

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Theses and Dissertations

7-10-2022

Understanding Juvenile Correctional Officers' Perceptions About Safety and Care of Youth in Their Facilities

Megan Patterson

Illinois State University, mpatte5@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Patterson, Megan, "Understanding Juvenile Correctional Officers' Perceptions About Safety and Care of Youth in Their Facilities" (2022). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1612.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/1612>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUREd@ilstu.edu.

UNDERSTANDING JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT
SAFETY AND CARE OF YOUTH IN THEIR FACILITIES

MEGAN M. PATTERSON

76 Pages

There is an increasing need to understand the environment confined juveniles are exposed to in America. This study examines the conditions of confinement for juveniles in detention facilities, mainly focusing on the indices of control, care, quality of life, and programs for confined youths. The study further examines how these confinement conditions are associated with juvenile detention officers' level of concern with the facility operation. Anonymous Likert scale surveys were administered to active juvenile detention officers. Results from this study provide better insight into understanding performance-based standards in juvenile detention facilities and specify what areas need to be improved for sufficient care of youth.

KEYWORDS: Detention; Juvenile; Correctional officer; Safety; Care

UNDERSTANDING JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT
SAFETY AND CARE OF YOUTH IN THEIR FACILITIES

MEGAN M. PATTERSON

A Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Criminal Justice Sciences

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2022

© 2022 Megan M. Patterson

UNDERSTANDING JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT
SAFETY AND CARE OF YOUTH IN THEIR FACILITIES

MEGAN M. PATTERSON

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mijin Kim, Co-Chair

Jessie Krienert, Co-Chair

Jeffrey Walsh

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Mijin Kim, Dr. Jessie Krienert, and Dr. Jeffrey Walsh for serving on my thesis committee.

I would also like to thank my Mom.

M. M. P.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLES	iv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Overview of Juvenile Detention	4
Physical Violence	5
Sexual Violence	6
Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders	7
Solitary Confinement	10
Physical Health: Sleep	11
Physical Health: Nutrition and Exercise	12
Environment and Comfort	13
Education and Vocational Preparation	15
Theoretical Framework	16
Current Study	20
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	22
Study Design	22
Data Collection	22
Measures	24
Analytic Techniques	27
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS	28
Overview	28
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION	40
Summary	40
Limitations	40
Discussion of Results	43

Future Research	47
REFERENCES	49
APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ADMISTERED TO JUVENILE DETENTION OFFICERS	60
APPENDIX B: SUBSET SCALES	75

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Officer Likelihood Responses for Security Measures	30
2. Officer Likelihood Responses for Environmental Dangers	31
3. Officer Likelihood Responses for Quality of Life	32
4. Officer Likelihood Responses for Programming Availability	33
5. Officer Concern Level Responses for Security Measures	34
6. Officer Concern Level Responses for Environmental Dangers	35
7. Officer Concern Level Responses for Quality of Life	36
8. Officer Concern Level Responses for Programming Availability	37
9. Job Satisfaction and Officers' Perceptions of Facility's Care Correlations	38

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Children in America are not safe from the pandemic that is mass incarceration. The United States incarcerates more of its children annually than any other country in the world, and almost 6,600 of these children were detained for non-violent offenses (such as status offenses and violations of their probation and parole requirements) in 2017 (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020). In 2017, approximately 43,580 youth were held in residential placement (such as juvenile detention) on any given day (Sickmund et al., 2019). Given the quantity of detained children, it is essential to examine the conditions of youth confinement facilities as they may negatively impact juveniles' physical and mental well-being (Sawyer, 2019). A study of needs and services for 7,073 youth in residential placement found youth held in these facilities report experiencing sexual victimization, fear of attack, strip-searches, unnecessary use of force and restraints, and solitary confinement (Sedlak & McPherson, 2010). This same study found that as facilities get larger (25 beds or more), youths receive less educational and vocational programming.

The officers who work in these facilities are often met with unique individual, situational, and organizational variables that influence their decisions and actions. This research examines organizational variables within detention centers. Organizational variables refer to interactions between physical, social, and psychological elements through the perceptions of organizational members (Saylor, 1984). Climate variables (such as training, administrative support, and role ambiguity) often exist within juvenile detention centers and can potentially impact juvenile detention officers' daily routines and actions.

Reformative programs often receive a great deal of academic and societal support because of the idea that they can reduce problematic behaviors of detained youths, which will enhance public safety in the long term. However, without understanding what types of

environments those juveniles were exposed to when confined, evaluating the effectiveness of those reformatory programs may be less meaningful. Youths' incarceration experience will largely shape their post-release behaviors in addition to the effectiveness of the reformatory program itself. Although some studies have pinpointed institutional safety that may be harmful to juveniles, much of the literature is either anecdotal or involves a small sample size. In this regard, there is still a research gap in understanding conditions of confinement among youths in detention facilities in the United States and to what degree correctional officers are concerned about their facility operation. To fill this research gap, the current exploratory study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Do juvenile detention centers offer a safe environment for detained youth?
2. What levels of concern do juvenile detention officers have regarding facility operation?
3. Is there a significant relationship between juvenile detention officers' reported levels of concern and reported quality of care?

The answers to these research questions reflect findings from existing research in the field of criminal justice and contribute to a better understanding of the system as a whole and the mindsets of juvenile detention officers.

To answer the research questions, correctional officers working in juvenile detention facilities were asked to participate in a voluntary survey that included 82 questions related to the conditions of confinement. This research aims to better understand the security measures and quality of care for youths confined in juvenile detention facilities. More specifically, the survey examines security measures (e.g., control mechanisms that are exerted over juvenile inmates' activities), environmental danger (both physical and mental), quality of life (e.g., individuality, freedom, facility conditions), and programming availability (e.g., therapeutic opportunities).

Findings suggest remedial measures to be taken to reduce potential negative impacts on physical, mental, and emotional health of confined youths.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Juvenile Detention

As of October 2018, there were 1,510 operating juvenile detention facilities in the United States (Hockenberry and Sladky, 2020). The definition of a juvenile delinquent can vary by jurisdiction, but for this study, it refers to an individual under the age of 18 who has committed a crime (Young et al., 2017). Although the number of juvenile arrests has fallen 67 percent since 2006, roughly 195,000 children are held inside detention facilities each year and the average length of stay for each child is 27 days (Puzzanchera, 2020; Juvenile Residential Facility Census Databook, 2018). According to Sickmund et al.'s (2019) review of juvenile justice census data, most children held in juvenile detention are boys but approximately 15% of youth held in detention are girls. Girls make up a much higher proportion of lower-level and non-violent offenders than boys, and more than half of youth held in detention for running away from home (a status offense) are girls (Sickmund et al., 2019).

A study of 2,100 youth by Irvine (2010) reports lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (L.G.B.T.Q.) youth make up approximately 15 percent of all youth in the juvenile justice system. L.G.B.T.Q. youth are twice as likely to be arrested and detained in juvenile detention for status and/or non-violent offenses. They are also more likely to be placed in solitary confinement for protective purposes (Irvine, 2010). Black youth are approximately four times more likely to be detained or placed in juvenile detention than white children, according to nationwide data collected in 2019 (Sickmund et al., 2021). Although Black children only comprise 15 percent of all youth in the United States, 41 percent of all youth in detention are Black (Puzzanchera et al., 2020). This significant overrepresentation of minority children confined in juvenile detention facilities highlights the possible racial and ethnic disparities in

sentencing that may begin at the time of arrest and continue throughout their involvement in the juvenile justice system.

As of 2018, about 60 percent of all operating juvenile detention centers in the United States were public facilities, and the remaining were run by private (and sometimes for-profit) groups (Hockenberry and Sladky, 2020). Walker and Herting (2020) estimate 75 percent of youth in juvenile detention are admitted for pretrial detention, meaning they are being held prior to adjudication to ensure the youth attend their court hearings. One study on the impact of pretrial detention on more than 46,000 juvenile cases found that pretrial detention created a 33 percent increase in felony recidivism and an 11 percent increase in misdemeanor recidivism within one year (Walker and Herting, 2020). Some of these youths have been charged with non-violent offenses, specifically, theft-larceny which had an arrest rate of 401 per 100,000 youth in 2016 (Puzzanchera, 2020). Hockenberry (2014) reports 23 percent of youth held in detention facilities in 2011 were for violent crimes.

Physical Violence

Despite a significant body of research establishing juvenile populations as highly marginalized and vulnerable, there are few studies focusing specifically on physical assault of youth by detention staff. One study in California found that 96 percent of 62 youths reported experiencing at least some type of abuse (e.g. verbal abuse) during their incarceration, while 77.4 percent experienced a direct form of abuse, including physical assault (Dierkhising, Lane, & Natsuaki, 2014). Another small-scale study of 60 detained youth in Louisiana yielded similar results: the interviewed youth reported physical abuse from staff members and excessive use of force, including being beaten while handcuffed (Human Rights Watch Children's Watch, 1995; Levitt, 2010). According to the report, staff members at the facilities generally confirmed these

allegations but noted a lack of documentation and record-keeping made validating these claims difficult.

Sexual Violence

In a study conducted by Smith and Stroop (2019), 2 percent of over 10,000 detained youth reported they were forced or coerced into sexual activity with staff members. In addition to potential exposure to violence, the rate of youth held in detention with mental health disorders is found to be consistently higher than those within the general population of youth (Underwood and Washington, 2016). According to a federal survey on victimization inside of juvenile detention conducted by Sedlak et al. (2013), more than a third of the 7,000 detained youth reported correctional officers using unnecessary force, and about half of the youth surveyed said they endured unfair punishment.

Field and Davis (2020), in a survey of 6,049 detained youths in 2018 found seven percent of surveyed youth reported being sexually victimized either by staff or other youth while detained. Additionally, they noted 51 percent of surveyed children who experienced prior sexual victimization in another juvenile facility also reported being sexually victimized in their current facility. A separate 2018 study of 8,659 youth in custody assessed the correlation between sexual victimization and juvenile detention. The results from this study found youth who were victims of sexual assault prior to incarceration were at a higher risk of victimization while in custody (Ahlin, 2018).

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (P.R.E.A.) requires a person being strip-searched to arrange or remove their clothing to allow a visual inspection of an individual's breasts, buttocks, or genitalia (Gould, 2020). When a child is detained, they are asked by an adult stranger to strip completely naked and be visually examined. They must lift their arms, breasts, penis, and any

other body folds or creases. They must remove any sanitary items such as pads or tampons in front of the stranger. They then are asked to squat down and cough, and then bend over and spread their buttocks for the stranger to see (Bernstein, 2014). The changes that occur to the human body during puberty can lead youth to feel vulnerable to embarrassment and stress. A threat to the control they have over their own bodies can result in stress that undermines the child's self-esteem (Feierman and Shah, 2007).

While strip-searching can be a routine procedure in juvenile detention centers, the coerced removal of clothing is considered institutionalized sexual violence by some juvenile justice professionals (McCulloch and George, 2009). Sexual assault can lead to a lifetime of adverse effects which may follow the child into adulthood. Their sense of trust and self-esteem can significantly decrease, especially when their abuser was someone in a position of power or a perceived protector, such as a juvenile detention officer (Mullen and Fleming, 1998). A systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Angelakis et al. (2020) based on 79 individual studies with 337,185 youth found childhood sexual abuse survivors are nearly three times more likely to report suicidal ideations and four times more likely to report plans for suicide than those who reported no sexual abuse history. In addition to self-esteem struggles and suicidal ideations, victims of childhood sexual assault may also be at a higher risk of mental health disorders such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (P.T.S.D.), eating disorders, personality disorders, dissociative disorders, depression, and substance use disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Gutierrez and Van Puymbroeck, 2006; Pearlstein, 2002; Penza et al., 2003; Spataro et al., 2004).

Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders

The children held in juvenile detention facilities are in a critical period of neurodevelopment, which means potentially harmful confinement conditions can exacerbate any

mental health conditions they were already combating. About two-thirds of confined youth have a diagnosable mental health condition but their mental health needs are unmet routinely in detention (Mendel, 2015). Only half of all public detention centers offer any on-site residential treatment such as mental health services and substance use treatment (United States Department of Justice, 2014). Untreated mental health problems can also develop suicidal thoughts among those confined youth offenders.

In one longitudinal study of 1,829 youth detained at the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center in Chicago, Illinois, approximately 1 in 10 juvenile detainees thought about suicide, and 11 percent had attempted suicide (Abram et al., 2014). Youths held in isolation are at the greatest risk for suicide: more than half of juvenile detention suicides occur while the child was alone in their room and more than 60 percent of these children had a history of being held in isolation (Fazel & Cartwright, 2008). Only half of all public detention centers offer any type of onsite residential treatment such as mental health services and substance use treatment (United States Department of Justice, 2014).

Approximately 90 percent of youth involved in the juvenile justice system have experienced severe trauma in their lifetime (Pickens et al., 2016). Although most states offer some form of mental health treatments, they are often limited and they do not always include trauma-informed services (Siegfried & Van Tassell, 2010). Youth who have experienced trauma prior to incarceration may be exposed to various triggers upon intake at detention facilities, such as verbal and physical aggression, which can severely intensify fear or traumatic symptoms (Adams, 2010). In addition, detained children who are diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder are more likely to experience problematic substance use (McNair et al., 2019).

While attempting to adapt to these new and strange conditions, children being processed in the juvenile detention system may be met with homesickness. These children are separated from family and friend groups when their development and acquisition of coping skills are still heavily influenced by these social interactions. Unlike adult offenders, adolescents are at an age where separation from parents and other family members may not be typical. However, some detention centers limit visitors and phone privileges, especially during the early stages of incarceration (Schulman & Cauffman, 2011). These security measures could have adverse effects on youth's mental health and behavior, such as an increase in depressive symptoms and a decrease in the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship (Monahan et al., 2011). According to Lee (2016), symptoms of depression can be aggravated by losing access to love and physical contact from family members. Additionally, a study conducted by the Human Rights Watch and the American Civil Liberties Union in 2012 found losing familial touch can cause “pain and suffering” for detained youth (Lee, 2016).

Once released from detention, significant issues may remain which could be detrimental to a child's life. For example, Underwood and Washington's (2016) review of delinquency and mental illness notes youths held in detention are at a significantly higher risk for substance use disorders, anxiety disorders, and mood disorders than those youths who have not been detained. Some of the most common mental health disorders among children in juvenile detention are depression, bipolar disorder, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (Underwood and Washington, 2016). According to Abram et al. (2013), nearly all youth (93%) held in detention already have experienced one or more traumatic events in their lifetime, which means incarceration may exacerbate their mental health conditions.

According to Dennis et al. (2019), 27 to 65 percent of justice-involved youth meet the criteria for some type of substance use disorder and it increases with the intensity of involvement. Only five to 35 percent of justice-involved youth in need of substance use resources receive any type of substance use treatment (Baumer et al., 2018). Abram et al.'s (2013) study of Cook County juvenile detention reported about 50 percent of the 1,829 surveyed youth struggle with substance use disorders and it was the most common disorder reported. Although 80 percent of detention centers report assessing for substance use disorders, it is difficult for these facilities to offer substantial help as youth are typically not held in these facilities for long (Desai et al., 2006; Puzanchera & Hockenberry, 2020).

Solitary Confinement

The Juvenile Residential Facility Census of 2014 confirmed that 79 percent of juvenile detention facilities utilized solitary confinement for “out of control” youth (Hockenberry & Sladky, 2018). Similar to adult jails and prisons, juvenile detention centers utilize solitary confinement for two different reasons. The first is punishment for misbehavior (commonly referred to as “disciplinary segregation”), and the second is “administrative segregation” which occurs when detention officials deem the child being in danger from other inmates. Regardless of the reasoning for solitary confinement, the experience can be detrimental to the child. The psychological effects of locking a person up all day for many days are overwhelming. For youth in particular, time in solitary confinement can lead to depression, anxiety, and psychosis (Birckhead, 2015). Those youth held in solitary confinement are also more prone to violent or unstable behavior, social and developmental harm, and academic diminishment (Lee, 2016).

Neuroscience research finds that adolescence may be a time of increased neuronal and hormonal reactivity to stress and these susceptibilities may result in an increased sensitivity to

stress when socially isolated (Romeo, 2013). In a study on prisoner of war captivity, Park et al., (2012) found that the older the captured prisoner was, the increased resilience to prolonged isolation. The hypothesis behind this was that increased maturity and life experience of older prisoners of war helped them cope with the stress of solitude.

Solitary confinement is not only harmful, but there is also no evidence that it improves behavior (Haney, 2018). According to Haney (2018), solitary confinement can have the opposite result of its intended goals (such as reducing inmate misbehavior) and numerous health agencies (including the National Commission on Correctional Health Care, The Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the American Psychological Association, and the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry) have advocated against the use of solitary confinement for juveniles entirely. Even those held in solitary confinement for their own safety are thus sacrificing their psychological well-being for physical safety.

Physical Health: Sleep

According to research completed by sleep experts, sleep is important for teenagers as it plays a vital role in their mental, physical, social, and emotional development (Sun & Dimitriu, 2020). Eight to ten hours of sleep is recommended, with quiet, dark, and relaxing atmospheres for bedrooms (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020). Creating a healthy sleep routine for children is valuable as it benefits children physically, emotionally, and academically. However, a healthy sleep environment and routine can be particularly difficult inside juvenile detention centers. Insufficient or poor sleep quality may negatively affect a child's cognitive and neurobehavioral functions. Those who do not get adequate sleep are at a higher risk of behavioral

deregulations, attention-related disorders, depression, anxiety, and suicidal behavior (Wong et al., 2011).

Studies indicate that high-school-aged youth held in detention facilities experience more sleeping problems than those in the general population, as about 34 percent of detained youth surveyed reported they “often” or “always” have difficulty sleeping, but only 11 percent of general population teenagers reported the same. Additionally, general population teenagers report difficulty sleeping due to their own racing thoughts, whereas most of those held in detention noted light and noise as their primary reasons for lack of sleep (Sedlak, 2017). For instance, correctional officers unlocking heavy security doors and peering in can be unsettling for children trying to get some rest.

Physical Health: Nutrition and Exercise

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2022) public site recognizes over 300 evidence-based model juvenile justice programs. However, only one of these programs includes information centered on nutrition and physical activity. According to the University of Rochester Medical Center, healthy eating is important to teenagers as their bodies are changing and experiencing growth spurts (University of Rochester Medical Center, 2021). In a double-blind study conducted by Gesch (2016), 231 young men (18-21) in prison were given either a placebo or real capsules containing a daily requirement of vitamins, essential fatty acids, and minerals. The inmates for both groups were chosen on a random basis. The results of this study showed that those who received the nutritional capsule committed 26 percent fewer offenses compared to the placebo group. This group also committed 37 percent fewer serious, violent crimes compared to the placebo group.

Brusseau et al. (2018) examined the fitness levels of 68 youth involved in the juvenile justice system. The findings revealed justice-involved youth are consistently falling short of recommended periods of exercise per day in order to improve their health-related fitness. A 2019 meta-analysis of literature regarding physical exercise and youth mental health found physical activity can improve youth mental health (Rodriguez-Ayllon et al., 2019). A similar study by Lubans et al. (2016), found exercise can improve youth's physical self-perceptions, which enhanced self-esteem in the majority of the measured studies that were reviewed. It is possible that the physical and nutritional needs of youth held in juvenile detention have an impact on their behavior and mental health concerns.

Environment and Comfort

A non-profit advocacy group, Protection and Advocacy for People with Disabilities Inc., recently filed a civil rights lawsuit against a juvenile detention facility in South Carolina. Claims of overcrowding, bugs, rats, mold, and water damage were presented, which could place the children inside at great risk of physical and emotional harm (*Protection and Advocacy for People with Disabilities Inc. v. Charleston County Juvenile Detention Center*, 2020). Overcrowded facilities can create unsafe living environments for detained youth, stretching basic needs such as food, clothing, and bathroom availability options thin. This also can jeopardize educational and medical resources for youth (Mendel, 2009).

All clothing options in juvenile detention are very similar in style, purposefully remaining as uniform as possible. A recent survey of 2100 detained youth found that about 15 percent of youth in detention halls identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or gender non-conforming, meaning they may not dress in socially conventional ways (Thomas, 2020). The clothing they are asked to wear is not only forcing them to lose their sense of individuality,

but it is also a form of gender policing that can cause severe psychological damages to the youth. Gender non-conforming youth may be bullied and harassed by their peers and this emotional toll can lead to threats to their physical health, such as an increased risk of exposure to violence, substance use, and self-harm (Bauermeister et al., 2017).

Additionally, clothing should consider the individual's cultural and religious identities to avoid discrimination. The Bob Barker Company, Inc. (2022) supplies a large inventory of clothing and supplies to federal, state, and local correctional agencies across America. There are no tunics, kippahs, hijabs, kurtas, or chivaras on the Bob Barker site (Bob Barker Company, Inc., 2022). According to the Maine's Mountain View Youth Development Center's official youth offender handbook, polo shirts, t-shirts, and sweatpants are the expectation and those who would like to wear religious necklaces must purchase them from the facility and wear them hidden inside of their shirt (Mountain View Youth Development Center, 2013). The Greene County Juvenile Detention Center, which states on its resident handbook's cover page that it does not discriminate based on gender identity or expression, notes gender-specific expectations, such as girls receiving a bra (Greene County Juvenile Detention Center, 2018). This may completely invalidate gender non-conforming youth. The Gila County Juvenile Detention Center uses colored shirts to designate cooperation levels among juveniles, and their handbook proclaims, "*We Expect a Better You*" (Gila County Juvenile Detention Center, 2018). For youth who may not identify or find comfort in these strict dress codes, their version of a "better" self may be harmful. During a stage of life where independence and individualism are eminent, these types of policies may be harmful to enforce.

Education and Vocational Preparation

An essential factor in reducing recidivism is education yet removing a child from their school and confining them to juvenile detention often takes away their educational opportunities. Aizer and Doyle (2013a) found in their research that youth going to juvenile detention have a strong negative correlation on their likelihood of getting an education and these youth were 39 percent less likely to finish high school than other youth. In 2015, almost 40 percent of juvenile detention facilities did not meet national education accreditation standards (Farn and Adams, 2016). Lack of education programming inside juvenile detention facilities is a significant barrier for youth offenders to obtain their high school degree, making it harder to be employed post-release.

The length of school days in juvenile detention may not be as long as days in public schools according to a Department of Education (2016) report. Per their findings, more than 15 percent of juvenile detention facilities offer less than 20 hours per week of schooling, meaning students in juvenile detention schools receive four hours less each day of the valuable time spent in a classroom than students in public school classrooms. Additional studies show that youth who achieve higher levels of education while detained are more likely to experience positive outcomes once released (Blomberg et al., 2011; Cavendish, 2014).

High school students in detention are unlikely to return to school once released, placing them at a higher risk of unemployment (Osborn & Belle, 2019). Some detained adolescents do not know how to complete college or job applications despite being of or near the age for completing applications (Mathur et al., 2009). With this regard, youth held in detention centers may benefit more if the focus was placed more on instilling professional development skills. For example, juvenile detention centers could implement education on career competency skills,

such as critical thinking and equity and inclusion (National Association of College and Employers, 2022). A life skill as simple as creating a resume may even enhance the youth's likelihood of finding employment after they are released. One predictor of adult crime is prior youth incarceration history, and providing adequate academic and vocational training for confined youths significantly reduced the likelihood of criminal activities (Ameen and Lee, 2012; Bernstein, 2014)

Theoretical Framework

Molleman and Leeuw's (2012) study of prison staff working conditions in Dutch prisons found inmates perceived their situation as more positive when correctional officers provided them with support. This multilevel approach utilized a Likert-scale questionnaire to survey 1,750 prison staff from 48 facilities. The scale these researchers used measured prison staff's levels of support based on if they prefer to help inmates rather than enforce rules, avoid begrudging inmates, involve inmates in matters they are concerned about, and provide individual help to inmates. They also surveyed the prison staff on rule orientation and meaningfulness of the job to determine how staff perceived their facility's rules for prisoners and how proud they felt of the work they do. Additionally, staff's perceived responsibility and professional conflict were gauged by asking questions regarding their expectations of themselves and their coworkers and how well they feel they are meeting these expectations. Administrative staff were also studied in this project on their level of leadership qualities, such as how they criticize poor work, reprimand staff, and delegate responsibilities.

The inmates in these facilities were also asked to participate in an independent survey. Molleman and Leeuw (2012) had 4,673 inmates participate in their study to explore the prisoners' perceptions of safety in their facilities, the levels of autonomy they felt they had in

their lives, and the level of monotony that came with living in a controlled and routine prison environment. The prisoners were also asked about their levels of satisfaction with available programming (such as recreation and education) and their restrictions on contacting their family, friends, and lawyers. Lastly, prisoners were asked about their clarity of prison rules and how clearly these rules were communicated to them.

Findings revealed inmates perceived concepts such as monotony, autonomy, connections with outside contacts, and programming as being more positive when they reported a supportive staff environment (Molleman and Leeuw, 2012). The theory behind this is helpful and friendly staff members facilitate beneficial outcomes for inmates. Clarity of rules and expectations also allowed the inmates to feel more at ease in their facilities. Results from the staff survey displayed congruency with the inmate survey regarding their perceptions of the prison. Staff and administrative officials at these facilities appear to either help or hinder the needs of inmates, such as discovering their autonomy. Inmates' perceptions of human dignity and recognized efforts of safety and reintegration were connected to staff characteristics.

Similar to the Dutch prison study, this research also draws from both the importation and deprivation models. Importation factors of prisoners, which were personal characteristics such as age, gender, length of current sentence, cultural background, and prior incarcerations, would affect the perceptions they hold of their facilities. An assumption made in their study, per their report, is "next to inmates' characteristics, environmental factors would affect these perceptions" (Molleman and Leeuw, 2012). It is likely the atmosphere of the prison and restrictions that come with it likely resulted in the inmates feeling deprived of some of their needs.

While the current study does not gather demographic information of participants for the sake of anonymity, it does look to explore juvenile detention officers' perceptions of safety and

care within their facilities. These traits and indicators of empathy may be imported by each surveyed staff member and thus cause variance among the findings. Additionally, the deprivation model may influence responses as officers who feel unprotected or unsatisfied in their facility may feel deprived of their human dignity and rights to safety as an employee.

Additional studies in the field of juvenile justice have evaluated the importance of staff characteristics and facility outcomes. In a study of juvenile detention and juvenile probation officers in six Midwestern states, Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack (2020) looked to extend existing literature regarding burnout among juvenile justice employees. The influence of the individual employee's imported traits (such as gender and highest educational level achieved) and organizational factors that potentially deprive the staff (such as perceived levels of dangerousness in their facility and work-family conflict) were also considered in this study. Of the 298 participants of the anonymous email survey, 210 (about 70 percent) identified as juvenile detention officers.

The researchers in this study hypothesized predictors of burnout (such as depersonalization and emotional exhaustion) would differ among the detention officers and the probation officers. This would potentially influence procedures and policies found in each job to reduce these predictors of burnout and increase the officers' feelings of personal accomplishment (Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack, 2020). They also hypothesized that these organizational variables would have the greatest impact on burnout (rather than individual factors). The findings indicated that the number of contact hours with the youth, work-family conflict, and role overload (demands of their work and the number of tasks they are assigned) correlated with levels of emotional exhaustion for the participants. Work-family conflict also impacted officers' levels of depersonalization. When officers felt they lacked opportunities to provide input on

decisions, their depersonalization and personal accomplishments levels were significantly impacted. The survey results lastly indicated that job characteristics had a greater influence on emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, but organizational variables had the strongest impact on officers' perceptions of personal accomplishment (Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack, 2020).

The final literature reviewed to establish the theoretical framework for this study highlights the importance of detention staff's interactions with detained youth and how the youth's detention experience may rest heavily on these interactions. Walden and Allen (2019) utilized an ethnographic case study approach and centered their study on the everyday interactions juvenile detention officers have with the youth they oversee. They evaluated these observations and how they may align with trauma-informed care concepts and thus promote a more supportive environment.

The Walden and Allen (2019) study observed a short-term, 30-bed facility in a Midwestern community. Approximately seven (out of about 50 total) staff were on duty during the observation. Staff were observed accompanying youth to court and school, as well as providing activity time and snacks. Walden and Allen (2019) also report staff monitored shower time and completed tasks such as laundry and documentation of behavior. Staff were required to perform round-the-clock safety checks every 15 minutes. In addition to studying daily routines and interactions, the researchers also conversed with staff members using open-ended questions about what they had witnessed. For example, staff were asked "what do you do to help youth feel safe?" These observations and conversations took place over approximately 220 hours over the period of approximately one year.

Findings from this study revealed youth were almost always observed by staff for the primary purpose of ensuring physical safety and minimizing the potential for altercations. Conversations of youth were also highly monitored by staff to reduce sharing of personal, potentially incriminating, information. The emotional safety of youth was shown as a priority by staff members in this facility. For example, the researchers observed staff verbally de-escalate potentially dangerous outbursts from upset youth. When interviewed after the incident, staff noted the youth's experiences and past traumas likely led to the outbursts, rather than actual personal attacks on the staff members (Walden and Allen, 2019).

Staff also displayed efforts towards maintaining emotional safety of youth by engaging the youth one-on-one, specifically those who appeared to be having difficulty adjusting to detention. Staff were seen building connections with youth through discussing sports or encouraging healthy coping skills such as drawing. Several staff members donated books, recycled soda cans to purchase new recreation equipment, hygiene items such as name-brand lotions, and snacks. Researchers noticed staff partaking in seemingly small tasks to make detention life easier for youth, such as ensuring hot sauce was available to youth during meals as it was so often requested (Walden and Allen, 2019). In summary, this study found evidence of staff promoting detained youths' emotional safety and staff encouragement of youths' success inside and outside of detention.

Current Study

Research has shown that maltreatment inside juvenile detention may be harmful to both the short-term and long-term mental and physical health of the detained youth (Brady, 2015). Incarcerating children reduces their chances of educational and employment success as well as increases their probability of incarceration as an adult (Aizer & Doyle, 2013b). Additional

findings show that juvenile confinement results in a significantly lower level of psychological well-being for the youth compared to all other youth (Erickson & Schaefer, 2020). Although research has provided contributions to assist the public in understanding that juvenile detention can be disadvantageous, there are still some facets left to be discussed. Juvenile detention officers may be inadvertently harming the youth they oversee because they are following the procedures set in place by their facilities. However, this may not be the intention of these officers. To fill these research gaps, this study explores the reasonings for these events with a focus on the staff and administrative officials who are employed in juvenile detention facilities.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This quantitative study relied on primary data collected from active juvenile detention officers to examine the perceptions they have of their work. The frequency of security measures, environmental danger, quality of life, and programming availability present in a facility was measured by the first portion of the survey. For example, one question in the survey asks the participants: “Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how often the following events occur: Juveniles are handcuffed as a discipline.” This question examined whether staff are utilizing handcuffs in a disciplinary manner. This topic was asked about again during the second portion of the survey, only it is inquiring about the officer’s level of concern if juveniles are or have been handcuffed in their facilities. The second portion of the survey questions (which ask the same exact scenarios as the first half of the survey) investigated how juvenile detention officers perceive the work they do.

Data Collection

The data used to study the perceptions juvenile detention officers have of their work was obtained from active juvenile detention officers. All noted participating facilities will remain unnamed in this study to preserve anonymity of all participants. The researcher dispersed an online survey using Qualtrics to administrative officials at five Midwest facilities, encouraging them to share it with their active juvenile correctional officers. Although five facilities, were contacted, only one facility recorded any responses. In addition, the survey was also distributed via social media sites (Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook) to encourage active juvenile detention officers to complete the survey. This anonymous survey was utilized to first analyze what has been presented in the literature review regarding the various types of potentially harmful events

that are reported to occur inside juvenile detention centers. The second function of the survey was to investigate the opinions these officers have regarding the potentially harmful practices they enforce.

The initial approach was to collect data from only five facilities that are within the same geographical region, which led to the project confronting validity concerns regarding generalizability. However, with the addition of the sixth link that utilized snowball sampling from social media posts, active juvenile detention officers from all over the United States were welcome to complete the survey. Policies and expectations inside juvenile detention centers may vary across state lines, meaning the results of this study may diverge from any similar studies that gathered information from other detention centers across the United States. As a pilot study, the researcher hopes to eventually increase the available network of juvenile detention officers and geographical scale of this survey to reduce external validity problems.

Complete anonymity of the juvenile correctional officers was provided as the survey contains no identifying questions and the researcher was unable to identify the subjects based on their responses. The participants in this study were not placed at a greater risk of harm than they normally would encounter in their daily lives, and they were not exposed to any psychological interventions or biomedical procedures. This study only sought volunteers who are currently employed as juvenile correctional officers in the United States and are 18 years of age or older. The participants of this study were provided with a survey consisting of 82 Likert scale questions. None of these questions were mandatory for the participants to complete, which was outlined in the consent form provided at the beginning of the survey.

Measures

A key aspect of this specific study was to explore whether juvenile detention centers offer a safe environment for youth. The researcher used a combination of the findings from previous literature and studies along with the survey questions designed to either support or dismiss these claims. One of the key survey questions for this component was “Please indicate your level of agreement: The facility I work in is concerned for the safety and care of youth in the facility.” This allowed participants the opportunity to clearly answer what their level of concern was regarding the safety and care of youth in their facilities. In addition, the researcher was able to investigate quality of life and security measure concerns through likelihood questions such as “there is mold in the facility” and “physical restraint is used as a discipline”. The frequency of these events had a significant impact on the researcher’s ability to answer important research questions in this study, including “Do juvenile detention centers offer a safe environment for detained youth?” and “Is there a significant relationship between juvenile detention officers’ reported levels of concern and reported quality of care?”

The second key aspect of this study was to evaluate the perception juvenile detention officers have of the events that occur at their workplace. To analyze environmental factors and conditions in juvenile detention, this study explored the potential relationship between these factors and the juvenile detention officers’ levels of concern. The questions used as an example previously regarding mold and physical restraint provided the researcher with an idea of how supportive a respondent was of these ideas or practices. If a respondent answered that their facility does have mold or utilizes disciplinary physical restraint, the respondent may be complacent in implementing it on youth. Even if the facility does not have mold or does not utilize disciplinary physical restraint, the officers’ perceptions were still gathered as the question

reads: “Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how concerned you are if the following issues are present, or how concerned you would be if they were present.”

Once the questions were created, they were organized into subset categories for the researcher to later use to run statistical analyses. These subset categories were security measures, environmental dangers, quality of life, and availability of programming. These four subsets were in two primary categories (likelihood and officer level of concern), leading to eight summative scale tables of data to analyze. There were nine questions in both categories for the security measure subsets. The questions examining security measures were all tools and methods juvenile detention officers could use to maintain order and safety in their facilities. Keeping lights turned on allows officers to perform security checks and ensure all youth are present and alive, even during nighttime hours. Strip searching is also considered a security measure as it allows detention officers to see if youth are transporting contraband items on their bodies or in their clothing (Daems, 2014). Solitary confinement and restraint tactics (such as physical restraint, shackling, and handcuffing) are also considered security measures as they may allow officers to have complete control over a youth or multiple youth who they have deemed unruly or a threat to their facility’s levels of security.

In the second set of categorical subsets, 14 questions asked participants about environmental dangers that may exist within their detention centers. Bug infestations, mold, or air conditioning or heating units improperly working can all be a threat to a person’s physical safety. Suicidal ideations and suicide attempts may also be signs of environmental distress among detained youths and a threat to their physical well-being (Abram et al., 2014). Sleeping on the floor or sleeping on worn out beds can also cause physical pain, discomfort, or poor sleep quality for youth held in juvenile detention (Shen et al., 2012). One question asked participants if

they (and their fellow detention officers) are ever responsible for directly giving prescribed medications to detained youth. This question falls under the environmental danger umbrella as it presents a potential for physical harm. An assumption is made that juvenile detention officers are not medical professionals, thus a potential for error in distributing medications among multiple youth is possible (Norton, 2012).

Officers were also asked 13 questions for the quality-of-life subsets. Quality of life, for the purposes of this study, values the physical, emotional, and social well-being of youth based on purposeful activities (Felce and Perry, 1995). Access to appropriate amounts of exercise and healthy food options are important to a youth's physical well-being (Lubans et al., 2016). Phone privileges and access to family member visits may be beneficial for detained youth and the loss of these activities may have negative consequences on the youth's emotional and social prosperity (Monahan et al., 2011). Similar to the question from the environmental dangers subset, losing access to a comfortable bed for disciplinary reasons may cause both physical and mental distress for youth (Chung et al., 2014). The topic of access to music was also questioned, as listening to music may reduce stress levels, which in turn could improve behavior (Finn and Fancourt, 2018).

The final subset category used in this project's survey was Availability of Programming for youth inside detention centers. Four questions addressed programming availability: school, mental health professionals, substance recovery professionals, and the detention officers' awareness of each youth's coping skills. Youth who achieve higher levels of education while detained are more likely to experience positive outcomes once released (Blomberg et al., 2011; Cavendish, 2014). Less than 35 percent of justice-involved youth in need of substance use resources receive any type of treatment for their substance use (Baumer et al., 2018).

Although the questions were organized by subset for the researcher's purposes, they were not placed in that order on the survey. Instead, they were ranked from "least potential to be offensive" to "most potential to be offensive". This was intentionally done to encourage continued participation from respondents (Rowley, 2014). For example, the first question that falls into a subset was: "Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how often the following events occur: The facility is overcrowded." This environmental danger is likely perceived as the fault of the facility's administration, rather than the individual officer. However, the final question reads: "Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how often the following events occur: Deadly force is used." Perhaps the most extreme of circumstances would call for deadly force to be used, so in an attempt to stimulate completed surveys, questions of extreme security measures were typically placed at or near the end of the survey.

Analytic Techniques

Upon receiving the results of the surveys, the researcher began to input the data into the Statistical Analysis Software Package (SPSS) for statistical analysis. To test the research hypotheses, the researcher ran univariate (i.e., mean, standard deviation) and bivariate (i.e., correlations) for analyzing survey responses. The most agreed upon standard p-value in social sciences (.05) was used in this study. Scales measuring the domain variables (security measures, environmental dangers, quality of life, and programming availability) were created.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Overview

A total of five anonymous survey links were distributed via email to five different Midwest detention centers. Out of the five detention center sites, only one site returned any survey responses, yielding a 20% response rate from detention center sites. Six responses were recorded on the Detention Center “B”’s anonymous link. The researcher called and emailed all detention center sites two times each, but unfortunately did not receive sufficient responses. A sixth link was created for general sharing on social media sites to encourage snowball sampling. This link was posted on the researcher’s Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook pages and recorded 12 responses, meaning a total of 18 individuals participated in the survey.

The first question on the survey was created to gauge the juvenile detention officers’ levels of job satisfaction. Of the 18 respondents, 16.7% reported feeling “very dissatisfied” with their job, while 27.8% reported feeling “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”. Approximately 44% of respondents reported feeling “satisfied” with the job as a juvenile detention officer and 11.1% reported they were “very satisfied” with their job. A median of 4.0 was calculated for the responses to this question.

The first research question of this study asks if juvenile detention officers offer a safe environment for detained youth. The data reveals reports of strip searching, mold, suicide attempts, food restrictions, and many other potentially dangerous scenarios for youth held in juvenile detention centers. While rare, 33.3% of surveyed officers reported using handcuffs and 38.9% reported using shackles. About 28% of officers reported youth sometimes attempt to complete suicide while in their facilities. Another 27.8% reported youth often have poor hygiene.

The second question of the survey looked to answer the second research question of this study. It asked the officers to indicate their level of agreement to the following statement: “The facility I work in is concerned for the safety and care of youth in the facility.” Around 11% of respondents disagreed with this statement while 5.6% neither agreed nor disagreed. Nearly 40% of officers reported that they agreed and 44.4% strongly agreed with the statement. The calculated median for the second survey question was 4.0. Overall, most (83.3%) officers either agreed or strongly agreed that the facility they work in is concerned for the safety and care of the youth held in the facility.

The final research question was able to be answered by reviewing the correlation matrix of this study. Specifically, the Pearson Correlations regarding job satisfaction and questions from the likelihood category. The data from this study showed that the more often security measures occur, the less satisfied juvenile detention officers are with their jobs. Additionally, job satisfaction decreased when environmental dangers were reportedly present. Access to activities to improve youth’s quality of life and availability to positive programming also increased as job satisfaction increased. There was a significant positive correlation found in the data between officer job satisfaction and the officers’ perceptions of their facility’s level of safety and care.

Table 1 Officer Likelihood Responses for Security Measures

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Lights in the facility remain turned on at all times.	0	0.0	1	5.6	4	22.2	4	22.2	8	44.4
Juveniles are handcuffed as a discipline.	7	38.9	6	33.3	5	27.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Juveniles are shackled as a discipline.	8	44.4	7	38.9	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Verbal punishment is used as a discipline.	9	50.0	4	22.2	3	16.7	1	5.6	1	5.6
Juveniles are strip searched.	0	0.0	6	33.3	9	50.0	2	11.1	1	5.6
Juveniles are monitored while showering.	6	33.3	0	0.0	4	22.2	3	16.7	5	27.8
Solitary confinement is used as a discipline.	7	38.9	2	11.1	4	22.2	5	27.8	0	0.0
Physical restraint is used as a discipline.	8	44.4	3	16.7	5	27.8	1	5.6	1	5.6
Deadly force is used.	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Scale Alpha	.79									
Scale Mean	21.65									

Surveyed officers reported low likelihoods of engaging in purposefully detrimental security measures in this study. As noted in Table 1, 50% of participants reported that verbal punishment is never used in their detention facilities. Roughly 72% of participants reported never or rarely using the security measure of handcuffing as a discipline in their facilities. The likelihood of deadly force being used is reported as very unlikely by participants in this study, as 94.4% of participants reported that it has never occurred. The questions regarding showering and lights remaining turned on were the only two questions of this subset to have significant likelihoods of always occurring. About 44% of participants reported that the lights always remain on in their facilities and 27.8% reported that the juveniles are always monitored while showering.

Table 2 Officer Likelihood Responses for Environmental Dangers

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
The facility is overcrowded.	4	22.2	6	33.3	6	33.3	2	11.1	0	0
The facility is understaffed.	0	0	0	0	5	27.8	11	61.1	2	11.1
The facility is bug-infested.	9	50	8	44.4	1	5.6	0	0	0	0
There is mold in the facility	10	55.6	6	33.3	1	5.6	1	5.6	0	0
The facility has water damage.	6	33.3	10	55.6	1	5.6	0	0	1	5.6
The facility beds are worn out.	2	11.1	4	22.2	9	50	3	16.7	0	0
The facility is loud at night.	2	11.1	7	38.9	8	44.4	1	5.6	0	0
Officers give juveniles their prescribed medication(s).	3	16.7	3	16.7	1	5.6	4	22.2	7	38.9
The facility's air conditioning units are NOT working sufficiently.	7	38.9	9	50	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
The facility's heating units are NOT working sufficiently.	9	50	6	33.3	3	16.7	0	0	0	0
The facility's freezer(s) is NOT working sufficiently.	9	50	6	33.3	3	16.7	0	0	0	0
Juveniles report feeling suicidal.	12	66.7	3	16.7	3	16.7	5	27.8	0	0
Juveniles attempt suicide while in the facility.	0	0	2	11.1	11	61.1	0	0	0	0
Juveniles sleep on the floor due to lack of available beds.	14	77.8	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	0	0	0
Scale Alpha	.634									
Scale Mean	30.53									

The data in Table 2 revealed 77.8% of respondents reported that juveniles never sleep on the floor due lack of available beds. Potentially in relation to this, 55.5% of respondents reported their facilities are never or rarely overcrowded with youth. However, 61.1% responded that their facilities are often understaffed with employees. When asked about suicidal ideations and suicide attempts among youth in their facilities, 66.1% of officers said youth sometimes report feeling suicidal and 66.7% officers report youth rarely have attempted suicide.

Table 3 Officer Likelihood Responses for Quality of Life

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Residents of the facility have poor hygiene.	1	5.6	5	27.8	5	27.8	5	27.8	2	11.1
Juveniles have access to music.	1	5.6	5	27.8	5	27.8	5	27.8	2	11.1
Juveniles are provided with at least a half hour per day of access to exercise.	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	38.9	11	61.1
Recreation time is restricted as a discipline.	5	27.8	6	33.3	3	16.7	3	16.7	1	5.6
Phone privileges are restricted as a discipline.	6	33.3	3	16.7	7	38.9	2	11.1	0	0
Family visits are restricted as a discipline.	6	33.3	4	22.2	7	38.9	1	5.6	0	0
Juveniles sleep on the floor as a discipline.	15	83.3	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	0	0	0
Shower usage is restricted as a discipline.	11	61.1	3	16.7	3	16.7	1	5.6	0	0
Flushing toilets are restricted as a discipline.	13	72.2	1	5.6	4	22.2	0	0	0	0.0
Food options are restricted as a discipline.	10	55.6	5	27.8	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	0
Juveniles are required to wear facility-issued clothing.	0	0	1	5.6	0	0	2	11.1	15	83.3
Dress codes are enforced specific to the gender of juveniles (ex. "girls must wear bras" or "boys must wear boxers").	6	33.3	1	5.6	0	0	4	22.2	7	38.9
Juveniles' clothes have unremovable stains on them.	1	5.6	7	38.9	7	38.9	2	11.1	1	5.6
Scale Alpha	.87									
Scale Mean	30.39									

As noted in Table 3, disciplinary actions related to the youths' quality of life are reportedly uncommon in participants' facilities. For example, 88.9% of respondents reported youth never or rarely sleep on the floor as a discipline. From Table 2, data showed 77.8% of

respondents reported that youth never sleep on the floor due lack of available beds. This likely means that regardless of disciplinary actions or lack of resources, youth are typically offered bedding to sleep on in these facilities. Another notable response from the quality-of-life subset is the question regarding facility-issued clothing. Just over 83% of respondents reported youth are always required to wear facility-issued clothing.

Table 4 Officer Likelihood Responses for Programming Availability

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Classroom (school) time for juveniles is disrupted.	2	11.1	7	38.9	7	38.9	1	5.6	1	5.6
Mental health professionals are available to juveniles.	0	0	3	16.7	3	16.7	5	27.8	7	38.9
Substance recovery professionals are available to juveniles.	1	5.6	4	22.2	7	38.9	3	16.7	3	16.7
Officers are aware of the positive coping skills of each juvenile.	1	5.6	4	22.2	7	38.9	3	16.7	3	16.7
Scale Alpha	.81									
Scale Mean	10.0									

Data from Table 4 reveals over 66% of respondents reported mental health professionals are often or always available to the youth in their detention centers. In addition, 77.8% reported classroom time is rarely or sometimes disrupted. Substance recovery professionals are also reportedly a presence in these detention centers, as 38.9% of respondents said they are sometimes available to the youth. Overall, beneficial programming is evident in these detention centers according to the surveyed juvenile detention officers.

Table 5 Officer Concern Level Responses for Security Measures

	Not at all concerned		Slightly concerned		Concerned		Very concerned	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Lights in the facility remain turned on at all times.	7	58.3	2	16.7	3	25	0	0
Juveniles are handcuffed as a discipline.	3	25	3	25	4	33.3	2	16.7
Juveniles are shackled as a discipline.	4	33.3	3	25	2	16.7	3	25
Verbal punishment is used as a discipline.	3	25	3	25	3	25	3	25
Juveniles are strip searched.	5	41.7	5	41.7	0	0	2	16.7
Juveniles are monitored while showering.	5	41.7	3	25	1	8.3	3	25
Solitary confinement is used as a discipline.	3	25	4	33.3	1	8.3	4	33.3
Physical restraint is used as a discipline.	4	33.3	1	8.3	4	33.3	3	25
Deadly force is used.	5	41.7	0	0	0	0	7	58.3
Scale Alpha	.927							
Scale Mean	20.75							

The second section of the survey repeated the same question concepts, only these subsets focused on the officers' concern levels for these actions. For example, Table 5 summarizes the responses officers provided regarding their concerns for security measures in their facilities. In regard to verbal punishment, respondents were equally varied (25%) across all possible responses. The majority (58.3%) of respondents said they would very concerned if deadly force was used in their facilities. However, the other 41.7% of participants said they would be not at all concerned if deadly force was used in their facilities. Lastly, 75% of respondents stated they would be not at all concerned or slightly concerned if the lights were left on at all times in their facilities.

Table 6 Officer Concern Level Responses for Environmental Dangers

	Not at all concerned		Slightly concerned		Concerned		Very concerned	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
The facility is overcrowded.	5	41.7	2	16.7	2	16.7	3	25
The facility is understaffed.	0	0	1	8.3	5	41.7	6	50
The facility is bug-infested.	5	41.7	2	16.7	1	8.3	4	33.3
There is mold in the facility	6	50	0	0	2	16.7	4	33.3
The facility has water damage.	4	33.3	3	25	2	16.7	3	25
The facility beds are worn out.	4	33.3	3	25	5	41.7	0	0
The facility is loud at night.	7	58.3	2	16.7	3	25	0	0
Officers give juveniles their prescribed medication(s).	5	41.7	3	25	3	25	1	8.3
The facility's air conditioning units are NOT working sufficiently.	3	25	2	16.7	3	25	4	33.3
The facility's heating units are NOT working sufficiently.	3	25	2	16.7	3	25	4	33.3
The facility's freezer(s) is NOT working sufficiently.	4	33.3	1	8.3	5	41.7	2	16.7
Juveniles report feeling suicidal.	1	8.3	4	33.3	3	25	4	33.3
Juveniles attempt suicide while in the facility.	2	16.7	4	33.3	1	8.3	5	41.7
Juveniles sleep on the floor due to lack of available beds.	4	33.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	5	41.7
Scale Alpha	.934							
Scale Mean	35.42							

In Table 6, officers' levels of concern regarding potential environmental dangers in their facilities are assessed. Fifty percent of the surveyed officers stated they would be not at all concerned if there was mold in their facilities and 41.7% said they would be not at all concerned

if their facilities were bug infested. Just over 58% of respondents reported they would be not at all concerned if their facilities were loud at night but 50% said they would be very concerned if they were understaffed. Lastly, 41.7% of respondents said they would be very concerned if youth attempted suicide while in the facility.

Table 7 Officer Concern Level Responses for Quality of Life

	Not at all concerned		Slightly concerned		Concerned		Very concerned	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Residents of the facility have poor hygiene.	3	25	3	25	3	25	3	25
Juveniles have access to music.	8	66.7	3	25	1	8.3	0	0
Juveniles are provided with at least a half hour per day of access to exercise.	6	50	3	25	2	16.7	1	8.3
Recreation time is restricted as a discipline.	4	33.3	2	16.7	5	41.7	1	8.3
Phone privileges are restricted as a discipline.	4	33.3	3	25	3	25	2	16.7
Family visits are restricted as a discipline.	3	25	3	25	4	33.3	2	16.7
Juveniles sleep on the floor as a discipline.	4	33.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	5	41.7
Shower usage is restricted as a discipline.	5	41.7	1	8.3	4	33.3	2	16.7
Flushing toilets are restricted as a discipline.	3	25	3	25	3	25	3	25
Food options are restricted as a discipline.	3	25	3	25	2	16.7	4	33.3
Juveniles are required to wear facility-issued clothing.	10	83.3	2	16.7	0	0	0	0
Dress codes are enforced specific to the gender of juveniles (ex. "girls must wear bras" or "boys must wear boxers").	7	58.3	1	8.3	3	25	1	8.3
Juveniles' clothes have unremovable stains on them.	4	33.3	5	41.7	2	16.7	1	8.3
Scale Alpha	.88							
Scale Mean	31.17							

The detention officers' levels of care for youths' qualities of life were collected in Table 7. The majority of participants (83.3%) said they would be not at all concerned if youth had to wear facility-issued clothing and 75% of them said they would not be concerned at all or only slightly concerned if the youths' clothes had unremovable stains on them. Additionally, 58.3% of respondents said they would not be concerned at all if gender-policing dress codes were enforced at their facilities.

Table 8 Officer Concern Level Responses for Programming Availability

	Not at all concerned		Slightly concerned		Concerned		Very concerned	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Classroom (school) time for juveniles is disrupted.	2	16.7	5	41.7	3	25	2	16.7
Mental health professionals are available to juveniles.	4	33.3	5	41.7	2	16.7	1	8.3
Substance recovery professionals are available to juveniles.	4	33.3	5	41.7	3	25	0	0
Officers are aware of the positive coping skills of each juvenile.	6	50	3	25	2	16.7	1	8.3
Scale Alpha	.835							
Scale Mean	11.67							

Table 8 highlights surveyed officers' levels of concern regarding programming availability within their facilities. Data from Table 8 shows respondents were generally slightly concerned with having programs within their facility. For example, 41.7% of participants reported they would be slightly concerned if mental health professionals or substance recovery professionals were available to the youth in their facilities. However, 41.7% also reported they would be slightly concerned if classroom time was disrupted.

Table 9 Job Satisfaction and Officers' Perceptions of Facility's Care Correlations

Pearson Correlations		
	Please indicate your level of satisfaction for your job.	Please indicate your level of agreement: The facility I work in is concerned for the safety and care of youth in the facility.
Please indicate your level of satisfaction for your job.	1	.599**
Please indicate your level of agreement: The facility I work in is concerned for the safety and care of youth in the facility.	.599**	1
Subset: Officer Likelihood Responses for Security Measures	-.662**	-.408
Subset: Officer Likelihood Responses for Environmental Dangers	-.528*	-.470
Subset: Officer Likelihood Responses for Quality of Life	-.689**	-.501*
Subset: Officer Likelihood Responses for Programming Availability	-.544*	-.352
Subset: Officer Concern Level Responses for Security Measures	-.336	-.017
Subset: Officer Concern Level Responses for Environmental Dangers	-.618*	-.452
Subset: Officer Concern Level Responses for Quality of Life	-.307	-.021
Subset: Officer Concern Level Responses for Programming Availability	-.319	.158
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).		
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).		

Table 9 outlines the Pearson Correlations for each subset as well as the first two questions of the survey, which asked about officer job satisfaction and their perceptions of their facility's levels of care the youth. There was a significant positive correlation of .599 between the first two questions of the survey, meaning the more the officer felt their facility cared for the

youth, the more satisfied they felt with their job. Additionally, every subset in the likelihood category showed a significant negative correlation when considering officer job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Summary

This pilot study sought to uncover how much, if any, maltreatment is occurring within juvenile detention centers in America. Additionally, this study examined juvenile correctional officers' perceptions of safety and care of their facilities and if there were any correlations between potential maltreatment and these officers' viewpoints. The majority of officers surveyed believed their facilities do care for the safety of the detained youth and they enjoyed the work that they do in their roles. They did not show signs of engagement in blatantly harmful acts, such as utilizing deadly force frequently or allowing environmental dangers like mold and bug-infestations to be a common issue for the youth they oversee. Many did not show concern for activities that may be considered harmful but are requirements of their positions, such as distributing prescribed medications, monitoring shower time, and conducting strip searches. This is likely due to the policies of their facilities and the expectations set on them by their administrations for safety and security purposes.

Limitations

Throughout the research process, the researcher encountered limitations in reaching the targeted sample. Despite multiple emails and phone calls to and with administrative officials, only six responses were recorded from the five Midwest facilities. All six responses were from the same facility, Detention Center "B". In order to increase sample size, the researcher provided an anonymous link on social media sites for active juvenile detention officers to utilize. The social media sites included Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook. This approach created potential reliability limitations as the link was made available to the general public. The researcher utilized the Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved message at the beginning of the survey to stress

the importance of participants needing to be employed as active juvenile detention officers. However, there is still a possibility that non-active juvenile detention officers took the survey, which can skew the true accuracy of the result. Despite this risk, the snowball sample technique did increase the sample size of this study from six to eighteen. Although the sample size was a tremendous limitation and made drawing statistical conclusions difficult, it sufficed for the purposes of this pilot study.

This project also faced reliability concerns due to social desirability among participants. These individuals are trained and compensated to carry out these policies and the survey questions may have initially felt like an attack against their character rather than a tool to gather information regarding their profession. In order to decrease the likelihood of social desirability influencing the outcome of the data, this researcher utilized two approaches. First, anonymity of participants is of utmost importance to encourage truthful and reliable answers. The researcher purposefully avoided using any demographic information, including naming the institutions used in this study, to reduce any social desirability or anxiety participants may experience regarding identification. Second, the questions were designed to avoid offending the detention officers by utilizing neutral words and justifications. This created a welcoming setting for participants to answer without feeling negative about their actions and potentially avoiding completing the survey.

These approaches can be seen throughout the survey questions. The first instance can be seen in the question regarding solitary confinement: “Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how often the following events occur: Solitary confinement is used as a discipline.” This question is only looking for a response to confirm or deny if their facility uses solitary confinement for disciplinary purposes. The use of solitary confinement can be

potentially harmful to youth as it may cause suicidal thoughts, cutting, and hallucinations (Birkhead, 2014; Lee, 2016). Emotional desensitization is a psychological process that may be used as a coping mechanism by juvenile detention officers as a result of repeated violent encounters (Mrug et al., 2016). The more consistently juvenile detention officers are presented with emotional and/or physical conflicts within their profession, the less sensitive the situation may feel for them. The researcher examined juvenile detention officers' perceptions and if the frequency of violent events has any effect on these perceptions.

To help eliminate the threat of reliability concerns, the researcher used the same exact group of scenario questions for both sections of the survey. Respondents were first asked about the likelihood of them having to do a specific task as a standard job duty. The scale used for all likelihood-related questions was 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Sometimes, 4. Often, and 5. Always. They were then asked the same core question, except regarding their level of concern for the activity with a scale of 1. Not at all concerned, 2. Slightly concerned, 3. Concerned, and 4. Very concerned. The goal of the survey questions was to first gather information on what is occurring in these facilities, followed by how those who potentially implement these policies feel about it.

For example, one question theme states "the facility's air conditioning units are NOT working sufficiently." By answering anything except "Never" for the first portion of the survey, the researcher knows there may be times when air conditioning is not being provided for the staff and youth within the facility. The second portion of the survey, which highlights the detention officers' feelings towards the procedures, enlightened the researcher on the level of care or awareness these individuals feel about this potentially dangerous event.

The researcher favored Likert-scale response options for this project because of the benefits Likert-scale response options provide specifically for quantitative data (Chyung et al.,

2018). Eliminating threats of biases or validity concerns is crucial for a study of this type. While qualitative information such as perceptions and opinions (such as the second half of this project's survey) can be difficult to measure in research, Likert-scale response options allow for the greatest degree of measurement and understanding in a potentially subjective topic (Joshi et al., 2015).

The final limitation of this study can be seen in some of the questions from the survey, specifically the second category, which focused on officers' levels of concern. It is possible there were misinterpretations or misunderstandings of some questions, which may have had an impact on the data. For example, when asked about the lights remaining on at all times, they may have responded that they were not at all concerned because this is such a common occurrence (for the sake of safety and security), rather than reading it as it was intended, which was how concerned they were for the youth having to sleep with the lights on at all times. Similarly, the question which asked about their level of concern in giving youth their prescribed medications may have been interpreted as a simple and ordinary job duty they are tasked with, rather than if they feel any nerves or discomfort about having this medical responsibility placed on them. Other examples of these misconstrued questions may include the questions on strip searching, shower monitoring, dress-codes (with possible tones of gender policing to them), and the level of noise in the facilities at night.

Discussion of Results

When it came to the degree of safety that was present in the detention facilities, officers' feedback varied. Access to appropriate resources, such as substance use counselors, were reported to be never or rarely available to youth by some officers, but often or always available by other officers. This could have a variety of explanations, but likely it is because officers from

multiple different facilities were surveyed, and a resource such as substance use counselors might be a higher priority in some facilities than in others. The use of solitary confinement faced similar results and a likely similar explanation, as many of the officers reported it was a rarity whereas others said it was utilized often. Although rare, a small percentage of respondents reported deadly force is used in their facility, likely meaning they have seen or heard of an officer in their facility utilizing deadly force on a detained youth. In addition, some officers reported that physical restraint as a means of discipline is always or often used in their facilities.

Results also indicated that officers overall are concerned about the implemented security measures, potential environmental dangers, quality of life, and availability of programming permitted to the youth in their facilities. This likely means that the majority of officers do care for the youth despite being required to perform duties that can potentially be harmful to the youth, such as strip searching and restricting positive activities such as exercise and music. Overall, most officers reported their facilities care about the physical safety and emotional well-being of the detained youth.

Lastly, there were negative correlations discovered in regard to job satisfaction and the frequency of typical job duties. For example, when officers reported they were more likely to implement security measures (such as handcuffing and shackling, observing showers, and strip searching), the less satisfied they felt in their jobs. This was true across all four subsets (security measures, environmental dangers, quality of life, and availability of programming) which may connect the other findings from this study. As mentioned, the surveyed officers reportedly do care about the safety and well-being of detained youth in the facilities, but they also report that the more restrictive their facilities' policies are, the less satisfied they are with their jobs.

Previous literature and research on officer burnout may also be connected to the results from this study. The turnover rate for juvenile detention officers in 2016 was 20% (Mikytuck and Cleary, 2016). Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack (2020) found that job characteristics had the greatest impact on burnout rates among juvenile justice employees (of the 298 participants of the anonymous email survey, about 70% identified as juvenile detention officers.) When the officers felt they lacked the ability to provide input to administrative officials, their depersonalization and levels of personal accomplishment significantly decreased. Lastly, they noted that participant's emotional exhaustion positively correlated with role overload (demands of their work) and the number of contact hours they had with the youth they worked with (Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack, 2020).

Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack's (2020) study of burnout rates showed a positive correlation with increased contact hours with the youth, which was similarly found in my results regarding job satisfaction and security measures, quality of life questions, and environmental concerns. As the frequency of these policies, actions, and conditions increased, the level of satisfaction the officers felt regarding their jobs decreased. Although there were no significant findings or correlations regarding the likelihood subsets and the concern-level subsets, these negative correlations regarding job satisfaction and likelihood subsets may tell the researcher that just because the officers were not concerned about carrying out their job duties, it does not mean they enjoyed doing them.

In relation to Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack's (2020) findings on contact hours and officer burnout rates, the Walden and Allen (2019) study also plays a potentially relevant role. This study found that detention officers were almost always observing the detained youth in their facility. This near-constant level of contact with the youth may give insight into the high burnout

rates as discussed in Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack (2020). In addition, the Walden and Allen (2019) study also concluded that the emotional well-being of the youth was the staff's top priority. The findings in the current study may strengthen this idea as there was a positive correlation found in job satisfaction and the likelihood of programming availability. This unique subset was worded in an opposite manner as the other three subsets, meaning the more often these programs were available, the more satisfied the officers were in their work. As Walden and Allen (2019) argued, officers were happier when the youth's emotional safety was being taken care of. Higher rates of access to healthy classrooms, mental health counselors, and substance use counselors positively correlating with job satisfaction may add additional substance to these theories and findings.

Similarly, the final study that developed the theoretical framework for the current research was the Molleman and Leeuw (2012) study. Researchers from this study found that prison staff preferred to help inmates rather than enforce restrictive policies. In addition, they found officers' pride in their work were positively correlated when they were allowed to help inmates rather than enforce rules. For the purposes of the current study, a similar trend was found as officers' job satisfaction decreased as their likelihood of enforcing restrictive policies or subjecting the youth to potentially harmful environments increased. These concepts all tie together to the Walden and Allen (2019) study, which found the youth's emotional well-being was the top priority for juvenile detention officers.

In the current study, officers who reported low levels of job satisfaction may be experiencing the organizational and administrative struggles mentioned in the Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack (2020) study. By interacting frequently with youth, officers may feel burnout and exhausted in their positions, leading to high rates of resignations. They may also feel that the

facility they work in does not care about the youth to the level that they do, which may cause frustrations and disputes among the staff who must actively implement the potentially harmful policies and administrative officials who create them. This can be significantly dangerous in the grander picture. As restrictive policies reduce job satisfaction, burnout and resignation rates may increase, leading facilities to face staffing difficulties. An understaffed facility can significantly increase the rates of violence and trauma for all who inhabit and work inside of it (Martin et al., 2012).

Future Research

In future studies, the researcher intends on clarifying the questions for the ease of the participants. This will hopefully reduce misinterpretations that were seen in this pilot study. Instead of phrasing these questions about a level of concern, questions on comfort levels may be used instead. Another option for future studies would be to allow the detention officers to identify the feelings they encounter when implementing uncomfortable policies and then analyzing the qualitative results. Additionally, the researcher plans to reduce the number of questions overall and focus on a specific policy or practice commonly found in juvenile detention centers. Likely, this research will center on strip searching and understanding the security benefits it provides, as well as any alternative tools or practices that can be used instead to reduce the amount of harm caused to the detained youth. The researcher hopes to use the groundwork and concepts from this study for future studies in this realm.

The next step for future studies would be to include demographic information in order to paint a clearer picture of the individuals who work inside of juvenile detention centers. The researcher will then be able to analyze these results with the feedback from the officers to determine if there are any patterns or trends among those of similar ages, backgrounds, and years

of service. Also included will be questions incorporated from the Rhineberger-Dunn and Mack (2020) study, such as the number of direct contact hours officers have with the detained youth.

The last critical step moving forward in this research is to increase the sample size by more aggressive recruitment strategies. An initial phone call agreement was not enough to keep administrative officials committed to distributing the survey to their staff. A potential solution to this would be to physically visit the detention centers and distribute the survey to detention officers during a staff meeting. Another potential option would be to build a professional connection with juvenile detention officers through committees or by attending relevant conferences.

REFERENCES

- Abram, K., Choe, J., Washburn, J., Teplin, L., King, D., Dulcan, M., and Bassett, E. (2014). *Suicidal thoughts and behaviors among detained youth*. United States Department of Justice.
- Abram K., Teplin, L., King, D., Longworth, S., Emanuel, K., Romero, E., McClelland, G., Dulcan, M., Washburn, J., Welty, L., and Olson, N. (2013). *PTSD, Trauma, and Comorbid Psychiatric Disorders in Detained Youth*. United States Department of Justice.
- Adams, E. (2010). *Healing invisible wounds: Why investing in trauma-informed care for children makes sense*. Georgetown University School of Medicine.
- Ahlin, E. (2018). Risk factors of sexual assault and victimization among youth in custody. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 36*(3-4), NP2164-2187NP.
- Aizer, A. & Doyle, J. (2013). *Juvenile incarceration, human capital, and future crime: Evidence from randomly-assigned judges*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Aizer, A., & Doyle, J. (2013). *What is the long-term impact of incarcerating juveniles?* VoxEU & CEPR.
- Ameen, E. J., & Lee, D. L. (2012). Vocational training in juvenile detention: A call for action. *The Career Development Quarterly, 60*(2), 98-108.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Angelakis, I., Austin, J., & Gooding, P. (2020). *Association of childhood maltreatment with suicide behaviors among young people: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. Jama Network.

- Bauermeister, J., Connochie, D., Jadwin-Cakmak, L., & Meanley, S. (2017). Gender policing during childhood and the psychological well-being of young adult sexual minority men in the United States. *American journal of men's health, 11*(3), 693-701.
- Baumer P., Dennis, M., & Estrada, B. (2018). *Needs, services received, and outcomes of adolescents and young adults in substance use disorder (SUD) treatment*. Adolescent Substance Abuse (pp. 67-139).
- Bernstein, N. (2014). *Burning down the house: The end of juvenile prison*. The New Press.
- Birkhead, T. R. (2015). Children in isolation: The solitary confinement of youth. *Wake Forest L. Rev., 50*, 1.
- Blomberg, T.G., Bales, W.D., Mann, K., Piquero, A.R., and Berk, R.A. 2011. Incarceration, education and transition from delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*(4):355-365.
- Bob Barker Company, Inc. (2022). *Clothing & Uniforms*. Bobbarker.com.
- Brady, J. (2015). *Re-examining juvenile incarceration*. The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Brusseau, T., Burns, R., and Hannon, J. (2018). *Physical activity and health-related fitness of adolescents within the juvenile justice system*. National Library of Medicine.
- Cavendish, W. 2014. Academic attainment during commitment and postrelease education-related outcomes of juvenile justice-involved youth with and without disabilities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 22*(1):41–52.
- Chung, S., Wilson, K. E., Miller, A. L., Johnson, D., Lumeng, J. C., & Chervin, R. D. (2014). Home sleeping conditions and sleep quality in low-income preschool children. *Sleep Medicine Research, 5*(1), 29-32.

- Chyung, S.Y., Kennedy, M., & Campbell, I. (2018). *Evidence-based survey design: the use of ascending or descending order of Likert-type response options*. Performance Improvement.
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). *Create a good sleep environment*. NIOSH Training for Nurses on Shift Work and Long Work Hours.
- Daems, T. (2014). 'Ceci n'est pas une Fouille á Corps': The Denial of Strip Searches in Belgian Prisons. *Punishment and Incarceration: A Global Perspective* (Vol. 19, pp. 75-94). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Dennis, M. L., Smith, C. N., Belenko, S., Knight, D., McReynolds, L., Rowan, G., et al. (2019). *Operationalizing a behavioral health services cascade of care model: Lessons learned from a 33-site implementation in juvenile justice community supervision*. Federal Probation, 83(2), 52–64.
- Desai, R., Goulet, J., Robbins, J., Chapman, J., Migdole, S., and Hoge, M. (2006). *Mental health care in juvenile detention facilities: A review*. The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law.
- Dial, K. (2010). Stress and the Correctional Officer. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 22, 1.
- Dierkhising, C. B., Lane, A., & Natsuaki, M. N. (2014). Victims behind bars: A preliminary study of abuse during juvenile incarceration and post-release social and emotional functioning. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20(2), 181–190.
- Erickson, G., & Schaefer, S. (2020). *Long term effects of juvenile correctional confinement*. Criminology and Post-Mortem Studies: Analyzing Criminal Behavior and Making Medical Decisions.

- Farn, A. and Adams, J. (2016). Education and interagency collaboration: A lifeline of justice involved youth. *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform*.
- Fazel, S. & Cartwright, J. (2008). *Suicide in prisoners: A systemic review of risk factors*. *Clinical Psychology*.
- Feierman, J. R., & Shah, R. S. (2007). *Protecting personhood: Legal strategies to combat the use of strip searches on youth in detention*. *Rutgers L. Rev.*, 60, 67.
- Felce, D. & Perry, J. (1995). Quality of life: its definition and measurement. *Research in developmental disabilities*, 16:51–74.
- Field, M. & Davis, E. (2020). *Victim, Perpetrator, and Incident Characteristics of Sexual Victimization of Youth in Juvenile Facilities, 2018 – Statistical Tables*. United States Department of Justice.
- Finn, S., & Fancourt, D. (2018). The biological impact of listening to music in clinical and nonclinical settings: A systematic review. *Progress in brain research*, 237, 173-200.
- Gesch, B. (2016). Adolescence: Does good nutrition = good behavior? *Nutrition and Health*, 22(1), 55-65.
- Gila County Juvenile Detention Center. (2012). *Student and Parent Handbook*. Gila County Arizona.
- Gould, M. (2020). *Cruel and unusual trauma: How Eighth Amendment principles governing conditions of confinement should apply to juvenile strip searches*. *Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.*, 52, 1009.
- Greene County Juvenile Detention Center. (2018). *Resident Handbook*. Greene County Missouri.
- Gutierrez, S. E., & Van Puymbroeck, C. (2006). Childhood and adult violence in the lives of women who misuse substances. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11(5), 497-513.

- Haney, C. (2018). *Restricting the use of solitary confinement*. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 1, 285-310.
- Hockenberry, S. (2014). *Juveniles in residential placement, 2011*. United States Department of Justice.
- Hockenberry, S. and Sladky, A. (2018). *Juvenile residential facility census, 2016: Selected findings*. United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Hockenberry, S. and Sladky, A. (2020). *Juvenile residential facility census, 2018: Selected findings*. United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Human Rights Watch Children's Watch. (1995). *Children in confinement in Louisiana*. Human Rights Watch.
- Irvine, A. (2010). 'We've had three of them': *Addressing the invisibility of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and gender non-confirming youths in the juvenile justice system*. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law*.
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D.K. (2015). *Likert scale: explored and explained*. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*.
- Juvenile Residential Facility Census Databook. (2018). *JRFC Databook*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Lee, J. (2016). Lonely too long: Redefining and reforming juvenile solitary confinement. *Fordham Law Review*, 85.
- Levitt, L. (2010). The comparative risk of mistreatment for juveniles in detention facilities and state prisons. *International journal of forensic mental health*, 9(1), 44-54.

- Lubans, D., Richards, J., Hillman, C., Faulkner, G., Beauchamp, M., Nilsson, M., Kelly, P., Smith, J., Raine, L., & Biddle, S. (2016). Physical activity for cognitive and mental health in youth: a systematic review of mechanisms. *Pediatrics, 138*(3).
- Martin, J. L., Lichtenstein, B., Jenkot, R. B., & Forde, D. R. (2012). "They can take us over any time they want" correctional officers' responses to prison crowding. *The Prison Journal, 92*(1), 88-105.
- Mathur, S., Griller Clark, H., & Schoenfeld, N. (2009). *Professional development: a capacity-building model for juvenile correctional education systems*. Correctional Education Association.
- McCulloch, J., & George, A. (2009). *Naked power: Strip searching in women's prisons*. The Violence of Incarceration (pp. 107-123). Routledge.
- McNair, D., Havens, J., Surko, M., Weinberger, E., Baetz C., Moaveni, M., Bart, A., Marr, M., Quinlan, C., & McCue-Horwitz, S. (2019). Post-traumatic stress and related symptoms among juvenile detention residents: Results from intake screening. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 92*, 22-31.
- Mendel, R. (2009). *Two decades of JDAI: from demonstration project to national standard. A progress report*. Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Mendel, R. (2015). *Maltreatment of Youth in U.S. Juvenile Corrections Facilities: An Update*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Mikytuck, A. M., & Cleary, H. (2016). Factors Associated with Turnover Decision Making Among Juvenile Justice Employees: Comparing Correctional and Non-Correctional Staff. *Journal of Juvenile Justice, 5*(2).

- Molleman, T. & Leeuw, F. (2012). The influence of prison staff on inmate conditions: A multilevel approach to staff and inmate surveys. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 18(2), 217-233.
- Monahan, K. C., Goldweber, A., & Cauffman, E. (2011). The effects of visitation on incarcerated juvenile offenders: how contact with the outside impacts adjustment on the inside. *Law and human behavior*, 35(2), 143.
- Mountain View Youth Development Center. (2013). *Resident Handbook*. University of Michigan, Michigan Law.
- Mrug, S., Madan, A., & Windle, M. (2016). *Emotional desensitization to violence contributes to adolescents' violent behavior*. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*.
- Mullen, P. & Fleming, J. (1998). *Long-term effects of child sexual abuse*. *Issues in Child Abuse Prevention*.
- National Association of College and Employers. (2022). *What is career readiness?* Naceweb.org.
- Norton, A. A. (2012). The captive mind: antipsychotics as chemical restraint in juvenile detention. *J. Contemp. Health L. & Policy*, 29, 152.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2022). *MPG programs by topic*. <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/model-programs-guide/mpg-programs-topic>
- Osborn, D., and Belle, J. (2019). Preparing juvenile offenders for college and career readiness: A cognitive information processing approach. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 29(3), 283-313.

- Park, C., Kaiser, A., Spiro, A., King, D., & King, L. (2012). Does wartime captivity affect late-life mental health? A study of Vietnam-era repatriated prisoners of war. *Research in human development, 9*(3), 191-209.
- Pickens, I., Siegfried, C., Surko, M., & Dierkhising, C. (2016). Victimization and juvenile offending. *The National Child Traumatic Stress Network*.
- Pearlstein, T. (2002). Eating disorders and comorbidity. *Archives of Women's Mental Health, 4*(3), 67-78.
- Penza, K.M. et al. (2003). Neurobiological effects of childhood abuse: implications for the pathophysiology of depression and anxiety. *Archives of Women's Mental Health, 6*, 15-22.
- Protection and Advocacy for People with Disabilities Inc. v. Charleston County Juvenile Detention Center, 2:20-cv-02738-DCN (2020).
- Puzzanchera, C. and Hockenberry, S. (2020). *Highlights from the 2018 juvenile residential facility census*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2020). *Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2019*. National Center for Juvenile Justice. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>
- Puzzanchera, C. (2020). *The decline in arrests of juveniles continued through 2019*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Remch, M., Mautz C., Burke, E., Junker, G., Kaniuka, A., Proescholdbell, S., Marshall, S., & Naumann, R. (2021). *Impact of a Prison Therapeutic Diversion Unit on Mental and Behavioral Health Outcomes*. American Journal of Preventative Medicines.
- Rhineberger-Dunn, G., & Mack, K. (2020). Predicting burnout among juvenile detention and juvenile probation officers. *Criminal justice policy review, 31*(3), 335-355.

- Rodriguez-Ayllon, M., Cadenas-Sánchez, C., Estévez-López, F., Muñoz, N. E., Mora-Gonzalez, J., Migueles, J. H., Molina-García P., Henriksson H., Mena-Molina A., Martínez-Vizcaíno, V., Catena, A., Löf, M., Erickson, K., Lubans, D., Ortega, F., & Esteban-Cornejo, I. (2019). Role of physical activity and sedentary behavior in the mental health of preschoolers, children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports medicine*, 49(9), 1383-1410.
- Romeo, E. (2013). *Stress and the developing adolescent brain*. Neuroscience.
- Rowley, J. (2014). Designing and using research questionnaires. *Management research review*.
- Sawyer, W. (2019). *Youth confinement: The whole pie 2019*. Prison Policy Initiative.
- Sawyer, W. & Wagner, P. (2020). *Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2020*. Prison Policy Initiative.
- Saylor, W. (1984). *Surveying prison environments*. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research.
- Schulman, E. and Cauffman, E. (2011). Coping while incarcerated: A study of male juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research and Adolescence*, 21(4), 818-826.
- Sedlak, A. (2017). *Survey of youth in residential placement: conditions of confinement*. Office of Justice Programs.
- Sedlak, A. & McPherson, K. (2010). *Survey of youth in residential placement: Youth's needs and services*. United States Department of Justice.
- Sedlak, A., McPherson, K., & Basena, M. (2013). *Nature and Risk of Victimization*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Shen, L., Chen, Y. X., Guo, Y., Zhong, S., Fang, F., Zhao, J., & Hu, T. Y. (2012). Research on the relationship between structural properties of bedding layer in spring mattress and sleep quality. *Work, 41*, 1268-1273.
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, T.J., Kang, W., & Puzanchera, C. (2019). *Easy access to the census of juveniles in residential placement*. Ojjdp.gov
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, T., Puzanchera, C., & Kang, W. (2021). *Easy access to the census of juveniles in residential placement*. National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Siegfried, C. and Van Tassell, R. (2010). *What states are doing about child trauma*. International Conference on Child and Family Maltreatment.
- Smith, E. & Stroop, J. (2019). *Sexual victimization reported by youth in juvenile facilities, 2018*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Spataro, J. et al. (2004). Impact of child sexual abuse on mental health: Prospective study in males and females. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 184*, 416-421.
- Suni, E. & Dimitriu, A. (2020). *Teens and sleep*. Sleep Foundation.
- Thomas, C. (2020). Ethical and legal issues in the care of transgender youth in the juvenile justice system. *Ethics, Medicine, and Public Health, 13*, 100464.
- Underwood, L. & Washington, A. (2016). *Mental illness and juvenile offenders*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.
- United States Department of Justice. (2014). *Juveniles in corrections, facility characteristics, percent of facilities providing treatment services, by facility operation*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2022). *What is an Employee Assistance Program (EAP)?* U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

University of Rochester Medical Center. (2021). *Why parents shouldn't use food as reward or punishment*. University of Rochester Medical Center Health Encyclopedia.

Walden, A. L., & Allen, N. E. (2019). Examining Correctional Staff Members' Engagement in Rehabilitation as Part of Their Everyday Practices in Short-term Juvenile Detention. *American journal of community psychology*, 64(3-4), 310-320.

Walker, S. C., & Herting, J. R. (2020). The impact of pretrial juvenile detention on 12-month recidivism: A matched comparison study. *Crime & Delinquency*, 66(13-14), 1865-1887.

Wong, M., Brower, K., & Zucker, R. (2011). *Sleep problems, suicidal ideation, and self-harm behaviors in adolescence*. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, pp. 505-511.

Young, S., Greer, B., & Church, R. (2017). Juvenile delinquency, welfare, justice and therapeutic interventions: a global perspective. *BJPsych bulletin*, 41(1), 21-29.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO JUVENILE DETENTION
OFFICERS

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Megan Patterson under the supervision of Dr. Mijin Kim and Dr. Jessie Krienert of the Criminal Justice Sciences Department at Illinois State University. The purpose of this study is to learn more about juvenile detention centers' routines and the opinions juvenile correctional officers hold regarding these routines.

Why are you being asked?

You have been asked to participate because you are currently employed as a juvenile detention officer in the United States. You are ineligible to participate if you are under the age of 18. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You will not be penalized if you choose to skip parts of the study, not participate, or withdraw from the study at any time.

What would you do?

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to provide your experiences and opinions about various parts of your profession in an online, anonymous survey. In total, your involvement in this study will last approximately 10 minutes.

Are any risks expected?

It is possible the questions related to opinions may trigger an emotional response but the likelihood of this is minimal. To minimize this risk, you are encouraged to skip any questions that make you feel uncomfortable.

Will your information be protected?

Your responses in the survey will be anonymous; nothing that will identify you will be linked to your responses. The findings from this study may be presented in conferences, meetings, and

publications. When these findings are presented, your responses will be combined with the responses of other participants.

Who will benefit from this study?

While you may not directly benefit from this study, your responses advance the understanding of juvenile correctional care.

Whom do you contact if you have any questions?

If you have any questions about the research, contact Megan Patterson at mpatte5@ilstu.edu, Dr. Mijin Kim at mkim113@ilstu.edu, or Dr. Jessie Krienert at jlkrien@ilstu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, contact the Illinois State University Research Ethics & Compliance Office at (309) 438-5527 or IRB@ilstu.edu.

You can print this form for your records.

Select "yes" below if you are 18 years of age or older and willing to participate in this study.

Yes (1)

No (2)

Please indicate your level of satisfaction for your job.

Very dissatisfied (1)

Dissatisfied (2)

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)

Satisfied (4)

Very satisfied (5)

Please indicate your level of agreement: The facility I work in is concerned for the safety and care of youth in the facility.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how often the following events occur:

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Always (5)
The facility is overcrowded. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility is understaffed. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility is bug-infested. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is mold in the facility. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility has water damage. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility beds are worn out. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom (school) time for juveniles is disrupted. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residents of the facility have poor hygiene. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lights in the facility remain turned on at all times. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The facility is loud at night.
(17)

Officers give juveniles their prescribed medication(s).
(18)

The facility's air conditioning units are NOT working sufficiently.
(19)

The facility's heating units are NOT working sufficiently.
(20)

The facility's freezer(s) is NOT working sufficiently.
(21)

Juveniles report feeling suicidal. (22)

Juveniles attempt suicide while in the facility.
(23)

Mental health professionals are available to juveniles.
(25)

Substance recovery professionals are available to juveniles. (26)

Juveniles have access to music. (27)

Juveniles are provided with at least a half hour per day of access to exercise. (29)

Officers are aware of the positive coping skills of each juvenile. (30)

Juveniles are handcuffed as a discipline. (32)

Juveniles are shackled as a discipline. (33)

Recreation time is restricted as a discipline. (36)

Phone privileges are restricted as a discipline. (37)

Family visits are restricted as a discipline. (38)

Juveniles sleep on the floor due to lack of available beds. (39)

Juveniles sleep on the floor as a discipline. (40)

Shower usage is restricted as a discipline. (41)

Flushing toilets are restricted as a discipline. (42)

Food options are restricted as a discipline. (45)

Juveniles are required to wear facility-issued clothing. (46)

Dress codes are enforced specific to the gender of juveniles (ex. "girls must wear bras" or "boys must wear boxers"). (47)

Juveniles' clothes have unremovable stains on them. (48)

Verbal punishment is used as a discipline. (49)

Juveniles are strip searched. (52)

Juveniles are monitored while showering. (53)

Solitary confinement is used as a discipline. (57)

Physical restraint is used as a discipline. (58)

Deadly force
is used. (62)

Thinking of the facility where you work, please indicate how concerned you are if the following issues are present, or how concerned you would be if they were present:

	Not at all concerned (1)	Slightly concerned (2)	Concerned (3)	Very Concerned (4)
The facility is overcrowded. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility is understaffed. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility is bug-infested. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is mold in the facility. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility has water damage. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility beds are worn out. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom (school) time for juveniles is disrupted. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residents of the facility have poor hygiene. (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lights in the facility remain turned on at all times. (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The facility is loud at night. (17)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Officers give juveniles their prescribed medication(s). (18)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility's air conditioning units are NOT working sufficiently. (19)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility's heating units are NOT working sufficiently. (20)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The facility's freezer(s) is NOT working sufficiently. (21)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juveniles report feeling suicidal. (22)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juveniles attempt suicide while in the facility. (23)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health professionals are available to juveniles. (25)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Substance recovery professionals are available to juveniles. (26)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Juveniles have access to music. (27)

Juveniles are provided with at least a half hour per day of access to exercise. (29)

Officers are aware of the positive coping skills of each juvenile. (30)

Juveniles are handcuffed as a discipline. (32)

Juveniles are shackled as a discipline. (33)

Recreation time is restricted as a discipline. (36)

Phone privileges are restricted as a discipline. (37)

Family visits are restricted as a discipline. (38)

Juveniles sleep on the floor due to lack of available beds. (39)

Juveniles sleep on the floor as a discipline. (40)

Shower usage is restricted as a discipline. (41)

Flushing toilets are restricted as a discipline. (42)

Food options are restricted as a discipline. (45)

Juveniles are required to wear facility-issued clothing. (46)

Dress codes are enforced specific to the gender of juveniles (ex. "girls must wear bras" or "boys must wear boxers"). (47)

Juveniles' clothes have unremovable stains on them. (48)

Verbal punishment is used as a discipline. (49)

Juveniles are strip searched. (52)

Juveniles are monitored while showering. (53)

Solitary confinement is used as a discipline. (57)

Physical restraint is used as a discipline. (58)

Deadly force is used. (62)

APPENDIX B: SUBSET SCALES

1. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' likelihood to witness or engage in security measures.
 - a. 9 questions.
 - b. Tools and methods juvenile detention officers could use to maintain order and safety in their facilities.
2. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' likelihood to witness or engage in environmental dangers.
 - a. 14 questions.
 - b. Potential threats in a person's physical surroundings that could damage their well-being.
3. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' likelihood to witness or engage in acts that would impact youths' quality of life.
 - a. 13 questions.
 - b. Values the physical, emotional, and social well-being of youth based on purposeful activities.
4. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' likelihood to witness or engage in programs offered to the youth.
 - a. 4 questions.
 - b. Youth's access to positive programs within their facilities, such as mental health and substance use counseling and a classroom environment conducive to learning.
5. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' levels of concern regarding security measures.
 - a. 9 questions.

- b. Tools and methods juvenile detention officers could use to maintain order and safety in their facilities.
- 6. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' levels of concern regarding environmental dangers.
 - a. 14 questions.
 - b. Potential threats in a person's physical surroundings that could damage their well-being.
- 7. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' levels of concern regarding youths' quality of life.
 - a. 13 questions.
 - b. Values the physical, emotional, and social well-being of youth based on purposeful activities.
- 8. Surveyed juvenile detention officers' levels of concern regarding programs offered to the youth.
 - a. 4 questions.
 - b. Youth's access to positive programs within their facilities, such as mental health and substance use counseling and a classroom environment conducive to learning.