, responsible for interpreting and implementing legislation and field-related recommendations and managing staff, and liaisons to other parts of their local juvenile justice system and the general community. Empirical examinations of leadership suggest the importance of leading by example. That is, leaders must be mindful of "walking the talk" to model examples of desired behavior, as well as "talking the walk" to demonstrate genuine commitment to the

behavior (Simons, 2002). Ideally, leaders at all levels of the setting are united; leaders' communication of consistent messages regarding implementation is necessary to adequately support a climate for implementation (Grojean, Resick, Dickson, & Smith; 2004). In this case, the ways that formal leaders convey messages regarding rehabilitative practices may be particularly important and potentially challenging in light of frequent state and national policy changes. Finally, leaders' abilities to support implementation in the organization may be in part a function of the history of the setting, specifically whether previous efforts to implement changes have been effective or not (Walker, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2007), which can serve as either a positive or negative influence on staff members' willingness to accept proposed change.

Organizational Setting. Organizational settings are often understood in light of *climate* and *culture*. Climate refers to the structural realities of an organization that make it possible for members to effectively perform their roles (e.g., James & Jones 1974). Culture refers to shared norms, values, and practices represented among members (or a subset of members) in an organization (e.g., Schein, 1990). Notably, there is empirical support for the assertion that climate and culture are distinct (Glisson & James, 2002), though organizational literature has often conflated the two (Denison, 1996). While highly interrelated, the current study examined these constructs individually given that each offers a unique lens. In the current study, climate refers to the tangible (observable) policies and procedures in the setting that aligned or contradicted the move toward rehabilitation, while culture refers to the broadly shared norms and values that pervaded the setting.

Climate. Implementation research suggests that the organizational climate affects implementation success (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Klein & Knight, 2005). Climate is arguably best understood in reference to purpose; that is, a climate *for* implementation (Schneider & Reichers,

1983). An organizational climate for the implementation of rehabilitative practices would include adequate training, support, and facilities for staff. Thus, climate reflects the tangible supports, resource, policies, and protocols that are in place to encourage or discourage rehabilitation. Importantly, climate can be viewed as a set of perceptions that exists within the individual (i.e., psychological climate) or, when shared widely among individuals in the setting, as a property of the organization (i.e., organizational climate; Denison, 1996). In this study, we focused on facets of climate that have been identified as important in the literature: a) clarity of job expectations; b) adequate training opportunities for staff; and c) evidence of a climate for implementation in “the text” of the setting. Further, given the focus on rehabilitative practices infused throughout the setting, we included another facet of interest that speaks to the extent to which these practices are present at the level of staff: d) opportunities for staff to receive emotional support.

Among correctional officers, clarity of job expectations may be particularly important. Indeed, current literature provides evidence of an association between increased role confusion (i.e., perceptions that their job is ill-defined or ambiguous; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993) and job stress among adult correctional officers (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). More so than their adult counterparts, juvenile justice correctional officers may experience even greater role confusion given the dual nature of their role (i.e., caretaker and correctional officer). Therefore, clarity of job expectations is a particularly important area of exploration in the current study.

The successful implementation of rehabilitative practices necessitates adequate tangible supports that comprise the climate of the setting. Adequate training for staff has often been associated with implementation success (e.g., Klein & Sorra, 1996). Indeed, staff members’ must possess the necessary information and skills in order to successfully implement rehabilitative practices. At the same time, early training is necessary, but not sufficient to support successful

implementation (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010), highlighting the need for ongoing support and continued training efforts.

Institutional behavior can also be governed by the text of the setting (e.g., Pence, 1999, Smith, 2005). The “text” refers to written policies and procedures that guide the efforts of the setting and how staff members carry out their work. In detention, successful implementation of rehabilitative practices would necessitate that the setting’s written policies reflect a rehabilitative orientation and support practices that align with this. This may be reflected in, for example, the setting’s mission statement as well as in policies that staff are expected to abide by (e.g., policies that govern the use of physical restraint). Thus, this study attended to these written policies and procedures in order to understand climate in the setting.

Finally, a climate for implementing rehabilitative practices in detention may require a fundamental shift in the organization’s orientation to consumers *and* providers in the setting (Harris & Fallot, 2001), particularly given the oscillation of the juvenile justice system between punishment and rehabilitation. Indeed, one key requirement of rehabilitative models (i.e., trauma-informed care; Fallot & Harris, 2009, Bloom et al., 2003) implemented in the context of routine practices is that these practices are infused throughout all levels of the setting. Common among trauma-informed models is attention to creating an environment characterized by emotional safety (e.g., Fallot & Harris, 2009; Hopper, Bassuck, & Olivet: 2010). Thus, detention must have the capacity to support staff emotionally in order to support their efforts to work with detained youth in a rehabilitative way. A climate for implementation of rehabilitative practices would include policies and protocol that shape staff members’ experience of opportunities to receive emotional support in the setting.

Culture. Importantly, culture is learned, passed on to new members through socialization, and has the ability to evolve through natural or guided processes (Schein, 1990); organizational culture shapes the social and technical aspects of implementation (Hemmelgarn, Glissel, & James, 2006). Indeed, staff members' relationships with one another shape the shared culture and stand to influence implementation (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Detention centers, like any other type of organization, have bounded rules and norms that govern the behavior of members in the setting and may also shape the culture. In contrast to climate, culture, in the current study, refers to unwritten rules and norms that govern staff behavior. These cultural realities are likely shaped not only by formal setting leaders, but also through informal leadership and staff networks. Thus, this study examined culture in the context of two facets: a) staff members' relationships with one another and b) cultural norms evident at the level of the setting

Attending to staff relationships with one another may be particularly important in detention settings given that staff members work as a team to ensure safety and adequate supervision of youth and attention to mandated procedures. Although staff members have particular assignments for the day, they are expected to assist one another and youth as needed. Despite the protocols in place (i.e., climate), staffs' interpretation and application of these may differ in practice and may be affected by their relationships with one another. This can include staff narratives and widely held norms, some of which may directly contradict the formal policies and protocols in the setting. The transmission of organizational culture may intersect in important ways with informal leadership; some staff may "set the tone" for interactions with youth and this may vary from one set of staff to another. These distinctions may be pronounced in a setting that has staff coverage twenty-four hours per day with distinct shifts.

As noted above in the description of climate, the implementation of rehabilitation in the context of routine practices necessitates that these practices are infused at all levels of the setting (e.g., Falloot & Harris, 2009; Bloom et al., 2003). Thus, emotional support, a core facet of rehabilitative models infused throughout settings (e.g., Falloot & Harris, 2009), should be evident among staff members' relationships with one another. Further, given the perennial tension between punishment and rehabilitation evident in the juvenile justice system itself, it is reasonable to expect that staff members' interactions with one another may reflect this tension, supporting a culture (or subcultures) that are generally rehabilitative or punitive in orientation.

Although individuals may contribute to culture and may experience and interpret norms and values in idiosyncratic ways, the present study was also concerned with patterns in norms and values that transcend the individual experience and speak to shared norms and values at the level of groups or subgroups within the setting. Specifically, this study explored the role of leadership in shaping culture in the setting. Indeed, setting leadership is often implicated as a strong shaping force for organizational culture (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1993). In detention, setting leaders may shape the culture of the setting in a variety of ways, including toward either supporting (or not) a rehabilitative aim.

Current Study

This study aimed to address the following research question: What processes and factors are associated with implementation (or lack thereof) of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention? Specifically, taking an ethnographic case study approach (Schwandt, 2007) cast in a mixed methods framework with the intention of pursuing *complementarity* (Greene, 1989; 2007), this study examined: (a) staff attitudes and values as related to rehabilitative practices, and (b)

setting level factors that have been associated with implementation success (i.e., leadership, climate, culture).

Method

Setting

This study was set in a juvenile detention center (henceforth referred to as detention) in a mid-sized Midwestern community that provided county-wide services and, occasionally, detained youth from neighboring counties. Precise information about the setting (e.g., location, number of staff, age of facility) is not provided in an effort to obscure the identity of the setting. Approximate numbers and information has been included to provide the reader with enough details to adequately contextualize the setting.

Juvenile detention was established in this county approximately 40 years ago, and the detention facility has beds for less than 50 youth. At the time of the study, the maximum capacity of detention was somewhat lower than the number of beds given the facility's funding and staffing. Detention staff included a superintendent and about 50 staff members (i.e., supervisors, line staff, and part-time transportation and master control operators). Detention staff were diverse with regard to gender and tenure. Approximately half of line officers and most supervising staff were female and staff tenure ranged from a few months to over 30 years of employment in the setting or justice system. Although there is some diversity with regard to race/ethnicity, the majority of detention staff were White/European American. In contrast, youth of color, particularly Black/African American youth were disproportionately represented in this detention facility at the time this study took place, mirroring national patterns of disproportionate rates of incarcerated youth of color (OJJDP, 2009).

Staff had regular and constant contact with youth throughout the day. Line staff officers were divided into shift teams. At least one supervisor was assigned to each shift. Shift membership was generally fixed, but subject to change, due to staff turnover and periodic changes in shift membership. Generally, line officers on the day shift had more contact with youth as their shifts overlapped with the majority of youths' waking hours. Day shift staff members accompanied youth, who were generally divided into groups based on school level and other factors (e.g., co-respondents are separated when possible) to school and any after-school groups occurring in the setting. Day staff also served youth each of their daily meals and accompanied them to court. Line officers on the evening shift accompanied youth during evening activities and provided youth with their evening snack, additional recreation time, and evening shower time. Evening shift staff also led nightly groups with the youth. In these groups, youth set weekly behavior goals and staff provided youth with feedback about their behavior based on information provided by day shift staff. Once youth were in their rooms for the evening, evening shift staff completed reports for each youth to be presented at court to the judge overseeing the youth's case, managed files, and completed other necessary tasks (e.g., laundry). Youth were brought to detention for potential detainment at any time, day or night, so all staff conducted necessary intake activities as needed.

Data Sources and Measures

This study explored the emergence of rehabilitative practices in detention through multiple data collection methods: ethnographic observations of staff members, one-on-one interviews with the detention superintendent, and survey data collected from staff.

Ethnographic Observations. Ethnographic observational data collection included the researchers' observations of staff as they interacted with one another and youth in the setting and

informal conversations and/or interviews with staff members. Observations of staff focused on capturing their interactions with youth and other staff members and locating these interactions in context. Conversations/interviews with staff members were generally open-ended and unstructured and focused on staff members' reports about their own behavior, including their engagement in rehabilitative practices (e.g., *"What do you do to help youth feel safe?"*), and their understanding of how their own attitudes and values (e.g., *"For youth in detention, what approach to intervention do you think is most appropriate?"*) and setting-level factors (i.e., leadership, climate, and culture; e.g., *"How do other staff on your shift affect the work that you do?"*) affect their work. The researcher spent over 220 hours in the setting, which included time planning the study in collaboration with detention supervisors and the superintendent and in-person observations collected as research data. The researcher engaged in data collection activities over the course of approximately one year, alternating her observation schedule to spend time with each shift. Observations were not scheduled in advance, though the researcher would often call the detention center at least an hour in advance to make sure that the supervisor on duty knew to expect the researcher. On rare occasions, that researcher would be asked to reschedule if, for example, the setting was particularly short-staffed that day or had received a high number of new intakes.

The researcher's role and purpose was known to all detention staff and detained youth present in the setting at the time of each observation. Recording devices of any kind, including cellular phones and computers, were not allowed in the secured area of the detention center, where line staff engaged in the bulk of their work and where detained youth are housed. The researcher carried a notepad at all times and was allowed to jot hand-written notes, including direct quotes. The researcher was granted access to all facets of detention operations within the

secure area, and accompanied willing staff as they went about their normal work. The researcher did not accompany staff outside of the detention setting (e.g., to/from court). The researcher always asked for explicit permission to accompany any individual staff as they went about their work. The researcher engaged in one-on-one and group conversations with staff when possible and could only record these conversations when they took place in non-secure areas (i.e., staff break room, supervisors' and superintendent's offices); only a few conversations between the researcher and staff were recorded, and only in non-secure areas, as staff work primarily in the secure area of the detention center.

Given that youth were in the presence of or observable (via video cameras and intercoms throughout the setting) by staff at all times, their privacy could not be guaranteed. Thus, youth were not explicit targets of the observations conducted throughout this study. That is, the researcher would observe staff and youth when they interacted with one another, and information about the interaction was recorded in observational field notes, but the researcher did not approach youth to elicit information about their experiences or follow-up with youth about any observed interactions with staff members. Additionally, youth who were identified by staff members as wards of the state were excluded entirely from this study (i.e., the researcher would avoid viewing interactions between these youth and staff and did not include information about interactions between these youth and staff in field notes).

All members of the setting, including youth, were provided with informed consent/assent and reminded periodically and when necessary that they may opt to have information about their observed behaviors/statements excluded from observational data and that they may request that the researcher leave their immediate area at any time. Thus, staff always had the option to request that they not be observed or that their comments not be recorded or used in the research

process (at all or at a particular time); youth always had the option of asking the researcher to leave the room and/or not include their interactions with staff in the study. In total, approximately 40 detention staff members, supervisors, and outside community service providers were present and included as potential participants in this study. One hundred twenty-one youth were assented and included as potential participants in this study. Notably, very few staff members refused to participate in any part of the study. The researcher did not pursue opportunities to observe or speak with these staff members and none of their actions or comments were included in the researcher's field notes. Staff and youth were not provided with monetary compensation for their time.

Following each observation, field notes were audio recorded and transcribed. Field notes were structured to attend to two purposes: (a) provide a summary of the activities and conversations that occurred during the observation, including the context in which the activities occurred, and (b) to reflect upon and organize content into conceptual "bins" corresponding to organizational dimensions of interest (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Interviews with the Superintendent. In tandem with the collection of observational data, the researcher engaged in one-on-one interviews with the detention superintendent. These interviews occurred both as part of the ethnographic observations and were generally open-ended and unstructured. Similar to conversations/interviews with other staff, interviews conducted with the superintendent focused on behavior, including her engagement in rehabilitative practices (e.g., *"What do you do to help youth feel safe?"*), and her understanding of how their own attitudes and values (e.g., *"For youth in detention, what approach to intervention do you think is most appropriate?"*) and setting-level factors (i.e., leadership, climate, and culture; e.g., *"How does your role as the leader in the setting affect the work that you do?"*) affect her work and the work

of staff in detention. Three interviews (approximately 1 hour each) with the superintendent were conducted throughout the study. These interviews took place in the superintendent's office and were not subject to audio recording restrictions given that they were conducted in a non-secure area of the facility. Audio files were transcribed for data analysis purposes.

Staff survey. As part of a larger study, the detention center (one of sixteen agencies), participated in an organizational assessment. The current study used a portion of the data gathered in this organizational assessment, described below, to understand factors that shape the implementation of rehabilitative practices in the setting. Twenty-three detention staff (line staff and supervisors; 60.9% (N = 14) female; 60.9% (N = 14) employed 10 or more years in the setting) completed paper or web-based versions of an organizational assessment survey. Items on the survey aimed to capture, for example, staff members' perceptions of organizational domains of interest (e.g., leadership, climate, culture) and actual practices occurring in the setting. See Table 1 for an overview of each of the scales described below.

Attitudes. Two items assessed the extent to which staff members perceived that institutional racism contributes to the disproportionality of African American youth in juvenile detention and their limited access to resources ($r = .86, p < .01$). Staff rated each of these items on a six-point Likert-type scale (e.g., "Staff in this organization believe that institutional racism, like discrimination against African American youth and families, contributes to disproportionate representation of African Americans in juvenile detention;" 0 = Not at all/Never to 5 = Always).

Additionally, a portion of the survey focused on staff members' endorsement of color-blind racial attitudes, measured using the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). The CoBRAS contains 20 items (half are reverse scored) that are rated on a Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree) and reflect

three specific factors: Racial Privilege (seven items), Institutional Discrimination (seven items), and Blatant Racial Issues (six items). Racial Privilege captures denial or blindness related to the existence of White privilege (e.g., “*Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich*”). Institutional Discrimination items measure participants’ limited recognition of institutional racism (e.g., “*Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality*” (Reverse scored)). Finally, Blatant Racial Issues encompasses items measuring participants’ general lack of awareness of pervasive racism (e.g., “*Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations*”). See Neville and colleagues (2000) for a thorough description of the construction and validation of the CoBRAS. Our reliability analyses indicated that Cronbach’s alpha was acceptable for each of the three factors and the total score, ranging from .70 to .90. Racial Privilege was significantly positively correlated with Institutional Discrimination ($r = .72, p < .01$) and Blatant Racial Issues ($r = .51, p < .05$). Institutional Discrimination and Blatant Racial Issues were positively, but not significantly correlated ($r = .30, p = .18$).

Leadership. Ten survey items conceptually reflected this organizational domain of interest; each of these items were rated on a six-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not at all/Never to 5 = Always). Reliability analyses indicated that Cronbach’s alpha was acceptable for these ten items ($\alpha = .89$). Principle components analysis of all leadership items yielded two scales, consisting of five items each, that reflect distinct domains of staff members’ perceptions of leadership in detention: staff members’ personal experiences of supervisors in the setting (e.g., “*My supervisors provide me with feedback that is constructive, even when it is negative or critical;*” $\alpha = .88$) and their perceptions of institutionalized practices related to leadership in the

setting (e.g., *“The organization’s leadership consistently communicates about changes to policies, services and expectations of staff;”* $\alpha = .86$).

Climate. Fourteen survey items conceptually reflected this organizational domain of interest; each of these items were rated on a six-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not at all/Never to 5 = Always). Reliability analyses indicated that Cronbach’s alpha was acceptable for these 14 items ($\alpha = .92$). Principle components analysis of all items pertaining to climate yielded three scales: a) five items assessing the extent to which detention provided staff with training opportunities (e.g., *“I am provided with the option to pursue additional training and skill development;”* $\alpha = .92$); b) five items capturing staff members’ perceptions that the setting provides structured opportunities for emotional support from other staff and supervisors (e.g., *“During staff/team meetings, time is allotted for staff to share concerns and seek emotional support;”* $\alpha = .87$); and c) four items assessing staff members’ perceived clarity around setting and job expectations (e.g., *“I have a clear idea of what my organization’s mission, goals and procedures are;”* $\alpha = .87$).

Culture. Nine items captured staff members’ perceptions related to the culture of the setting; each of these items were rated on a six-point Likert-type scale (0 = Not at all/Never to 5 = Always). Reliability analyses indicated that Cronbach’s alpha was acceptable for these nine items ($\alpha = .91$). Principle components analysis of all items pertaining to culture yielded two scales with four and five items each, respectively: staff members’ perceived norms related to their own role and relationships with others (e.g., *“I feel comfortable disagreeing with my colleagues and supervisors during discussions about service provision;”* $\alpha = .90$) and general norms infused throughout the organization (e.g., *“This organization encourages staff to work together and collaborate on a variety of tasks;”* $\alpha = .90$).

Data Analysis

This study assumed, in line with a post-positivist stance (e.g., Ponterotto, 2005), the presence of observable patterns in staff members' behaviors and survey responses that could be understood and categorized as they aligned with particular factors associated with implementation. Further, a goal of this stance is that understanding the phenomenon of interest (i.e., implementations processes) will result in an increased ability to predict or control them (i.e., engage in more effective implementation efforts). At the same time, this study also recognized and valued the multiple realities represented in the setting and this study (i.e., staff members and the researcher). Importantly, though the researchers approached this project with an eye toward capturing measurable phenomena (i.e., predominantly a post-positivist stance), the goal of this study was not to seek convergence among perspectives; each data source is valid in its own right, as it reflects a particular perspective (e.g., staff member, researcher) and moment in time. Thus, areas of disagreement among data sources were highlighted and explored as opposed to seeking consensus. Although findings are particular to this setting, ideally the results of this study will contribute to a larger understanding of rehabilitation in short-term juvenile detention settings.

Transcribed field notes and interviews were analyzed using NVivo (version 10 for Macintosh) qualitative data analysis software. Multiple strategies were employed throughout the process of coding. First, transcripts were reviewed and coded to reflect organizational constructs of interest (i.e., attitudes, leadership, climate, and culture). To further generate emerging codes and alternative interpretations of data and themes, the researcher engaged in peer debriefing. This occurred with team members who transcribed the audio files into written field notes but who were not involved in the data collection process and with an additional team member who supervised the research process but was not directly involved in data collection or transcription.

To promote rigor throughout the research process and resulting interpretation of the qualitative data, the researcher invoked classic qualitative validity criteria, which parallels traditional quantitative validity criteria (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Specifically, credibility (internal validity) was advanced via the researcher's long-term engagement in the setting, persistent observation (i.e., the researcher's immersion in the setting to understand context and culture), peer debriefing, member checking (via open-ended survey completed by staff once data collection was complete), and progressive subjectivity (via field notes recorded after each observation). Transferability (external validity) was advanced through the researcher's engagement in "thick description" of the observed instances of themes to locate them in context, thus allowing the reader to judge the transferability of findings to other settings. Finally, dependability (reliability) was facilitated through the researcher's tracking and accounting for, throughout the research process, shifts in the themes and interpretations and rationale for these decisions.

Survey data were analyzed to uncover patterns or trends in staff members' perceptions of the setting and their work; the small sample size limited our ability to engage in quantitative analyses beyond a descriptive level. In pursuit of complementarity, trends uncovered in the quantitative survey data were examined side by side with the qualitative data to explore the extent to which staff members' perceptions of their work and the detention setting were supported through observational data and to contextualize the nature of their implementation (e.g., to what extent expressed color-blind racial attitudes map on to observed implementation practices). These perceptual data are an important, as they illuminate staff members' own lived experience of the setting and their work.

In integrating results of each data source, data analysis and interpretation proceeded with attention to mixed methods *legitimation* (an alternative term to “validity”) types articulated by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006). In support of our pursuit of legitimation, staff members from the setting were represented across both observation and survey data (*sample integration*). However, we recognize that, due to staff turnover and the voluntary nature of participation, some staff members may have participated in one mode of data collection but not the other. We engaged in efforts to check our emergent themes and findings against staff members’ perceptions (via open-ended exit survey) and the researcher’s own assumptions via regular peer debriefing and progressive subjectivity (*Inside-Outside*). Further, we respected and valued the multiple perspectives represented in this study and aimed to represent them in our results and conclusions, (*Multiple Validities*). Regarding this facet of *legitimation*, this study operated under two important assumptions about our constructs of interest. First, we assumed that we could, by way of conducting researcher observations and analyzing staff survey data, discern patterns in the data that speak to the existence of the constructs of interest and how these operate to promote or hinder the implementation of rehabilitative practices. This assumption is in line with a post-positivist stance (e.g., Ponterotto, 2005). Second, we assumed that the researcher and staff members each have their own experiences related to these phenomena and that these experiences certainly vary. Further we believe that these assumptions are compatible and indeed stand to enrich our understanding of the factors that shape implementation in this setting.

Thus, data sources were examined in light of one another to pursue the mixed methods intent of *complementarity*. That is, observation, interview, and survey data measured different facets of the same phenomenon - factors that shape the implementation rehabilitative practices. This is consistent with Greene et al.’s (1989) description of *complementarity*; different data

sources were combined to enhance understanding of the phenomenon of interest while capitalizing on inherent advantages of each method. In this study, survey-based data regarding staff implementation practices and perceptions of setting-level factors that influence their work were explored to illuminate patterns that could enhance the understanding of qualitative data analyses. Observational and interview data contextualizes and expands on, through rich descriptions and illustrations, findings from quantitative data sources. This approach builds a rich and nuanced picture of detention as a critical case study example and promotes a deep understanding of the factors that shape the implementation of rehabilitative practices in a particular context.

Results

This study builds on previous research that examined the nature of the implementation of rehabilitative practices as part of staff members' routine practices and the contexts in which these emerged (see chapter 3). Observation data analysis efforts attended carefully to staff/youth interactions to examine the emergence of rehabilitative practices and the lack thereof. The focus here was on actions taken by staff, embedded within setting policies and procedures, that promoted a rehabilitative aim (i.e., detained youths' competencies and/or skills that will support their ability to succeed as members of the community). Though examples of rehabilitative practices were observed on a regular basis by the researcher (i.e., during nearly every observation session), a key general observation was that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of rehabilitative practices. The observed variation among staff members' implementation of rehabilitative practices propelled the current study's focus on examining factors that shape staff members' engagement in these practices as part of their routine interactions with youth in detention.

Results are presented below and organized by the implementation domains of interest (i.e., staff members' values and attitudes, leadership, climate, and culture). Table 3 presents descriptive information (i.e., range, mean, median, standard deviation, and reliability) for all quantitative variables of interest. Notably, the tension between punishment and rehabilitation emerged across all areas of interest in this study. Our data provided a paucity of information that speaks to punishment or rehabilitation as a specific held belief among individual staff members. Thus, the presence of this tension was inferred in a variety of ways, including staff members' stated opinions and observed actions.

Individual-level Factors Affecting Implementation

Staff Members' Values and Attitudes. We explored staff members' attitudes and values along two dimensions: a) an orientation to rehabilitation versus punishment, and b) an orientation to the social context shaping opportunities for youth with particular attention to racial ideology. Broadly, our analyses revealed that staff members' values and attitudes and their actions were indicative of their orientation toward either rehabilitation or punishment.

Orientation to rehabilitation versus punishment. Analyses of observation and interview data revealed numerous instances in which staff members provided their opinions about the factors that contribute to youths' involvement in the juvenile justice system, and we observed that these were linked with actions demonstrating a general orientation toward either punishment or rehabilitation. Most often, staff members discussed the youths' parents, peer group, or neighborhood, for example, as related to their involvement in the justice system. Though it is not clear why staff focused more on these particular aspects, one explanation could be that these were often salient in the context of their work. For example, a number of staff members reported frustrating interactions with parents of detained youth. Instances in which youths' parents

refused to receive and return phone calls, declined opportunities to visit the youth, or did not show up for youths' court hearings (and the effect this had on the youth) were recounted easily and often by staff in the setting. Further, it is also possible that the racial/ethnic makeup of staff shaped their experiences and awareness of racism and could have contributed to their focus on facets of context other than race; the majority of staff members at all levels were White.

Despite the general agreement among staff that youths' contexts played an important role in their detainment, these beliefs, for some staff members, operated at a relatively superficial level and were observed in association with a more punitive orientation. That is, a contextual perspective of how the youth became involved in the justice system did not, for these staff members, translate into a contextually-rooted explanation of youths' behavior, particularly disruptive, while detained. Staff members who exhibited these attitudes and beliefs seemed to view their role as enforcers and the purpose of the setting as punitive and/or incapable of achieving any kind of rehabilitative aim.

In contrast, other staff expressed a contextually-informed understanding of how the youths' lived experiences and settings contributed to their involvement in the juvenile justice system as well as their behavior while detained. Generally, these beliefs appeared to shape staff members' expectations of youth and their interactions with them. Accompanying this orientation was a genuine belief or hope that youth could improve their lives and that it was worthwhile for staff members to make efforts to transfer knowledge and skills to youth. Observed interactions between these staff and detained youth were generally oriented toward building opportunities for youths' personal growth. This included providing youth with information about the juvenile justice system itself (e.g., the names, roles, and duties of key players in the local system; youths' rights, within and outside of detention), processing youths' feelings and actions (e.g., when youth

returned from a bad day in court; when youth lost their temper at someone), and encouraging them to think positively about their future (e.g., engaging youth in discussions about pursuing education and one day serving as adult role models for detained youth). Regarding adherence to rules, these staff members were more inclined to view rule infractions as related to youth being upset or experiencing distress rather than intentional malicious efforts to misbehave.

Despite these different approaches to their work, staff members, with few exceptions, reported that they were working in detention because they wanted to help youth. Staff members who placed high value on the rigid enforcement of rules supported their opinion with a variety of reasons, ranging from the prioritization of physical safety for both staff and detained youth in the setting to the belief that the setting should operate as similarly as possible to adult corrections in order to deter youth from reoffending. Staff members who employed an orientation toward skill building and attempted to tailor responses and services were viewed as inconsistent or prone to manipulation due to “coddling” youth. On the other hand, staff members who viewed their role in terms of supporting youths’ personal growth reported that this orientation was more useful for detained youth and more effective in terms of de-escalation and maintaining good relationships between staff and detained youth; these staff often talked about themselves as role models or mentors for youth.

Orientation to social context. Analyses of survey data indicated that staff members, on average, did not generally perceive that racism is related to the overrepresentation of African American youth in the juvenile justice system nor a lack of access to services ($M = 1.66$, $SD = 1.22$; 0 = Not at all/Never to 5 = Always), indicating that staff perceived that racism contributes to disproportionality between “very rarely” and “rarely.” Staff members’ color-blind racial attitudes were also explored. The mean summed scores for items within each of the three

CoBRAS factors and total score indicated that detention staff members, including those in leadership roles, reported a moderate level of color-blind racial attitudes. Notably, the mean total score observed here (74.23) was higher than the highest average score (Range = 49.28 – 70.65) obtained by Neville, et al. (2000) across four separate and diverse samples of college students and community members (N = 594); the highest possible total score for the CoBRAS is 120. Staff members' endorsement of color-blind racial attitudes, on average, was observed near the mid-point of the scale ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .81$; "slightly disagree" to "slightly agree"). When broken down further, responses to items on the CoBRAS subscales indicated that staff, on average, endorsed color-blind racial attitudes regarding racial privilege at a level above the mid-point of the scale ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.23$; "slightly agree" to "moderately agree"). Staff endorsed color-blind racial attitudes regarding institutional discrimination near the midpoint of the scale ($M = 3.76$, $SD = .91$; "slightly disagree" to "slightly agree") and below the midpoint for blatant racial issues ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .74$; "moderately disagree" to "slightly disagree").

Descriptive survey analysis results suggested that staff members did not generally endorse a stance that implicates racism as a primary contributing factor to youths' juvenile justice involvement. Indeed, the average response to items assessing beliefs about disproportionality, "very rarely" to "rarely," indicated that, on the whole, staff do not perceive that discrimination often plays a role in the overrepresentation of African American youth in detention or limits their access to resources. Perhaps consistent with this view, staff, on average, reported moderate or above levels of color-blind racial attitudes. Comparatively, staff members' reported being a greater attunement to the general pervasiveness of racism, followed by a moderately aware of racism in the context of institutional settings, and leaned more toward racial color-blindness (i.e., lack of recognition of racism) with regard to their understanding of

privilege. Perhaps consistent with the trends observed in the quantitative data, overt discussions of the role of race and racism were rarely observed between staff in the setting. Although discussions about race were not commonly observed, staff members overwhelmingly reported beliefs that youth had experienced adversity (e.g., trauma, lack of parental guidance/oversight, poverty, unsafe neighborhood) and that this contributed to their current detainment. Notably, these beliefs were expressed by staff regardless of their observed or expressed orientation toward punishment or rehabilitation.

Implications for implementation. Staff members' values and attitudes appear to be important shaping forces with regard to the implementation of rehabilitative practices in detention. Staff members generally may have been less attuned to racism generally, and particularly as an explanation for youths' involvement in the juvenile justice system. However, staff did exhibit their understanding of other aspects of youths' contexts that contributed to their detainment and, in some cases, behaviors while detained. Further, the perceived "acceptability" and "appropriateness" of a rehabilitative approach, was observed to be greater among staff members who engage a contextually-informed understanding of youth inside and out of detention and skills-building approach to their interactions with youth. These staff members were observed engaging in rehabilitative practices on a more regular basis. In contrast, perceptions of "acceptability" and "appropriateness" of rehabilitative practices were observed as lower for staff members who saw their role in terms of enforcement (punitive) rather than intervention. Indeed, a number of these staff viewed detention as a space that is inappropriate for or incapable of achieving rehabilitation. For example, detention was described by some staff members as being like "*summer camp*," implying that youth may view their time in the setting as easy or even pleasant, thus undermining a goal of making detention a place that they will not want to return to.

Conditions for Implementation.

Leadership. Two particular aspects of leadership were important for furthering our understanding of how leadership operated in the setting and facilitated or hindered the implementation of rehabilitative practices: a) line staff members' relationships with setting leaders and b) actions of formal leaders in the setting.

Staff members' relationships with leaders. Analyses of the survey data indicated that staff members' endorsement of leadership was generally positive. The average scaled response fell above the midpoint of the scale ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .78$; "occasionally" to "very frequently"). Staff members' average response to both the subscale capturing their own relationships with leaders (e.g., comfort bringing concerns to supervisors) in the setting ($M = 3.56$, $SD = .90$) and perceptions of leaders' institutionalized practices (e.g., adequate oversight of setting; $M = 3.57$, $SD = .84$) were above the midpoint of the scale, "occasionally" to "very frequently."

Observation and interview data elaborated on the patterns highlighted in the survey data. Aligning with patterns observed within survey data, at the aggregate level, findings from qualitative data suggested that staff members were generally comfortable bringing their concerns and feedback to detention supervisors and the superintendent. Indeed, it is essential in an implementation process that barriers are removed, paving the way for success. Thus, line staff members' perceived ability to communicate with leaders may operate in this capacity. Indeed, leadership in the setting was not observed as strictly unilateral. During data collection for this study, line staff members were in the process of leading modifications to the setting's behavior management plan. Changes were driven by staff members' perceptions of what was and was not working with the current plan, and, according to some staff who were familiar with the effort, incorporated feedback from detained youth (e.g., to adjust rules related to certain contraband,

such as lip balm). Formal leadership seemed relatively hands-off throughout the process; line staff met with one another, without the presence or input of leaders, to brainstorm adaptations to the current program, which were then presented to the superintendent for approval.

At the same time, an examination of individual survey items revealed that staff members' experience of having input in the setting varied. It is worth noting that responses to the two (out of ten total) items assessing staff members' perceived ability to influence the setting (i.e., "*I feel that I can trust administrators and supervisors to listen respectfully to my concerns*", $M = 3.30$; "*This organization's leaders communicate that staff members' input is important, even if this input is not always implemented*" $M = 3.0$) contained the most variability ($SD = 1.30$, $SD = 1.24$, respectively) compared to all other leadership items. Indeed, staff members' varied experiences of their ability to provide their feedback or input to setting leaders were evident in qualitative data. For example, staff members sometimes complained to one another about particular policies related to implementing the behavior management plan (e.g., time outs) or general staffing issues (e.g., how staff were rotated [or not] through different duties; which staff would get to leave the building for lunch) and reported their hesitancy to bring these issues to supervisors due to perceptions that their concerns would be dismissed. These findings are somewhat mixed. Indeed, it is inevitable that not all staff members will feel equally positive about relationships with leaders, particularly if staff express resistance to implementing rehabilitative practices supported by setting leaders. At the same time, it may be difficult in some instances (e.g., which staff members get to leave the building at lunch) to yoke staff members' mixed experiences, as described above, directly to the implementation of rehabilitative care.

Actions of formal leaders. Leaders' interactions with one another and with line staff often modeled a rehabilitative orientation, setting the tone for line staff under their supervision.

Supervisors assigned to a particular shift team seemed to know their line staff well due to the relatively stable team composition and because they spent much of their time working alongside them in the secure area. Being embedded in the shift team was observed as a structured avenue for facilitating rehabilitation. One salient context for this was orientation meetings led by supervisors at the beginning of each shift. Supervisors used this meeting update line staff about any changes in detention population and behavior or staffing issues. Often, the supervisor set the tone for the oncoming shift by modeling a rehabilitative orientation in their discussion of detained youth. Additionally, supervisors were often present with line staff and throughout the shift and sometimes used these opportunities to reinforce rehabilitative practices or attitudes. For example, staff members and a supervisor were observed having a discussion with one another about the conditions of detention. A few staff members commented that detention was “nothing like adult jail,” implying the detention was, or should be, easier for youth to handle. The supervisor on the shift pointed out ways that detention, even if less stressful or difficult in some ways, was quite similar to jail. The supervisor reminded staff of youths’ lack of freedom, privacy, and comfort; youth sleep “three feet from a stainless steel toilet,” in a room that always has a light on, and that they never get a good night’s sleep due to the clanging of heavy steel doors and the noises made by equipment used by staff during their mandated room checks every 15 minutes.

Though leaders consulted often with one another, individually and as a group, when issues arose in the setting (e.g., complaint about a line staff member, grievance from a detained youth), supervisors were not uniform in their orientation to rehabilitative practices and disagreements between leaders regarding “best” practices were evident. In particular, differing interpretations of policies and procedures were evident and sometimes resulted in mixed

messages to staff about policies or procedures. As a result, leaders sometimes undermined one another's efforts, derailing progress toward successful implementation of rehabilitative practices. Individual item responses from the survey support results from qualitative data. Specifically, a majority of survey respondents (65%; N =15) were somewhat lukewarm in their endorsement of leaders' consistent communication about changes that affect them. Survey participants reported that leadership "occasionally" consistently communicates about changes to policies, services and expectations of staff (M = 3.2, SD = .94). Thus, staff members' experience of leadership in the setting may have varied based on the number of leaders that they typically had contact with in the setting (i.e., day shift generally had contact with more leaders) and the extent to which these leaders interpreted and communicated detention policies and procedures. Ethnographic and survey data suggest there may be some variability from one supervisor to the next in terms of their consistent communication.

Information about the history of the setting demonstrates the commitment of formal leadership, particularly the superintendent, to implementing rehabilitative practices. As a primary example, detention initiated a partnership with academic researcher (not this researcher) over a decade ago with the goal of increasing the detention's understanding of and response to disruptive detained youth. The partnership yielded several changes in practice. Key among them was the inclusion of trauma screenings as part of general intake procedures. Staff members' engagement in these systematic screenings helped them make decisions and take more effective actions with regard to youths' risk for self-harm and need for services. This change in practice also provided a common framework for staff to communicate with one another about the youths' needs. The partnership also included an evaluation component, conducted by the partnering researcher, and feedback to the setting about the effectiveness of their use of the screening tool to

assist them in their continued implementation. Currently, this screening is still part of normal detention procedures and newly hired staff receive training in the screening tool as part of their required orientation to the setting.

Implications for implementation. Our findings related to leadership provide evidence of particular facets of leadership that facilitate the successful implementation of rehabilitative practices. Namely, staff members' reported generally positive perceptions of leaders (e.g., their comfort bringing concerns to leaders in the setting) and were observed exerting their influence aspects of detention center operations. Specifically, staff members were observed taking a leadership role in the process of modifying the behavior management plan to be more consistent and in line with a rehabilitative aim. Thus, leadership was not unilateral in the setting, allowing staff to have a sense of ownership over some aspects of their work, which may have increased the perceived acceptability of rehabilitative practices, at least among these staff. Formal leaders served as both facilitators and barriers to successful implementation. Supervisors' differing orientations toward rehabilitation and punishment sometimes resulted in mixed messages to staff regarding how they should do their work. At the same time, leaders were often observed setting a rehabilitative tone for their shifts and engaging in efforts to re-orient staff toward rehabilitative thinking or actions, and the setting itself has adopted policies and procedures that support rehabilitation.

Climate. Our analyses suggested that climate, that is the codified policies and procedures in the setting, were characterized by four important themes that affected implementation: a) staff members' clarity of job expectations, b) training opportunities for staff members, c) evidence of a climate for implementation in "the text" of the setting, and d) opportunities for staff to receive emotional support.

Clarity of job expectations. Survey responses indicated that staff members' perceptions of the clarity of their job expectations, on average, were rated above the midpoint of the scale ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .72$; "very frequently" to "always"). The juxtaposition of survey and observation data revealed that staff members' perceptions of climate and the researchers observations differed in important ways. Although staff members, on average, reported a relatively strong sense of their job expectations via quantitative survey data, patterns in qualitative observations suggest that individuals' perceptions may not necessarily reflect a widely-shared understanding of job expectations. Indeed, staff members interpreted policies based on how these were conveyed and reinforced by leaders in the setting (who may not always encourage the same interpretation) and through their own lens. Thus, individual staff members may feel totally clear about policies and expectations, yet interpretation and subsequent implementation of policies, procedures, and practices were observed to differ across staff. This was particularly salient in the context of staff members' implementation of the behavior management program. Specifically, how staff interpreted the purpose and procedure for time outs affected how these were implemented. First, descriptions of the purpose of time outs were not consistent across staff, including at the level of leadership. Importantly, staff members' understanding of the purpose of the timeout, again in terms of rehabilitation or punishment, shaped their implementation of this consequence. Some staff members defined time outs in alignment with a rehabilitative aim, as opportunities for youth to engage in reflection about behavior to improve future behavior, and viewed supporting this process as part of their job. Other times, staff members were so averse to the time out, in many cases because they viewed them as ineffective punishments (e.g., "*kiddie stuff*"), that they opted to implement another consequence entirely. As a result, the tension between punishment and rehabilitation played out in real time among staff members as reflected

in their decision-making regarding consequences for youths' disruptive or rule-breaking behaviors.

Training opportunities for staff. Staff members' reported, on average, that training opportunities are offered "rarely" to "occasionally" ($M = 2.97$, $SD = .99$). Similar to patterns observed in survey data, staff members generally conservative in their report about the amount of training opportunities available to them. Although newly hired staff complete many hours of training, ongoing opportunities were perceived as somewhat limited. Staff reported that this could be due, at least in part, to time constraints (both inside and outside of working hours). Previous research documents the importance of adequate training to support successful implementation (e.g., Klein & Sorra, 1996). Thus, increasing staff members' access to training opportunities, particularly related to rehabilitative practices, may increase the implementation of rehabilitative practices in the setting.

Written policies and procedures. Survey data did not assess the extent to which the "text" of detention supported a climate for rehabilitation. However, qualitative data sources revealed some important aspects of text that speak to implementation strengths, reflected in the setting's values, mission, and vision statements. These statements are displayed in the administration area of the building, where staff and visiting service providers can view them. Of particular note, these statements indicate that the purpose of detention is to provide a "*safe and caring environment*" with aims of guiding youth "*toward productive and lawful lives*" and enhancing "*community safety and well-being*." The setting's statements evidence an orientation toward viewing youths' potential; youth are "*our greatest natural resource and represent our collective future*." Further, these statements specify some particular avenues for achieving these aims, such as implementing effective programming and recognizing that "*the always-present potential for*

change can only be realized through the building of positive relationships.” Detention is also part of local efforts to develop a community service system, which support rehabilitative practices, such as trauma-informed care, learning collaborative and trainings that include representatives from detention. An analysis of the text provides an important view of setting practice given that there is evidence that institutional behavior can be governed and changed with attention to texts (e.g., Pence, 1999; Smith, 2005). Thus, the “text” of detention evidenced a commitment to rehabilitative aims and practices.

Opportunities for staff to receive emotional support. Staff members’ reported, on average, that structured opportunities for emotional support from staff and supervisors were present “occasionally” to “very frequently,” though leaning closer to the former ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 1.20$). Indeed, results from qualitative data supported the existence of such opportunities (e.g., staff meetings), though the extent to which staff utilized these varied. For example, though staff members could receive counseling services paid for by the setting, very few staff reported this resource, and no one reported having used these services. Importantly, the climate for support may have clashed with setting norms (culture) around the expression of emotions among detention staff. Generally, female staff were observed to exhibit more emotional expression and discussions about emotions relative to their male peers. Notably, several relatively less expressive staff members viewed talking about or exhibiting feelings (other than anger) as evidence that another staff member was “soft” and therefore more prone to manipulation by detained youth. On one hand, the emotional distance that some staff kept between themselves and youth and other staff may have intended to protect them from the often difficult feelings (e.g., anger, sadness, disappointment) that other staff experienced in relation to seeing youth cycle through the juvenile justice system, often with increasingly severe charges and consequences. On

the other hand, the efforts some staff took to close off their feelings, where youth and other staff were concerned, may have had negative consequences for implementation, such as increased depersonalization, a facet of burnout that has been associated with punitive attitudes among correctional staff (Lambert, Hogan, & Jiang, 2010).

Implications for implementation. Though the “text” of detention was supportive of a rehabilitative aim, other facets of climate were mixed. In particular, given the variability in staff members’ actual implementation of practices aligning with the setting’s values, mission, and vision, the translation of the text aspect of climate into practice remains a particular challenge for the setting. Climate and culture may have intersected in important ways that inhibit staff members’ expression of emotions with one another, and the general lack of training opportunities provided to staff may hinder effective implementation of rehabilitative practices.

Culture. Similar to our findings regarding staff members’ values and attitudes, findings related to culture in the setting evidenced staff members’ general orientation toward either punishment or rehabilitation. Norms were evident at two levels: a) staff members’ relationships with one another and b) cultural norms evident at the level of the setting. Related to implementation, membership in either of these two subcultures, rehabilitative and punitive, seemed to influence staff members’ actions in ways the either supported or impeded rehabilitation.

Staff members’ relationships with one another. Survey responses indicated that, on average, staff members reported positive and effective working relationships with one another ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.04$; “occasionally” to “very frequently”). The nature of staff relationship may be central to the implementation of rehabilitative practices given that shift membership is relatively stable, staff members on the same shift work closely with one another for extended

periods of time, and staff members rely on one another, for example to ensure one another's physical safety. Interestingly, one item, included as part of the relationship norms scale, assessed the extent to which staff members felt comfortable sharing their emotional experiences with one another (i.e., "*I feel comfortable sharing my emotional responses to my work with other staff and supervisors*"). The mean response for this item ($M = 3.0$, $SD = 1.35$) indicated that staff, on average felt comfortable sharing their emotional responses with other staff and supervisors "occasionally." It is worth noting the variability in responses; approximately one-third of responding staff members (30.4%, $N = 7$) reportedly feel comfortable sharing their emotions "rarely" or "never." Between one-third and one-half of staff reported feeling (39.1%, $N = 9$) reported feeling "very frequently" or "always" comfortable sharing their emotional responses with co-workers. Though observational data revealed some patterns in norms for emotional expression evident among a subset of staff (i.e., emotional expression, outside of anger, is a sign of weakness), it may be that these norms are limited to a small number of vocal staff and not generally representative of a shared norm; staff members' comfort sharing feelings, on the whole, could be idiosyncratic. Emotional sharing among staff may be a core facet of the implementation of rehabilitative practices given the emphasis on facilitating emotional safety – not only among resident of the center, but among responding staff. (e.g., Bloom, Bennington-Davis, Farragher, McCorkle, Nice-Martini, & Wellbank, 2003)

Observations of staff revealed that staff members with similar understandings of delinquency and orientations toward punishment or rehabilitation gravitated toward one another. Within these interactions, staff reinforced each others' like-minded attitudes and behaviors. For example, staff members were observed engaged in a discussion about the ways in which the definition of delinquency has shifted over time. The group took turns recounting

things they had done as children or teenagers (e.g., shooting a neighbor in the leg with a BB gun) and labeling them with charges, such as “*mob action*” and “*assault*.” They described examples of things that youth currently get arrested for and acknowledged that this seemed unfair. Conversely, staff members’ interactions and conversations with one another (e.g., discussions about the whereabouts of some formerly detained youth) sometimes served to reinforce norms that were counter to a rehabilitative focus, such as the belief that youth are incapable of positive change.

Institutional norms. Survey responses indicated that staff members were generally positive in their endorsement of institutionalized cultural norms (items assessing staff members’ perceptions of how the setting promotes collaboration among staff and brings out the best in staff (M = 3.41, SD = .91; “occasionally” to “very frequently”). Indeed, staff members’ ability to effectively collaborate was particularly evident in their responses to crises. For example, during one observation, a youth attempted to seriously injure himself while sitting alone in a day room. Staff members responding to the alert from master control acted quickly and collaborated seamlessly to ensure that the youth’s safety and connect him with necessary emergency services. In a follow-up discussion about the incident, a setting leader reported always being impressed by staff members’ ability to “*come together*” during a crisis and forget any “*drama*” that may be going on between them. Thus, demands of the setting may sometimes override individual orientations in service of a common goal. Setting leaders were attentive to staff culture and dynamics and appeared to act in service of supporting a rehabilitative culture. For example, during the study, setting leaders made the decision to re-arrange some staff members in an effort to improve staff relationships and support the rehabilitative focus of the setting.

Implications for implementation. Staff members’ behaviors toward one another and youth were shaped by their subculture membership, and these subcultures were evident across

shifts. As a result of these subcultures orientation toward either punishment or rehabilitation, staff often overtly butted heads on a number of issues related to their practices and interactions with detained youth, which served to undermine effective implementation of rehabilitative practices. Despite this, staff members demonstrated their ability to work together effectively, particularly in response to crises, and leaders of the setting engaged in efforts to steer the setting toward rehabilitative aims, for example, by re-arranging shift membership.

Discussion

Despite the growing evidence to support rehabilitative interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth, the effectiveness of these hinges on successful implementation. This study builds on previous research that found evidence to support the presence of rehabilitation as part of detention staff members' routine practices (see chapter 3). This study adds to the current literature by examining the process of implementation, that is, the factors that shape staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices. Specifically, this study employed qualitative ethnographic observations/interviews in the setting and quantitative survey data collected from detention staff and leaders to explore factors associated with the implementation of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention: (a) staff attitudes and values as related to rehabilitative practices, and (b) setting level factors that have been identified as important factors associated with implementation success (i.e., leadership, climate, culture). Findings from this study indicated that each of the facets examined shaped implementation in important ways.

The ongoing tension between punishment and rehabilitation represents a primary challenge to successful implementation of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention. Our study found evidence to suggest that this tension operates at the individual and setting level, across all factors included in this study, and shaped staff members' implementation (or not) of

rehabilitative practices. Indeed, this tension is well documented in juvenile justice research that has implicated both individual factors, such as gender (e.g., Bazemore, Dicker, & Al-Gadheeb, 1994) and organizational environment (e.g., Bazemore & Dicker, 1994) as important predictors of staff members' personal orientations. Additionally, juvenile justice researchers have examined consequences, such as burnout (e.g., Lambert, Hogan, Altheimer, Jiang, & Stevenson, 2010), associated with a punitive orientation.

Regarding individual level factors, detention staff members' orientation toward punishment or rehabilitation may have shaped by their attributions of youths' behavior to contextual factors, such as race and other circumstances (e.g., experiences of trauma, neighborhood or family violence). This study found that detention staff members, on average, reported that racism plays a relatively minor role in the disproportionate representation of African American youth in the juvenile justice system and endorsed moderate levels of color-blind racial attitudes. Of note, staff members were rarely observed discussing race, though most reported a general belief that youths' contexts played a role in their involvement in the juvenile justice system. Importantly, staff members' who exhibited a limited contextual understanding of detained youth seemed to exhibit more punitive orientations. Indeed, attitudes may be particularly difficult targets for change. Research with juvenile corrections officers suggests that organizational characteristics may be influential with regard to staff members' interactions with detained youth but less so with regard to staff members' attitudes (Bazemore & Dicker, 1992). Thus, education or training efforts focused on changing staff members' practices may positively affect implementation, even if attitudes and beliefs remain relatively stable.

When infused throughout the setting, leadership may support the implementation of rehabilitative practices. This study found evidence that leadership in the setting was not

unilateral. Indeed, staff members endorsed generally positive relationships with setting leaders and line staff were observed exerting their influence via efforts to revise their behavior management plan. Related to staff members' autonomy, shared decision-making may be particularly important for successful implementation of rehabilitative practices in detention, as lower decision-making input has been associated with higher rates of staff burnout in correctional settings (Lambert, Hogan, & Jiang, 2010). Additionally, setting leaders worked alongside line staff, where they were positioned to reinforce a rehabilitative orientations and practices among the staff they were supervising. However, given that the setting includes multiple levels of leaders (i.e., supervisors and the superintendent), leaders may have struggled to effectively communicate uniform expectations about policies and procedures. In their articulation of the mechanisms through which setting leaders effectively establish a values-based organizational climate, Grojean and colleagues (2004) assert that consistency, at all levels of leadership, is critical for establishing and reinforcing a values-based climate. Thus, inconsistent communications between leaders and staff in the setting undermined the creation of a climate for the implementation of rehabilitative practices.

Notably, though we did not have enough information to speak to the specific ways that outside forces shaped leadership, and the general institutional context, it is useful to note that some participants mentioned these as important. Detention is part of a larger juvenile justice and local community service system, and detained youth commonly overlap with involvement in other services. Beyond the local context, detention operates in alignment with state and national policies and mandates, which are ever evolving. The superintendent, more so than supervisors or line staff, reported experiencing the influence that outside forces can have on detention. In turn, detention staff experienced these changes as filtered through the superintendent and supervising

staff. Thus, implementation was shaped by outside forces, for example, in the context of formal leadership's communication of new policies and procedures.

Organizational literature emphasizes the importance of creating a climate *for* a particular innovation (e.g., Schneider & Reichers, 1983). Overall, though a climate for implementation of rehabilitative practices was evident in the text of the setting, there was evidence of a disconnect in translating the values, mission, and vision in the setting into a climate that supports staff members' ability to engage in practices aligning with these. In particular, our results suggested that opportunities for staff members to seek emotional support may be perceived to be present in the setting sometimes, staff members' willingness to utilize these may swayed by cultural norms around emotional expression among staff members. Existing models for infusing rehabilitation in staff members' routine practices indicate that these practices must also be infused at every level of the organization (e.g., Fallot & Harris, 2009). Thus, emotional safety, an identified rehabilitative practice evident in detention staff members' work with youth (see chapter 3), may be lacking at the line staff and leadership levels of the organization. Strengthening this aspect of climate may require that, in addition to providing more explicit opportunities for support, the setting challenge staff members' cultural norms around emotional expressions and connections with detained youth. Indeed, staff members' emotional safety is a key component of models that infuse rehabilitative practices throughout organizational settings (e.g., Bloom et al., 2003).

Similarly, increasing a shared climate among staff related to their job expectations may be key to supporting a climate *for* rehabilitative practices. Although staff members were generally confident in their understanding of their job duties, observations of staff in the setting revealed that perceptions of staff members' purpose or role were not uniform. As noted above, leaders' inconsistent communication may have contributed to staff members' differing

interpretation of policies and procedures, thus undermining efforts to establish a rehabilitative (i.e., values-based) climate (Grojean, et al., 2004). In addition to establishing climate via increasing leaderships' consistent communication and practices, the climate for rehabilitation in the setting may be strengthened through increased training in rehabilitative practices. Notably, training opportunities were identified as somewhat lacking in the setting. Indeed, adequate staff training is crucial to successful innovation implementation generally (Klein & Sorra, 1996), and training in rehabilitative practices in particular has been associated with juvenile correctional staff members' increased use of rehabilitative strategies (Marsh & Evans, 2006).

Setting cultures can be strong shaping forces that reify members' beliefs and actions. Indeed, two subcultures, organized around punishment and rehabilitation, were evident in the setting. Organizational culture exists at the setting level, and is learned, passed on to new members through socialization, and has the ability to evolve through natural or guided processes (Schein, 1990). Importantly, culture can be greatly influenced by setting leadership, which can effectively steer culture in a desired direction (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Indeed, one area of strength for this setting stemmed from leaders' support of staff members collaborative problem solving and actions, particularly in crisis situations. Further, leaders demonstrated their awareness of the punitive and rehabilitative subcultures and took actions (i.e., rotating staff members to different shifts) to support the setting's rehabilitative aim.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has a number of strengths. First, this study is one of the first to articulate the ways that individual and organizational factors shape the implementation of rehabilitative practices in short-term detention staff members' daily routine. Indeed, this study makes important strides toward articulating how rehabilitative practices, as opposed to pre-packed

programs, may be successfully implemented in settings that are highly secure and restrictive by design. Further, the use of survey and ethnographic observation/interview data were employed and integrated in pursuit of the mixed methods purpose of *complementarity*. These sources of data captured different facets of the same phenomenon - factors that shape the implementation rehabilitative practices – capitalizing on the various strengths of these data. Including multiple sources of data allowed us to examine staff members’ own perceptions, as reported via survey data, and expand on and contextualize these through ethnographic observations/interviews with staff members that took place over the course of approximately one year. Thus, the researcher’s long-term engagement in the setting supported a deep understanding of implementation processes in context of setting members’ lived experiences. Although findings from this study may not be widely generalizable, particular aspects of this study may be common among juvenile correctional settings and therefore useful for planning or evaluating future implementation efforts.

We also noted a number of limitations in the present study. First, survey and observational/interview data were collected at different time points (i.e., within a year). Due to staff turnover, it is possible that some staff members represented in the survey data did not participate in the ethnographic portion of this study and vice versa. Further, participation in both portions of the study was voluntary. Survey data may reflect a highly motivated and self-selected sample, as some staff members did not participate in this portion of the study. Additionally, our small survey sample size limited our ability to analyze this data beyond a descriptive level. Although very few staff members refused to participate in the ethnographic portion of the study, staff members varied with regard to how much they interacted with the researcher. Thus, the

amount of observational/interview data collected varied across staff members. Further, this study took place in a single setting, thus findings may not generalize to other detention settings.

Finally, it is necessary to note that juvenile detention is part of a larger system in which persons of color are disproportionately represented (e.g., Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; OJJDP, 2009; Puzzanchera & Adams, 2009) and is often critiqued for employing racially biased policies and practices (e.g., Albonetti & Hepburn, 1996; Leiber & Mack, 2003). However, it is reasonable to assume that the juvenile justice system, and juvenile detention, will remain in existence for the foreseeable future. Still, research examining factors affecting the implementation of rehabilitative practices in these settings, such as those articulated in the present study, is worthwhile to support the improvement of detained youths' experiences (via more effective implementation and dissemination).

Conclusion

Despite the growing evidence to support the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions with juvenile justice-involved youth, research examining rehabilitation, particularly in the context of correctional staffs' routine practices, is lacking. Detention facilities, which serve as a brief detainment location for a large proportion of juvenile justice-involved youth representing a wide range of offenses, are an important setting for intervention that is particularly absent in extant research literature. This study builds on previous research that examined the nature of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention via observations of staff members engaged in routine practices. This study focused on exploring individual and setting level factors that may affect staff members' implementation of these practices via mixed methods analyses of survey and ethnographic observation/interview data. Specifically, this study focused on understanding how staff members' attitudes and values and conditions for implementation (i.e., leadership,

climate, and culture) shape staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices. Patterns from each data source informed our analyses and interpretation of the data and results. Our results indicated that each of these factors was related to implementation in the setting, and highlight some strengths of the setting, such as leadership's commitment to implementation and promotion of staff members' collaborative efforts in crisis situations. Results also revealed areas for improvement or growth in the setting, such as increasing leaders' consistency in communication with staff to promote a stronger climate for the implementation of rehabilitative practices. Indeed, one essential recommendation is that the setting increases the amount of staff trainings offered and tailors these to address areas of improvement.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Though juvenile arrest rates have declined over the past decade (37% fewer arrests were made in 2012 compared to 2003), approximately 1.3 million youth are arrested annually (OJJDP, 2014). Further, juvenile arrests continue to demonstrate a “revolving door” pattern in which juvenile justice-involved youth are likely to have multiple contacts with the system (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006), and approximately 81,000 youth reside in juvenile detainment facilities (OJJDP, 2010). The adoption of increasingly punitive policies in response to delinquency has had widespread negative effects across the juvenile justice system. For example, the number of juvenile cases transferred to adult court has increased (Bishop, 2000). Adult convictions, as opposed to juvenile records, are not sealed and may be accessed through public record searches. The effects of a minor’s adult criminal conviction becoming part of their permanent record may be life-long, serving as a source of stigma and potential hindrance for success (e.g., obtaining employment). Rehabilitation is generally presented in juxtaposition to punitive practices, and these are often viewed as mutually exclusive (Dunlap & Roush, 1995). Indeed, the oscillation of policy and public opinion from rehabilitation to punishment is well documented (e.g., Schultz, 1973; Cullen, Golden, & Cullen, 1983; Piquero et al., 2010).

Rehabilitation, as it pertains to juvenile justice, generally refers to intervention practices that aim to build juveniles’ competencies and/or skills to decrease the likelihood of recidivism (OJJDP, 1999). Specific outcomes of interest can include reduced recidivism and increased emotional or social (e.g., Nelson-Gray et al., 2006; Trupin, Stewart, Beach, & Boesky, 2002), and independent living skills (Javdani & Allen, 2014). Most commonly, rehabilitation has been studied in the context of specific, packaged interventions (e.g., Lipsey, 2009).

While punitive practices are ubiquitous, there is a strong case to be made for engaging and broadly disseminating rehabilitative approaches. Indeed, a growing body of evidence supports the effectiveness of rehabilitative approaches to interventions targeting juvenile justice-involved youth. Lipsey's (2009) meta-analysis found that juvenile justice interventions across contexts that are associated with reduced recidivism were characterized as having a "therapeutic orientation" (versus, for example, punitive), targeting high-risk youth, and a high quality implementation. Indeed, interventions employing "scare them straight" tactics showed no positive effects or actually increased recidivism. Importantly, Lipsey asserted that rehabilitation could be implemented as part of routine practices in a setting. Indeed, there is a relatively small but growing body of literature documenting the promise of interventions infused throughout staff members' daily routines (e.g., Fallot & Harris, 2009)

Juvenile detention is one such setting in which the dissemination of rehabilitative interventions must occur. Detention facilities are often a first-stop, though not necessarily the last or only stop, for juvenile justice-involved youth. A general purpose of detention is to serve as a secure holding location for youth while their cases are processed through the court system, though youth move in and out of detention through a variety of avenues. Detainment periods in detention are typically brief, though youth may be housed for longer periods of time depending on a variety of circumstances. Youth facing adult charges, for example, may be housed longer as adult court cases tend to move slower compared to juvenile court. Youth may also be sentenced to detention per the order of a judge (e.g., probation violation) or may stay in detention while awaiting transfer to another correctional facility. Finally, youth brought in by law enforcement who do not meet criteria for detainment, as determined by detention staff, are released to their guardians without completing intake (i.e., "catch and release"). Youth detained in juvenile

detention facilities represent a spectrum of delinquency, from truancy to murder, as well as general involvement in the juvenile justice system. Thus, detention centers serve as a critical context for intervention given the nature and size of the youth population that come into contact with these settings. Importantly, juvenile detention facilities may pose unique challenges for implementation, due to structural (i.e., high security) barriers and restrictive policies and procedures, and may lack the capacity to implement packaged programs. Thus, interventions may be more sustainable if delivered in the context of detention staff members' routine practices.

Although juvenile justice-involved youth are likely to have contact with multiple individuals in this system (e.g., police, attorneys, judges, probation officers), detained youths' experience of this system may rest predominantly in their interactions with detention center staff, who are in contact with youth around the clock. Perhaps unique to juvenile corrections, the nature of relationships between staff and youth are not completely unlike those between a child and caregiver (e.g., Guarino-Ghezzi & Tirrell, 2008); thus interactions between staff members and detained youth constitute a large proportion of staff members' routine practices. Hence, the successful implementation of rehabilitation practices as part of routine care in detention relies on individual staff members' actions. Despite the promise of rehabilitative interventions, little is known about the extent to which detention settings can support the implementation of rehabilitative practices and what conditions shape this implementation.

This study made meaningful strides toward understanding the implementation of rehabilitative practices in juvenile detention in the context of staff members' routine practices. In this study rehabilitative practices were defined as actions taken by staff, embedded within codified setting procedure and protocol, and that promoted a rehabilitative aim (i.e., detained youths' competencies and/or skills that will support their ability to succeed as members of the

community). Specifically, this study articulated the nature of the implementation of rehabilitative practices (i.e., what do these practices look like in detention) and offered insights into the process of implementation by examining individual and organizational level factors that shape the extent to which staff members implement these practices.

Findings from the portion of the study described in chapter 3 indicated the emergence of four primary forms of rehabilitative practices in the context of staff members' everyday activities: a) promotion of detained youths' emotional safety, b) provision of rights-based information and explanations, c) the orientation of detained youth to the culture of the justice system to promote youths' success in this system, and d) investment in youth that extended beyond detention. Further, these practices were observed across four critical contexts: a) staff-led group activities, b) routine contact between individual youth and staff (e.g., formal intake procedures, informal conversations in a dayroom), c) staff-only spaces, and d) in staff members' contact with formerly detained youth living in the community. Further, this study included detained youths' perceptions of staff members' engagement in rehabilitative practices as an important source of information to extend our understanding of these practices. Notably, although youths' responses supported the existence of rehabilitative practices in the setting, youth were not uniform in their opinions, which supported our observation that staff members were not uniform in their implementation of these practices.

Thus, the second portion of this study (described in chapter 4) focused on exploring individual and setting level factors affecting staff members' implementation of these practices via mixed methods analyses of survey and ethnographic observation/interview data. An overarching finding of this study was that the tension between rehabilitation and punishment was evident in each factor of interest. Staff members who exhibited a more contextually based

understanding of youths' involvement in the juvenile justice system generally exhibited a rehabilitative orientation and were observed engaging in rehabilitative practices more often. Though staff members' attitudes seemed to be linked to their behavior, existing research suggests that targeting correctional staff members' attitudes may be less effective compared to organizational factors to change their behavior (Bazemore & Dicker, 1992).

Organizational factors were found to operate in unique and connected ways. Notably, leadership was not observed as unilateral, and line staff were observed exerting influence over formalized practices. However, formal leaders in the setting were not consistent in their messages to staff regarding the interpretation (rehabilitative and punitive) of policies and procedures, which may have contributed to the lack of shared climate among staff regarding their role in the setting, thus undermining the climate *for* implementing rehabilitative practices. Other emerging theme within our examination of climate suggested that increasing training for staff members in rehabilitative practices and infusing rehabilitative practices (i.e., opportunities for emotional support) throughout all levels of the setting would strengthen the climate for implementation. Indeed, previous research demonstrates the utility of training in rehabilitative aims to support correctional staff members' increased implementation (Marsh & Evans, 2006) and models for infusing rehabilitative practices in the context of routine practices emphasize the need for these practices to extend to all levels of the organization (e.g., Falloot & Harris, 2009). Finally, punishment and rehabilitation emerged in the form of two subcultures in the setting, evident across shifts. Previous research documents the relationship between leadership and culture; leadership may steer culture in important ways (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Indeed, this was evident in the setting, as leaders made changes to shift composition in support of their rehabilitative aim.

These studies provide empirical support for Lipsey's (2009) theoretical assertion that the implementation of rehabilitative practices is possible in the context of service providers' routine practices and provide important information about the factors that shape implementation in the setting. By utilizing a multi-method approach to data collection, that included ethnographic observations and survey data from staff in the setting, this study was able to provide rich descriptions of phenomena of interest in the setting that incorporated multiple perspectives. In the first portion of the study, ethnographic observations allowed the researcher to experience staff members' implementation in vivo and prolonged engagement in the setting promoted the researchers' ability to understand observed interactions between staff and youth in a more nuanced way.

Findings from this study suggested future avenues for research. The present study pushes the current literature forward by articulating the nature and factors affecting the implementation of rehabilitative practices in detention. Thus, future research is needed to connect rehabilitative practices that are infused in staff members' daily routine to outcomes of interest (e.g., recidivism). Additionally, this study found that many staff members keep in touch with formerly detained youth, though we were largely unable to observe these relationships as they occurred in the community (i.e., outside of the detention setting). Future explorations of staff members' decisions to keep in touch with youth (or not) may provide insight into how staff members view their work with youth and the youth themselves and how their roles shift in the context of relationships with formerly detained youth. Further, the inclusion of detained youth, who are often absent in research examining juvenile correctional settings, allowed for a broadened understanding of the implementation of rehabilitative practices from the perspective of targets of these practices. Notably, youths' perspectives highlighted the importance of future research that

focuses on unpacking the relationships between detained youth and staff, particularly with regard to youths' discernment between staff members as helpful and supportive (or not) and how this affects their experience of the setting.

Though the present study explores an institutional response in juvenile detention that aims to support rehabilitation, it is necessary to note that juvenile detention is part of a larger system in which persons of color are disproportionately represented (e.g., Alexander, 2012; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; OJJDP, 2009; Puzzanchera & Adams, 2009) and is often critiqued for employing racially biased policies and practices (e.g., Albonetti & Hepburn, 1996; Leiber & Mack, 2003). Still, it is reasonable to assume that the juvenile justice system, and juvenile detention, will remain in existence for the foreseeable future. Research on rehabilitative practices and factors affecting their implementation in these settings, such as those articulated in the present study, supports the improvement of detained youths' experiences (via more effective implementation and dissemination).

The employment of a mixed methods approach to the analysis of survey and ethnographic observation/interview data in the second portion of the study was beneficial, as patterns from one data source could be examined next to patterns observed in the other. In this way, staff members' perspectives from the survey could be understood in context of qualitative data and vice versa. In particular, this approach facilitated the ability to illustrate the complexities inherent in implementation efforts from the perspective of staff members and an outside observer to the setting (the researcher).

The strengths of this study lie in the use of multiple methods and, in particular, ethnographic observations/interviews. Ethnographic methods were well-suited to the aims of this study. Juvenile detention centers are a special kind of community – the population of detained

youth is ever-rotating and staff members are also not permanent residents, though they do spend a significant amount of time with detained youth. Indeed, ethnographic methods have an established history in institutional settings with the aim of understanding, broadly, how settings function (e.g., Schein, 1990; Smith, 2005). Observational data in particular provided the ability to contextualize, and thus enhance through illustration, findings from quantitative data sources. Their interplay and attention to the range of constructs of interest supported a rich description of detention center as a critical case study example that promoted a deep understanding of the implementation of rehabilitative practices in a particular context. At the same time, findings from this study contribute to a larger understanding of rehabilitation in juvenile detention.

In sum, this study contributes to a growing body of literature documenting rehabilitative practices in the context of service providers' daily routine. The focus on implementing "brand name" programs has been viewed as an ineffective long-term solution for delinquency intervention (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010). The ability for a setting to successfully infuse rehabilitative practices into staff members' work presents an exciting shift toward higher order change in service delivery organizations. Notably, this study is among the first to examine these practices in the context of juvenile detention, and thus at the forefront of highlighting the nature of rehabilitative practices and factors that shape these in juvenile correctional settings. Importantly, this study demonstrates that nature of rehabilitation practices may be somewhat unique in these settings given the nature of youth and staff relationships, the focus on physical safety in the setting, and the overarching tension between punishment and rehabilitation evident as a shaping force at all levels of the setting.

REFERENCES

- Aarons, G. A. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership: Association with attitudes toward evidence-based practice. *Psychiatric Services, 57*(8), 1162-1169.
- Aarons, G., & Sommerfeld, D. H. (2012). Leadership, innovation climate, and attitudes toward evidence-based practice during a statewide implementation. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 51*(4), 423-431.
- Albonetti, C. A., & Hepburn, J. R. (1996). Prosecutorial discretion to defer criminalization: The effects of defendant's ascribed and achieved status characteristics. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 12*(1), 63-81.
- Allen, N. E., Larsen, S., Javdani, S., & Lehrner, A. (2012) Council-based approaches to reforming the healthcare response to domestic violence: Promising findings and cautionary tales. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50*, 50 – 63.
- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Antonio, M. E., & Young, J. L. (2011). The effects of tenure on staff apathy and treatment orientation: A comparison of respondent characteristics and environmental factors. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*, 1-16.
- Ashkar, P. J., & Kenny, D. T. (2008). Views from the inside: young offenders' subjective experiences of incarceration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 52*(8), 584-597.

- Azeem, M., Aujla, A., Rammerth, M., Binsfeld, G., & Jones, R. B. (2011). Effectiveness of Six Core Strategies Based on Trauma Informed Care in Reducing Seclusions and Restraints at a Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Hospital. *Journal Of Child & Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 24*(1), 11-15.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 112-121.
- Bazemore, G., & Dicker, T. J. (1994). Explaining detention worker orientation: Individual characteristics, occupational conditions, and organizational environment. *Science, 22*(4), 297-312.
- Bazemore, G., Dicker, T., & Al-Gadheeb, H. (1994). The treatment ideal and detention reality: Demographic, professional/occupational, and organizational influences on detention worker punitiveness. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 19*, 21-41.
- Belcastro, Bergseth, K. J., & Bouffard, J. A. (2007). The long-term impact of restorative justice programming for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice 35*, 433-451.
- Bergseth, K. J., & Bouffard, J. A. (2012). Examining the effectiveness of a restorative justice program for various types of juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 57*(9), 1054-175.
- Bishop, D. (2000). Juvenile offenders in the adult criminal justice system. *Crime and Justice, 27*, 81-167.
- Black, P. J., Woodworth, M., Tremblay, M., & Carpenter, T. (2012). A review of trauma-informed treatment for adolescents. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 53*(3), 192-203.

- Bloom, S. L., Bennington-Davis, M., Farragher, B., McCorkle, D., Nice-Martini, K., & Wellbank, K. (2003). Multiple opportunities for creating sanctuary. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 74(2), 173-190.
- Brewer, R. M., & Heitzeg, N. A. (2008). The racialization of crime and punishment: Criminal justice, color-blind racism, and the political economy of the prison industrial complex. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(5), 625-644.
- Chen, M., Miller, B., Grube, J., & Waiters, E. (2006). Music, substance use, and aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 67(3), 373-379.
- Clay, A. (2006). "All I need is one mic": Mobilizing youth for social change in the post-civil rights era. *Social Justice*, 33(2), 105-121.
- Conseur, A., Rivara, F. P., & Emanuel, I. (1997). Juvenile delinquency and adolescent trauma: How strong is the connection? *Pediatrics*, 99(3), 1-7.
- Cullen, F. T., Golden, K. M., & Cullen, J. B. (1983). Is child-saving dead? Attitudes toward juvenile rehabilitation in Illinois. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11, 1-13.
- Davidson-Arad, B. (2005). Observed violence, abuse, and risk behaviors in juvenile correctional facilities: Comparison of inmate and staff report. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, 547-559.
- Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619-654.
- Dilulio, J. J., Jr. (1995) The coming of the super-predators, *Weekly Standard* 27 November: 23-28.

- Dowden, C., & Tellier, C. (2004). Predicting work-related stress in correctional officers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 31-47.
- Dunlap, E. L., & Roush, D. W. (1995) Juvenile detention as process and place. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 3*-16.
- Edwards, V. J., Holden, G. W., Felitti, V. J., & Anda, R. F. (2003). Relationship between multiple forms of childhood maltreatment and adult mental health in community respondents: Results from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 160*, 1453-1460.
- Fallot, R.D., & Harris, M. (2009). Creating Cultures of Trauma-Informed Care (CCTIC): A Self-Assessment and Planning Protocol. Community Connections.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood experiences (ACE) study. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 14*(4), 245-258.
- Flückiger, C., Del Re, A. C., Wampold, B. E., Symonds, D., & Horvath, A. (2012). How central is the alliance in psychotherapy? A multilevel longitudinal meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(1), 10-17.
- Gendreau, P., Smith, P., & Theriault, Y. L. (2009). Chaos theory and correctional treatment: Common sense, correctional quackery, and the law of fartcatchers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 25*(4), 384-396.
- Glisson, C., & James, L.R. (2002). The cross-level effects of culture and climate in human service teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(6), 767-794.

- Gonzalez, T., & Hayes, B. (2009). Rap music in school counseling based on Don Elligan's rap therapy. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 4*(2), 161–172.
- Gordon, J.A. (1999). Do staff attitudes vary by position? A look at one juvenile correctional center. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 24*(1), 81-93.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255-274.
- Grigorenko, E. L., (ed. 2012), The “why(s)” of criminal behavior in juveniles: The long and short of it. In Grigorenko, E. L. (Ed.), *Handbook of Juvenile Forensic Psychology and Psychiatry* (35-51). New York: Springer.
- Guarino-ghezzi, S., & Tirrell, C. (2008). Guards or guardians? A theoretical and empirical analysis of parenting styles in juvenile correctional programs. *Justice Policy Journal, 5*(2).
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation. In Lincoln, Y. S. (Ed.) *Fourth Generation Evaluation* (228-251). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications
- Harris, M., & Fallot, R. D. (2001). Envisioning a Trauma-Informed service system: A vital paradigm shift. *New Directions for Mental Health Services, 89*, 3-22.
- Hemmelgarn, A. L., Glissel, C., & James, L. R. (2006). Organizational culture and climate: Implications for services and interventions research. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 13*(1), 73-89.
- Hepburn, J., & Knepper, P. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effect of job satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly, 10*, 315-335.

- Hopper, E. K., Bassuk, E. L., & Olivet, J. (2010). Shelter from the storm: Trauma-informed care in homelessness services settings. *The Open Health Services and Policy Journal*, 3, 80-100.
- James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 1096-1112.
- Javdani, S. & Allen, N. E. (2014). A model for intervention with justice-involved girls with disruptive behavior problems: Development and preliminary prospective evaluation of the Girls Advocacy Project. *Feminist Criminology*. 1-28.
- Keating, L. M., Tomishima, M. A., Foster, S., & Alessandri, M. (2002). The effects of a mentoring program on at-risk youth. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 717-734.
- Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., & Eno Loudon, J. (2012). Firm, fair, and caring officer-offender relationships protect against supervision failure. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(6), 496-505.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2005). Parent management training: Treatment for oppositional, aggressive, and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kira, I. A. (2001). Taxonomy of trauma and trauma assessment. *Traumatology*, 7(2), 73-86.
- Klein, K. J., & Knight, A. P. (2005). Innovation implementation: Overcoming the challenge. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 243–246.
- Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1055–1080.

- Ko, S. J., Ford, J. D., Kassam-Adams, N., Berkowitz, S. J., Wilson, C., Wong, M., & ... Layne, C. M. (2008). Creating trauma-informed systems: Child welfare, education, first responders, health care, juvenile justice. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 39*(4), 396-404.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., Altheimer, I., Jiang, S., & Stevenson, M. T. (2008). The relationships between burnout and support for punishment and treatment: A preliminary examination. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 54*(6), 1004-1022.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., Barton, S. M., Jiang, S., & Baker, D. N. (2010). The impact of punishment and rehabilitation views on organizational commitment among correctional staff: A preliminary study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*, 85-98.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., & Jiang, S. (2010). A preliminary examination of the relationship between organisational structure and emotional burnout among correctional staff. *The Howard Journal, 49*(2), 125-146.
- Leiber, M. J., & Mack, K. Y. (2003). The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*(1), 34-70.
- Leiber, M. J., Schwarze, K., Mack, K. Y., & Farnworth, M. (2002). The effects of occupation and education on punitive orientations among juvenile justice personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*, 303-316.
- Linehan, M. M. (1993). *Cognitive behavioral treatment of borderline personality disorder*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Lipsey, M. W. (1999). Can rehabilitative programs reduce the recidivism of juvenile offenders?: An inquiry into the effectiveness of practical programs. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law*, 6, 611.
- Lipsey, M. W. (2009). The primary factors that characterize effective interventions with juvenile offenders: A meta-analytic overview. *Victims & Offenders*, 4(2), 124-147.
- Lipsey, M. W., Champman, G. L., & Landenberger, N. A. (2001). Cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 578, 144-157.
- Lipsey, M. W., Howell, J. C., Kelly, M. R., Chapman, G., & Carver, D. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs: A new perspective on evidence-based practice. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University.
- Maikoetter, M. (2011). From Intuition to Science: Re-ED and Trauma-Informed Care. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 19(4), 18-22.
- MacKenzie, D. L., Wilson, D. B., & Kider, S. B. (2001). Effects of correctional boot camps on offending. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 578, 126–143.
- Marsh, S. C., & Evans, W. P. (2006). Predictors of staff responses to problematic youth behavior in detention and correctional settings. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 44(1), 59-79.
doi:10.1300/J076v44n01
- Marsh, S. C., & Evans, W. P. (2009). Youth perspectives on their relationships with staff in juvenile correction settings and perceived likelihood of success on release. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7(1), 46-67.

- Martin, D. J., Garske, J. P., & Davis, K. M. (2000). Relation of the therapeutic alliance with outcome and other variables: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(3), 438-450.
- Matthews, B. & Hubbard, D. (2007). The helping alliance in juvenile probation: The missing element in the “what works” literature. *Mental Health Issues in the Criminal Justice System, 45*(1-2), 105-122.
- Michaelis, B., Stegmair, R., & Sonntag, K. (2009). Affective commitment to change and innovation implementation behavior: The role of charismatic leadership and employees’ trust in top management. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(4). 399-417.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Miller, A. L., Rathus, J. H., & Linehan, M. M. (2007). *Dialectical behavior therapy with suicidal adolescents*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mulvey, E., Schubert, C., & Odgers, C. (2010). A method for measuring organizational functioning in juvenile justice facilities using resident ratings. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(11), 1255-1277.
- Nelson-Gray, R. O., Keane, S. P., Hurst, R. M., Mitchell, J. T., Warburton, J. B., Chok, J. T., & Cobb, A. R. (2006). A modified DBT skills training program for oppositional defiant adolescents: Promising preliminary findings. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 44*, 1811-1820.
- Neville, H., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(1), 59-70.

- Nugent, W. R., Williams, M., & Umbreit, M. S. (2004). Participation in victim-offender mediation and the prevalence of subsequent delinquent behavior: A meta-analysis. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*(6), 408-416.
- Ogawa, R., & Bossert, S. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(2), 224-243. DOI: 10.1177/0013161X95031002004.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1999). Juvenile justice bulletin: Reintegration, supervised release, and intensive aftercare. Retrieved from http://www.ojjdp.gov/jjbulletin/9907_3/contents.html
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2009). Disproportionate minority contact. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/228306.pdf>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2010). *How OJJDP is forming partnerships and finding solutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/237051.pdf>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2014). *National report series bulletin: Juvenile arrests, 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/248513.pdf>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The validity issue in mixed research. *Research in the Schools, 13*(1), 48-63.
- Pence, E. (1999). Some thoughts on philosophy. In M. F. Shepard & E. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 25–40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piquero, a. R., Cullen, F. T., Unnever, J. D., Piquero, N. L., & Gordon, J. A. (2010). Never too late: Public optimism about juvenile rehabilitation. *Punishment & Society, 12*(2), 187–207.

- Ponterotto, J. G. (2006). Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept "Thick Description". *The Qualitative Report*, 11(3), 538-549.
- Proctor, E., Silmere, H., Raghaven, R., Hovmand, P., Aarons, G., Bunger, A., Griffey, R., & Hensley, M. (2010). Outcomes for implementation research: Conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. *Administrative Policy in Mental Health*, 38, 65-76.
- Puzzanchera, C., & Adams, B. (2011). Juvenile arrests 2009. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. Washington D.C. Retrieved from http://www.njjn.org/uploads/digital-library/resource_1191.pdf
- Rovard, J. C., Bloom, S. L., McCorkle, D. & Abramovitz, R. (2005). Preliminary results of a study examining the implementation and effects of a trauma recovery framework for youths in residential treatment. *Therapeutic Community: The International Journal for Therapeutic and Supportive Organizations* 26(1): 83-96.
- Rogers, E. T. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Schein, E. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Schneider, B. & Reichers, A. E. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 19-39.
- Schubert, C. A., Mulvey, E. P., Loughran, T. A., & Losoya, S. H. (2012). Perceptions of institutional experience and community outcomes for serious adolescent offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(1), 71-93.
- Schufelt, J. L. & Coccozza, J. J. (2006) Youth with mental health disorders in the juvenile justice system: Results from a multi-state prevalence study. National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice.

- Schultz, J. L. (1973). The Cycle of Juvenile Court History. *Crime & Delinquency*, 19(4), 457-476.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shelton, D., Sampl, S., Kesten, K. L., Zhang, W., & Trestman, R. L. (2009). Treatment of impulsive aggression in correctional settings. *Behavioral Sciences and Law*, 27, 787–800.
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between manager's words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 18-35.
- Slate, R. N., & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 397-408.
- Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Lanham, MD AltMira Press.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stenius, V. M., & Versey, B. M. (2005). "It's the little things:" Women, trauma, and strategies for healing. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(10), 1155-1174.
- Tilton, J. (2013). Rethinking youth voice and institutional power: Reflections from an inside service learning partnership in a California juvenile hall. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35, 1189-1196.

- Trupin, E. W., Stewart, D. G., Beach, B., & Boesky, L. (2002). Effectiveness of a Dialectical Behavior Therapy program for incarcerated female juvenile offenders. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 7*(3), 121-127.
- Vidal, S., Oudekerk, B. A., Reppucci, N. D., & Woolard, J. (2015). Examining the link between perceptions of relationship quality with parole officers and recidivism among female youth parolees. *Youth, Violence, and Juvenile Justice, 13*(1), 60-76.
- Walker, H. J., Armenakis, A. A., & Berneth, J. B. (2007). Factors influencing organizational change efforts: An integrative investigation of change content, contest, process, and individual differences. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(6), 761-773.
- Wright, K. N., Saylor, W. G., Gilman, E., & Camp, S. (1997). Job control and occupational outcomes among prison workers. *Justice Quarterly, 14*(3), 525-546.

TABLES

Table 1

The Emergence of Rehabilitative Practices Across Critical Detention Contexts

<u>Critical Contexts</u>	<u>Rehabilitative Practices</u>			
	<i>Emotional Safety</i>	<i>Rights-based Information/ Explanations</i>	<i>Successful Navigation of Detention</i>	<i>Extended Relationships with Youth</i>
<i>Staff-led Group Activities</i>	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Routine Contact Between Individual Youth and Staff</i>	✓	✓		
<i>Staff-only Spaces</i>	✓			✓
<i>Interactions with Youth Post-detention</i>				✓

Table 2**Youth Survey Items: Descriptive Statistics**

	Range	Mean/Median	SD
<u>Emotional Safety</u>			
<i>Staff notice when I feel uncomfortable or unsafe.</i>	0/5	2.79/3.00	1.79
<i>Staff are calm and act like they care about me when I am upset.</i>	0/5	3.00/3.00	1.39
<i>Staff help me plan for what to do when I get very upset or sad.</i>	0/5	2.89/3.00	1.65
<u>Rights-based Information/Explanations</u>			
<i>I believe that staff keep my information private – they don't talk about me with people outside of the [detention center] and court system.</i>	0/5	3.36/4.00	1.55
<u>Successful Navigation of Detention</u>			
<i>Staff explain how things work at the [detention center] and why they work that way.</i>	0/5	3.61/4.00	1.42
<i>Staff let me ask questions about how things work at the [detention center].</i>	1/5	3.46/3.00	1.11
<i>Staff often go over my goals and possible choices with me.</i>	0/5	3.89/4.00	1.23
<i>Whenever I talk to or work with staff, they help me build useful skills.</i>	0/5	3.25/3.00	1.38
<u>Extended Relationships with Youth</u>			
<i>Staff explain how they will and will not interact with me (inside and outside of the [detention center]) using examples that I understand. (For example – staff tell me how they will react if they ever see me once I leave the [detention center]).</i>	0/5	2.68/3.00	1.81
<i>Staff ask me about friends, family, or other important people in my life, and they try to help me stay connected with them.</i>	0/5	2.39/2.00	1.55
<i>Staff care about what I want and what my goals are.</i>	0/5	2.79/3.00	1.71
<i>Staff care about what happens to me while I'm at the [detention center] and after I leave.</i>	0/5	3.39/3.50	1.34
<u>Additional Areas of Interest</u>			
<i>Choice</i>			
<i>Staff let me choose the service, groups, and activities that I participate in.</i>	0/5	2.29/2.00	1.54
<i>Staff let me choose who I want to help me.</i>	0/5	2.46/3.00	1.26
<i>Staff believe that I know how to make decisions for myself.</i>	0/5	3.44/3.00	1.25
<i>Staff Dependability</i>			
<i>Staff do what they say they are going to do.</i>	0/5	2.75/3.00	1.11

Table 3

Staff Survey Items and Descriptive Statistics				
Scaled Variable Name	Range	Mean/Median	SD	Reliability
<i>Total CoBRA</i>	1.8 / 5.1	3.70 / 3.75	.81	$\alpha = .90$
<i>Racial Privilege</i>	1.6 / 6.0	4.44 / 4.71	1.23	$\alpha = .90$
<i>Institutional Discrimination</i>	2.0 / 5.1	3.76 / 3.71	.91	$\alpha = .74$
<i>Blatant Racial Issues</i>	1.7 / 4.5	2.75 / 2.67	.74	$\alpha = .70$
<i>Disproportionality</i>	0 / 3.0	1.66 / 1.75	1.22	$r = .86$
<i>Total Leadership</i>	1.5 / 4.9	3.57 / 3.60	.78	$\alpha = .89$
<i>Staff's Relationships with Leaders</i>	.80 / 5.0	3.56 / 3.60	.90	$\alpha = .88$
<i>Institutional Practices</i>	1.8 / 5.0	3.57 / 3.60	.84	$\alpha = .86$
<i>Total Climate</i>	1.6 / 4.9	3.32 / 3.29	.84	$\alpha = .92$
<i>Clarity of Job Expectations</i>	2.5 / 5.0	4.07 / 4.25	.72	$\alpha = .87$
<i>Structured Emotional Support</i>	.8 / 5.0	3.07 / 3.20	1.20	$\alpha = .87$
<i>Training Opportunities</i>	.4 / 4.8	2.97 / 3.00	.99	$\alpha = .92$
<i>Total Culture</i>	1.7 / 5.0	3.32 / 3.33	.87	$\alpha = .91$
<i>Staff's Relationship Norms</i>	1.0 / 5.0	3.20 / 3.25	1.04	$\alpha = .90$
<i>Institutional Norms</i>	1.8 / 5.0	3.41 / 3.40	.91	$\alpha = .90$

Note. $N = 23$, ** $p < .01$

APPENDIX A

OBSERVATIONAL DATA POTENTIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Note: This document represents a conceptual map of the researchers' overarching domains of interest and contains a sample of possible questions (i.e., these are not exhaustive). These domains of interest may be modified or expanded upon through the use of additional probes that match the spirit of the original inquiry. As is expected in qualitative research, this protocol may be adapted in real-time or as additional themes arise.

- Engagement in rehabilitative practices:
 - Sample questions:
 - What does it mean to you to do your work with the goal of ensuring safety/ trustworthiness/choice/collaboration/empowering youth?
 - What do you do to help youth feel safe/build or maintain trust/promote youths' ability to have choices/collaborate with youth/empower youth?
 - What happens when youth have a disagreement with staff?
 - To what extent do detention staff continue to have contact/relationships with youth once they are released?
- Attitudes and values
 - Sample questions:
 - What do you think causes delinquency?
 - What role do you think trauma plays in youths' involvement with the juvenile justice system?
 - What do you think should be done with youth accused of breaking the law?
 - How possible do you think it is to work with youth using trauma-informed care practices in the detention center?
 - What do you think about the possibility of creating more choice/collaboration for youth at the detention center? How viable do you think this is?
 - For youth in detention, what approach to intervention do you think is most appropriate?
- Leadership:
 - Sample questions:
 - Do supervisors encourage you to work with youth in a way that promotes youths' safety/trust/choice/collaboration/empowerment?
 - How do supervisors want you to respond to youth who are in distress?
 - How do your supervisors interact with youth here?
- Climate

- Sample questions:
 - What types of training opportunities have been offered to you? Have you been provided with the necessary time and compensation to attend them?
 - What policies are in place that get in the way of your ability to work with youth using trauma-informed care practices?
 - How has the detention center made it easy for you to implement empowerment/choice/collaboration/trustworthiness with youth? How has it been hard?
 - What would make it easier for you to be engaged in trauma-informed practices?
 - How, if at all, has the detention center's partnership in the local service system had an impact on detention policies?

- Culture
 - Sample questions:
 - What are your relationships like with other staff members?
 - Are there certain types of roles that some staff tend to fill more than others?
 - How do other staff on your shift affect the work that you do?
 - In what way do staff dynamic with one another help or hinder the ability to implement trauma-informed care practices.
 - How, if at all, has the detention centers' partnership in the local system of care had an impact on what you do or how the detention center operates?

APPENDIX B

OBSERVATIONAL FIELD NOTE PROTOCOL

Field Notes: Detention Center Ethnography

After each visit at the detention center, the following information is recorded.

Date(s)/Time(s)	
Location(s)	
Sense cues	Sights: Sounds: Touch: Taste: Smell:
People	
Activities	
General Mood	
Of note...	
Note for later	
Keywords	

Observations (Chronological Order):

APPENDIX C

TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE YOUTH SURVEY

(Starting on next page)

Read each sentence and think about how much you agree with it.

Circle one number next to each sentence that matches the word that best describes your opinion.

Ask Angela if you need help! Thank you for sharing your opinions! ☺

	0 Not at all/Never	1 Almost Never	2 Not Very Often	3 Sometimes	4 Most of the Time	5 Always
Staff notice when I feel uncomfortable or unsafe.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff are calm and act like they care about me when I am upset.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff help me plan for what to do when I get very upset or sad	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff explain how things work at the [detention center] and why they work that way.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff let me ask questions about how things work at the [detention center].	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff do what they say they are going to do.	0	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that staff keep my information private – they don't talk about me with people outside of the [detention center] and court system.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff explain how they will and will not interact with me (inside and outside of the [detention center]) using examples that I understand. (For example – staff tell me how they will react if they ever see me once I leave the [detention center]).	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff let me choose the service, groups, and activities that I participate in.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff let me choose who I want to help me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff often go over my goals and	0	1	2	3	4	5

possible choices with me.

	0 Not at all/Never	1 Almost Never	2 Not Very Often	3 Sometimes	4 Most of the Time	5 Always
Staff ask me about friends, family, or other important people in my life, and they try to help me stay connected with them.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff care about what I want and what my goals are.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff believe that I know how to make decisions for myself.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Staff care about what happens to me while I'm at the [detention center] and after I leave.	0	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever I talk to or work with staff, they help me build useful skills.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Please write in your race: _____ How old are you?: _____

Please circle your gender: Male Female

Please use the space below to write anything you want me to know about your experience at the [detention center]. Remember that you are not allowed to discuss your case.

To thank you for your time and opinions, I will donate \$5.00 worth of equipment/supplies to the [detention center]. I want your help deciding what to spent this \$5.00 on.

Please rank (1, 2, and 3) your top three suggestions.

_____ **Commissary items** (examples: Pizza Rolls, Ice cream, Zebra Cakes, Hot Pockets)

Got a suggestion for a type of food? Write it here: _____

_____ **Special Hygiene Items** (Shampoo, Conditioner, Soap, Body Wash)

Got a suggestion for a type/brand of item? Write it here: _____

_____ **Recreation equipment** (Yoga Mats, Puzzles, Books, Art Supplies)

Got a suggestion for a type/brand of item? Write it here: _____

_____ **Something Else?** Write it here: _____

APPENDIX D

STAFF SURVEY ITEMS

Response Scale for all items is as follows:

0 = Not at all/Never	1 = Very Rarely	2 = Rarely	3 = Occasionally	4 = Very Frequently	5 = Always	NA = Not Applicable
----------------------	-----------------	------------	------------------	---------------------	------------	---------------------

Subscale	Item
<i>Disproportionality</i>	Staff in this organization believe that institutional racism, like discrimination against African American youth and families, contributes to disproportionate representation of African Americans in juvenile detention.
	Staff in this organization believe that institutional racism, like discrimination against African American youth and families, affects African Americans access to programs and resources in our community.
<i>Leadership</i>	
<i>Staff's Relationships with Leaders</i>	I feel supported by my supervisors in my day-to-day work.
	I feel that I can trust administrators and supervisors to listen respectfully to my concerns.
	I feel that my supervisors have clearly explained the expectations of my position.
	My supervisors provide me with feedback that is constructive, even when it is negative or critical.
	The feedback I receive from my supervisors includes both my strengths and areas for improvement.
<i>Institutional Practices</i>	My program director and supervisors have a clear understanding of the work of the staff they oversee.
	The organization's leadership consistently communicates about changes to policies, services and expectations of staff.
	The staff receive performance reviews and feedback that are clear and constructive, even when feedback may be negative or critical.
	The protocols or forms for providing staff performance reviews and feedback include a space for recording staff strengths and capabilities.
<i>Climate</i>	
<i>Clarity of Job Expectations</i>	The work I do day-to-day is consistent with my written job description.
	I have a clear idea of what my organization's mission, goals and procedures are.
	I have a clear idea of the expectations my organization has for my professional conduct.
	I have a clear idea of the expectations my organization has for the duties included in my position.

Subscale	Item
<i>Structured Emotional Support</i>	I feel that my organization encourages staff to practice self-care.
	There are procedures in place for staff that need emotional support from other staff and supervisors.
	During staff/team meetings, time is allotted for staff to share concerns and seek emotional support.
	There are formalized ways for staff to provide feedback and ideas to the organization (e.g., surveys, annual reviews).
	Staff meetings including all levels of staff are held regularly.
<i>Training Opportunities</i>	I am provided with the option to pursue additional training and skill development.
	This organization provides adequate training for responding to youth and families experiencing emotional distress.
	This organization provides training for recognizing signs of trauma and responding in a trauma-sensitive manner.
	This organization provides training on cultural competence.
	This organization provides training about cultural differences in how people understand and respond to trauma.
<i>Culture</i>	
<i>Staff's Relationship Norms</i>	I feel comfortable sharing my emotional responses to my work with other staff and supervisors.
	I feel there is a balance of autonomy (making my own decisions) and organizational guidance (my decisions are based in organizational requirements) in my day-to-day work.
	I feel like I have input into factors affecting my work (e.g., size of case load, types of duties, when to take time off, location of workspace).
	I feel comfortable disagreeing with my colleagues and supervisors during discussions about service provision.
<i>Institutional Norms</i>	I think that my supervisors and colleagues are able to successfully resolve disagreements about service provision.
	I feel that my talents and capabilities are engaged in my work in a way that provides me with a sense of satisfaction in my work.
	This organization encourages staff to work together and collaborate on a variety of tasks.
	Staff and supervisors are able to challenge each other, disagree, collaborate, resolve conflicts and learn from the process.
	This organization fosters a sense of shared accountability and responsibility when facing challenges rather than placing blame.

APPENDIX E

COLOR-BLIND RACIAL ATTITUDES SCALE (COBRAS) STAFF SURVEY

Response Scale for all items is as follows:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Moderately Disagree
- 3 = Slightly Disagree
- 4 = Slightly Agree
- 5 = Moderately Agree
- 6 = Strongly Agree

1. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
2. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
3. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.
4. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
5. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.
6. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
7. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.
8. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people.
9. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.
10. English should be the only official language in the U.S.
11. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
12. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
13. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.
14. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.
15. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.
16. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.

17. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.

18. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.

19. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.

20. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.