

EBSCO Publishing Citation Format: APA (American Psychological Assoc.):

NOTE: Review the instructions at http://support.ebsco.com/help/?int=eds&lang=&feature_id=APA and make any necessary corrections before using. **Pay special attention to personal names, capitalization, and dates.** Always consult your library resources for the exact formatting and punctuation guidelines.

References

Mikytuck, A., Woolard, J. L., & Umpierre, M. (2019). Improving engagement, empowerment, and support in juvenile corrections through research. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 5(2), 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000190>

<!--Additional Information:

Persistent link to this record (Permalink): <https://libraryresources.columbiasouthern.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pdh&AN=2019-31170-007&site=eds-live&scope=site>

End of citation-->

Improving Engagement, Empowerment, and Support in Juvenile Corrections Through Research

By: Alyssa Mikytuck

Department of Psychology, Georgetown University;

Jennifer L. Woolard

Department of Psychology, Georgetown University

Michael Umpierre

Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University

Acknowledgement:

In the past decade, placement in juvenile secure confinement facilities has dropped dramatically, decreasing by more than 50% across the United States (Horowitz, 2017; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2018a). In 2016, secure confinement facilities, including pretrial detention facilities and postdisposition correctional institutions, held approximately 45,000 youth, compared to 92,000 youth in 2006 (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2018a; Sedlak & McPherson, 2010). Even though there are fewer youth placed in these facilities, juvenile justice personnel have reported a higher concentration of youth residents who are at high risk of (re)offending and who have significant education, physical health, and/or mental health needs (Tiano, 2018). Managing this population of youth has greatly challenged facility staff who are tasked with managing youth behavior and supporting youth to achieve positive outcomes during placement and upon community reentry.

Reform initiatives have focused on helping facilities to manage the challenges of this concentration of high-risk, high-need youths. The Youth in Custody Practice Model (YICPM), one evidence-based reform initiative developed by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University and the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, aims to bridge the gap between research and practice for juvenile confinement facilities through training and technical assistance. Using a monograph of best practices as a guide (Umpierre, Dedel, Marrow, & Pakseresht, 2016), the YICPM consulting team works

to first identify gaps in secure confinement facility-based policy and practice and then develop strategic action plans to address those challenges. The YICPM team trains agency personnel on the research undergirding the reform approach and guides the facility improvement efforts, focusing on issues ranging from case planning to facility-based programs to community reentry planning and services. The YICPM team does this work with state and county juvenile pretrial detention and postdisposition correctional facilities.

The development and implementation of the YICPM have illustrated the need for additional research to support reforms in facility-based policy and practice in at least three critical domains: family engagement, youth empowerment, and staff support. Reform efforts based in these three areas make intuitive sense, align with developmental and psychological principles, and resonate with the practices and the experiences of juvenile justice stakeholders but nevertheless are based on a body of literature that has limited applications in confinement contexts. Although reform efforts have empirical support in places, the reality is that facility-based practice has outpaced research in these domains and additional studies are warranted.

This article critically reviews the family engagement, youth empowerment, and staff support literatures and proposes an agenda for future research to keep pace with reform efforts in juvenile confinement facilities. For each area, we summarize the available literature—what is known and what is unknown empirically—and discuss how the gaps in the current literature impede facilities' reforms. We rely on our direct experiences implementing and evaluating the YICPM for examples of translating literature into practice. [We draw upon interdisciplinary literatures to propose concrete areas of focus for future translational research in these three domains. This article serves as the first critical review of these understudied areas in juvenile confinement contexts and argues that addressing these gaps in knowledge through translational research is essential to move the field forward in theory and in practice.](#)

Family Engagement

The family provides the principal environment for adolescent development ([Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006](#)). The family context gives adolescents a space to develop autonomy and an individual identity while parents monitor and support their actions ([Longmore, Manning, & Giordano, 2012](#)). Authoritative relationships (firm, but nurturing) between parents and their children have been linked with positive youth developmental outcomes, including higher levels of school achievement as well as lower levels of depression and anxiety ([Steinberg, 2001](#)).

In theory, the family context remains important for incarcerated youth, even though they are physically separated from their families, and for juvenile confinement facility staff ([Dolan, Bernstein, & Slaughter-Johnson, 2016](#)). The family context and authoritative parent–adolescent relationships positively influence youth behavior in samples of serious adolescent offenders similar to samples of nonoffenders, suggesting that even for high-risk youth, the family context is an importance influence on development (see [Steinberg, Blatt-Eisengart, & Cauffman, 2006](#)). Furthermore, families have firsthand knowledge of the youths' prior behavior that can be useful for juvenile confinement facility staff. It can be difficult for families to share their knowledge if they do not know how to navigate the juvenile justice system ([Dolan et al., 2016](#)). Juvenile justice agencies and staff increasingly acknowledge both the challenges and vital importance of families. For example, a facility in Chester County, Pennsylvania, hired parent advocates to help families navigate the justice system and advocate for their child or children (see [Models for Change, 2008](#)).

Maintaining Contact With Incarcerated Youth

Family contact has benefits incarcerated youths' psychological and behavioral functioning in confinement facilities, but not all youth are equally likely to have family contact while in custody. Incarcerated youth who received visits from their parents reported a reduction in depressive symptoms, and the more frequent the visits, the sharper the decline (Monahan, Goldweber, & Cauffman, 2011). The reduction in depressive symptoms was not moderated by the quality of the parent–adolescent relationship, suggesting something innate to the contact between parent and adolescent was important to incarcerated adolescents' psychological adjustment. Incarcerated youth with family contact also had higher grade point averages, had lower behavioral infractions, and acquired greater socioemotional skills during their time in custody, compared to their counterparts who did not receive such contact (Villalobos Agudelo, 2013; Walker & Bishop, 2016). However, other research found that as the amount of travel time to the facility increased for families, the likelihood youth received any in-person contact or any phone contact decreased (Mikytuck & Woolard, in press). There were also racial differences in contact levels; White youth were more likely to have more frequent family contact than Black or Hispanic youth (Mikytuck & Woolard, in press). These differences in contact levels could be attributed to subjective barriers (i.e., feeling welcomed) and/or objective barriers (i.e., transportation).

Gaps in the Literature

Given the evidence on the importance of and disparity in family contact, it is logical that institutions would want to reform family policy; however, there are two main gaps in the juvenile justice literature that impede the ability to sustainably implement reforms. First, the literature generally does not acknowledge that families are heterogeneous in composition and relationships. Families may be composed of biological relatives of the youth or nonbiological individuals responsible for the youth's upbringing (Burke, Mulvey, Schubert, & Garbin, 2014). Research that restricts the definition to biological relatives risks missing individuals that function as family to youth. Furthermore, contact with incarcerated youth may not be desirable for all families at all times throughout the youth's system involvement. Some families may perceive the child's period of incarceration as a welcomed respite in which family members are able to take a safe, regulated break from youth who have acted in unsafe or unpredictable ways.

Second, the literature has predominantly focused on the concept of family involvement rather than on family engagement (Burke et al., 2014; Walker, Bishop, Pullmann, & Bauer, 2015). One model defined *family involvement* along four ordinal dimensions: (1) exclusion—families were not informed of the justice/confinement proceedings; (2) informing—families were systematically informed of proceedings; (3) eliciting—families were questioned for input; and (4) decision making—families were at parity with justice system staff in making decisions (Walker et al., 2015). The model expanded from involvement into what has been considered engagement only with the final level of decision making (Pennell, Shapiro, & Spigner, 2011). Indeed, *family engagement* refers to the sustained participation of families as decision makers in their children's treatment (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2018b). The aforementioned empirical evidence on the benefits of family contact primarily assessed the exclusion/inclusion of families. This is not to say that research was not valid; it was a well-reasoned preliminary step but does not unlock the greater potential for sustained family youth connections and participation (Ferlazzo, 2011).

Translational implications

In the YICPM sites, administrators and staff have generally seemed to understand the importance of families for incarcerated youth but have struggled to involve families and more meaningfully engage them in their child's treatment. For example, most of the YICPM facilities do not have the resources to provide transportation for family visitation or family event days, which has lowered attendance levels. This may have contributed to the subjective barriers (i.e., feeling welcomed) and objective barriers (i.e., attending events) for families to become involved as decision makers in alignment with family engagement efforts. When families are absent from visitation or event days, it also creates an additional challenge for staff to contact families in order to include them as decision makers in their child's proceedings within the facility.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Moving the Juvenile Justice Literature Forward

The child welfare literature has a more nuanced conceptualization of how to define and engage families that leads the way for juvenile justice researchers to build upon in confinement contexts. Although the child welfare field's mission and practices notably differ from the juvenile justice field, they serve some of the same youth and families (Lutz & Stewart, 2015). In child welfare, the term *family engagement* has been used to describe agency efforts to include family, individuals who are related or otherwise support youth, in decision making (Pennell et al., 2011). As one child welfare agency noted, "Effective family engagement occurs when child welfare practitioners actively collaborate and partner with family members throughout their involvement with the child welfare system, recognizing them as the experts on their respective situations and empowering them in the process" (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2016, p. 1). With this notion, the child welfare literature addresses two weaknesses in the juvenile justice literature—broadening the definition of family and empowering families as partners.

In addition to drawing on child welfare concepts, we argue participatory action research (PAR) methods should be used to address the gaps in the juvenile justice literature on family engagement. Families of incarcerated youth and staff within juvenile confinement institutions are both critical stakeholders to family engagement reforms, and yet their viewpoints have been neglected historically. With PAR, family and staff would be actively involved in the research process. For example, in one community-based PAR project, youth from the child welfare system worked with researchers to design the research instruments, recruited participants, and disseminated the results to the community (Mountz, Capous-Desyllas, & Pourciau, 2018). The PAR methodology fosters knowledge exchanges, where the researchers and the stakeholders discuss their perspectives and solutions to issues in the field (Graham et al., 2006). In juvenile confinement facilities, this could help illuminate the barriers families and facilities have faced with family engagement reform efforts as well as help to convey the heterogeneity of families. The unpredictability of PAR can cause trepidation for researchers—particularly for academic researchers focused on refereed articles (Baum, MacDougall, & Smith, 2006). However, PAR methodologies can occur in tandem with traditional research methods to capture the intricacies of family engagement efforts in the field.

Youth Empowerment

Similar to the challenges of engaging families, empowering youth residents in the facilities can run counter to the inherent environment of a secure confinement facility. *Individual empowerment*, also known as psychological empowerment, is created in situations in which individuals "create or are given opportunities to control their own destiny and influence the decisions that affect their lives" (Zimmerman, 1995, p. 583). Confinement facilities are total institutions, meaning they are institutions in which all aspects of life (work, rest, social) occur in the same place, explicit rules exist, and the schedule of

activities follows a strict pattern that is designed to fulfill the institution's overarching mission (Goffman, 1961). The inherent level of control in a total institution can create an environment in which youth do not feel self-efficacy, particularly when they believe they have been wronged or have engaged in rule violations. Youth are active forces in their environment (Darling, 2007); managing youths' behavior in the facility in a manner that empowers them to make positive choices within and when they leave the facility has been a crucial yet difficult target of reform.

The Juvenile Justice Literature on Behavior Management

Based on several decades of research on positive youth development (PYD), Butts, Bazemore, and Meroe (2010) reformulated a behavior management strategy for justice-involved youth intended to empower youth based on their strengths, called the positive youth justice (PYJ) model. This strengths-based framework based in developmental theory posits that adolescence-heightened neural plasticity coupled with positive contextual influences promotes positive youth outcomes (Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas, & Learner, 2005; Zarrett & Lerner, 2008). The PYJ model offers an approach that explicitly connects that developmental literature to the philosophical and practical realities of juvenile justice service delivery via two core assets—learning/doing and attaching/belonging. The learning/doing asset includes helping youth to develop competencies, take on new roles, and improve self-efficacy. Similarly, the attaching/belong asset includes linking youth to prosocial groups and assisting them to gain a sense of belonging. These two core assets can be strengthened through six practice domains: work, education, relationships, community, health, and creativity (Butts et al., 2010). For example, youth could learn new skills in a group-oriented vocational program led by community providers, thereby increasing their competencies, self-efficacy, and prosocial connections to peers and adults (Butts et al., 2010). Although the PYJ framework does not explicitly reference youth empowerment, the activities in the learning/doing domain specifically engage and promote youth empowerment, which shows that at least in theory, a total institution environment can empower youth.

Gaps in the Literature

Although theory and anecdotal evidence have supported the efficacy of empowerment-oriented practices and programs in confinement, empirical evidence of their effectiveness remains scarce. Some correlational studies suggest indirect effects of PYD programs on life goal and identity development (e.g., Eichas, Montgomery, Meca, & Kurtines, 2017). Additionally, a PYJ program evaluation in an Alaskan juvenile correctional facility descriptively found fewer behavioral incidents in the facility during the initial 6 months of implementation (Barton, Mackin, & Fields, 2008). A PYJ approach requires identifying and modifying institutional practices and procedures that undermine positive development. In order for many agencies to undertake the investment of modifying existing behavior management practices and policies, there needs to be stronger empirical evidence to support them. Moreover, evaluations of the effectiveness of empowerment-oriented behavior management programs have a limited conceptualization of program efficacy that does not always acknowledge the total institution environment of a confinement facility. Effectiveness is more than the reduction or elimination of institutional infractions; it is also the ways in which transitions to prosocial developmental pathways are strengthened. For instance, beyond assessing if behavioral infractions were reduced, it is important to assess if educational or other prosocial competencies were gained. Evaluations of effectiveness need to be grounded in the larger institutional context in order to be sustainable. For example, increasing agency and empowerment of youth could lead to staff concerns about control and safety (Cox, 2013). Those concerns, whether or not they are grounded in empirical data, comprise a real and critical component of successful change (Jones & Van de Ven, 2016; Straatmann, Kohnke, Hattrup, & Mueller, 2016).

Translational implications

Related to these gaps in the literature, two tiers of problems beset facilities that have struggled to consistently empower youth and manage their behavior. First, some facilities have not set up the foundational policies and structures for a strengths-based approach. A strengths-based approach that incorporates youth empowerment likely requires changes to underlying infrastructure, resource allocation, and norms and attitudes (Foster-Fishman, 2000, cited in Durlak et al., 2007). Second, even facilities with strengths-based practices and policies have struggled to have multiple staff consistently apply those programs to a single youth and to have each staff member consistently apply the policies to all the youth with whom they work. Youth residents need consistent expectations and feedback regardless of which role a staff member plays or what shift they work. Further, those rules need to be applied consistently across all youth of different backgrounds.

Although most YICPM sites support a strengths-based or empowerment-oriented approach, directly applying that within a behavior management frame has been challenging. One simple but important example is language. In YICPM sites, reformers have worked with facility personnel to reconceptualize the term *behavior management*, which connotes control-based strategies, to *behavior motivation*, which emphasizes a youth's agency over his or her own behavior in the institution. Just as the juvenile court uses different terms than the criminal court (e.g., *adjudicated* in place of *convicted*), confinement facilities should use different language to connote their orientation toward reforming youth behavior. Language matters for institutional culture and practices. The second tier of challenges—the challenge of maintaining consistent behavioral management responses within youth and across youth—is a more salient challenge for YICPM sites. For example, agency staff noted the conflict between advocating for individualized treatment for youth based on unique risk and service needs and advocating for uniform behavioral management responses. The gaps in the existing literature have left them without an evidence base for their practices.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Moving the Literature Forward

Other related child-serving contexts, particularly behavioral health and systems of care, offer valuable lessons for implementing empowerment programs in juvenile confinement settings. For example, an evaluation of a youth group in the mental health system showed that youth reported the group helped them develop coping mechanisms and successfully move through their programs of care (Gyamfi, Keens-Douglas, & Medin, 2007). However, youth voiced frustration at the perceived limits of their input for policy and practice changes. Despite having youth as members of advisory boards that could implement policy and practice changes, some youth reported they were not encouraged to voice their opinions and instead functioned as token youth members on the board (Gyamfi et al., 2007). Further studying the benefits (e.g., youth developing coping strategies) and the potential challenges (e.g., limited ability to reform practice and policy) from these approaches could greatly inform the efforts of juvenile confinement facility researchers and reformers. Even the evaluation method utilized, a qualitative study that incorporated youth voices, was consistent with an empowerment philosophy and a useful guide for future juvenile justice research.

Future research needs both process and outcome evaluations to understand how empowerment approaches are being made in behavioral management and their impact on youth and staff. This could include, for example, assessing if youth grievance systems are associated with higher levels of individual empowerment. Quantitative and qualitative research about youth experiences, staff perceptions, and subjective/objective impacts of youth engagement on substantive issues would greatly

aid this understanding. Beyond understanding the links between empowerment practices and behavior within the facility, researchers need to assess if youth who are able to exert influence in the facility are more successful once they leave the facility. If empowerment is effective, facilities should be able to see a measurable impact not only on shorter-term outcomes in facility operations but also on longer-term outcomes of youths' transitions to adulthood.

Additionally, the literature would greatly benefit from in-depth case studies of confinement facilities that have successfully implemented strengths-based behavioral management programs. The Missouri Model (Mendel, 2010) is one example of a strengths-based confinement program that boosts PYD and youth empowerment principles. Understanding how other programs, in different contexts, implement these programs within the broader context of confinement provides a base of knowledge for juvenile confinement facilities to draw upon with reforms.

Staff Support

Nationally, the ability of staff to fully implement improvement efforts in juvenile confinement facilities, such as family engagement or youth empowerment reforms, is frequently compromised by the high rate of voluntary turnover of staff. *Voluntary turnover* refers to the rate employees choose to leave their positions, which is detrimental to correctional facilities because it contributes to employee burnout and lowers the morale of the organization (Minor, Wells, Angel, & Matz, 2011; Minor, Wells, Lambert, & Keller, 2014). Further, turnover costs correctional organizations approximately \$10,000–\$20,000 per employee due to recruiting, training, and hiring costs (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Annual estimates of voluntary turnover in juvenile confinement facilities were around 20% (Wright, 1993). In comparison, turnover rates in law enforcement were notably lower at 10.8% (Wareham, Smith, & Lambert, 2013). Although much of the literature on staff turnover has focused on adult correctional settings, this article only reviews the subset of studies that focused on employees in juvenile facility contexts. Juvenile facilities differ from adult facilities in their focus on rehabilitation as well as their facility structures, which could impact both the type of people who choose to work in the facilities as well as their experiences (Wells, Minor, Angel, Matz, & Amato, 2009).

Staff Attrition

Both individual characteristics of the employees and organizational attributes of the agency are related to the high level of voluntary turnover in juvenile confinement facilities. Individual characteristics of employees are factors such as age and education, whereas organizational attributes are factors such as job satisfaction and stress. Organizational factors more strongly predicted turnover intentions in juvenile facilities than employees' individual attributes (Mitchell, Mackenzie, Styve, & Gover, 2000). For example, juvenile correctional officers expressed stress over safety concerns, which were related to their decision to leave the organization (Mikyuck & Cleary, 2016). Problematically, turnover mutually reinforced safety concerns—when there were fewer staff on the floor of facilities, there were more safety concerns, and when there were more safety concerns, more staff left their positions (Lambert, 2004).

Furthermore, it is well established, and perhaps unsurprising, that staff in confinement facilities suffer from burnout. Job-related burnout is a psychological state of fatigue that results from stressors and demands in the workplace (Freudenberger, 1974). Farmer (1988) found that perceived exploitation in the workplace contributed to burnout with confinement staff. One study found that even with adaptive coping strategies, confinement staff still experienced burnout related to the demands of their jobs

(Gould, Watson, Price, & Valliant, 2013). In sum, the existing literature has linked the taxing nature of the work in confinement facilities to the high levels of voluntary turnover.

Gaps in the Literature: Recruitment and Retention

Although the literature has identified contributors to the high turnover rate, it has not focused on recruitment and retention strategies for confinement facilities as heavily. Arguably, employee retention begins with recruitment for the position. At a very basic level, there is scant research on how many employees to recruit. The Prison Rape Elimination Act advises a staff-to-youth ratio of 1 staff to 8 youth during waking hours and 1 to 16 during sleeping hours (Nelsen, 2014), but it is unclear if or how that level was empirically derived. Additional research is warranted to determine the optimal staffing levels in detention and postdisposition facilities.

While some jurisdictions reported correctional officers ranked as one of the top 10 jobs in number of applicants in the state (Baldwin, 2010), the high levels of attrition suggest that organizations would also benefit from research on how to recruit the right employees for the position. Psychological inventories could be used to help predict employee retention at the recruitment phase. However, there is limited empirical evidence on the use of these inventories in confinement settings, perhaps because the costs and labor of the traditional inventories may not be practical for facilities to administer (Shusman, Inwald, & Landa, 1984). The need for such tests still exists in the confinement context, though, leaving a gap for evidence-based recruitment strategies.

The literature on voluntary turnover is also missing a thorough examination of the differences between custody and noncustody staff. Custody-oriented staff, like juvenile correctional officers, focus on managing inmates and securing the facility (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2002). Noncustody staff, like nurses, counselors, teachers, or administrators, are responsible for facility operations (Lambert et al., 2002). Despite the very different nature of their positions, the majority of voluntary turnover studies have not analyzed employees separately based on position type or have focused exclusively on custody staff. The limited literature that assessed these employees separately found differences in their decisions to leave the agency. On average, custody staff stayed in their positions for less time and were more likely to report safety concerns, and educational opportunities were associated with their decision to voluntarily leave compared to noncustody staff (Mikytuck & Cleary, 2016). Although only one study, the results suggest that reforms targeted to retain employees should differ by the employee position.

Translational implications

Many agencies involved with the YICPM lament their ability to fully implement reforms in family engagement, youth empowerment, and other domains due to chronic staffing problems. The mere fact that agencies are voluntarily participating in the YICPM indicates that they are invested in reform. However, inadequate facility staffing levels can impede the operation of such improvement efforts. For example, family event days and the delivery of PYJ programming are difficult to implement if the facility is short-staffed. In short, staffing levels and reform goals cannot be disentangled from each other. Research on empirically based staffing levels can be utilized, in a very practical sense, to advocate for the budget for additional positions to legislative decision makers. Thus, addressing staffing concerns through research is of utmost priority for facility practice.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Moving the Literature Forward

There is a century of work on staff attrition issues in the industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology literature (Hom, Lee, Shaw, & Hausknecht, 2017). Research in I/O psychology found that recruiting

through employee referrals was associated with lower premature turnover (Weller, Holtom, Matiaske, & Mellewigt, 2009). I/O psychological studies also found that organizational embeddedness, or the commitment an individual has to the organization, was linked to retention of employees (Hom et al., 2017). Organizational embeddedness can be promoted through employer investments, financial or otherwise, in employees (Hom et al., 2017). For example, staff recognition events are a nonfinancial way to promote embeddedness in the agency. In short, the I/O literature has recruitment and retention strategies that could be applied in juvenile confinement contexts.

Utilizing the knowledge from child welfare studies about secondary traumatic stress (STS) can also be useful for expanding the research on burnout in the juvenile justice literature. STS, also known as compassion fatigue, occurs when employees indirectly experience the trauma of youth in their care (Figley, 1999). Like child welfare workers, confinement facility staff are likely to indirectly experience trauma of the youth incarcerated in the facility, particularly with a population of youth in the facility who have high levels of risk and service needs. Trauma-informed self-care involves recognizing the emotional toll of the profession and practicing self-care in the work environment (i.e., working with a team and asking for support) and in the home environment (i.e., creating a work–life balance; Salloum, Kondrat, Johnco, & Olson, 2015). This reduced child welfare workers levels of burnout, although for experiences of trauma, more individualized efforts were needed (Salloum et al., 2015).

In order to move the literature forward, the interdisciplinary concepts from I/O psychology and child welfare need to be applied to juvenile confinement contexts. Juvenile correctional facilities are unique contexts that differ from other work environments. As noted previously, during the workday, the staff are immersed in a total institution environment (Goffman, 1961). The recruitment and retention techniques from the I/O psychological studies and the literature on STS in the child welfare field may or may not translate to the confinement environment, so additional studies will need to assess if these interdisciplinary tools and techniques can be successfully applied in juvenile confinement facilities.

Conclusion

The decline in the number of incarcerated youth in confinement facilities does not negate the pressing need for research on best practices in juvenile confinement facilities. In fact, the concentration of high-risk and high-service needs youth in combination with the limited literature applied in juvenile confinement contexts warrants additional research efforts to support reform in the field. Specifically, the lack of translational research in family engagement, youth empowerment, and staff support has challenged the implementation of sustainable facility-based reform efforts as evinced by the YICPM reform sites. In order for research to keep pace with reform in these domains, we advocate a research agenda guided by interdisciplinary literatures to move the field forward in theory and in practice.

Footnotes

¹ The quantitative data and evaluation component of the YICPM are still in development.

References

- Baldwin, B. (2010). Internet applications to the state of Washington: A demographic analysis. *Public Personnel Management*, 39, 77–96. 10.1177/009102601003900201
- Barton, W. H., Mackin, J. R., & Fields, J. (2008). Assessing youth strengths in a residential juvenile correctional program. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 23, 11–36. 10.1080/08865710609512715

- Baum, F., MacDougall, C., & Smith, D. (2006). Participatory action research. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 60, 854–857. 10.1136/jech.2004.028662
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793–828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Burke, J. D., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., & Garbin, S. R. (2014). The challenge and opportunity of parental involvement in juvenile justice services. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 39, 39–47. 10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.01.007
- Butts, J. A., Bazemore, G., & Meroe, A. S. (2010). *Positive youth justice: Framing justice interventions using the concepts of positive youth development*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Juvenile Justice.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2016). *Family engagement: Partnering with families to improve child welfare outcomes*. Retrieved from https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubPDFs/f_fam_engagement.pdf
- Cox, A. (2013). *Juvenile facility staff responses to organizational change*. New Paltz: SUNY Press.
- Darling, N. (2007). Ecological systems theory: The person in the center of the circles. *Research in Human Development*, 4, 203–217.
- Dolan, N., Bernstein, K., & Slaughter-Johnson, E. (2016). *Mother's at the gate: How a powerful family movement is transforming the juvenile justice system*. Retrieved from <http://www.ips-dc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/k-dolan-mothers-at-the-gate-5.3.pdf>
- Durlak, J. A., Taylor, R. D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M. K., DuPre, E. P., Celio, C. I., . . . Weissberg, R. P. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39, 269–286. 10.1007/s10464-007-9112-5
- Eichas, K., Montgomery, M. J., Meca, A., & Kurtines, W. M. (2017). Empowering marginalized youth: A self-transformative intervention for promoting positive youth development. *Child Development*, 88, 1115–1124.
- Farmer, J. A. (1988). Relationship between job burnout and perceived inmate exploitation of juvenile correctional workers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 32, 67–73. 10.1177/0306624X8803200109
- Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Involvement or engagement? *Educational Leadership*, 68, 10–14.
- Figley, C. R. (1999). Compassion fatigue: Toward a new understanding of the costs of caring. In B. H. Stamm (Ed.), *Secondary traumatic stress: Self-care issues for clinicians, researchers, and educators* (2nd ed., pp. 3–28). Lutherville, MD: Sidran.
- Foster-Fishman, P. (2000). *Creating system change*. Lansing: Michigan Developmental Disabilities Council.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159–165. 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums*. New York, NY: Anchor.

Gould, D. D., Watson, S. L., Price, S. R., & Valliant, P. M. (2013). The relationship between burnout and coping in adult and young offender center correctional officers: An exploratory investigation. *Psychological Services, 10*, 37–47. 10.1037/a0029655

Graham, I. D., Logan, J., Harrison, M. B., Straus, S. E., Tetroe, J., Caswell, W., & Robinson, N. (2006). Lost in knowledge translation: Time for a map? *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 26*, 13–24. 10.1002/chp.47

Gyamfi, P., Keens-Douglas, A., & Medin, E. (2007). Youth and youth coordinators' perspectives on youth involvement in systems of care. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 34*, 382–394. 10.1007/s11414-007-9068-0

Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 530–545. 10.1037/apl0000103

Horowitz, J. (2017). *Juvenile confinement drops by half: Most states diverting youths from residential facilities*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trust. Retrieved from <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2017/juvenile-confinement-drops-by-half>

Jones, S. L., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2016). The changing nature of change resistance: An examination of the moderating impact of time. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 52*, 482–506. 10.1177/0021886316671409

Lambert, E. G. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *The Prison Journal, 84*, 208–227. 10.1177/0032885504265078

Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. (2009). The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent: A test of a causal model. *Criminal Justice Review, 34*, 96–118. 10.1177/0734016808324230

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2002). Satisfied correctional staff: A review of the literature on correlates of correctional staff job satisfaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 115–143. 10.1177/0093854802029002001

Lerner, R. M., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., & Lerner, J. V. (2005). Positive youth development: A view of the issues. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 25*, 10–16.

Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Giordano, P. C. (2012). Parent-child relationships in adolescence. In M. A. Fine & F. D. Fincham (Eds.), *Handbook of family theories* (pp. 28–50). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Lutz, L., & Stewart, M. (2015). *The crossover youth practice model*. Retrieved from <https://cjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/CYPM-Abbreviated-Guide.pdf>

Mendel, R. (2010). *Missouri model: Reinventing the practice of rehabilitating youthful offenders, summary report*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey.

- Mikytuck, A. M., & Cleary, H. M. D. (2016). Factors associated with turnover decisions among juvenile justice employees: Comparing correctional and non-correctional staff. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 5, 50–67.
- Mikytuck, A. M., & Woolard, J. L. (in press). Family contact in juvenile confinement facilities: Analysis of the likelihood of and barriers to contact. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*.
- Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., Angel, E., & Matz, A. K. (2011). Predictors of early job turnover among juvenile correctional facility staff. *Criminal Justice Review*, 36, 58–75. 10.1177/0734016810379253
- Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., Lambert, E. G., & Keller, P. (2014). Increasing morale: Personal and work environment antecedents of job morale among staff in juvenile corrections. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41, 1308–1326. 10.1177/0093854814544702
- Mitchell, O., Mackenzie, D. L., Styve, G. J., & Gover, A. R. (2000). The impact of individual, organizational and environmental attributes on voluntary turnover among juvenile correctional staff members. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 333–357. 10.1080/07418820000096351
- Models for Change. (2008). *Models for change 2008 update: Gathering force*. Retrieved from <http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/105>.
- 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, 143–151. 10.1007/s10979-010-9220-x
- Mountz, S., Capous-Desyllas, M., & Pourciau, E. (2018). “Because we’re fighting to be ourselves”: Voices from former foster youth who are transgender and gender expansive. *Child Welfare*, 96, 103–125.
- Nelsen, A. M. (2014). *Management and facility administration. National Partnership for Juvenile Services and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved from <https://info.nicic.gov/dtg/node/14>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2018a). *OJJDP statistical briefing book*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/corrections/faqs.asp>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2018b). *Family engagement in juvenile justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family-Engagement-in-Juvenile-Justice.pdf>
- Pennell, J., Shapiro, C., & Spigner, C. (2011). *Safety, fairness, stability: Repositioning juvenile justice and child welfare to engage families and position communities*. Washington, DC: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.
- Salloum, A., Kondrat, D. C., Johnco, C., & Olson, K. R. (2015). The role of self-care on compassion satisfaction, burnout and secondary trauma among child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 49, 54–61. 10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.12.023
- Sedlak, A. J., & McPherson, K. S. (2010). Conditions of confinement. *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved from www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/227729.pdf

- Shusman, E. J., Inwald, R. E., & Landa, B. (1984). Correction officer job performance as predicted by the IPI and MMPI: A validation and cross-validation study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 11, 309–329. 10.1177/0093854884011003004
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, 1–19. 10.1111/1532-7795.00001
- Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes: A replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16, 47–58.
- Straatmann, T., Kohnke, O., Hattrup, K., & Mueller, K. (2016). Assessing employees' reactions to organizational change: An integrative framework of change-specific and psychological factors. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 52, 265–295. 10.1177/0021886316655871
- Tiano, S. (2018). Los Angeles probation leaders battle over treatment of incarcerated youth. *The Chronicle of Social Change*. Retrieved from <https://chronicleofsocialchange.org/justice/juvenile-justice-2/la-probation-leaders-battle-solitary-confinement-minors>
- Umpierre, M., Dedel, K., Marrow, M., & Pakseresht, F. (2016). *Youth in custody practice model*. Retrieved from <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/YICPM-Abbreviated-Guide-January-2016.pdf>
- Villalobos Agudelo, S. (2013). *The impact of family visitation on incarcerated youth behavior and school performance: Findings from the families and partners project*. Retrieved from <http://archive.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/family-visitation-and-youth-behavior-brief.pdf>
- Walker, S. C., & Bishop, A. S. (2016). Length of stay, therapeutic change, and recidivism for incarcerated juvenile offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 55, 355–376. 10.1080/10509674.2016.1194946
- Walker, S. C., Bishop, A. S., Pullmann, M. D., & Bauer, G. (2015). A research framework for understanding the practical impact of family involvement in the juvenile justice system: The juvenile justice family involvement model. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 56, 408–421. 10.1007/s10464-015-9755-6
- Wareham, J., Smith, B. W., & Lambert, E. G. (2013). Rates and patterns of law enforcement turnover: A research note. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 26, 345–370. 10.1177/0887403413514439
- Weller, I., Holtom, B. C., Matiaske, W., & Mellewigt, T. (2009). Level and time effects of recruitment sources on early voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1146–1162. 10.1037/a0015924
- Wells, J. B., Minor, K. I., Angel, E., Matz, A. K., & Amato, N. (2009). Predictors of job stress among staff in juvenile correctional facilities. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 245–258. 10.1177/0093854808329334
- Wright, T. A. (1993). Correctional employee turnover: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21, 131–142. 10.1016/0047-2352(93)90071-T

Zarrett, N., & Lerner, R. M. (2008). Ways to promote the positive development of children and youth. *Child Trends Research-to-Results Brief. Publication 2008-11*. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/01/Youth-Positive-Development.pdf>

Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 581–599. 10.1007/BF02506983

Submitted: June 29, 2018 *Revised:* February 15, 2019 *Accepted:* February 26, 2019

This publication is protected by US and international copyright laws and its content may not be copied without the copyright holders express written permission except for the print or download capabilities of the retrieval software used for access. This content is intended solely for the use of the individual user.

Source: Translational Issues in Psychological Science. Vol. 5. (2), Jun, 2019 pp. 182-192)

Accession Number: 2019-31170-007

Digital Object Identifier: 10.1037/tps0000190