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Every day there is the existence of crime and other behaviors considered outside of the parameters of societal expectations. While crime on the streets is frequently addressed by police sanctions and interventions, there is another form of crime that is taking place behind prison and jail walls often termed Institutional Misconduct. This misconduct is often treated differently varying greatly from one institution to the next. In addition this is not a phenomena isolated to only adult facilities, nor in major urban communities. Children experience these phenomena as well, all children whom are incarcerated including those of Appalachia. This study was designed to specifically examine this unique population.

A convenience sample of 769 records corresponding to male juveniles between the ages of 12-and 17 years of age who resided within an Appalachian county juvenile detention center were collected and analyzed in this study. The focus of this study was to examine the presence of a relationship, if any, between the independent variables of Traumatic experiences as measured on the MAYSI-2, Anger/Irritability as measured on the MAYSI-2, and Alcohol/Drug
as measured on the MAYS-I-2 with the dependent variable Institutional Misconduct as defined by the partnering agency as a sanction resulting in a youth being placed in their cell due to behavior using logistic regression analysis. An additional hypothesis was generated to examine a logistic regression model of all 3 independent variables in addition to age, race, and duration to explore a real world model of the youth’s total environment and person interaction with the data that was made available.

Initial evaluation of the three independent variables found that only Alcohol/Drug as measured on the MAYSI-2 was a significant predictor. However the fourth hypothesis test moved Alcohol/Drug out of significance indicating that only duration was a significant predictor. Findings from this evaluation suggested that institutional misconduct may be more closely related to environmental strain in lieu of the interpersonal features associated to the alcohol/drug, traumatic experiences, or anger irritability personality constructs.
To all the children of Appalachia.
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1. **Adjudication:** The judicial action at which the judgment of whether a juvenile defendant is or is not responsible for the offense he or she is charged with (Justice Policy Institute, 2009).

2. **Alcohol/Drug Use:** Use of alcohol or another mood altering drug that identifies the individual as being at risk of meeting the criteria for substance abuse or dependence as defined by the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 4th edition text revised (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

3. **Anger and Irritability:** A state in which a person endorses regular or recurrent feelings of aggression and or thoughts of revenge as well as the feelings of, displaying, or engaging in destructive behavior (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

4. **Appalachian Population:** Difficult to define, this term often refers to individuals living within the Appalachian Mountainous region (Keefe, 2005). Members of this population may also have specific cultural, economic, and historical criteria (Raitz & Ulack, 1991) that is frequently defined by the individual. For the purpose of this study we will define the Appalachian population as any person living within the Appalachian mountainous region as recognized by the Appalachian Regional Coalition (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010).

5. **Appalachian Regional Commission:** A federal/state partnership that works to improve sustainable community and economic development in Appalachian counties (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010).

6. **Corrections:** A branch of criminal justice responsible for the punitive and rehabilitation aspects of criminal procedures (Siegal & Bartolas, 2011).

7. **Crime:** Anti-social behavior that is outside of the legal parameters for a given society as defined by that societal group (Brown, Esbensen & Geis, 2010).
8. **Criminogenic:** Having the qualities of or producing crime.

9. **Courtview:** A database utilized by criminal justice systems in the management of case, court, correctional, and judicial procedures (Courtview Justice Systems, 2013).

10. **Ecological Theory:** A framework for conceptualizing total behavior as a function of the person and their environmental interactions (Lewin, 1935).

11. **Incarceration:** The condition of being placed in a detention facility for punitive or safety purposes (Siegal & Bartolas, 2011).

12. **Institutional Misconduct:** Behaviors within a correctional facility that are outside of the expected rules for that facility (Berk, Kriegler & Baek, 2006).

13. **Juvenile Justice:** The branch of criminal justice assigned to address the criminogenic behaviors of persons under the age of 18 years (Elrod & Ryder, 2009).

14. **Rehabilitation:** “A set of measures that assist individuals who experience, or are likely to experience, disability to achieve and maintain optimal functioning in interaction with their environments” (World health association & World Bank, 2011).

15. **Reported Crime:** The statistic associated with the amount of crime that is reported to and recorded by authorities. This is a statistic that does not include the percentage of crime that is not reported to criminal justice professionals (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013).

16. **Screening Instrument:** Screening instrument refers to a preliminary assessment tool. It serves as a first look at the possibility of an individual’s potential mental health needs. It does not seek to diagnose a mental disorder or to provide information associated to long-term interventions (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

17. **Traumatic experiences:** An experience in a person’s life in which they were the recipient of abuse, or direct and perceived harm
that could have put their life or the life of another at risk, (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).
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Problem Statement

There are currently over 70,000 children placed in correctional settings in the United States (Sickmund, Sladky, Kang & Puzzanchera, 2011). Justice statistics typically do not include criminal behavior engaged by incarcerated populations as criminal, instead this behavior is considered institutional misconduct (IM). While this misconduct is not specifically targeting society, it still has a profound impact on the community and society as a whole. The costs associated to the exposure for detained youth, the distress experienced by staff and other residents housed in the facility, as well as the financial impact on tax payers are considerable (Lovell & Jamelka, 1996). Efforts to understand and address these behaviors are required.

Of specific interest is the population of youth incarcerated in Appalachian communities. This population is comprised predominantly of White European Americans located within the eastern region of the United States along the Appalachian Mountain range (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010). There are several factors that make this group of individuals sensitive and worthy of efforts to better understand the presence of criminogenic factors and in need of services. For example within the home life, youth in this region may be exposed to increased levels of violence that is overlooked and suppressed by a male dominated culture (Dekeseredy, 2007) potentially influencing a higher tolerance for aggression. In addition, youth in this region may be at greater risk to use substances (Pettigrew, Miller, Krieger & Hecht, 2012; Scaramella & Keyes, 2001) suggesting the potential for higher levels of substance related distress. Recognition of how these factors may influence acting out or deviance is worthy, specifically in institutional environments where familial supports are limited, youth are exposed
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to a higher concentration of criminogenic peers, and institutional supports may not be meeting the individual needs of the juvenile.

Data Analysis

There has been considerable research focusing on the exploration of criminogenic factors that may predict misconduct for detained populations in correctional settings such as; anger and irritability (Butler, Loney & Kistner, 2007), trauma (DeLisi, Drury, Kosloski, Caudill, Conis, Anderson, Vaughn & Beaver, 2010), substance use (Chapman & Ford, 2008), age and sentencing length (Cunningham & Sorenson, 2007), deviant thought process (DeLisi, Vaughn, Beaver, Wright, Hochstetler, Kosloski & Drury, 2008), anti-social factors (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997), risk levels (Holsinger et al., 2006), emotional processing (Kimonis, Frick, Munoz & Aucoin, 2007), and placement in diverse facilities (Kuanliang, Sorensen & Cunningham, 2008). A review of the literature however did not yield any findings for Male youth within Appalachia.

In the current study the specific variables examined in an effort to predict IM are listed below with operational definitions. These variables were analyzed using logistic regression models generated with the use of SPSS v. 22 software.

- Traumatic Experiences: An experience in a person’s life in which they were the recipient of abuse, or direct and perceived harm that could have put their life or the life of another at risk. (Grisso & Barnum, 2001)

- Substance abuse: Higher risk use of alcohol or another mood altering drug that identifies the individual as being at risk of meeting the criteria for Substance abuse or dependence as defined by the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 4th edition text revised, (2005) (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).
• Anger and Irritability: A state in which a person endorses regular or recurrent feelings of aggression and or thoughts of revenge as well as the feelings of, displaying, or engaging in destructive behavior (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

• Institutional Misconduct: Any conduct that is displayed by a resident of a correctional facility that is outside of the expected norm or rule set for that setting. Measured by when the incarcerated person(s) has/have been reported for such behavioral violations by detention staff (Berk et al., 2006).

• Race: The self-identified racial orientation identified by the male youth at the time of the intake for incarceration.

• Age: The self-reported age, in units of years, reported by the male youth at the time of the intake for incarceration.

• Duration of Stay: The amount of time the youth remained in the detention center measured in units of calendar days. Youth staying in for less than 24 hours were identified as staying 1 day.

When examining IM, trauma is a meaningful fit to explore the nature of predicting aggression as there is literature suggesting that past traumatic experiences are a predictor of criminal behavior with male populations (Topitzes, Mersky & Reynolds, 2011), as well as a potential predictor in the increased probability of substance use (Vermeiren et al., 2003). Recognition of such factors can be significant in detecting aggressive tendencies which can be associated to IM of a violent nature, thus exploring the presence of this construct within an incarcerated adolescent population when examining IM is necessary.

The presence of anger has been heavily researched as one of the more likely predictors of IM (Daffern, Howells & Ogloff, 2007; Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Novaco &Taylor,
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2004). As anger may lead to an increase in behaviors such as bullying, fighting, assaults and destruction of property it is an important psychological factor to examine in recognizing risks associated to IM and inmate adjustment (Novero, Loper & Warren, 2011). Considering some of these assertions related to IM and anger it was determined that anger and irritability are worthy of examining with the Appalachian male population.

There has been a noted relationship between substance use and violence (Stoddard et al., 2013). Additionally research supports the notion that those inmates with substance related disorders are at an elevated risk for IM (Houser, Beleko & Brennan, 2012). These indicators in predicting misconduct make a reasonable argument for the importance of examining if there is a relationship between substance use and IM with the Appalachian male population.

Despite current research examining these factors a review of the literature yielded no findings with a focus among male juvenile populations within the Appalachian region. This study is intended to contribute to this gap in the literature. By using a meta-theoretical ecological frame work, borrowing heavily from Lewin’s (1935) perspective focusing on person and environment interaction, this study is exploring the relationship between IM with trauma, anger, and substance use within a juvenile detention setting located in an Appalachian county. Specifically this study is exploring the various factors that youth entering the agency may in a sense bring with them into this new context, this is a concept called importation (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). This framework supports this research in the sense that we can better understand and acknowledge the importance of environmental context when conceptualizing assessing, and evaluating clients (Salzinger, Feldman, Stockhammer & Hood, 2002). As well, this theoretical lens has been demonstrated as effective when working with Appalachian youth (Tang & Russ, 2007).
To explore potential factors that may contribute to IM with the male juvenile population, the following study focused on the examination of measures from the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument, 2nd edition (MAYSI-2) on the three scales of: traumatic experiences, alcohol and drug use, and angry/irritable (Grisso & Barnum, 2001) and their corresponding relationship to reported IM as identified by correctional staff in a southern Ohio juvenile detention facility located in a county designated by the ARC as an Appalachian county (ARC, 2010).

**Research Questions**

The MAYSI-2 is one of the most widely used screening instruments in use in the United States for screening during the intake of youth in a correctional setting (Kerig, Moeddel & Becker, 2011). This instrument has demonstrated reliability and validity for youth with the juvenile population (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). By using logistic regression this study made efforts to better understand the presence of a relationship, and any predictive value of the relationship between IM and the three measures from the MAYSI-2 among youth detained in a facility located in Appalachia, answering the following questions.

1. What is the relationship between traumatic experiences, and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting?

2. What is the relationship between substance use, and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting?
3. What is the relationship between anger and irritability, and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting?

4. What is the relationship between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with reported IM for juvenile males detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting?

Null hypotheses were generated for each of the four research questions. These hypotheses were:

- $H_01$. There is no relationship between traumatic experiences and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.
- $H_02$. There is no relationship between substance use and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.
- $H_03$. There is no relationship between anger and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.
- $H_04$. There is no relationship between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with reported institutional misconduct for juvenile males detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.

**Significance of this study**

Previous research has explored the detection of factors that may contribute to psychopathology and deviance which may contribute to acting out behaviors (Holsinger et al., 2006; Grove, Zald, Lebow, Snitz & Nelson, 1995; Hoge, 2002; Houser, Beleko & Brennan,
Steven W. Patrick, Doctoral Dissertation 2012; Kimonis, Frick, Munoz & Aucoin, 2007). Currently there are a limited number of studies in the literature addressing the specific needs of youth detained in Appalachian criminal justice correctional settings. This study provides a platform to begin an exploration of factors that may contribute to IM within this unique population. By exploring the presence of a relationship between the factors of trauma, substance use, and anger with IM, researchers will be able to further explore the nature of any statistically significant relationships; alternatively, should these relationships not exist, service providers may focus their attention on other factors that may have a greater impact on predicting IM with this population.

Counselors and other human service professionals working with incarcerated populations within an Appalachian region can utilize this information to identify problematic features of their clients and enhance programing and services to address specific client needs. Additionally, recognition of needs that may be specific to this population can offer insights into the origins of familial, criminal, and or social deviance that may require clinical attention to help generate pro-social outcomes.

Within the partnering facility, administrators have expressed an interest in being able to utilize current low cost measures in helping predict high risk factors that may contribute to their ability to provide interventions and services to reduce the occurrence of and or the impact of behavioral violations that have considerable costs to their operations (Lovell & Jamelka, 1996). This study can enhance how criminal justice professionals in a correctional setting engage with and address residents with specific needs.

**Findings of this study**

Examination of the variables of Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, Anger/Irritability, and the variables added to the fourth hypothesis of Age at time of intake for the youth, reported
race, and duration of stay within the partnering detention facility did yield significant findings when tested with the dependent variable of IM. Independently Alcohol/Drug as reported on the MAYSI-2 did find a predictive relationship with IM. However, when all the above listed independent variables were controlled for in the fourth hypothesis only duration presented with a significant ability to predict IM.

Limitations of this study

This study utilized pre-existing quantitative and qualitative data generated by the partnering detention center defining the presence of institutional misconduct. Research that generates original data and allows for a study to follow a prospective group over time, as in a cohort, may present a greater level of understanding of relationships between variables as opposed to utilizing secondary data (Carter, 2011). The present study was not able to follow a model of primary data analysis given the nature of the partnering agency’s current restrictions associated to the relinquishment of data for research purposes. Despite the presence of this limitation the current study is still valuable in offering some inferences in the relationships examined. Some of the recognized limitations of using secondary data include: inaccurate coding of behavioral violations, inconsistent use of discretion by detention staff when intervening with youth potentially refraining from reporting misconduct as a means of motivating improved behaviors, potential errors in the data collection process as the data utilized in this study was collected and de-identified by the partnering correctional institution, some of the participants in this study may not identify as members of the Appalachian population, and the data collected for this study was the result of a single convenience sample to represent members of the Appalachian population.
The MAYSI-2 has some limitations in its use. It is a dichotomous self-report instrument designed to be utilized during the intake process for correctional service providers in juvenile justice (Grisso & Barnum 2001). It has been extensively tested and has demonstrated utility with juvenile populations. Despite these findings youth may be fictitious in their reports either denying or endorsing inaccurately. Also it is noteworthy that this instrument has not been validated for use with the Appalachian population.
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Literature review

Research exploring the various criminogenic factors experienced by youth in Appalachia is nearly non-existent in the literature. Attention to this area is warranted as recognition of specific criminogenic needs can be a helpful tool in assessing and providing needed services for youth involved in the criminal justice system (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). Additionally of interest in the current study is the recognition of the unique qualities that exist for the community members of Appalachia (Keefe, 2005). Using the ecologically aligned systems based Importation theory (Irwin & Cressey, 1962), this study seeks to explore the relationships between traumatic experiences, anger, and substance use as measured on the MAYSI-2 (Grisso & Barnum, 2001) and their predictive relationship with IM. This chapter provides an overview of the literature related to these variables and sets the framework describing the significance of this study.

The Juvenile Justice System

Juvenile justice has undergone a series of adaptations for several decades, evolving as criminal justice professionals recognized that juveniles required specialized services to address their developmental needs. According to the Illinois Juvenile Court Act of 1899 (Legal information institute, 2012), recognition of the presence of developmental factors for youth offenders resulted in the courts determining that their role should be to act as the Kind Parents. This recognition of specialized requirements brought about a series of changes in how juvenile justice responded to and explored the specific needs of adolescent offenders, as well as the development of a number of treatment programs intended to meet the specialized treatment requirements of this diverse population.
Alternatively, a different shift occurred in how the criminal justice system responded to juvenile justice in Roper vs. Simmons (Legal information institute, 2012); while a strong rehabilitation model was still utilized and encouraged by the courts, there became an increased awareness of extremely heinous behaviors that required special attention. As a result, an increasing number of juveniles were being considered for bind overs (United States Department of justice, 2013), which is a judicial outcome in which the juvenile is considered an adult from a legal and punitive perspective, and is subject to adult sentencing penalties (United States Department of justice, 2013) and in extreme circumstances capital punishment (Legal information institute, 2012). Research assessing the outcomes of bind over cases has not been favorable (Schubert et al., 2010). These shifts continue to present unique challenges to professionals exploring how to best serve this population.

In correctional and punitive cases, juveniles are frequently detained in a youth detention center or other facility specifically designed for underage offenders (Sickmund, Sladky, Kang & Puzzanchera, 2008) as it has been deemed unreasonable to place them within an adult population whenever separate placement options exist. While incarcerated, many juveniles can experience a number of challenges that can result in major long term consequences such as isolation from family, a lesser quality education, exposure to higher risk offenders potentially increasing criminality, or be subject to hazing and or criminal behaviors from other detainees (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006). These criminal behaviors are often not considered crime in a correctional setting; instead they may be referred to as IM. Despite the term used, these behaviors can include theft of food items, physical fighting or assaultive behaviors, bullying, neglect, and gang related activities (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006). In a community-based setting these behaviors would likely receive attention from authorities and be treated as legal violations; however, in a
correctional setting misconduct is often treated with an in house procedure and sanction implemented at the discretion of correctional facility’s staff. There is a need to address this issue of institutional misconduct from a scientifically sound prevention model.

Early identification of risk factors that may correlate to acting out while incarcerated can be an effective strategy for implementation of interventions potentially reducing the number of incidents of misconduct. An important factor in assessing a valid instrument is that instrument’s ability to be culturally sensitive to numerous specialized populations, including the Appalachian population. Identified in large part due to their residence within the Appalachian mountain region ranging from Georgia up through New York (ARC, 2010), this unique group of juvenile detainees possess qualities that can make classification and identification of special needs challenging. With a number of possible cultural variations including mistrust of authority, strong family commitments, difficulties with being separated from families of origin and increased use of substances (Keefe, 2005) it may be difficult to accurately interpret functional impairment and high risk factors. The challenge in not accounting for cultural influences is that professionals could interpret findings that result in a misunderstanding of persons within this population. This then can result in services not being put in place, and or discordant services being implemented.

A review of the literature resulted in no findings of any literature offering attention to the specific needs of the detained adolescent male population within an Appalachian regional facility. Early identification of high risk factors can help focus the introduction of strategies that can be recommended for correctional staff members and policy makers to help generate a safe and suitable environment for juvenile detention residents (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). Prevention efforts in this area can result in the savings of numerous resources including financial and personnel resources, making this research worthy of attention (Lovell & Jamelka, 1996).
This work can greatly impact society as a whole as often children are identified as the greatest resource of any community. These resources are valuable regardless of deviance and acting out behaviors. It is the duty of society to be mindful of the reciprocal relationship that we have with all members of our society, including delinquent populations. Given the special factors that may be a part of juvenile delinquency and the push for healthy development, it only makes sense to pursue a scientifically sound method for identification of risk factors related to IM so that service providers can offer the most reliable and fitting services or settings for inmates (Beck et al., 1988). This may include placement in appropriate settings to reduce the impact of IM, efforts to decrease exposure to more deviant and potentially violent peers, or addition of staff to support specific inmate needs (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006).

**Ecological Theory**

Proposed as a framework with which to conceptualize person and environment interactions (Lewin, 1935), with an emphasis on the reciprocal interaction of the individual and a series of environmental and conceptual levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), the ecological theory offers a multidimensional framework with which to describe and conceptualize behavior and development. While not specifically a single theory, the ecological theory is a unique meta-theoretical approach which can help to understand and interpret behavior (Cook, 2012). Many theoretical approaches attempt to look at the discord or conflict of personal choice and or behavior. This perspective allows researchers to take a different view of total behavior in a way that is inclusive of numerous interactional factors ranging from individual characteristics (i.e. cognition, physical abilities and or disabilities, emotional distress, and medical traumas) to external supports and or deficits (i.e. lack of family support, negative peer settings, marginalized cultural origins, limited financial resources, and legal expectations of society), with an emphasis
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on the interactional characteristics, from an integrated approach. This recognition of intrapsychic and extrapsychic factors are an essential part of the current study in terms of interpretation, as the samples being measured are being collected within a controlled and often undesirable context for the target population. By exploring these complex interactional chains, professional helpers (either in criminal justice or mental health) can be better prepared to understand the diverse and multifaceted challenges experienced by our service recipients from both a historical and current situational perspective when they enter a correctional institution.

In a sense ecological theory is inclusive of the many other theoretical models, incorporating their various similarities and strengths into one consistent systems type model. Consistent with many systems based conceptualizations of human behavior, the ecological perspective offers a reliable foundation to establish a research framework that is targeting a better understanding of human behavior, in particular when that behavior is associated to social deviance and or behaviors that are inconsistent with societal expectations. By the very nature of criminal behavior we are exploring the specific actions of an individual that are outside of the acceptable limitations or expectations of that person’s community or societal setting. Many theories about crime fall within the ecological perspective, all identifying the interaction of the acting out person and the tolerance of that person’s environment and or peers. Examples of this are Travis Hirschi’s social bond theory that suggests that persons connected to or attached to their environment will be less likely to engage in crime (Hirschi, 1969). Additionally we can see similar interactional ideas in Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activity theory, which suggests that when the situation is favorable for crime (specifically a suitable target is without adequate guardianship, i.e., a detention facility that is understaffed) a motivated offender will act out their criminal behavior, or if incarcerated, institutional misconduct.
Even some of the more biologically oriented theories of behavior represent a portion of the ecological perspective allowing for a comprehensive lens for understanding total behavior. Current biologically driven researchers are recognizing the need for a more multidimensional model allowing for an understanding of the social phenomena identified as crime (Fishbein, 2000). Further the comprehensive nature of the ecological theory is an excellent fit for understanding the interactional properties that exist within social constructs, especially a correctional environment. Individuals who then are placed in a correctional setting are often expected to conform to the rules and expectations of the correctional institutions, regardless of their biological or social limitations. Given the anti-social nature of these individuals, hence the reason they are incarcerated, this expectation of conformity is unreasonable.

Researchers have utilized ecological theory to better understand the relationships between neighborhoods and how they impact adolescents’ well-being (Meyers & Miller, 2004), as well as how community characteristics influence violence at the family, community, and individual levels (Rosenthal & Wilson, 2003). Further this theory has been useful in helping to determine how institutions like schools, community centers, and churches may influence developmental aspects of an individual’s growth (Farmer et al., 2011; Leonard, 2011). Perhaps most importantly of all, is the way that the ecological theory can account for cultural factors, recognizing the importance of multi-systemic factors that fit within a person’s context. It is this comprehensive perspective that makes this theoretical framework a best fit for identifying and understanding risk factors that may contribute to adolescents acting out in a detention setting. This is especially true with the Appalachian population, as they have various community or family level norms that are often inconsistent with other populations. As such being placed within a correctional facility modifies all pre-existing relationships either with the addition of, or
the loss of extraneous factors. This model allows for understanding internal and external conditions and factors that contribute to behavior.

Use of this theoretical model has been recurrent in the literature especially when observed in measuring deviant behavior. A review of the current literature resulted in research exploring aspects of peer associations and deviance (Zimmerman & Messner, 2001), density of alcohol vendors and intimate partner violence (Cunradi et al., 2001), elevated crime rates in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Hanie, Silver & Teasdale, 2006; Zimmerman & Messner, 2001), and police decision making within various geographical locations (Phillips & Sobal, 2011). Each of these studies examined the interaction of individual and environmental factors and concluded that environmental factors did appear to have significant impact on behavior.

In this particular study it was determined that an ecologically oriented examination of the various factors that juvenile male residents may already possess prior to incarceration is likely to predict their engagement in IM. Consistent with a concept proposed by Irwin & Cressey (1962) this phenomenon is identified as Importation theory. In accordance to this model the residents have experienced numerous social influences, either pro-social or anti-social, that have contributed to the shaping of their behavior in society, as such when they are positioned in a new context, like a jail, their behaviors and actions may not be consistent with the rule sets of the new environment (Berg, & DeLisi, 2006; Jiang, & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Tasca et al., 2010). This is consistent with the ecological theory in that the individual has developed a norm set of behaviors and coping strategies within one social context. Then having a major environmental shift that requires a new set of rules and expectations, like incarceration, completely modifies the ability to utilize those previous norm sets within the confinement setting. This study is proposing that by examining the preexisting presence of trauma (Delisi et
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al., 2010), substance abuse and misuse (Pettigrew et al., 2012) and features of anger (Deskeredy & Joseph, 2006), all of which may be a part of the residents’ delinquent subculture, that we can potentially identify a relationship between these constructs with IM for youth while incarcerated.

The Appalachian Population

Ranging from southern New York to north-eastern Mississippi the Appalachian region is comprised of 420 counties in 13 states. These counties are either within or bordering the Appalachian Mountain chain and harbor a rich environment both in natural resources and in cultural and anthropological history (ARC, 2010). Many of the counties in this region report statistically to be economically at risk or in transition, with the average per capita annual income being $7,000 less than that of the average American (ARC, 2010). Governmental attention has been directed to enhance and supplement the industry and economy of Appalachia, an economy that once thrived on the mining and manufacturing industries, that is now competing with a global market (ARC, 2010).

A number of geological factors influenced the development of the Appalachian culture. Travel was often difficult through the mountains as often the weather would determine if one was able to safely arrive to a desired destination (Keefe, 2005). As a result, the people of this region developed survival strategies that were not fully consistent with persons of other regions of the nation. Dependence on family for medical and community support became a critical function of survival as service providers were often scarce for numerous reasons such as the high amount of travel needed to engage the communities, small caseloads, frustration with language barriers, few opportunities for continuing education and or advancement, and misinterpretation of cultural definitions (Keefe, 2005). As a result of these barriers, members of their respective communities, communities that often had a high percentage of family members within it, would
work together in order to provide needed support. This, in turn, helped to promote the outside perception of isolated and distrustful people that were often paranoid of others’ desire to take from them (Algeo, 2003). From the inside however, these barriers have promoted a strong sense of reliance and protection that was experienced by members of the family units. Persons could feel at ease or safe when within their communities. Conversely, such family ties create numerous challenges for those individuals who violate norms often resulting in the perception or feeling that they may be ostracized from their family. Consequently when exposed to new situations that may remove them from their comfort, like many people, Appalachian community members may have increased anxiety associated to being isolated from their family or community supports (Keefe, 2005).

Many of the residents in the Appalachian region did have reason to fear a loss of their property. As industry and mining increased, investors made efforts to obtain land rights in order to extract many of the precious resources found within the region (Algeo, 2003). This action, changing the face of the natural region, was a form of environmental trauma for many of the residents of the affected area as it changed the formation of the land that many of them depended upon for survival. In addition as industry moved in, the taxes on property increased and in some cases this resulted in the loss of family properties, as residents could not afford the new tax rates.

As this increase occurred with the industrial revolution there arose a need for better transportation and highways. The construction of these systems brought about significant change for the land including the redirection of waterways, the damming and draining of water resources, and other geographical changes that altered the lives of Appalachian residents immensely. This did in fact generate some discontent, and even anger, among the residents of
the Appalachian communities, contributing to considerable distrust of governmental and big business entities (Algeo, 2003).

In 2010, the members living within the Appalachian region reported a poverty rate of 15.4%, down from nearly 30% in 2005. This is new statistic is much more similar to the other regions of the US that reported a combined poverty rate of 15.1%. Much of this change is a direct link to the tourism that is related to the mountains themselves (ARC, 2010). In addition to similar poverty rates, the unemployment rate within the Appalachian region is 9.7 compared to the US Average of 9.6% (ARC, 2010). Despite the above listed numbers comparing economic conditions of Appalachia, there remains one continuous threat to this community. This threat is outmigration, outmigration of residents and businesses alike. Despite having similar economic rates to the other regions of the country, it was estimated that during the recession many sections of the Appalachian region suffered much greater losses overall than other regions of the country that appear to be recovering (ARC, 2010). It was additionally discovered that there was a strong relationship between unemployment and substance use for persons living in Appalachia (Thornton & Deitz-Allyn, 2010), with limited resources to address the demand for clinical services.

An examination of the various challenges associated to health disparities among individuals within the Appalachian regions revealed considerable literature to suggest not only that there is seemingly a greater level of health concerns for residents of Appalachia (Barker, Gerzoff, Crespo, and Shrewsberry, 2011; Behringer & Friedell, 2006; Smith & Holloman, 2011; Meyer, Toborg, Denham & Mande, 2008; Short, Oza-Frank, & Conrey, 2012), but also that access to health and wellness resources are greatly limited (Behringer & Friedell, 2006; Smith & Holloman, 2011). Strategies for overcoming these challenges have been identified, with
conclusions supporting the importance of the utilization of family unit bases strategies, specifically strategies that emphasis the role of the women in the family (Denham, Meyer, Toborg & Mande, 2008). Denham et al., (2004) further assert that successful strategies will also include a strong preference for realism, or “the facts” (Denham et al., 2004).

Of special note is that there are recognized differences even between the counties located within in Appalachia regarding health concerns. For example in a study to explore the age of diagnosis of diabetes in poorer Appalachian counties compared to other rural counties Barker, Gerzoff, Crespo, and Shrewsberry (2011) found that children of the poorer counties were diagnosed on average two to three years sooner than those in more economically established counties. This finding supports the assertion that members within these regions with limited access to health education and resources are at even greater risk than other members of more socioeconomically established regions (Short, Oza-Frank & Conrey, 2012).

Consistent with medical challenges faced by Appalachians, there is also a real presence of historical and generational drug abuse (Leukefeld et al., 2007). While current trends are more aligned with opiate and prescription medication, the use of substances is a long running tradition for many Appalachians. Moonshining, and production of other alcohols were not uncommon (Katz & Whitaker, 2001), especially for the more rural and farming communities. Acceptance of mood altering substances were seen as widely a part of many people’s life experiences (Leukefeld et al., 2007). Increased prevalence in recent times has been linked to some of the economic and employment struggles observed in the more disadvantaged or at risk counties, despite these growing rates the communities are promoting a model for reform over punishment (Leukefeld et al., 2007).

Institutional Misconduct
Modern approaches to corrections in America are strongly associated to the prison and jail systems. Often when a person is convicted in adult cases, or adjudicated in juvenile cases, the sentence of incarceration is identified during the disposition of these cases (Legal Information Institute, 2012). Not always are these persons then placed in a correctional facility as other resources may be utilized such as community control, fines, and or community service. However some of the offenders will be placed in a correctional facility, with limited resources and restrictions on their actions and interactions. A review of the literature yielded no findings related to an examination of IM with relation to youth that may reside within an Appalachian county detention facility.

A correctional facility is one that is utilized by some authority, often an agent acting on behalf of society, (ex. the justice system) to separate persons from the community. This separation is designed to provide one or more of several functions including punishment, protection of society, protection of the incarcerated person, and holding during a trial to prevent efforts by the accused to abscond from authorities (Siegal & Bartollas, 2011). Each of the various facilities housing prisoners vary in size and type of inmate that may be incarcerated there. Prisons for example are specifically designed to house persons that have been convicted or adjudicated of a felony level offense, while jails and detention centers are designed to house persons that have offended at the misdemeanor level and or are awaiting trial (Siegal & Bartollas, 2011). Both prisons and jails often have a level of security measure ranging from low, medium, high, and then super maximum security. These classifications are often defined by the state or federal governments as institutions meet certain standards.

Often within these facilities, which by their very nature are institutions that contain a high concentration of persons who may align with antisocial features, there is a regular occurrence of
behaviors that would likely be considered serious felonies in non-correctional settings (Berk, Kriegler & Baek, 2006). Misconducts often range from drug use, assault, sexual acts, fighting with or without a weapon, possession of contraband, failure to follow staff directives, and tampering with locks to name a few, (Holsinger et al., 2006; Berk et al., 2006). These offenses are often inconsistently addressed within the facility, frequently without the addition of formal charges returning to the courts (Light, 1990) and are identified then as IM. The consequences and efforts to address these infractions are often left to the discretion of staff members within the facility and have been scrutinized for such interventions having a lack of congruency and at times being ineffective in addressing the behavior in a fair and consistent manner (Light, 1990). This is a real factor as pointed out by Kuanliang, Sorensen, and Cunningham (2008) who recognized that as many as 24% of a juvenile inmate population (N= 703) were reported to have engaged in one category of IM, fighting. They suggested that some incidents may have been unreported as a result of discretion and or non-reporting by staff, as well as lack of self-report by inmates, potentially resulting in a much higher number of actual incidents than what is recognized by the correctional authorities.

The presence of IM in a correctional setting poses a number of challenges for the staff, and inmates alike. For the staff, there is the threat to security and maintenance of order, considered the highest priority for many prison administrators (Cullen, Latessa, Burton & Lombardo, 1993). Additionally the costs of managing disruptions both monetarily and emotionally are great. Lovell and Jamelka (1996) explored a medium security prison facility and estimated the costs required to address IM on average was $970.00 per incident. This dated cost is substantial when taken into consideration that approximately 15% of the 73,000 members of the incarcerated juvenile population (Sickmund, Sladky, Kang & Puzzanchera, 2011) are
reported as having acted out with some form of IM each year (Berk et al., 2006). More recent findings in terms of cost were not available; however given inflation costs and cost of living increases for correctional staff and facility costs, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the actual current cost for addressing each incident may be somewhat higher. This is in addition to the approximate $5.7 billion spent annually to house juvenile offenders alone (Justice Policy institute, 2009). Considering that a facility could have numerous infractions on a daily basis, considerations for the economic impact incurred by IM are of great concern. In addition to financial resources, incidents also limit the coverage of staff to address daily tasks. As staff engages with problematic inmates, the opportunity to engage in deviant behavior is likely increased for other inmates (Cohen & Felson, 1979), which can further compromise overall security. Not only then is the supervision by an authority compromised in these situations, but also there is increased stress resulting from the problematic interactions for the residents, the staff, and administrators of a correctional institution.

As a result of the many risk factors involved with various occurrences of IM, a number of attempts have been made to better understand this phenomena in order to implement security and classification efforts to reduce the potential for acting out through the use of interventions such as anger management, specialized physical placements, and isolation (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997). Some specific efforts to identify and classify early on in the placement of offenders have been through the use of psychometric screens and tests. While some of these instruments have been developed and normed for the prison/jail population, others have not. Researchers have discovered that some of the factors that may contribute to the likelihood of IM may be related to the psychological and social function of the inmates. One current trend is to identify when a prisoner is admitted to the facility, identify a level of risk, and determine an appropriate
placement within that facility. This has received tremendous support as research has demonstrated that low risk offenders who are placed with high risk offenders have an increased probability of engagement with IM (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006). Through the use of identification strategies, some evidence suggests that staff and administrators can reduce IM with the early detection of various risk factors, such as anti-social attitudes, and past criminal history (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997).

While there is a separation in the housing facilities that juveniles are detained in, there is often little variation in the structure of the actual facilities themselves, either adult or juvenile, both administratively and structurally. Both settings will experience IM however the adolescent population may be significantly more likely to engage in IM in comparison to the young adult and adult population (Kuanling, Sorensen & Cunningham, 2008). Given the recognition of IM as being a security concern requiring staff attention, and with increased occurrences, staff and residents alike in a juvenile facility may experience additional stressors. This assertion would then support the idea that efforts to understanding IM within a juvenile detention center is worthy of attention.

The current study focuses on juvenile offenders and, in the US, there are differences that are recognized between juveniles and adults. The placement of juveniles in an adult facility, jail or prison, is strongly discouraged as a potential violation of the 8th Amendment of the United States Constitution, which protects against cruel and unusual punishment; only in extreme circumstances does this overlap occur. IM presents a rather unique dilemma for juvenile correctional professionals. Given the developmental processes that adolescents are experiencing, including limited ability to think about the long term consequences of current behaviors, greater emphasis can be placed on the environment to influence their behavior (Conyne & Cook, 2004).
As such correctional staff working with youth may have additional responsibilities as an inherent part of their occupational requirements. These additional requirement, including parental interactions and knowledge of the developmental needs of children can result in additional stress on staff, despite the nature of many of the occurrences of IM being consistent between adults and juveniles, (Holsinger et al., 2006; Berk et al., 2006).

Researchers have been able to identify various inmate-centered factors that can be used to predict future acting out, specifically with juveniles (Holsinger et al., 2006). Much of these findings are the result of two main types of research, research focusing on the qualitative experiences of correctional staff, and more recently the use of actuarial psychometric testing instruments (Holsinger et al., 2006; Grove et al., 1995; Hoge, 2002) with support for use of such tools in identifying a relationship between aggression and acting out for detained youth (Kimonis et al., 2007). In exploring these relationships specific factors utilized for youth have recurrently been related to each of the following areas, criminal history, educational and/or employment experiences, significant relationships in the offender’s life, substance abuse/use, mental health issues (ie depression, anxiety, mood, aggression, etc.), antisocial cognitions (Holsinger et al., 2006; Kimonis et al., 2007), and trauma (Delisi et al., 2010). It is noteworthy that some of the factors identified can also be mitigating factors, positive parental interactions and religion, which can be related to pro-social behaviors (Petts, 2009).

**Specific Risk Factors: Trauma, Anger, and Substance Use**

In an effort to understand the relationship between individual and social factors intrinsic to inmates and the occurrence of IM, recent efforts have attempted to identify various risk factors that can help to identify what aspects might be most likely to be associated to any acting out for inmates while incarcerated (Delisi et al., 2010; Holsinger et al., 2006; Delisi et al., 2008; &
Mulder et al., 2012). It is noteworthy that there is a lack of research currently done with the adolescent population within Appalachian regions, as a review of the literature generated no findings for work being specifically done with this population. Taking this into consideration, the following risk factors were identified as having the most potential given current research trends observed in the general population and the contextual factors Appalachian youth may experience; trauma, anger and substance use.

**Trauma.** Child abuse and neglect cases are an epidemic with the general population that is often missed. Despite this, the existence of these traumatic phenomena is real, and can have severe psychological effects. Trauma can be inclusive of experiences similar to being the victim of assaults, observing others being assaulted, seeing another killed, being the victim of a violent crime, sexual assault, psychological trauma, abandonment, and neglect (Dohrenwend, 2010). Often due to factors such as poor qualitative reporting to investigators, law enforcement, other authorities such as teachers, and the challenges of interviewing techniques used to ascertain the voracity of these offenses the actual occurrence of abuse is unknown (Wallenstein, 1998). Widom (1989) reported that in conjunction with the cycle of violence hypothesis, persons who experience early life violence could be somewhat impaired in their development. Widom further found support for this assertion, finding that 50% of the juvenile participants and 28% of the adults in a 2001 study of abused persons were arrested for criminal behavior by age 32 (Widom & Maxfield, 2001). Additionally traumatic experiences have also been found to be related to the increased use of substances (Vermeiren et al., 2003). These findings all support the importance of this factor as a reasonable fit for exploring the potential relationship between trauma and IM (DeLisi et al., 2010)
While these findings were not based upon the Appalachian population, we can anticipate that given the frequent suppression of violent behavior (i.e., domestic violence, threats and gestures to reduce talking outside of the family unit, and the use of force) related to the dominant male component often found in the Appalachian communities (Dekeseredy, Donnermeyer & Schwartz, 2009) that attention to this factor is warranted. In addition there may also be suppression of the reporting and recognition of sexual assault in Appalachian communities (Dekeseredy, 2007). These assertions when taken into consideration of the intergenerational cycle of violence theory warrant further exploration of this factor within these regions.

While reported crime in Appalachia is lower than the national average (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013) this does not mean that this area is devoid of criminal behaviors. This is pointed out by Dekeseredy, Donnermeyer, and Schwartz (2009) who identify the presence of a patriarchal male dominated culture within Appalachia that actually suppresses the reporting of criminal behaviors. Bull, (2010) reported findings suggesting that there is in fact severe occurrences of domestic aggression within Appalachian homes. This was often then linked to other themes that may have significant outcomes on future development of children. These factors were identified as living as if an orphan, surviving in chaos, and manifesting a devalued self (Bull, 2010). These occurrences of violence have been shown to pose a significant risk to childhood development and adjustment (Hungerford, Wait, Fritz & Clements, 2012). These authors suggest then that as there is crime, especially of a domestic violence nature, members of the community are not likely to act in response to this even if they are aware of the occurrence due to suppression enforced by authority figures within the homes and communities (Dekeseredy & Joseph, 2006). It was further suggested that in Appalachian areas some crime will be more tolerated, such as domestic violence, substance abuse, and sexual assault while other crime is
less tolerated such as theft or vandalism (Dekeseredy, 2007). These limitations of reporting could be a factor related to the closed and personal nature of the Appalachian community members, who may report a lack of faith or trust with the governmental agencies, which is a significant ecological factor. These factors make it difficult to fully understand what levels of crime may exist with this population as well as other important sociological factors such as family violence, unsuccessful attempts to divorce, and abuse (Dekeseredy, 2007).

**Anger.** Anger or aggression related traits, of an emotive nature, are one of the more frequently identified characteristics associated to a risk for IM (Daffern, Howells & Ogloff, 2007; Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Novaco & Taylor, 2004). These features may be observed in the form of physical fighting, bullying, resistance of staff directive, verbal assaults on staff and peers, and or destruction of property. For example, Vitacco et al. (2008) found that in their survey of residents in an institutional setting that anger was a strong predictor of reactive aggression. Often the precursors to these characteristics are identified through a psychometric instrument used to identify certain intrinsic factors of the individual that may present some indication of any abnormalities that may be related to IM (Kroner & Mills, 2001). Many of the commonly used instruments like the MAYSI-2 have a specific category for anger, or some closely related category attempting to identify violent characteristics.

A review of the literature regarding the origin of anger resulted in a number of positions supporting the importance of social and familial interactions in childhood as a strong predictor of anger. Much of this anger can be linked to the past generational exploitations of the region and the people within it (Algo, 2003). As this phenomena becomes generationally engrained into the existence of personal and family bias and disengagement from outsiders, certain internal and external practices of rejecting associations with potential threats seems likely. White & Widom
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(2003) recognized that early patterns of abusive and neglectful behavior seemed to have a predictive relationship with later occurrences of aggression. This is consistent with the model proposed by Doan (2012) who utilizes a social model for describing the development of and intensity of moods. These findings support the use of this construct with review of persons within an Appalachian region as individuals within this population may be at risk for exposure to violence (Deskeredy & Joseph, 2006). As this particular quality tends to be a consistent variable in understanding IM in other populations, further exploration is advantageous especially when taken into consideration the prevalence of increased risk factors for abuse and violence within these communities (Deskeredy & Joseph, 2006).

**Substance Use.** As the issue of violence is explored, it is not uncommon to discover research that identifies that there is a relationship between violence and substance use (Stoddard et al., 2013). Houser, Beleko, and Brennan (2012) found that risks for IM were significantly higher for inmates that presented with substance related disorders, and considerably higher if there were a co-occurrence of substance use and mental health related factors, some of this may be linked to lack of access to drugs as a coping tool, and or withdrawal based effects. These findings are supported by researchers at the National Institute on Drug Abuse’s (2008) who asserted that often the symptoms of single disorders are greatly increased when in conjunction with a substance related disorder. Beck, Kline, S., and Greenfeld, (1988) discovered in their multi-state survey on incarcerated youth that nearly 80% of the respondents had a drug using history, with 47.6% reporting that they were under the influence at the time of their offense. There is a clear relationship between substance use and violent behavior and past trauma (Stoddard et al., 2013; Vermeiren et al., 2003; Schneider et al., 2009; Beck et al., 1988).
When examining the epidemiological causes of substance use there is no singular factor defining the specific origins of this phenomenon as a combination of cultural, psychological, and or genetic factors seem to contribute to a person’s propensity for using substances (Swendsen & Le Moal, 2011). Despite what perspective that is examined there is evidence that the presence of substance use at an early age is consistent with long term problem use and problem behavior (McGue & Laccono, 2008). Recognizing the presence of this condition as a risk factor then has strong meaning in recognizing the potential for its contribution to IM.

Thornton & Deitz-Allyn, (2010) recognized alcohol and drug use in Appalachia as a growing social and economic problem that requires attention. Members of the Appalachian region have frequently been associated to having a high incidence of substance using/abusing behaviors. The substances, being any mind or mood altering substance obtained through legal or illegal means, used can consist of (but are not limited to) tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, opiates, amphetamines, and barbiturates. Rhew et al., (2011) reported findings linking rural youth to higher exposure to risk factors indicating that additional support is warranted for youth in country rural regions versus towns or cities. Some rural risk factors have been identified as a lack of recreational opportunities and a lack of having a chance to engage in supervised structured activities, as a result youth may be more likely to engage in substance use (Scaramella & Keyes, 2001). Pettigrew et al. (2012) found that rural students in an Appalachian county identified specific areas that they were likely to locate drugs including parties, within the homes (when parents were not present), and just “hanging out” within their communities. This finding supports the assertions proposed by Scarmella and Keyes (2001) regarding increased use as a function of lacking structured activities. While there is a widely accepted knowledge of alcohol and marijuana as being some of the most frequently abused drugs, prescriptions opiates were the
most frequently identified abused prescription drug with Xanax being the most frequently abused benzodiazepine (Leukfeld et al., 2007). Additionally recent research has demonstrated that opiate use has increased significantly in recent years across the US, and the Appalachian communities have had a relatively high amount of reported misuse with Appalachians reporting higher rates of usage of over the counter and prescription drugs “just to feel good” (Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati, 2012). Rural regions tend to have a higher prevalence of substance use, and Appalachian youth in general may be at a higher risk of early onset than many other populations (Pettigrew et al., 2012).

Efforts to identify studies which demonstrate a relationship between substance use and IM in relation to the Appalachian population in the literature did not yield any results. However, as recognized by Thornton & Deitz-Allyn (2010), substance use in Appalachia is a growing factor that requires attention. With rural youth being at risk of an increased likelihood of engagement in drug using behavior (Pettigrew, Miller, Krieger & Hecht, 2012), it seems reasonable to consider this factor among Appalachian youth given its likely relationship to aggression and mental health. As substance use has been identified as a behavioral action that can be related directly to IM (Houser, Beleko & Brennan, 2012), a possible relationship between substance use and IM is worthy of examination with the Appalachian population.

**Other factors of consideration.** In addition to the variables of Trauma, Alcohol/Drug use, and Anger/Irritability there are other factors in the literature that may be of merit to consider in conjunction with these previously identified variables. Specifically age, race, and duration of sentence (Flanagan, 1980; Goetting & Howson, 1986). Each of these variables is of merit for exploration as the residents within a facility as a part of their ecological contexts is experiencing each of these factors universally.
The above mentioned factors, trauma, anger, and substance use along with the variables of age, race, duration and number of contacts as well as deviance of each of the contacts, have strong connections to the occurrence of potential violence and acting out. This is demonstrated consistently throughout the current body of existing literature. Additionally, the presence of these factors seems to have some concordance with persons within an Appalachian region. A front end exploration of youth entering a youth detention center may support preventive correctional efforts if these factors can be identified and further analyzed. There are current instruments that are designed to do this, however recognition of these instruments and their utility in relation to the Appalachian population requires more attention.

Conclusion

While the Appalachian region reports having some of the lowest crime rates in the US. (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013), recognition of the potential underreporting is recognized (Dekeseredy, Donnermeyer & Schwartz 2009). As such attention to this special population is needed. Despite the lower reported crime rates, there are still a significant number of juveniles being incarcerated in correctional facilities located within Appalachia. Exploring some of the intrinsic aspects of the adolescent population within Appalachia, as well as the unique factors intrinsic to any juvenile population, demands attention from the research community.

A review of the literature uncovered considerable attention focusing on IM primarily with adults (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Cunningham & Sorenson, 2007; Guy et al., 2005; and Swobadna, 2006). Currently, limited attention has been placed upon the juvenile population as a whole. With respect to research specific to the Appalachian regions, this research is seemingly nonexistent. Identification of potential risk factors associated to IM with this population of adolescents is a considerable contribution to the existing literature. This research is best served
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by utilizing an ecological framework which will allow for researchers to better understand total behavior from an integrated person environment perspective. This framework has previously been utilized in the research community as an adjunct to more commonly recognized research orientations. However in this study, the framework offered by the ecological theory is a best fit to help understand the target population, as understanding Appalachian special needs from an Appalachian perspective has been identified as a critical component for earning the opportunity to work within and better understand this population (Tang & Russ, 2005).
Chapter 3

Methodology

Research design is a critical component of any work exploring and contributing to existing bodies of knowledge. Exploring emotional and social factors of detainees can be a helpful tool in assessing and recognizing needed services for youth involved in the criminal justice system (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). The purpose of this study was to determine the presence of a relationship between the three independent variables; traumatic experiences, substance use, and anger, with the dependent variable of IM. This chapter will provide an overview of the methodological approach to this study including the participants, the correctional setting from where the data was collected, the data collection process, the variables being compared, the instrumentation, and analysis.

Within the scope of this study use of quantitative and qualitative archival data provided by the partnering detention facility was analyzed in examining the predictive relationships between traumatic experiences, substance use, and anger as measured by the MAYSI-2 with IM as reported by the partnering agencies staff. By using logistic regression analysis performed with SPSS v. 22 software the researchers explored the following research questions:

- Is there a relationship between traumatic experiences and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county?
- Is there a relationship between substance use and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county?
Is there a relationship between anger and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county?

Is there a relationship between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county?

Subjectivity statement

Despite various discussions regarding the utilization of subjectivity, it has been recognized as a potential benefit to research as individuals with insider knowledge may have a greater grasp or understanding of the topics of study (Drapeu, 2002). The inclusion of a subjectivity statement in this work is important in that I, as the primary investigator consider this work as a form of ‘intimate insider research’ (Taylor, 2011). Taylor (2011) identifies the term intimate insider research as; “…the researcher is working, at the deepest level, within their own ‘backyard’; that is, a contemporary cultural space with which the researcher has regular and ongoing contact; where the researcher’s personal relationships are deeply embedded in the field; where one’s quotidian interactions and performances of identity are made visible; where the researcher has been and remains a key social actor within the field and thus becomes engaged in a process of self-interpretation to some degree; and where the researcher is privy to undocumented historical knowledge of the people and cultural phenomenon being studied.” (p. 9). This term is a reasonable fit for me in this work as I have had an ongoing professional and pro-bono relationship with the partnering detention center and its respective court system for seventeen years, as well as a member of the Appalachian community for thirty seven years. As a result the following subjectivity statement is offered to describe this relationship and the strategies utilized to address any potential biases in the results of this work.
As a self-identified Appalachian community member I find this work to be something of great importance. Certainly, as I was brought up in a rural community setting, I never perceived myself or my family as having differences from other community members; much of this was associated simply to the culture. In a sense we were cut from the same cloth. It would be unreasonable for me to deny that this, in part, is associated with my attraction to pursuing this research.

Additionally during my undergraduate studies I had the opportunity to work within the criminal justice system, and have continued to do so for the past seventeen years with much of this time in conjunction with the partnering agency associated to this project. I would be remiss if I did not disclose that I intend to continue my work with this population and potentially this agency in the future as a researcher.

My general attraction to this population as a whole is consistent with my self-fulfilling altruistic desire to improve the opportunities and functioning of the children within our community. In the hopes then that these children can develop and grow into a stronger community, a community that includes my family and me. My community happens to be in Appalachia; my people happen to be in Appalachia.

Also of noteworthy recognition, I have worked in conjunction with the partnering agency, and in the profession of criminal justice for nearly seventeen years. I have served in the role of youth leader (detention guard), probation officer, case manager, and therapist within this group. It is this pre-existing relationship that has contributed to me being at this point as I have strong commitments to helping enhance and promote services within the partnering agency. This pre-existing relationship was a critical component in obtaining entrée with this group and partially responsible for the current research agenda.
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There is some potential to observe research biases on behalf of my work. In part, this is countered by the statistical analysis that is being placed upon this work. In addition through the support of mentors and faculty at the University of Cincinnati, influential biases can be reduced in order to help generate original scholarly work that can contribute a meaningful message to the research community.

**Research Hypotheses**

Null hypotheses were generated for each of research questions posed. These hypotheses are:

- $H_01$. There is no relationship between traumatic experiences and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county.

- $H_02$. There is no relationship between substance use and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county.

- $H_03$. There is no relationship between anger and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county.

- $H_04$. There is no relationship between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county.

These Hypotheses were generated to specifically test the variables of interest for this study. The first three hypotheses test for the variables independently. The fourth hypothesis was generated honoring the recognition of these factors not truly existing within a vacuum in real
world applications. As a result the independent variables of Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, and Anger/Irritability as measured on the MAYSI-2 were tested with the independent variables of reported age, reported race, and duration of stay. This hypothesis design was elected as a means of making efforts to account for the actual living experience of the youth utilizing the data made available for this study.

Participants

For inclusion into this study, the participants in the existing data set were 12-17 year old adolescent males who were incarcerated in a youth detention center during calendar years 2008 through 2012. The participants were predominantly European Americans and residing within an Appalachian county (ARC, 2010) youth detention center in order to meet criteria for consideration as a participant in this study. Participants had no face-to-face contact with any research personnel as the data being analyzed will be existing files obtained by the detention facility for purposes of intake and conduct reporting during their residence in detention.

For the participants to be eligible for this study they needed to complete a valid administration of the MAYSI-2 at the time of their intake. Additionally, as the time of stay is not a constant factor for all residents, this study utilized data only from residents who were detained for 1-20 days. This decision was made based upon the average length of stay reported by the partnering agency that identified their average length of stay as 14 days (Partnering Detention Center administration, 2013). The data was be de-identified by the detention staff for the purpose of this study.

Setting

This study utilized data from a southern Ohio juvenile detention center. This facility mainly houses juveniles under the age of eighteen years of age. If a youth is held in custody at
the time of their eighteenth birthday they are released to adult services or released from incarcerated, unless otherwise ordered by the jurisdiction of the juvenile court (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013). The facility is a 38-bed facility and ascribes to a twelve resident to one staff ratio, consistent with the Ohio Department of Corrections standards. At the time of intake, youth undergo a brief screening and intake process utilized to manage their stay in detention. The staff at this facility keeps electronic records of incidents of misconduct, identified by youth record, utilizing the Courtview electronic data base. The data collected by the detention staff at the time of intake and for the duration of their incarceration was analyzed in this study. Court administration approved the release of this data for the purposes of this study only.

**Research Variables**

The following variables were used for this study; traumatic experiences (IV), substance use (IV), anger (IV), race (IV), age (IV), duration of stay (IV) and IM (DV). The independent variables were measured using the MAYSI-2. The dependent variable was collected from qualitative data entered into the Courtview system by detention staff in the participating facility. Operational definitions of the variables are as follows.

- **Traumatic Experiences**: An experience in a person’s life in which they were the recipient of abuse, or direct and perceived harm that could have put their life or the life of another at risk. (Grisso & Barnum, 2001)

- **Substance abuse**: Higher risk use of alcohol or another mood altering drug that identifies the individual as being at risk of meeting the criteria for Substance abuse or dependence as defined by the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 4th edition text revised, (2005) (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).
• Anger and Irritability: A state in which a person endorses regular or recurrent feelings of aggression and or thoughts of revenge as well as the feelings of, displaying, or engaging in destructive behavior (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

• Institutional Misconduct: Any conduct that is displayed by a resident of a correctional facility that is outside of the expected norm or rule set for that setting. Measured by when the incarcerated person(s) has/have been reported for such behavioral violations by detention staff (Berk et al., 2006).

• Race: The self-identified racial orientation identified by the male youth at the time of the intake for incarceration.

• Age: The self-reported age, in units of years, reported by the male youth at the time of the intake for incarceration.

• Duration of Stay: The amount of time the youth remained in the detention center measured in units of calendar days. Youth staying in for less than 24 hours were identified as staying 1 day.

This study hypothesized that there is a relationship between each of the independent variables of Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, and Anger/Irritability with the dependent variable, occurrence of IM, for Appalachian male youth detained in the participating correctional facility. The duration of time youth will be incarcerated in order to qualify for this study is 1-20 days.

Instrumentation

There are numerous instruments currently used in an effort to classify juvenile detainees. Some of the instruments that have demonstrated utility in this task have been the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI; Holsinger et al., 2006), the Massachusetts
Adolescent Youth Screening Instrument 2nd edition (MAYSI-2; Grisso & Barnum, 2001) the
Childhood Psychopathy Scale (CPS; Douglas, Epstein & Poythress, 2008), Anti-social Belief
and Attitude Scale (ABAS; Butler, Leschied & Fearon, 2007). These instruments have had a
considerable amount of utility not only in clinical practice, but in research arenas as well. They
make effort to identify specific factors that may be able to identify higher probability profiles for
acting out in various environmental settings.

In this study each of the independent variables of Substance abuse, Anger/Irritability, and
Traumatic Experiences were measured using the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument
version 2 (MAYSI-2) at the time of intake for each of the participants. This instrument is
currently being utilized as standard practice by the participating detention facility. The MAYSI-
2 is a dichotomous (yes/no) 52 item screening instrument designed for use by juvenile detention
centers for early identification of factors that may require clinical attention (Grisso & Barnum,
2001). While this instrument does not identify mental or emotional disorders it is considered
useful in identifying individuals who may present with symptoms at a problematic level
consistent for each of the areas explored (Grisso et al., 2001).

The MAYSI-2 was designed specifically for use with youth engaged with the juvenile
correctional system (probation, detention, and court involvement; Grisso & Barnum, 2001). The
first version of this instrument was developed as a prototype in 1994-1998 in part with a grant
funded by the William T. Grant foundation (Grisso et al., 2001). After being normed with the
population in Massachusetts, the instrument was then tested in California and demonstrated
validity and reliability through a separate factor analysis (Grisso et al., 2001). After considerable
testing and analysis was done to ascertain the best understanding of the specific scales and score
ranges the instrument was as the MAYSI version 2 (Grisso et al., 2001). This instrument has
currently been accepted to be used state wide in 40 states (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). Given the wide range of acceptance for this instrument it continues to be the subject of numerous studies.

The instrument itself is a screen that requires approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Scoring is very simple and can be done in approximately 3 minutes, unless the electronic version is done in which the scoring is done immediately with a computer, reducing the potential for scoring error. Individual scores are determined from basic yes/no answers based upon resident responses. These responses are then categorically aligned into one of seven scales (six scales for females as the researches did not have enough data to offer an accurate measure of thought disturbance for females during their research; Grisso & Barnum, 2001). The categories are; Alcohol/Drug use, Angry/irritable, Depressed/Anxious, Somatic Complaints, Suicidal Ideation, Traumatic Experiences, and thought Disturbances (for males only; Grisso & Barnum, 2001). Each of these scales are then designed to have a statistical cutoff marked at two thresholds, caution suggesting a potential need for services, and warning suggesting a high risk area in need of further clinical attention (Grisso & Barnum 2001). Each scale has independent cutoff scores. For the use of this study, the cut off scores are not a factor as the purpose of this research is to explore the existence of a relationship between the scale scores for traumatic experiences, alcohol/drug use, and angry/irritable with institutional misconduct for Appalachian males.

Design of this instrument was normalized for three ethnic groups; African American, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic White. It was recognized that additional research could greatly improve the use of this instrument as other studies included the use of this instrument with diverse populations. A review of the literature resulted in no findings in the current body of research with the Appalachian population and this instrument.
While the designers of this instrument did not identify with any specific theoretical orientation in their design, it appears to be evident that their approach is consistent with the Ecological theory in design. Researchers explored frequently occurring psychological factors that recurrently were elevated for youth undergoing psychometric testing in the juvenile justice system and identified areas of general concern (Grisso & Barnum 2001). They then explored the existence of these factors based upon the perceptions reported by juvenile justice professionals. By analyzing these factors using independent factor analysis, the researchers determined the final set of factors as seen below (Grisso & Barnum, 2001; Grisso et al., 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Item</th>
<th>*Range of internal reliability</th>
<th>**Effect size of variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug use</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry-irritable</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grisso et al., 2001 original study data. Massachusetts White male sample.

**DeLisi et al., 2010. Effect size using Binomial regression, in prediction of misconducts.

**Scales**

Three of the MAYSI-2 scales were selected for use in this study based upon the review of the literature and the factors that appeared to be most relevant for the Appalachian male juvenile detention resident population (Dekeseredy, Donnermeyer & Schwartz 2009; Thornton & Deitz-Allyn, 2010). The identified scales are Traumatic Experiences, Substance Use, and Angry/Irritable.
The Traumatic Experiences Scale is designed to identify if a youth has had more traumatic experiences than other youth their age (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). This scale is unique from the other scales as it utilizes questions encouraging the respondents to identify situations from a life-long perspective in-lieu of the past few months. Specific questions explore past perceptions of abuse, concerns of others talking about them, beatings, bad thoughts or dreams, and witnessed the severe injury or death of a person in life (Grisso & Barnum, 2001).

The Alcohol/Drug use scale is designed to identify which youth may be using alcohol or drugs to a significant degree, suggesting an increased risk of substance abuse or dependence (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). This scale asks respondents to identify their use of substances or interactions with substances based upon the past few months, in relation to the time of administration. There are eight items on this scale focusing on behaviors when intoxicated, interactions with others related to usage, misbehaviors when using, use of drugs to improve feelings, use related to school obligations, use of alcohol and drugs at the same time, and using to the point of blacking out.

The Angry/Irritable scale is intended to identify those youth who may have tendencies to experience feelings of preoccupying anger, as well as general tendencies towards irritability and frustration as they relate to anger (Grisso & Barnum, 2001). This nine item scale asks respondents to identify within the past few months which of the following areas they can identify with feeling; loss of temper, easily upset, feelings of revenge, hyper, bad moods, persistent anger, duration of anger states, and destruction of property.

Internal reliability for the scales on the MAYSI-2 have demonstrated mixed results with more current research (Archer, et al., 2010) yielding findings consistent with Grisso & Barnum’s (2001) original findings.
Obtainment of Data

Data was provided by the participating correctional facility. This writer has extensive experience working with criminal justice organizations and had a pre-existing relationship with the partnering agency. Staff within the facility generated reports including the following information for respondents for the 2008-2012 calendar years: initial MAYSI-2 scores generated at the time of intake, length of stay, race, age, residential zip code, and the occurrence of misconduct. A copy of the data collection tool used to chart this data can be found in Appendix E. All data collected was de-identified by the detention staff.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) was designed by the principle researcher and partnering agency. This MOU then underwent numerous screenings and revisions in order to support the interest of all parties involved. Upon completion and approval of the MOU the data collection process began. In collecting the selected data the partnering agency agreed to review past files of male youth from calendar year 2008-2012, until 800 participants had been documented. Using Cohen’s (1992) model for multiple regression with six coefficients, alpha at the .05 threshold, and the reported effect size for the MAYSI-2 subscales in question the suggested number to have adequate statistical power was N=686. Given that the data collection was conducted onsite without being viewed by the researcher, 800 participants were deemed an adequate number to meet the power requirements and account for any attrition. The partnering detention center offered 783 participants from their files that met criteria for the study. This number was identified as a reasonable number of respondents by the researchers in order to meet statistical power required for the small effect size of the Alcohol/Drug subscale (.04) for the MAYSI-2 (DeLisi, 2010; Cohen, 1992). The other subscales, Anger (.14) and Traumatic Experiences (.21) as reported by DeLisi (2010) were closer to a medium effect size. Each of
these 783 files the partnering detention agency’s staff collected contained the scores from the MAYSI 2 administrations, as well as the dates of intake and release for the youth, the zip code to assist with the geographic location of the youth (helping determine if youths resided within an Appalachian region), ethnicity, and the age reported by the youth at the time of their admission to the facility. This data was then tracked on the data organization tool designed for this study (Appendix E), with the data being entered in numerical values for dates, age, zip code, identification of ethnicity as (W) White, (B), Black, (O) other, and reported MAYSI-2 scale scores. Then the partnering agency agreed to cross reference all of the youth reviewed in previous course that qualified for the study with the Courtview system to identify if the youth had received any sanctions resulting in their placement in a cell as a sanction while detained during their stay. This information was also documented in the data organization tool.

**Defining Misconduct**

Youth detained in the facility are mandated by the staff to abide by a set of specific rules that are introduced to the youth at the time of intake (see Appendix A). Youth take a brief quiz to ascertain their understanding of the various rules mandated by the facility. When youth violate these rules it is the staff’s function to intervene and determine consequences (see Appendix B).

For this study the threshold of youth being reprimanded and placed in their cell will be the measure for IM. The purpose for this threshold is that detention administrators are unable to qualify infractions that are not documented in the Courtview system. As staff have some discretion in the implementation of their behavioral interventions it was determined that a sanction resulting in the use of entry code “Youth placed in cell” would be the most reliable qualifier for institutional misconduct. This threshold was determined in part by the partnering
agency; it is a unique threshold set by the parameters of the agency’s specific coding system within Courtview (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013). This measure contrasts with other studies which use more specific parameters including specific occurrence such as theft, assault, sexual assault, and obtaining and or concealing contraband (Holsinger et al., 2006; Berk et al., 2006). Given the nature of the data available for this study this was the agreed upon threshold that the partnering agency accepted to provide.

Protocols and Data Analysis

Table of Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1.</th>
<th>Develop memorandum of understanding with partnering agency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.</td>
<td>Submit proposal to IRB at the university of Cincinnati for approval to begin research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3.</td>
<td>Partnering agency will agree to collect and de-identify existing data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4.</td>
<td>Principle investigator will receive de-identified data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.</td>
<td>Data will be entered into SPSS for analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.</td>
<td>Run frequencies on independent and dependent variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7.</td>
<td>Analyze data using logistic regression analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7a.</td>
<td>Analyze relationship for H₀1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7b.</td>
<td>Analyze relationship for H₀2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7c.</td>
<td>Analyze relationship for H₀3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7d.</td>
<td>Analyze relationships for H₀4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9.</td>
<td>Present findings to partnering agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For this study SPSS, version 22 was used for data management and analysis. Only males from the ages of 12 years old through 17 were used as participants. Participants were selected by date of admission beginning in January of calendar year 2008 through December of 2012, and will have been incarcerated for 20 days or less. This parameter was put in place as the average length of stay for residents within the partner facility was 14 days (Partnering Detention Center administration, 2013). The 20 day cut off allowed for the majority of the population to be examined while eliminating bias from residents who were incarcerated for longer periods of time. It was pre-determined that 686 participants would be the target number of individuals to meet the criteria for statistical power using Cohen’s (1992) values for a small effect size on each of the scales (DeLisi et al., 2010). 800 participants were requested to account for attrition, based upon the qualifying residents presented by the partnering detention facility we were able to collect 769 samples that meet all criteria. The research team determined this would be adequate.

Statistical Analysis

Logistic regression analysis was utilized to examine the relationship between each of the dependent variables reported for the participants with the reported occurrence of IM. This method is consistent with other research conducted in the prediction of IM with youth populations (Berk et al., 2006; Butler, Loney & Kistner, 2007; Cunningham & Sorenson, 2007; Holsinger et al., 2006). This offered an evaluation of the presence of a relationship, and the level of effect, if any, the dependent had with the reported presence of IM. This measure was able to satisfy the research questions regarding the presence of a relationship between the independent and dependent variables examined for the population of male inmates residing within the Appalachian community detention center.
Population Description

The samples in this study were all male youth between the ages of 12 and 17 years old whom were identified as residents of or near the county in which the partnering agency was located within. There were a total of 783 entries offered from the partnering agency. Of the 783 entries 769 reported that they resided within an Appalachian county as evidenced by their reported zip codes when reporting their respective addresses therefore those 769 samples were determined to be the only entries utilized for this study as a means of staying as close as reasonable to the geographical criteria that was elected in determining inclusion criteria for the study. It is noteworthy to report that during the calendar years of 2008 through 2012 there were 1689 total male admissions. Those youth that were included into the study were chronologically drawn from the hard file warehouse and were drawn starting from January 2008 until December 2012. As youth’s data were recognized as meeting inclusion criteria for this study; age restriction, duration of stay in facility, partnering detention center county was identified as youth’s county of residence, and complete administrations in the MAYSI-2 at the time of intake, this data was placed in the eligible data set. This collected information was then de-identified as the data sample. The inclusion criterion for this study was such that it incorporated 45.5 percent of the total male youths admitted. This number of \( N = 769 \) was determined to meet the criteria for satisfying statistical power given the internal consistency scores reported on the MAYSI-2 (Cohen, 1992).

The predetermined age criteria were to include only male residents between the ages of 12 and 17 years old. The most frequently reported age was 17 years old, and a mean age represented in this sample was 15.45 years old with a standard deviation of 1.47 (Table 4.1).
The range of stay for the entries in this study was from 1 to 20 days so as to offer the partnering agency a sample consistent with the majority of their detainees, in which it was reported that they had an average stay of 14 days (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013). Individuals who may have been within the facility for less than 24 hours were coded as being present for one day. As a result all of the entries ranged from 1 day to 20 days. In this sample there were 212 entries that were identified as being incarcerated for 1 day (27.6%) this was the highest frequency for days reported. The average length of stay within this sample was 5.66 days, with a standard deviation of 5.13 days (Table 4.2).

The race descriptors reported were one of three categories; White, Black, and Other. (Other is a category utilized by the detention center that encompasses all races not identified as White or Black). There were 714 entries identifying as White totaling 92.8% of the population. Thirty-seven of the entries identified as Black, comprising 4.8% of the population, and 18 entries identified as Other, totaling 2.3% of the population (Table 4.3).

Of the youth identified as candidates for this study, 158 (20.5%) were placed in their cell by the partnering agency as a behavioral sanction. A total of 620 youth (79.5%) were not placed in their cell during their stay with the detention center (Table 4.4).

Mailing zip codes were used to ascertain the residence of the youth being reported by the partnering agency. The intention of gathering this information was to identify a guide to identify if the reported youth resided within an Appalachian county recognized by the ARC. There were 31 zip codes recorded by the detention center, eight of which were not located within the Appalachian region. As they were not within the parameters prescribed to determine inclusion of the Appalachian population they were removed from the sample. Based upon this information,
99.1% of the original sample reported a mailing zip code indicating residence within an Appalachian Community. After removing those not reporting residence within an Appalachian county, the remaining number of entries equaled 769 (Table 4.5).

**Distribution of scores reported on the MAYSI-2**

For this study 3 subscales were targeted from the MAYSI-2 instrument as a measure of the constructs of interest for the participants. These subscales were: Alcohol/Drug, Angry/Irritable, and Traumatic Experiences. The Alcohol and Drug subscale has a range of zero to nine. The Angry/Irritable subscale has a range of zero to nine. And the Traumatic Experiences subscale ranges from zero to five. The scores reported are reported in chapter four.

The following MAYSI-2 scales were measured by self-report instrumentation during the intake process for each of the youth incarcerated within 24 hours of being admitted to the partnering agency. The Traumatic Experiences scores reported ranged from zero to five, with a mean score of 1.37, and a standard deviation of 1.45 (Table 4.6). The scores reported on the Alcohol/Drug subscale ranged from zero to eight, with a mean score of 1.87, and a standard deviation of 2.13 (Table 4.7). Reported scores on the Angry/Irritable subscale ranged from zero to nine, with a mean score of 3.15, and a standard deviation of 2.59 (Table 4.8). As each participant’s scores were provided as a total score and the individual item responses for each of the subscales were not available for this study, internal consistency could not be determined.
Chapter 4

Results

The current study was proposed and conducted in order to support the need to recognize and understand various criminogenic factors experienced by youth in Appalachia which is a lacking in the literature. Attention to this area is warranted as the Appalachian regions are home to more than 25 million people (Appalachian Regional Commission, 2010). Of interest in this study are the youth residing in some of the communities found within this region. Using the ecologically aligned systems based Importation theory (Irwin & Cressey, 1962), this study seeks to explore the relationships between traumatic experiences, anger, and substance use as measured on the MAYSI-2 (Grisso & Barnum, 2001) and their predictive relationship with IM. This chapter outlines the results of the current study exploring the predictive relationship between traumatic experiences, substance use, and anger as measured by the MAYSI-2 with IM as measured by qualitative data entered by the partnering youth detention center’s staff. Each hypothesis is reported as well as the results of the SPSSv.22 logistic regression analysis for each hypothesis test. The end of the chapter houses the tables depicting the demographic data obtained in this study as well as the logistic regression tables.

Hypothesis Test Results

Four hypotheses were formulated for this study to answer the four proposed research questions, each using logistic regression analysis as the test for the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The results of these tests are listed below.

Hypothesis Test 1
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$H_0.1$. There is no relationship between traumatic experiences and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.

Logistic regression analysis was used to test for a relationship between youths’ reported scores regarding Traumatic Experiences on the MAYSI-2 and the occurrence of being placed in a cell by staff as a form of a behavioral sanction. The omnibus test of model coefficients on the Traumatic Experiences sub-scale did not statistically differentiate whether a male juvenile detainee would be more likely to be placed in a cell as a sanction during their stay ($X^2(1) = 0.31, p = 0.577$). Traumatic Experiences did not significantly predict the occurrence of cell placement as a sanction (Wald = 0.313, $p = 0.576$) (Table 4.9). The results are represented on table 4.9. As a result the null hypothesis was not rejected suggesting that there was not a predictive relationship between these two presenting variables as indicated by the measures used. This finding of no significant relationship is consistent with other research in the area of predicting IM by using the MAYSI-2 (Butler et al., 2007), however it should be noted that research in this area is limited. Additionally the Butler et al. (2007) study was not reportedly associated to Appalachian youth.

Hypothesis Test 2

$H_0.2$. There is no relationship between substance use and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.

Logistic regression analysis was used to test for a relationship between youths’ reported scores regarding Alcohol/Drug use on the MAYSI-2 and the occurrence of being placed in a cell by staff as a form of a behavioral sanction. The omnibus test of model coefficients reported on the Alcohol and Drug sub-scale did statistically differentiate whether a male juvenile detainee
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would be more likely to be placed in a cell as a sanction during their stay ($X^2(1, N=767) = 12.034, p < 0.001$). Further this subscale significantly predicted the occurrence of cell placement as a sanction ($Wald = 12.340, p < 0.001$) (Table 4.10). Nagelkerke’s $R^2$ of .024 indicated a small portion of the variance is predicted by the model (Cohen, 1992). The results are represented on table 4.10. As a result the null hypothesis was rejected suggesting that there was a predictive relationship between the scores on the MAYS1-2 for the subscale Alcohol/Drug with placement within a cell as a sanction based upon the measures used. Specifically with a reported exponent beta of 1.150(Table 4.10), each score reported on the MAYS1-2 increases the probability of placement within a cell as a sanction by 0.15. Theoretically then this means that a person that scores a four on the MAYS1-2 is 0.45 times more likely to be placed in a cell when compared to a person with a score of one. This finding is inconsistent with other research in the area of predicting IM by using the MAYS1-2 (Butler et al., 2007), however it should be noted that research in this area is limited. Additionally the Butler et al. (2007) study was not reportedly associated to Appalachian youth.

**Hypothesis Test 3**

$H_o3$. *There is no relationship between anger and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.*

Logistic regression analysis was used to test for a relationship between youths’ reported scores regarding Anger/Irritability on the MAYS1-2 and the occurrence of being placed in a cell by staff as a form of a behavioral sanction. The range of scores reported on the MAYS1-2 by the youth ranged from 0 to 9, with this sample providing a mean score of 3.14 and a standard deviation of 2.587 (Table 4.8). The omnibus test of model coefficients reported on the Anger/Irritability sub-scale did not statistically differentiate whether a male juvenile detainee
would be more likely to be placed in a cell as a sanction during their stay ($X^2(1, N=767) = 1.517, p = 0.218$). Additionally Anger/Irritability did not significantly predict the occurrence of cell placement as a sanction (Wald = 1.525, $p = 0.217$) (Table 4.11). The results are represented on table 4.11. As a result the null hypothesis was not rejected as there was not an indication of a predictive relationship between these two presenting variables as indicated by the measures used. This finding is not consistent with other research in the area of predicting IM by using the MAYSI-2 (Butler et al., 2007), as the above mentioned study found a relationship between the Anger/Irritability scales and misconduct. The reported dependent variables on the Butler et al. (2007) study were not consistent with the current work. Additionally the Butler et al. (2007) study was not reportedly associated to Appalachian youth.

**Hypothesis Test 4**

$H_04$. There are no relationships between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with reported institutional misconduct for juvenile males detained in an Appalachian regional detention setting.

Logistic regression analysis was used to test for relationships between the combined effects of youths’ reported scores regarding Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, and Anger/Irritability as reported on the MAYSI-2, with reported race, reported age, and reported length of stay on occurrence of being placed in a cell by staff as a form of a behavioral sanction. The omnibus test of model coefficients reported on the combined variables in this model did statistically differentiate whether a male juvenile detainee would be more likely to be placed in a cell as a sanction during their stay ($X^2 (6, N=767) = 130.633, p < 0.001$). Controlling for all the variables combined within this model, only duration was a statistically significant predictor of youth placement in a cell as a sanction when controlling for the other variables (Wald = 103.402,
Nagelkerke’s R² of .245 indicated a large portion of the variance is predicted by the model (Cohen, 1992). Alcohol and drug was no longer significant (Wald = 3.085, \( p < 0.079 \)) (Table 4.12), Anger and Irritability was not significant (Wald = 0.044, \( p < 0.833 \)) (Table 4.12), Traumatic experiences was not significant (Wald = 0.26, \( p < 0.873 \)) (Table 4.12), Race presented as not significant (Wald = 0.063, \( p < 0.801 \)) (Table 4.12), and age was not significant (Wald = 1.221, \( p < 0.269 \)) (Table 4.12). As a result the null hypothesis was rejected suggesting that there were predictive relationships in this model between these presenting variables as indicated by the measures used, specifically Duration and youth placement within a cell as a sanction. In application of these findings in relation to duration which yielded an exponent beta score of 1.209 (Table 4.12), each day the youth is detained the probability of their placement within a cell as a sanction is increased by 0.20. In essence then a youth who is placed in detention for four days is 0.60 times more likely to be placed in a cell compared to a youth detained for only one day. These findings are new to the literature as the variables analyzed with youth within an Appalachian regional county were not discovered during a review of the literature.

**Summary**

The current study was designed to explore the potential relationship between the three subscales of; Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, and Anger/Irritability with the reported incidence of IM of the partnering detention facility; located within an Appalachian regional county. Additionally a fourth analysis was conducted in order to explore the potential relationship among each of the identified independent variables and IM when controlling for each of them as well as the race of the youth, the duration of time incarcerated, and the age of the youth. Using bivariate logistic regression analysis there was not a significant relationship that
was presented in the current data sets between Traumatic Experiences, and Anger/Irritability as measures by the MAYSI-2 and IM as reported by the partnering detention facility located within an Appalachian regional county. Using the same statistical procedures there was an observed significant relationship between Alcohol/Drug as measured on the MAYSI-2 and IM. Finally in the test of the fourth hypothesis controlling for Traumatic Experiences, Anger/Irritability, Alcohol/Drug, duration of stay, race, and age duration was the only variable to demonstrate significance in predicting IM.
**Tables**

### Table 4.1 Demographics reported age at time of intake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Age</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu=15.45, \ SD=1.479$

### Table 4.2 Length of stay in Detention center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu=5.66, \ SD=5.127$

### Table 4.3 Demographics by reported race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 Youth placement in cell as a sanction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not placed in Cell</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Cell</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Demographics Appalachian Regional Coalition recognized Zip Codes as reported by youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45102</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45103</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45106</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45107</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45122</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45157</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45176</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45244</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45245</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45255</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Scores reported on the MAYSII for subscale Traumatic Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of items endorsed by youth</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu=1.37$, $SD=1.442$
Table 4.7 Scores reported on the MAYSII-II for subscale Alcohol/Drug

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of items endorsed by youth</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu=1.86$, $SD=2.121$

Table 4.8 Scores reported on the MAYSII-II for subscale Anger/Irritability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of items endorsed by youth</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu=3.14$, $SD=2.587$

Table 4.9. Bivariate Logistic Regression Analysis for Traumatic Experiences on Placement within a Cell as a Sanction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.400</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>126.682</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2$ Nagelkerke=.001, $R^2$ Cox & Snell =.000

Table 4.10. Bivariate Logistic Regression Analysis for Alcohol/Drug on Placement within a Cell as a Sanction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drug</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>12.340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.640</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>168.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2$ Nagelkerke=.024, $R^2$ Cox & Snell =.016
Table 4.11. Bivariate Logistic Regression Analysis for Anger & Irritability on Placement within a Cell as a Sanction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger &amp; Irritability</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.489</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>106.748</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2$ Nagelkerke = .003, $R^2$ Cox & Snell = .002

Table 4.12. Summary of Logistic Regression Results for Alcohol/Drug, Anger/Irritability, Traumatic Experiences, Duration, Race, and Age on Placement within a Cell as a Sanction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drug</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>3.085</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger &amp; Irritability</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>103.402</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.693</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2$ Nagelkerke = .245, $R^2$ Cox & Snell = .156
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive power of three constructs of Anger/Irritability, Substance Abuse, and Traumatic Experiences on institutional misconduct among juveniles living within an Appalachian county. Three hypotheses were developed to test these respective relationships. Additionally a fourth hypothesis was generated to examine these three factors along with reported age, race, and duration of stay to account for the comprehensive experience of the youth detained within the partnering detention facility. The study was specifically designed to examine the relationship between these constructs and IM with males aged 12-17 who identified as residing within a southern Ohio Appalachian regional county as identified by the Appalachian Regional Coalition. Through the use of convenience sampling, archival data originally collected for administrative processing, was provided by the partnering detention center for use with this analysis.

This chapter will discuss the distribution of demographics for the youth within the study, the instrumentation used to measure the independent variables, the constructs of the partnering agency’s criteria for IM, and statistical test outcomes generated for each of the hypotheses. In addition it will offer policy, clinical, correctional, and theoretical implications based upon the outcomes. Finally limitations of the study as well as direction for future research will be offered.

Discussion of Descriptive Data

The study utilized convenience sampling and secondary data generated and maintained by a youth detention center located within a southern Ohio Appalachian regional county. For the purposes of this study only data collected on males from the age of 12 through 17 who resided
within the partnering detention center for up to 20 days were used, as this was reported to be the most prevalent group serviced by this facility (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013).

The partnering detention center reported using three criteria in determining race; White, Black, and Other. The majority of the males utilized in this study identified as White (92.8%), followed by Black (4.8%), and then Other (2.3%). This representation is inconsistent with the data presented by the ARC who report a “White” Appalachian population of 83.5%, a “Black Non-Hispanic” population of 9.1%, a “Hispanic or Latino” population of 4.2, and an “Other” category consisting of 3.1 percent of the population (ARC, 2012). It should be noted that the criteria utilized by the partnering detention center in this study is different than that represented by the ARC (2012), specifically the partnering detention center did not utilize a “Hispanic or Latino” nor did they recognize a “Black Non-Hispanic” category instead “Hispanic or Latino” would fit the criteria of other, and “Black Non-Hispanic” were identified as Black. Each of the entries utilized in this study reported an address that was consistent with being located within an Appalachian county at the time of their intake to the detention center.

**Discussion of Instrumentation**

Three of the MAYSI-2 scales were of interest for the current study including Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug use, and Anger/Irritability. Initial independent evaluation of each of the subscales has generated reliability measures for each of the instrument’s scales in relation to their ability to accurately report in the areas of interest (Grisso et al., 2001). In prior studies among male populations the Traumatic Experiences scale was identified as having an internal reliability coefficient of .63, the Alcohol/Drug use scale had a reported internal reliability score of .80, and the Anger/Irritability scale had a reported internal reliability score of .80 (Grisso et
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al., 2001). Efforts to obtain the actual administrations of the MAYSI -2 from the partnering agency were not possible given the method in which they maintained their files. This resulted in no ability to obtain an actual test for internal consistency with this population. Additionally there was no evidence of this instrument being tested for utility for the Appalachian population present in the literature. Identifying with other studies supporting the findings of Grisso & Barnum (2001) it was determined that use of this instrument seemed reasonable within the context of this study (Grisso et al, 2001). The partnering agency reported that all administrations of the MAYSI-2 were valid and had been incorporated as a core component of their intake process.

The use of this instrument seemed a reasonable fit as it identified the three factors considered to be of interest with the Appalachian population in relation to having some effect on misconduct. Research had linked trauma as a potential precipitant for institutional misconduct among prisoners (DeLisi et al., 2010). This feature of the MAYSI-2 was valuable in examining the presence of these phenomena as the members of rural regions, like many of the Appalachian counties, may also be at risk of increased traumatic experiences (Deskerdy, 2007).

Recognition of the presence of drug and alcohol prevalence in rural communities has been heavily examined (Cronk & Sarvela, 1997; Pettigrew et al., 2012; Donnermeyer, 1992; Warner & Leukfield, 2001) thus making this feature of the MAYSI-2 attractive as it attempts to identify factors that may suggest that the respondent is in need of services for this particular area. Research has identified a link between alcohol and drug use with IM (Jiang, 2004), thus making this subscale reasonable for this project.

Examination of anger in understanding potential occurrences of IM seems logical as reports of anger have been linked to patterns of aggression (White & Widom, 2003). This presented as an area of as rural Appalachian youth may be at elevated risk to have life
experiences (Deskeredy & Joseph, 2006) that elevate their aggressive behaviors (Novaco & Chemtob, 1998). The presence of this subscale on the MAYSI-2 re-enforced its use within this study.

**Discussion of Institutional Misconduct**

Institutional Misconduct is defined as behaviors within a correctional facility that are outside of the expected rules for that facility (Berk, Kriegler & Baek, 2006). The actions that fall under this category are various as differing institutions have their own set of rules that are identified within acceptable limits. Infractions can range from minor verbal outbursts to actions that could be considered criminal, and at times charges may be filed by the institutions (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013). Additionally each facility may have unique designations for the level of interventions utilized for each of the various infractions. Appendix A of this document outlines the rules and potential sanctions recognized by the partnering agency. For the purposes of this study, institutional misconduct was measured more by the partnering agency’s staff response to violations than for the violations themselves. IM was measured by the sanction implemented and documented by the staff resulting in the youth being placed in their cell. There were no specific descriptors of the infractions that took place in each of the situations in which the sanctions were offered. As a result this measure is essentially of a qualitative nature subject to the interpretation of the staff and how they apply the rules and sanctions. This concept is identified as discretion. This area of criminal justice has received attention more so in the policing arenas; however, it is equally present in the correctional settings (Walker, 1993). In practice, staff may treat various youth more favorably than others, thus potentially modifying the outcome of the application of sanctions.
Discussion of Hypotheses

Hypotheses were generated to assist in the examination of the constructs of Anger/irritability, Substance Abuse, and Traumatic Experiences and their effect on IM. Utilizing an ecologically oriented theory hypotheses were generated for each of the relationships between the dependent variable and the independent variables. Specifically Importation theory was utilized. This theory suggests that a person who lives within one context, when placed in a different environment with differing expectations and rules which differ from previous rule sets, will experience difficulties within the new context (Zamble & Porporino, 1990). Part of this theory assumes that behaviors and attitudes that are acceptable within one setting then are not reasonable within the new setting. This is observed in this study as youth who are removed from their respective communities are placed in a highly restrictive detention facility. Specific stressors of the new setting may be the reduced acceptability of anger outbursts and or lack of access to substances. As a result of the shift in expectations and acceptability youth may engage in unacceptable behavior patterns. Each of the following hypotheses tested the effect of these predisposing factors on IM, providing an indication of the role of such person and environmental factors on the juvenile’s behavior in this new setting.

Discussion of Hypothesis 1

The first hypotheses test in this study was developed to answer the research question; is there a relationship between traumatic experiences and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county? This hypothesis was developed after consideration of the potential for traumatic experiences that youth in Appalachia may be exposed to (Bull, 2010).
Consistent with a similar study (Butler, Loney, & Kistner, 2007) the findings from the logistic regression did not reach statistical significance, and therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. Having offered these findings however, there is still merit to the current work as it shows that the instrumentation and reporting standards of the partner detention center do not recognize a significant relationship between Traumatic Experiences and institutional misconduct.

**Discussion of Hypothesis 2**

The Second hypotheses test in this study was developed to answer the research question; is there a relationship between substance use and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county? This hypothesis was generated after findings within the literature supported the presence of high levels of substance use among Appalachian populations (Pettigrew, Miller, Krieger & Hecht, 2012).

The findings related to this hypothesis did support the presence of a relationship between substance use and institutional misconduct, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This study discovered that for each additional item endorsed on the Alcohol/Drug scale the male resident was 1.15 times more likely to be placed in his cell as a sanction. These findings are consistent with other findings offered by Houser et al., (2012) suggesting that alcohol and drug use may be a predictor of IM. Noteworthy however is the recognition of differing genders between the populations studied in this study and the Houser et al., (2012), study which analyzed female adults. In the study presented by Butler et al. (2007) examining the misconduct of male juveniles over 90 days, they did not find a predictive relationship between Alcohol/Drug use and misconduct in their analysis. The current findings suggesting a relationship between alcohol/Drug use and IM are intriguing and worthy of additional exploration.
Discussion of Hypothesis 3

The third hypotheses test in this study was developed to answer the research question; is there a relationship between anger and reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county? This hypothesis was developed after recognition of the potential presence of anger for youth in Appalachia. There are supporting factors to promote recognition of the presence of anger for these youth, for example domestic aggression (Bull, 2010).

The results of this hypotheses test did not reach statistical significance; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. In the similar study presented by Butler et al., (2007), Anger/Irritability was found to have a significant positive relationship among the male juvenile population over a 90 day period of review. As such continued exploration of a relationship between these factors is meaningful as anger has been identified as a potential contributor to acting out (Butler et al., 2007; Dubro, 1992).

Discussion of Hypothesis 4

The fourth and final hypotheses test in this study was developed to answer the research question; is there a relationship between traumatic experiences, substance abuse, anger/irritability, race, age, and length of stay with reported institutional misconduct for male juvenile detention residents detained in a facility located within an Appalachian county? The purpose for this hypothesis was to test if each of the above factors combined had an impact on the occurrence of reported institutional misconduct when analyzed together. The only independent variable to demonstrate significance in this model was duration, or length of stay (minimum of 1 day, maximum of 20 days) in review of this particular analysis. The bivariate logistic regression analysis controlling for all the other variables in this particular hypothesis
revealed that for each day unit increase the resident was 1.20 times more likely to receive placement in their cell as a sanction. Findings associated to time incarcerated as a predictor of IM are mixed and dated (Flanagan, 1980; Goetting & Howson, 1986). Flanagan (1980) was able to identify that longer sentences were associated to reduced misconducts likely related to the method of which longer term inmates adapt to their environment in contrast to short term inmates. In contrast, Goetting and Howson (1986) identified age, race, and gender as stronger predictors of misconduct in lieu of duration incarcerated. While the designs of these two studies were not identical their findings are intriguing in that duration seemingly is an ambiguous factor to understand in relation to misconducts. Also noteworthy is that both of these authors generated their results utilizing an adult prison population. There is currently limited data in the research examining the effect of duration on an adolescent detention population, and while this study found this variable to be significant, the impact of this variable on misconducts for this population is worthy of future examination. Additionally it is noteworthy to recognize within this logistic model that Alcohol/drug was no longer significant when controlled for all other variables. The predictive strength of Duration was such that it resulted in the significance of Alcohol/Drug (p = 0.079) as being just outside of the acceptable threshold of p < 0.05 level.

The findings suggested by this research question are that environmental factors, out of the control of the individual, are worthy of exploration when attempting to predict occurrences of IM. This is consistent with deprivation theory (Irwin & Cressey, 1962) as it supports the idea that the change in the environment has a larger impact on reported IM. Further research to explore if deprivation is a factor that predicts IM is worthy of attention.

**Summary Discussion of Hypotheses**
The discovery of no relationship between Traumatic Experiences and IM in the first hypothesis test was rather interesting. The literature has suggested that there is a relationship between the presence of traumatic experiences and psycho-social problems (Siegal & Williams, 2003; Widom, 1989; Wolff et al., 2014). The cycle of violence as proposed by Widom (1989), suggests that persons who were exposed to abuse present with increased odds of deviance and incarceration. Therefore to identify that within this study there was not a predictive relationship raises a few questions. First what is the ability of the instrument within this study to accurately predict the presence of trauma with youth residing within Appalachian communities? A review of the literature was not able to yield any evidence to suggest there is a meaningful fit for this instrument and Appalachian youth. Exploring the fit of this tool, and others, with Appalachian youth appears to be an important next logical step.

It would be erroneous however to suggest that the instrumentation alone is responsible for the lack of evidence for any meaningful relationship here. Other challenges may include cultural variations among the Appalachian communities, discretion of the patterning agency, and how trauma is defined among our target population. It is documented that Appalachian families are guarded when it comes to relationships with outsiders or larger institutions (Keefe, 2005). Therefore knowing how individuals in these Appalachian communities express, and experience trauma would be of great interest. Taking into consideration some of the various traumas experienced by the Appalachian communities and families across generations, suppression of standard trauma based expressions might be observed. This examination would greatly assist in the process of engaging youth who are incarcerated, as the incarceration process itself may be perceived as a traumatic and troubling experience leading to greater levels of withdraw and misrepresentation of self on assessment instrumentation. An examination of the potential for
fictitious and or underreporting reporting may be of merit for a clearer understanding of the
dynamics factoring into these findings. Recognition of the historical lack of trust and regard for
authority might be an interesting component of this examination, (Algeo, 2003; Elam, 2002). It
could be that these traditional positions have had an impact on youth’s willingness to disclose to
correctional staff their experiences as a result of an engrained disdain of governmental
authority. Further, there is no clear definition of how trauma is defined for this population. The
literature speaks volumes about the trauma of the land, however little of the people within that
land.

Additionally, there is no evidence that the partnering agency is administering the
instrument as intended, nor is there evidence of the consistency in measuring the dependent
variable of IM as a result of discretion (light, 1990). A programmatic review of the partnering
agency itself may be able to shed more light on some of these implications.

As a whole, the result of this particular hypothesis test raises more questions than
answers. Recognizing that there is an incongruent fit between the outcomes presented within
this study and some evidence currently in the research literature, further examination is
warranted. Perhaps evaluation of the methodological procedures and research design itself can
be helpful in collecting additional data to pursue a greater understanding of the relationship
between Traumatic Experiences and IM within this population.

The result of the second hypothesis test is exciting in that it there is conflicting results in
the literature regarding the relationship between Alcohol/Drug and IM. There has been a long
standing recognition of connections between drug use and psycho-social problems, hence the
inclusion of the current research question to examine these phenomena with the current
population. Seeing drug use as a behavioral feature in lieu of a psycho-social factor however
makes this particular test unique, as use of substances may be in response to either trauma or anger, as a means of reducing the strain experienced from those two features. Compounding that with the recognition of increasing drug related problems within rural and Appalachian regions (Pettigrew, Miller, Krieger & Hecht, 2012; Scaramella & Keyes, 2001; Thornton, Deitz-Allyn, 2010), considerable attention is needed to further explore this variable.

While this predictive relationship answers the primary research question, within this test arises a few additional questions. First what are some of the factors that might be influencing this relationship? In a sense what are the variables within this relationship that youth in the current partnering detention facility are experiencing that supports this relationship. Further is this experience generalizable to other members of the Appalachian population with similar experiences of having a relationship with the Criminal Justice correctional system.

Another question becomes to what extent Appalachian youth experience drug use problems. Thornton & Deitz-Allyn, (2010) asserted that drug use in Appalachia was a growing problem. Beyond this however it is also recognized that drugs have had a place throughout Appalachian history (Leukefeld, et al., 2007). Knowing more about how this history combined with current stressors relates to the various patterns of substance use for youth residing in Appalachia is warranted. With a greater understanding of how drug use is impacting Appalachian youth, perhaps services may be able to target some of the needs required to reduce this growing problem.

An additional look within the facility itself is reasonable with regard to drug use and the potential implications. Berk, Kriegler & Baek, (2006) recognize that potential misconduct within a correctional facility may be drug use itself. Examining the frequency of potential drug use while incarcerated would be helpful, as well the prevalence of consequences for such use.
which would certainly meet criteria for placement within a cell (see Appendix B). Additional examination and evaluation of the facilities qualitative data regarding infractions may be of merit in exploring this area further.

Another interesting consideration for the findings in this study relates to the recognition of substance use as a being a statistically sound predictor for IM as reported by the youth and staff. Understanding more about patterns of use for youth in this region and the potential relationship between that use and trauma and anger seems logical. For example, is the use of substances being done as a method for avoiding or managing past traumatic experiences and features of present feelings of anger? Furthermore understanding the place of drug use in the Appalachian youth’s culture would be important. Perhaps recognition of substance use is seen as less problematic than features of anger and trauma, perhaps even as a form of a rite of passage.

Answering the question regarding the relationship discovered within this hypothesis test in the partnering detention facility is encouraging. Still there remain many more unanswered questions resulting from these findings that deserve exploration. Acknowledging that the prevalence of drugs continue to remain a problem within the Appalachian region (Thornton & Deitz-Allyn, 2010) there remains much potential for enhancing the lives of youth by exploring these variables further.

The third research hypothesis test was designed as a result of the recognized link between anger and aggression (Kimonis et al., 2007). Further Bull, (2010) acknowledged that domestic aggression is a concern within Appalachian communities. The link between aggression and IM seemed logical; however the results of this study did not support this link. A re-examination of the measured variables in this test is reasonable. As this population may have been consistently exposed to higher levels of long term violence and abuse (Bull, 2010) exploration of the
instrumentation used to measure anger seems reasonable. In a sense if youth within Appalachia have normalized thoughts and feelings of anger and aggression they may not be as responsive to the measures represented on the MAYSI-2.

Again to explore challenges with the instrumentation is not the only area of further need here in understanding these findings. Exploring some of the culturally specific reactions to stressors seems important. For example an examination of how these youth experience and express their anger would make sense. Recognizing the potential for long term generational anger as a condition of the family cycle of violence (Widom & Maxfield, 2001), it may be that youth residing within the current population have a manifestation of angry feelings that is not consistent with other cultural groups. Also as this study was examining the response of youth being relocated to a new environmental context as a part of their inclusion for this study, perhaps the innate guarded quality of the Appalachian population (Keefe, 2005) is also influencing outcomes in this measure. Additionally there is merit to recognize the potential for suppression of certain traits as a result of cultural distrust of authority as a contributing feature effecting the outcome of this test. Exploration of the potential for youth to be suppressing their emotions and or redirecting them into more covert outlets not recognized by authority would be very interesting.

The findings in hypothesis test four are extremely important. First of noteworthy attention is examining the overall model and the importance of recognizing that this hypothesis test is the most comprehensive and therefore closest to the actual experience of youth in the detention setting generated in this study. Next is the shift of Alcohol/Drug use to non-significance, and finally the importance of recognizing the importance of duration.
What seemed very surprising is that when each of the selected variables were selected together in this test, the previously significant Alcohol/Drug scale was no longer significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. The predictive strength of duration was seemingly so strong that it had the greatest effect on the logistic model. Examination of the relationship between duration and Alcohol/Drug yielded no interactional effects with the current data available. Understanding what is actually occurring between these two variables is not clear in the given study. It is possible that youth respond differently to detainment in relation to adults. Further it is documented that youth substance use experiences differ within age groups, and certainly vary from adult drug use (SAHMSA, 2013). Additional examination of these variables, specifically studying the potential for various relationships between substance use and the amount of time incarcerated, is warranted as it is recognized that a large percentage of the incarcerated population in the US have drug related experiences and or convictions. A better understanding of the experience of persons presenting with these features is a logical direction for additional review.

Seemingly the most intriguing outcome of the current model was the effect of duration on the logistic model. Initially factors specific to the youth and the environments where they live were targeted as the variables of interest. Now there is evidence to suggest that the immediate environmental effects of the detention setting warrant further investigation. Research regarding time incarcerated has suggested that longer periods afford greater time for adjustment (Flanagan, 1980) thus less potential for IM. In the current study however this does not hold true and an explanation for this is not presently clear. Exploration of short term adjustment to incarceration and resources of short term facilities seem to be logical areas of study to identify factors that may contribute to the increased probability of IM related to length of stay for the youth residing
within the partnering detention center. Also this study specifically looked at only youth incarcerated for up to twenty days. It is possible that long term periods of incarceration may have a different effect on youth. It may be that the current study is targeting a time of high volatility and adjustment for the youth. A better understanding of their phenomenological experiences would be very intriguing as this can afford researchers greater insights to the specific struggles experienced by youth. Examination of these stressors as well as how they may change over time then may offer a different understanding of the youth’s time incarcerated.

Policy recommendations

Given the findings on this study, further evaluation is considered to be important to fully examine the current research questions and be able to generalize the findings to the Appalachian community as a whole. Nonetheless the findings of this study offer some interesting inferences into the current functioning of the youth within the partnering detention facility, and perhaps about the functioning of the facility itself. First additional examination of the presence of drug and alcohol related issues seems to be of merit including exploration of service implementation and additional screening to test for the predictable relationship that was eluded to in this study, however overridden by the variable of duration when all variables were controlled for in the fourth hypothesis.

Another direction for policy consideration is the context of the detention facility itself. Given the significance of duration in predicting IM it appears that evaluation of the facility and other contextual factors (ie. Staff issues, facilities, living conditions, etc.) may be able to further understand some of the factors that may increase the likely of youth to engage in IM. This recommendation is grounded in the assertions of Irwin & Cressy (1962) in describing deprivation theory.
Clinical Implications

The current study offers a number of clinical implications that can be considered for mental health and substance abuse counselors. In the current study, the partnering institution reported that nearly 20 percent of their population had engaged in conduct warranting a placement in their cell. A review of the literature did not find any evidence of how this variable compares to other studies; however recognition of this frequency and cost, even by dated standards (Lovell & Jamelka, 1996) suggest that additional services attempting to mediate sanctions is of value. The role of clinical services may be able to help mitigate this frequency by targeting specific interventions towards the areas of supporting youth in their ability to meet the criteria needed to be released from custody within the shortest time frame possible. This can be accomplished by focusing on interventions that may meet the needs of the youth both in the institution and in the home settings. By focusing on services that may reduce the duration of time spent in detention (i.e., home settings and fitness of parents, admission to outpatient community based clinical services in a timely manner, and inclusion of services to assist in management of stressors while incarcerated), institutions may, in turn, reduce IM.

Additionally in consideration of the findings of a relationship between Alcohol/Drug as Measured by the MAYSI-2 and the independent relationship to IM as represented in this study, implementation of services addressing this area may be of merit. An increase in the presence of clinical and chemical dependency providers presents a logical strategy to implement as a means of targeting some of the challenges that may be present for youth struggling with the duress of incarceration. By offering these clinical services perhaps youth that might be experiencing difficulties as a result of a lacking coping mechanism, like drugs, a reduction in IM could be the
result. Additional analysis of the relationship between drug and alcohol based needs with IM may be of merit for youth and the detention facilities.

This task of implementing additional services would require the permission of correctional institutions to allow for the presence of clinical providers within their facility resulting in a multi systemic approach to meeting presenting concerns. This is an area that has great potential for youth populations. One service that makes sense is the implementation of clinical assessments, which require clinically trained professionals to provide, that can provide a greater level of detection of symptoms that may increase the risks for youth to engage in IM. Another possible direction in which these services could impact the frequency of misconducts is by implementing strategies for reducing the amount of time youth are detained, which at times can be drug related (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication 2013). Additionally by focusing on strengthening the community and family settings in which youth will return to, as well as providing stress coping strategies, potentially related to the strains of the facility and or drug related stress, while incarcerated would be of merit, as reduced infractions of youth while incarcerated can likely reduce the length of stay if the courts may be agreeable to no longer find the detainment of the youth as necessary (Partnering Detention Center administration, personal communication, April 29, 2013).

**Correctional Implications**

Taking into consideration the many challenges associated to institutional misconduct such as costs both financial and personnel (Lovell & Jamelka, 1996), it makes sense that criminal justice organizations would benefit from examining what specific factors may contribute to institutional misconduct as a strategy for reducing these phenomena. Additionally as IM may contribute to a longer duration of stay, which demonstrated a predictive relationship with IM
thus creating a cycle of IM and longer durations of stay, recognition of factors that can address these concerns is important. Future longitudinal studies should examine not only the youth being detained, but the conditions of the facility as well (Steiner, Butler & Ellison, 2014). Further increasing the ability of researchers and clinical providers to engage and promote services to the youth being served in the detention centers may be of merit, as this may promote a greater understanding of the internal and external working of the youth being served by these providers.

**Study Limitations**

The participants utilized in this study were selected through convenience sampling of a single institution. The information was a cross sectional design data collection model of secondary historical documentation generated by an Appalachian county youth detention center with a pre-existing relationship with the primary investigator of this study. Additionally the information that was collected and analyzed was generated with the intention to be utilized as documentation of a correctional purpose established by the partnering detention center. An examination of the collected data was reviewed and there were no apparent outliers within the data set.

There are certain intrinsic limitations with the use of any self-report instrument. The MAYSI-2 is one such instrument in which the information collected is based entirely on the report of youth being entered into the criminal justice systems during the initial stages of the intake process. As such this information is subject to be not accurate in the sense that respondents may present in a fictitious manner. Some examples of fictitious reporting can include malingering and or exaggeration of symptoms, as well as under reporting of symptoms. This information is not subject then to triangulation or some other form of validating source. For
cases in which the youth may not have fully completed the MAYSI-2 at the time of intake they were removed from the pool of respondents presented for examination in this study.

One important consideration within this study is that no findings in the current literature were discovered comparing the utility of the MAYSI-2 with the Appalachian population. Further the developers of the MAYSI-2 normed their instrument with only Massachusetts and California groups (Grisso & Barnum, 2001), the likelihood of Appalachians being represented in that study is not likely. While the literature offered findings of internal consistency and reliability for the use of this tool, with marginal internal consistently for the MAYSI-2 measure of Traumatic Experiences (Grisso et al., 2001), none of the findings were specific to this population. Future research regarding detection of potential risks factors that may be precursors to predicting IM is meaningful. In this exploration not only is testing the utility of the MAYSI-2 reasonable, but examination of other assessment tools with this population seems logical and even encouraged (Butler et al., 2007; Holsinger et al., 2006)

With respect to the measurement of the occurrence of placement in cell this study relied solely on the discretion of the staff operating within the partnering detention center. This facility relies on the services of numerous individuals in the role of Youth Leader all subject to apply their own level of discretion when deploying this particular sanction. The role of the youth leader is to serve as the direct care staff for youth in the detention center. This role includes the determination of infractions and implementation of sanction. A review of their duties is present in appendix B. The facility reported that the staff members are trained to follow specific rule sets; however there is no empirically based control in place to assure accuracy in the application of this sanction. As a result there is not a sound measure to ensure that the utilization of this sanction is consistent.
Race as defined by the partnering agency was limited at best with only three categories of White, Black, and Other. This may have some implications on the cultural emphasis of this work. In the 2010 census regarding racial identity for the county the current study was conducted in the following demographic data was distributed as; white = 95.9%, Black or African American = 1.4%, American Indian and Alaska Native = 0.2%, Asian alone = 1.1%, Native Hawaiian = value greater than zero but less than half unit of measure shown, Two or more races = 1.4%, Hispanic or Latino = 1.7% (United States Census Bureau, 2015). While data specific to persons under the age of eighteen, as was required to be participants in this study, was not available it is not unlikely that the youth may be consistent with the represented figures reported on the census data. As such there is a recognized limitation in the coding of the race as offered by the partnering agency.

**Directions for Future Research**

Despite the above listed limitations there are findings within this work that suggest several directions for future research. First would be expanding the current study across numerous Appalachian detention centers throughout the Appalachian region which could offer a greater level of understanding of this population as a whole versus one singular sample drawn from a single site. In completing this expansion an emphasis should be placed upon the use of culturally sensitive measurements to explore the individual level features as well as some of the policy and procedural features of the facilities being examined.

The above recommendation may be augmented if additional instrumentation could be utilized in the measurement of the factors being assessed. Specific examination of the utility of the MAYSI-2, or any of the other instruments with an Appalachian specific population to measure these instruments’ ability to predict intended measures with this group of unique
individuals would be of merit. Such instruments could include but should not be limited to the Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (Butler et al., 2007) or the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (Holsinger et al., 2006).

Additionally qualitative assessment may provide a level of insight unique to the youth residing within Appalachian communities that are not detectable with current screens and assessment tools normalized for the US general population. Along with this additional data collection model likely including numerous measures into the same study would be of value to the literature to identify specific instruments and measures that may be able to better understand this population.

Recommendations for the future design include the presence of primary data that was the result of intentional research analysis. The current study utilized archival data that was generated by the partnering detention center for tracking and documentation purposes. Future analysis with greater practical research design may be advantageous in examining the relationships between these two variables. This design can allow for addressing any of the various factors that may arise which can corrupt the data collection process including but not limited to the reluctance of partnering agencies to comply, mis-documentation by non-research trained personnel, and recognition of trends within the facility themselves that may be discovered to be of value for future review.

Also at the agency level it would be meaningful to identify the presence of drug related offenses. Exploration of the experiences of these youth while detained would be of merit. Specific questions would be directed to examine the presence of withdrawal symptoms, potential drug related charges, and use of substances while incarcerated. Comparing the findings of youth
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incarcerated to a study identifying features of youth using drugs in Appalachian communities without being incarcerated would be very interesting.

Included into evaluation of the partnering facility examination of the consistency of policy and procedural conduct of the staff would be interesting. Recognition of the role of the authority on youth might afford additional insights into the overall experience for the resident. One example might include the exploration of the response of the judges and or guards toward youth who are expected to have extended stays, drug related adjudications, and violent related offenses. Comparing these reactions to youth who do not display these features may offer insights into biases that impact staff discretion.

Given the cultural aspects of this study, recognition of qualities that may be specific to persons residing within Appalachian communities is essential. This is a population that has not received a tremendous amount of attention in the research historically; it is time for that to change. An examination of the presence of mistrust and guardedness, in a sense to see if some of the recognized historical traits are still prevalent in today’s Appalachian population, can be an invaluable scientific contribution to counselors and human service professionals. As well, the presence anger and how this anger is displayed for persons living in Appalachian communities would be very important to understand how they interact with the world.

Further examination of Trauma and the impact that traumatic experiences has on members of the Appalachian regions would be very intriguing. If the suggestion that Appalachian community members are at greater risk to be exposed to domestic violence and or aggression, would it be reasonable to think that these community members actually perceive traumatic experiences with a greater level of acceptance. In a sense do these individuals have a greater level of resilience to such exposure?
Conclusion

In this study the MAYSI-2 Scores of 769 male residents of an Appalachian county youth detention center were examined for their predictive ability to determine which youth may be more likely to be placed in their cell as a form of behavioral sanction. Three specific scales on the MAYSI-2 were examined to help understand some of the areas that may be intrinsic of the Appalachian American population; Traumatic Experiences, Alcohol/Drug, and Anger/Irritability. The findings concluded that only the variable of Alcohol/Drug had a significant predictive value on the determination of youth being placed in their cells as a sanction. However when tested while controlling for Race, Duration, Age, Traumatic Experiences, Anger/Irritability, and Alcohol/Drug use the Alcohol drug scale no longer maintained its significance at the p<.05 level. Duration, as measured in days incarcerated, however did account for being a significant predictor. Recommendations for future research directions were offered.
Appendix A:

Partnering Juvenile Detention Center Resident Handbook

This handbook will explain what is expected of you and what you can expect while being housed in the Detention Center. You will be given time to read this handbook during the intake process and a copy will be posted in the pods for you to read at a later time. Please read this handbook many times over so that you are familiar with the rules and regulations of the facility. If you have any questions about these rules or regulations, or need clarification, please ask a JDC staff member. You are required to follow all rules and regulations of the facility. If you fail to do so, you will be subject to disciplinary consequences. You will conduct yourself in a respectful manner with all JDC Staff.

RESIDENT RULES OF CONDUCT

Minor Violations

1. Swearing, lying, making obscene or threatening remarks, gestures, acts of bullying, or any other act of insubordination is prohibited.

2. Failure to follow staff instructions.

3. JDC staff members will be respectfully referred to by their first name.

4. Residents will follow classroom rules.

5. No leaning back on or laying on chairs, sitting on tables, putting feet on seats, tables, desks, or jumping on or over furniture.

6. Residents are required to keep their cell clean and toilets flushed.

7. Residents will fold their blankets and keep them neatly folded on their mat anytime the resident is out of their cell.

8. Residents will not block the lights, vents, or intercoms, in their cell, or have any unapproved items/contraband in their cells.

9. Residents will use proper hygiene, including taking showers.

10. Residents are not allowed to take food from another resident, give food away, conceal or save food, throw / play with food.

11. Communication to other residents between cells and / or rooms is not allowed. This includes singing, whistling, tapping or excessive noise.

12. Residents will not pass or receive telephone numbers, notes, addresses or pictures.

13. Residents will not talk or communicate with residents of the opposite sex while at JDC.
14. When moving from one location to another, residents will line up and remain in a single file, keeping their head down, eyes forward and hands placed behind their backs while remaining silent.

15. During pat downs you are to remain silent except to answer any questions staff may ask. Stay facing the wall, do not move, until told otherwise by staff.

16. Possession of another resident’s belongings is not allowed.

17. No physical contact with other residents including, but not limited to; arm wrestling, slap boxing, or horseplay of any type.

18. Misuse / Minor Destruction of Detention property, recreational and/or school supplies is not allowed.

19. Verbal outbursts, inappropriate responses, vulgar language, and profanities are not allowed.

20. Lying and Manipulation of staff is not allowed.

21. Residents will not disrespect staff, other residents, visitors, or probation officers.

22. Residents will not cause a disruption between staff and/or residents.

23. Residents are required to attend group activity.

24. Residents are not to cross the blue lines on the floor in the pods, unless directed by staff, to use the intercom, and/or an emergency exists.

25. When returning to your cell after activities do not look or go into other residents’ cells.

26. Residents are required to treat evacuation drills as if an actual emergency exists. **Major Violations:** (Will Result in Loss of all Levels).

26. Not returning to detention on time or immediately after approved activity/furlough is not allowed.

28. Gang activity is not allowed.

29. Possession of a deadly weapon and/or obtaining or concealing contraband is not allowed.

30. Serious threats made against staff, other residents, visitors, or probation officers is not allowed.
31. Escape or attempted escape is not allowed.

32. Physical fights with anyone including other residents, staff, visitors or probation officers is prohibited, whether provoked or unprovoked.

33. Serious acts of self mutilation/self harm and any type of suicide attempts are not allowed.

34. Residents will not start or attempt to start a riot.

35. Major Destruction of the facilities property is not allowed.

36. Residents are not allowed any type of sexual conduct and/or contact with any resident, visitor, staff or Probation Officer.

37. Punching / kicking walls, doors, etc., or banging head to the point of potential harm or injury is not allowed.

38. Physically resisting staff authority is not allowed.

**DISCIPLINE**

You are subject to disciplinary action for violation of any rule, regulation, or procedure contained in the Resident Handbook. Willful disobedience to any order or directive by staff members will also incur discipline.

Disciplinary action that can be taken against you includes re-clarification of the rules, loss of privileges, timeout, segregation time in isolation or your cell, and/or loss of reward group. Criminal acts committed in the facility, such as assault, destruction of property, etc., could result in criminal charges filed against you.

**PRIVILIGES**

Examples of privileges are: telephone calls, level privileges, (rec) recreation, voluntarily helping staff with cleaning duties, extra time out of your cell, any approved group or activity (not including school, child focus groups, etc.), books, cards, games/game pieces, extra group recreation time.

**GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE:**

If you have a complaint about a JDC policy or procedure, or you believe you have been wronged by another resident or a staff member, you may file a grievance.
Before filing a grievance about another resident, first discuss your problem with a shift leader; he/she may be able to resolve the situation. If the problem directly involves a staff member, or if the problem has not been resolved regarding another resident, you may ask for a grievance form. You will be given 15 minutes per day to write grievances and this time will be based on staff availability to safely allow the resident to do so. If the resident is not calm or is causing a disturbance, the resident will not be allowed to write a grievance until the shift leader deems the resident calm enough to do so.

Your grievance will be read by the Assistant Superintendent and/or the Superintendent and will be kept confidential. Either the Assistant Superintendent or the Superintendent will meet with you regarding the grievance and discuss the situation.

This is a breakdown of the level system which is based on length of time served and behavior. If you are written up, you can be subject to loss of level which you would have to earn back with positive behavior and no additional rule violations. Loss of level due to rule violations requires 14 days to progress back to next level.

**LEVEL I**  (1-14 days)
Two 5 minute phone calls per week. Allowed 1 book and 1 bible in cell.

**LEVEL II**  (15-30 days)
Two 7 minute phone calls per week. Allowed 2 books & 1 bible in cell.
Allowed deck of cards in cell.

**LEVEL III**  (31-60 days)
Two 8 minute phone calls per week. Allowed 2 books & 1 bible in cell.
Allowed deck of cards in cell.
May have additional half hour of level time after lights out.
(Discretion of staff)
1 letter in cell

**LEVEL IV**  (beyond 60 days)
Two 10 minute phone calls per week, one possible 5 min. level call. May call approved person other than parent. (Discretion of Supervisor/Asst.Superintendent/Superintendent)
Allowed deck of cards in cell.
May have additional hour of level time after lights out. (Discretion of staff)

2 Letters in cell

**TELEPHONE CALLS:**
During the intake process you will be allowed 1 phone call to your parent or guardian. If you refuse this phone call, a staff member will contact your parent or guardian to let them know the resident is at the facility, and to notify that parent/guardian of the detention hearing information. Residents will be allowed 2 phone calls per week, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday Evenings. Telephone calls, other than intake calls, attorney or probation officer calls, are a privilege that can be revoked for misbehavior.

**VISITATION:**
Juveniles are permitted 2 visits a week. Visitation days are Thursday evenings, and Saturday and Sunday afternoons. There will be no change in the visitation schedule due to Holidays. There is no physical contact allowed during visitation. Visitors are not permitted to bring in anything for the juvenile and juveniles are not allowed to give any items either.

**MEALS:**
You will receive three meals a day and one snack in the evening.
All meals will be eaten in your cell or designated area. Residents are not permitted to store or hide food in their cell. Residents are not allowed to take or trade food from another resident. Gambling for food is prohibited. Special diet meals will be provided to those residents that have a verified food allergy, or verified medical or religious food restriction.

**MEDICAL/MENTAL HEALTH CARE:**
In the event you have a medical problem during your stay in JDC you must put in a sick call slip requesting to see the nurse. The nurse conducts sick call 7 days a week. If necessary, you may be seen by the doctor during one of his/her regular visits. If you have a sudden medical emergency, notify any staff member immediately.
Residents are not permitted to wear contact lenses while here in JDC. Only prescription eye glasses will be allowed.
All prescription medication will be given to you by the nurse or a shift leader. You may refuse to take your medication without fear of consequences, but your refusal will be documented. If you are caught giving your medication to any other resident, you will receive consequences here in detention and you may have additional criminal charges filed against you.

**COUNSELORS**
You may request to speak with Child Focus staff during your stay here if your parent/guardian has signed the release form. Staff will add you to the request list and Child Focus Staff will meet with you individually at their next opportunity.

**RELIGIOUS SERVICES:**
While in detention, residents have the opportunity to voluntarily attend non-denominational church services, which are held on Sunday evenings. If residents do attend services they are required to act appropriately or they may be removed and/or written up.

Residents can also request to see a chaplain. If a resident would like to visit with their own minister from their church, they may ask their parent(s) to contact him/her and have them call detention to schedule an appointment.
RECREATION/EXERCISE:
Residents are allowed a minimum of 1 hour of recreation (rec) per day unless there is a medical restriction.

MAIL:
JDC provides all writing materials and stamps needed to write 2 letters a week. If you want to send out more than 2 letters a week, we will provide the paper, pencil and envelopes, but your parent/legal guardian must provide the extra stamps. All stamps will be kept in the control room and placed on the envelopes by staff. Juveniles are permitted to write anyone except:

- Other juveniles on probation, unless authorized by the juvenile’s probation officer.
- Persons who have a no contact order signed by the Judge or Magistrate.

All mail received by juveniles will be uncensored. Mail will be opened in front of the juvenile, by a JDC staff member, and checked for contraband. Resident’s envelopes must be addressed properly.

EMERGENCIES:
In the event of an emergency, such as a fire or a tornado warning, you will be told that an emergency exists. Tornado warnings - residents will be directed to go to the designated areas. Fire - If not already out of your cells you will be released from your cells and told to line up in preparation for evacuation. You will remain absolutely silent and will obey all instructions from staff. Evacuation routes are posted on placards in the pods; familiarize yourself with these routes. Emergency drills are conducted on a regular basis. Drills will be treated as if an actual emergency exists.

“Against the Wall”
If during a fight or emergency situation if a staff person says “Against the Wall” you will immediately stand against the wall, facing the wall, with your hands at your sides and will REMAIN SILENT. Failure to do so can result in disciplinary action.

RESIDENT CLOTHING AND HYGEINE
Residents uniforms will consist of:

1 uniform shirt and pants (blue for boys, green for girls)
1 pair underwear (boxers for boys)
1 undershirt (girls only)
1 pair of socks
1 pair of shoes

1 Sweatshirt (seasonal)

Residents will change shirts and pants on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Undershirts (girls only), underwear and socks will be changed daily and sweatshirts will be changed on Tuesdays and Fridays. All clothing will be handed out to residents by staff only. Residents are not allowed to ask for or wear bigger than appropriate sizes. Residents are not allowed to keep extra clothing.

Pants must be pulled up at all times, the pant legs must not be rolled up unless at rec w/ permission from staff, and waistbands cannot be rolled down. Sweatshirts and undershirts must be tucked in when out of your cell. Pants must be worn on the waist. No sagging.

Residents will receive 2 blankets which will be replaced on Fridays. All blankets must be folded neatly and placed at the foot of the bed before residents come out of their cell.

Residents will be given 4 minutes to shower. If you exceed the 4 minutes, staff will turn off the water. Residents will be encouraged to wash their hair.

Neither male nor female residents are allowed to have long fingernails at JDC. During intake and while a resident remains here, residents fingernails will be inspected, and if deemed too long, they will be directed to cut them, with staff present. Fingernail polish and make up must be removed at the time of intake. All hair extensions and hair braids must be removed or undone. Female residents shall be required to wear elastic hair ties any time they are out of their cells.

**DAILY CLEANING:**

You are required to participate in daily housekeeping of your pod and cell. Your pod and cell will be inspected daily by staff. Cleaning includes: floors swept and mopped; trash removed from cells and pod common area; all surfaces cleaned; showers cleaned. The laundry cart and the cleaning cart are off limits to residents. Staff will spray the chemicals as residents are not allowed to handle any of the cleaning chemicals.

**CONTRABAND:**

Contraband is any item that was not issued or made available to you by JDC, has been altered from its originally intended use, or legal items in excess quantities. Legal items in excess quantities include books, toilet paper, and linens are also considered contraband.

If an item in your possession violates the law, you may be charged with a crime. If an item in your possession violates a rule but is not otherwise unlawful to possess, you may face disciplinary action as well as having the item confiscated. You will be routinely searched anytime you enter the secured living area. You will be subject to search anytime contraband is suspected on your person or facility items/contraband are unaccounted for.
**COURT APPEARANCES**

If you were sent from court, you have either been adjudicated and given an amount of time to serve at disposition or you have been given another court date and remain with us until then.

If you were brought in by a police officer, probation officer or any other person authorized to drop you off, you will attend a detention hearing the following business day. If you are brought in on a weekend or holiday, then you will have a hearing on Monday morning or the next court day. Detention hearings are held at either eleven (11) am or one (1) pm. The Judge or Magistrate will determine if you will be released after the hearing or if you will remain in detention. All residents are required to wear handcuffs and shackles to and from court.

**PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT**

Information regarding your protection from sexual abuse/assault is on page 3 of the resident handbook. Please refer to the information posted in the classrooms and in room 10.
Appendix B:

Partnering Juvenile Detention Center STAFF GUIDE:

RESIDENT RULES OF CONDUCT AND CONSEQUENCES

Minor Violations

1. Swearing, lying, making obscene or threatening remarks, gestures, or any other act of insubordination including acts of bullying are prohibited.
2. Failure to follow staff instructions.
3. JDC staff members will be respectfully referred to by their first name.
4. Residents will follow classroom rules.
5. No leaning back on or laying on chairs, sitting on tables, putting feet on seats, tables, desks, or jumping on or over furniture.
6. Residents are required to keep their cell clean and toilets flushed.
7. Residents will fold their blankets and will keep them neatly folded on their mat anytime the resident is out of their cell.
8. Residents will not block the lights, vents, or intercoms, in their cell, or have any unapproved items/contraband in their cells.
9. Residents will use proper hygiene, including taking showers.
10. Residents are not allowed to take food from another resident, give food away, conceal or save food, throw / play with food.
11. Communication to other residents between cells and/or rooms is not allowed. This includes singing, whistling, tapping or excessive noise.
12. Residents will not pass or receive telephone numbers, notes, addresses or pictures.
13. Residents will not talk or communicate with residents of the opposite sex while at JDC.
14. When moving from one location to another, residents will line up and remain in a single file, keeping their head down, eyes forward and hands behind their backs while remaining silent.
15. During pat downs you are to remain silent except to answer any questions staff may ask. Stay facing the wall, do not move, until told otherwise by staff.
16. Possession of another resident’s belongings is not allowed.
17. No physical contact with other residents including, but not limited to; arm wrestling, slap boxing, or horseplay of any type.
18. Misuse of property, recreational and/or school supplies.
19. Verbal outbursts, inappropriate responses, vulgar language, and profanities are not allowed.
20. Lying and Manipulation of staff is not allowed.
21. Residents will not disrespect staff, other residents, visitors, or
probation officers.
22. Residents will not cause a disruption between staff and/or residents.
23. Residents are required to attend group activity.
24. Residents are not to cross the lines on the floor in the pods, unless directed by staff, to use the intercom, or an emergency exists.
25. When returning to your cell after activities do not look or go into other residents’ cells.
26. Residents are required to treat evacuation drills as if an actual emergency exists.

The shift leader/OIC will ultimately be responsible for approving all write ups and imposing all consequences during their shift. The consequences for rule violations shall be progressive and are as follows:

1st offense: write up and verbal re-clarification of the rules, possible loss of level, possible loss of privileges, and possible time out in a pod chair for up to 15 minutes.

2nd offense: write up, re-clarification of rules, possible loss of level, possible loss of privileges, possible 1-3 hour segregation/room restriction

3rd offense: write up, re-clarification of rules, possible loss of level, possible loss of privileges, possible 1-8 hour segregation/room restriction

Major Violations:
27. Not returning to detention on time or immediately after approved activity or furlough
28. Gang activity is not allowed.
29. Possession of a deadly weapon and/or obtaining or concealing Contraband
30. Serious threats made against staff, other residents, visitors, or Probation officers
31. Escape or attempted escape
32. Physical fights with anyone including other residents, staff, visitors or probation officers, whether provoked or unprovoked.
33. Serious acts of self harm/self mutilation and any type of suicide attempt
34. Starting or attempting to start a riot
35. Major destruction of facility property
36. Residents are not allowed any sexual conduct and/or contact with any resident, visitor, staff or Probation Officer.
37. Punching walls, doors, etc., or banging head to the point of potential harm or injury
38. Physically resisting staff authority is not allowed.

**The consequences for major violations are as follows:**

Write up, re-clarification of rules, loss of all levels, loss of privileges, 3 – 23 hour segregation/room restriction.

A resident may only receive a twenty-three (23) and one (1) room restriction (resident in their cell 23 hours out for 1 hour of recreation a day) with express verbal consent of the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent.

**The following are guidelines regarding “jurisdiction” during school / group programming:**

Teachers / group facilitators have jurisdiction regarding “School / Group Segregation” and “Time Out” when residents are involved directly in programming activities. The Supervisor on Duty has the discretion to intervene whenever safety / security concerns warrant staff involvement during programming activities, or when notified by teachers / group facilitators that assistance is needed due to resident behavior issues.

**School / Group Segregation** – If a resident is removed from school or group they will be placed on “school / group segregation”. “School / Group Segregation” will result in a school / group write up and possible loss of level, possible loss of privileges. Loss of level due to rule violations requires 14 days to progress back to next level.

If a resident is removed from class for the day due to behavior issues, the resident will be written up, and placed on segregation for the remainder of the class day and could be given an additional 1– 5 hour segregation time. One of the teachers will meet with the resident before the start of the next school day to determine if the resident is allowed to come back to class. If the resident is unwilling or deemed unable to return to class, he or she will be subject to additional segregation time for the day.
School / Group Time Out – At the teachers / group facilitator’s discretion, a resident can be removed from class / group programming activity for a “Time Out” period due to minor behavior issues. “Time Out’s” are designed to be brief in duration, and will require coordinated intervention by staff and teachers / group facilitators to accomplish. “Time Out’s” can take place in the hallway outside classrooms / room 10, back in the POD or in Isolation and should involve collaboration between the Supervisor on Duty and the Teachers / Group Facilitators. The ultimate goal with a resident placed in “Time Out” is the ability for that resident to exhibit a level of behavioral stability, to the point that he or she could be allowed to return to school / group programming activities.

Teachers are responsible for all behavioral reports / write ups of all “School / Group Segregations” / “Time Out’s” in Court View. If a Group Segregation / “Time Out occurs when neither teacher is present, the Supervisor on Duty is responsible for the completion of all behavioral reports / write ups.

Teachers / Group Facilitators and or the Supervisor on Duty must inform all residents placed on School / Group Segregation or “Time Out” the reasons for their removal, their consequences, and behavioral expectations as soon as possible, but no later than the same day the incident has occurred.

When calculating segregation time served, shift change, silent sustained reading, and meals in cells will count toward the total segregation time served.

Examples of privileges are: telephone calls, level privileges, (rec) recreation, voluntarily helping staff with cleaning duties, extra time out of your cell, any approved group or activity (not including school, child focus groups, etc.), books, cards, games/game pieces, extra group recreation time.
Appendix C:

School and Group Policy in Juvenile Detention Center

(Intake Education/Group Form)

Education Policy

The availability of school in Ohio Detention Centers is mandatory by law. The law states that we have to offer school. In our detention center the teachers reserve the right to refuse students that fail to comply with the rules and regulations within the classroom that will hinder the education of yourself and others. The educational focus will be based upon quality of schoolwork, behavior, personal growth, and effort. Completed class work will be kept for the time that you are detained and will be given to currently enrolled district upon release. ALL detainees are required to attend school and comply with classroom rules. Listed below are the rules and consequences for education in CCJDC:

Classroom Expectations:

1. Students will enter class and sit quietly with chairs and feet placed on the floor to prepare for instruction.

2. Students will follow instructions and comply with teacher instructions.

3. Students will be expected to participate and engage in classroom activities. These activities include state testing (OGT, OAA), home district work, virtual programs, or any other given material from the school district.

4. Students will not take any materials outside of the classroom.

5. Students will respect themselves and others in the classroom.

6. Computer Rules:

   Only sites directly related to assignments may be visited (Educational use only!)

   No Communication via the internet, to outside population.

   No social networking sites (including but not limited to MySpace and Facebook.)

   Misuse or violation of the computer rules can result in loss of computer privileges and will be subject to the classroom/group discipline procedures.
Any internet searches that are not directly school/group related will also result in school/group consequences including, but not limited to, loss of computer privileges.

**Group Policy**

There are several community agencies that provide group and program services to the residents at JDC. Groups are provided to teach you the importance of healthy social and communication skills, anger management, substance abuse prevention, and to promote positive decision making for overall healthy living. Groups and programs offered to JDC residents are a privilege.

**Group Expectations:**

1. Be respectful – always use appropriate language.
2. Participate – group is not playtime.
3. Pay attention – listen to the group leader(s), your peers, and learn.
5. Do not brag about your crime.
6. Keep feet and chairs on the floor at all times.

**Rewards:**

Resident rewards take place each Friday. In order to earn “Reward Friday” residents must follow the rules and requirements established by the education staff and group program leaders. The following requirements must be met in order to attend:

**Requirements:**

1. Residents begin each week with two behavior points. Points may be deducted for inappropriate behavior in school and in group programs at the discretion of the teachers or group leaders. Points will also be deducted for write-ups. Residents will lose one point for minor write-ups, and a loss of two points for major write-ups. The loss of two points will result in the resident losing their reward privileges.
2. Resident must attend, demonstrate appropriate behavior, and participate in school and in **ALL** school related activities/programs.
3. Residents must attend, demonstrate appropriate behavior, and participate in **ALL** groups programs.
4. Residents may not receive any school/group program write – ups or be removed from
school/group programs.

5. Residents must attend, at minimum, one full day of school before Friday. The day of a detention hearing doesn’t count as a full day.

**Consequences:**

If a resident is removed from school or group they will be placed on “school / group segregation”. “School / Group Segregation” will result in a school / group write up and possible loss of level, possible loss of privileges. Loss of level due to rule violations requires 14 days to progress back to next level.

If a resident is removed from class for the day due to behavior issues, the resident will be written up, and placed on segregation for the remainder of the class day and could be given an additional 1– 5 hour segregation time. One of the teachers will meet with the resident before the start of the next school day to determine if the resident is allowed to come back to class. If the resident is unwilling or deemed unable to return to class, he or she will be subject to additional segregation time for the day.

Teachers/group leaders may take behavior points away for inappropriate behavior. The loss of two points will result in the resident losing reward privileges on Friday.

*****************************************************************************

At any time the teachers and/or group leaders reserve the right to amend set requirements, withhold “Reward Friday”, and receive recommendations from Shift Supervisors to withhold rewards from any resident that displays inappropriate behavior.

*****************************************************************************
Appendix D:
Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument II Questionnaire
Adapted from original Version

MAYSI-2 Questionnaire

Name

Male ☐ Female ☐

Date of Birth

Today’s Date

These are some questions about things that sometime happen to people. For each question, please circle YES or NO to answer whether that question has been true for you IN THE PAST FEW MONTHS.

Please answer these questions as well as you can.

Circle Y (yes) or N (no)

1. Have you had a lot of trouble falling asleep or staying asleep?

2. Have you lost your temper easily, or had a “short fuse”?

3. Have nervous or worried feelings kept you from doing things you want to do?

4. Have you had a lot of problems concentrating or paying attention?

5. Have you enjoyed fighting, or been “turned on” by fighting?

6. Have you been easily upset?

7. Have you thought a lot about getting back at someone you have been angry at?

8. Have you been really jumpy or hyper?

9. Have you seen things other people say are not really there?

10. Have you done anything you wish you hadn’t, when you were drunk or high?

11. Have you wished you were dead?
12. Have you been daydreaming too much in school? Y N
13. Have you had too many bad moods? Y N
14. Have you had nightmares that bad enough to make you afraid to go to sleep? Y N
15. Have you felt too tired to have a good time? Y N
16. Have you felt like life was not worth living? Y N
17. Have you felt lonely too much of the time? Y N
18. Have you felt like hurting yourself? Y N
19. Have your parents or friends thought you drink too much? Y N
20. Have you heard voices other people can’t hear? Y N
21. Has it seemed like some part of your body always hurts you? Y N
22. Have you felt like killing yourself? Y N
23. Have you gotten in trouble when you’ve been high or have been drinking? Y N
24. If Yes, is this fighting? Y N
25. Have other people been able to control your brain or your thoughts? Y N
26. Have you had a bad feeling that things don’t seem real, like you’re in a dream? Y N

When you have felt nervous or anxious: Circle Y (yes) or N (no)

27. Have you felt shaky? Y N
28. Has your heartbeat very fast? Y N
29. Have you felt short of breath? Y N
30. Have your hands felt clammy? Y N
31. Has your stomach been upset? Y N
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32. Have you been able to make other people do things just by thinking about it? Y N

33. Have you used alcohol or drugs to help you feel better? YN

34. Have you felt that you don’t have fun with your friends anymore? Y N

35. Have you felt angry a lot? Y N

36. Have you felt like you don’t want to go to school anymore? Y N

37. Have you been drunk or high at school? Y N

38. Have you felt that you can’t do anything right? Y N

39. Have you gotten frustrated a lot? Y N

40. Have you used alcohol and drugs at the same time? Y N

41. Has it been hard for you to feel close to people outside your family? Y N

42. When you have been mad, have you stayed mad for a long time? Y N

43. Have you had bad headaches? Y N

44. Have you hurt or broken something on purpose, just because you were mad? Y N

45. Have you been so drunk or high that you couldn’t remember what happened? Y N

46. Have people talked about you a lot when you’re not there? Y N

47. Have you given up hope for your life? Y N

48. Have you EVER IN YOUR WHOLE LIFE had something very bad or terrifying happen to you? Y N
49. Have you ever been badly hurt, or been in danger of getting raped?     Y N

50. Have you ever been raped, or been in danger of getting raped?     Y N

51. Have you had a lot of bad thoughts or dreams about a bad or scary event that

        happened to you?     Y N

52. Have you ever seen someone severely injured or killed (in person – not in movies

        or on TV)?     Y N
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