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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Youths’ Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community

by

Bryan Thomas Glasrud

Master of Science in Criminal Justice and Criminology
San Diego State University, 2014

This study explores juvenile probationers’ perceptions of legitimacy and procedural justice in juvenile corrections through content analysis of eleven interviews concentrating on their experiences in a community reentry program affiliated with the San Diego County Office of Education and the San Diego County Probation Department’s Camp Barrett. The present study helps track the attitudes of juveniles in confinement with the hope that those administering the programs can better understand juveniles’ perspectives. It also seeks to answer the following research question: Does Camp Barrett and its programs provide an environment that is legitimizing, delegitimizing or neutral for its participants? The study’s findings support literature that indicates the second-generation boot camp style of confinement at Camp Barrett is not legitimizing, nor delegitimizing, but is neutral in this regard.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile recidivism, a return to custody following time in detention, is damaging to communities and costly for taxpayers. Considering that perceptions of and attitudes towards law enforcement can influence adult and young people’s behavior (Tyler, 1990), it is important for policy makers to find ways to influence youth in a manner that builds respect for their communities, the law, and law enforcement. The perception of legitimacy is an example, as it involves the discernment that something or someone is reasonable and valid. Tom Tyler’s (1990) legitimacy theory suggests that the more a person feels that an authority is legitimate, the more likely that person is to feel obligated to obey the law and cooperate with law enforcement. Research shows that perceptions of legitimacy regarding the criminal justice system have a strong influence upon people’s sense of obligation to obey the law, to abide by court decisions, and to cooperate with authorities (Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, & de Vera Park, 1993; Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, & Sherman, 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990; Tyler, Sherman, Strang, & Barnes, 2007).

Tom Tyler (1990) developed legitimacy theory to help explain people’s behaviors when interacting with law enforcement. This applies as well to individuals held in confinement within the criminal justice system. Further research investigating legitimacy theory shows that the way in which a “facility is administered” can have a direct impact on whether attitudes toward the justice system are negatively or positively affected (Franke, Bierie, & MacKenzie, 2010, p. 113). Negative attitudes can exacerbate frustrations during the reentry process that could lead to reoffending in the community and recidivism (Duran, Plotkin, Potter, & Rosen, 2013). The current study investigates the perceptions of juveniles housed in a second-generation boot camp\(^1\) regarding how they viewed their experiences in incarceration and the reentry back to their communities in terms of legitimacy.

\(^1\)The second-generation boot camp is one that maintains a military structure of organization and discipline.
THEORY AND PURPOSE

Policy makers, facility operators, and even researchers have traditionally been hesitant to take into account juveniles’ perceptions regarding confinement mainly because of a belief that such perceptions would not hold any value (Schubert, Mulvey, Loughran, & Losoya, 2012). The ambiguity surrounding access to the population and assessment of their perceptions compounded the problem (Schubert et al., 2012).

Research regarding recidivism and the experience of formerly incarcerated adults in the traditional, prison style environment shows that such an experience can be both criminalizing (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis, Kovandzic, & Marvell, 2007) and delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987). Franke and colleagues (2010), in a study of adults’ perceptions of legitimacy regarding their experiences in a traditional, prison style environment used data from a separate study (MacKenzie, Bierie, & Mitchell, 2007) that compared the perceptions of inmates who experienced a boot camp style of incarceration to those of a traditional prison. Franke and colleagues (2010) discovered that the boot camp style of confinement did not have a delegitimizing effect. Instead, they found that the boot-camp style environment produced a neutral effect in this regard (Franke et al., 2010).

To date, there is minimal research in juvenile corrections in regards to legitimacy theory (Hinds, 2007) or in regards to juveniles’ perceptions of confinement and sanctions in general (Burke, 2013; Schubert et al., 2012).

The current study’s purpose is to expand the limited literature that currently exists regarding juveniles in boot camp style environments and their reentry back into the community by using a similar assessment structure implemented by Franke and colleagues (2010) in an investigation of a second-generation juvenile boot camp in San Diego County.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The current study’s aim is to provide an avenue for juvenile probationers to express their feelings and perceptions regarding their experience in confinement and the reentry process back to their community. The study also looks to answer the following research question: Does Camp Barrett and its programs provide an environment that is legitimizing, delegitimizing, or neutral for its participants?
HYPOTHESIS

This thesis expounds upon the current procedural justice and legitimacy literature by investigating the relationship between procedural fairness and perceptions of legitimacy at Camp Barrett. According to the literature, individuals who perceive fairness in their processes with authorities are more likely to perceive those authorities as legitimate (Tyler, 1990), and by extension, are more likely to feel obligated to obey the law or specific rules (Skogan & Frydl, 2003). The current study focuses on the experiences juvenile probationers had at Camp Barrett while participating in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. The probationers’/students’ experiences are used to assess whether their perceptions of their time at Camp Barrett had legitimizing, delegitimizing, or neutral effects. Therefore, as offered above, the current research question is, in terms of procedural justice, “Does Camp Barrett and its programs provide an environment that is legitimizing, delegitimizing, or neutral for its participants?” The study hypothesis is that the students will provide statements in the interviews that indicate positive, legitimizing experiences at Camp Barrett and as part of the Transitions/Pathways to Success reentry program. A review of the current and relevant literature follows.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, CRIME AND RECIDIVISM

Snyder (2004) states that approximately 100,000 juveniles are released from confinement back to their communities every year in the US, the vast majority of whom are eligible for reentry programming. Although the number of juvenile arrests and probationers in confinement has declined since the late 1990s (Taylor, 2013; Turner & Fain, 2005), the statistics indicate that juvenile recidivism remains high. Snyder (2004) emphasizes the importance of focusing on the success of these individuals in the community by stating:

Youth returning to their homes after their commitment to a juvenile custody facility bring with them track records of failure . . . The simple truth is that the tangible and intangible costs to society of a youth’s failure to thrive following release from juvenile custody are so high that society must learn how to reduce this risk. (p. 54)

Snyder and Sickmund (2006) make a crucial point considering research that shows 55 percent of these juveniles will reoffend.

The most recent available data shows that California experienced a juvenile rearrest rate (three years post release) of approximately 70 percent (Lee, Christeson, & Wondra, 2007, p. 4) and rate of return back to “any state-level incarceration” (one year post release) of 24.7 percent (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2012, p. 63). Table 1 displays the number of juveniles’ arrests in California for 2011. As shown in the table, 21,345 juveniles were placed in county facilities, of which 83 percent were male and 56 percent were between the ages of 16 and 21 (Taylor, 2013). The vast majority of these youth was, or will be, released back to their communities.

On a county level, juvenile arrests in San Diego County fell in 2012, which was partially explained by a decrease in arrests for status offenses (Burke, 2013). Research shows

---

2 Mears and Travis (2004) provide national estimates that indicate approximately 200,000 juveniles and young adults, from under 18 and up to 24 years of age, are released back into the community every year.
Table 1. Juvenile Criminal Outcomes in California for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests in California</td>
<td>167,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Probation</td>
<td>148,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Heard in Juvenile Court</td>
<td>73,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles Made Wards of the Court</td>
<td>47,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles Placed in County Facility</td>
<td>21,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


that there were 10,250 juvenile arrests in San Diego County in 2012,\(^3\) 21 percent of which were status offenses (Burke, 2013). The number of juvenile arrests for 2012 represents a 44% reduction from 2008. The number of status offenses dropped from 2008 by 41 percent as well (Burke, 2013). The youth characteristics of those supervised by the SDCPD are provided in Table 2.

### Table 2. Who San Diego County Probation Supervised in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,456 wards were supervised on Dec. 31, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,242 wards were supervised throughout the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age 16 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,412 (23%) females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,840 (77%) males</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% African-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56% Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2 is significant when considering the potential for juveniles who enter the criminal justice system based on a status offense to be negatively influenced by high-risk offenders when placed in confinement. From a national perspective, recent research suggests that approximately 20 to 25 percent of juveniles labeled as status offenders or non-offenders, such as those within the child welfare system, were placed in confinement alongside juveniles who were charged/adjudicated for crimes that included murder, manslaughter, and

\(^3\) Most recent year data was available.
sexual assault (Sedlak & McPherson, 2010). Doing so, according to the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (2013), risks an increase in delinquency and/or criminal behavior.

Considering the research indicating the criminalizing effect most traditional prison experiences have on adults (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007), a drop in status offense lowers the potentially criminalizing risk traditional forms of confinement pose to juveniles. Facilities that are overcrowded and understaffed compound the risk for further criminalization (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006). Fortunately for the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program participants, Camp Barrett is not understaffed nor overcrowded (County of San Diego - Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012).

The SDCPD witnessed a recidivism rate (new law violation) of 29 percent for juveniles in 2011-2012 (San Diego County Probation Department, 2012a). Burke and others (2008) found that one-year after release, 38 percent of Camp Barrett participants were “arrest free” and 23 percent received a technical violation (also referred to as a probation violation (p. v). A direct comparison between the two recidivism rates, however, should not be considered accurate as Camp Barrett’s participants are typically repeat offenders with numerous risk factors and low resiliency scores (Burke et al., 2008).

**LEGITIMACY THEORY**

Legitimacy, as defined by Tyler (1990), refers to the perceptions held by community members regarding the performance of law enforcement (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler et al., 2007). Tyler (1990) uses legitimacy to gauge perceptions of fairness or “procedural justice” to assess a community’s sense of obligation towards legal compliance (p. 8). The voluntary acceptance of decisions made by legal authorities (police, courts, corrections, etc.) on the part of community members is associated with perceptions of fairness in how law enforcement implements decisions (Lind et al., 1993; Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2004, 2010; Tyler & Huo 2002; Tyler et al., 2007).

Tyler (1990) suggests that legitimacy is directly related to a law or institution’s ability to stimulate people’s feelings of voluntary obligation to follow the law (Bottoms, 1999; Paternoster et al., 1997; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995; Sparks, Bottoms, & Hay, 1996; Sunshine

---

4 Most recent year data available.
& Tyler, 2003; Tyler et al., 2007). If a community’s perception of the police, for example, reflects low levels of legitimacy, there is a lower chance that people within that community will cooperate with investigations or conduct community-policing measures in congruence with local authorities (Tyler, 2003), obey police orders (Tyler, 1990), or abide by authorities’ decisions (Benesh & Howell, 2001; Tyler, 1984).

Tyler (1990) suggests that the perception of legitimacy in the police influences people to obey the law and, by extension, makes law enforcement more effective (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler et al., 2007). Tyler (1990) contends that legitimacy plays a more significant role regarding the voluntary obligation to obey the law than that of potential consequences independent from outcomes (Paternoster et al., 1997). Tyler (1990) argues, “The way people assess procedural fairness is strongly linked to their judgments of whether the authority they are dealing with is motivated to be fair” (p. 164).

Beetham (1991) sees legitimacy in a slightly different way. He states that a “power relationship is not legitimate because people believe in its legitimacy, but because it can be *justified in terms of* their beliefs,” (Beetham, 1991, p. 11). In *The Legitimation of Power* (Beetham, 1991), he identifies a specific condition of legitimacy as legally obtained power utilized in a lawful manner. He also suggests that a belief in the notion of legitimacy is foundational in the procurement of perceptions of legitimacy in a certain authority (Beetham, 1991).

Liebling, Durie, Stiles, and Tait (2005) suggest that the criminal justice system undermines its own rehabilitative ability if its actors assume legitimacy inherently exists within it. A prison should not be run under an assumption that because it represents authority and rule of law, people will perceive it as legitimate (Liebling et al., 2005). In order for a person to perceive her or his incarceration experience in a way that imbues perceptions of legitimacy in the facility and its operators, the person must be treated fairly (Liebling et al., 2005). If a facility is run based on the assumption that it is inherently legitimate and its operators do not consider the potential consequences of not treating those confined with dignity and respect, the operators run the risk of undermining the facility’s rehabilitative potential (Liebling et al., 2005). The relationship between legitimacy and institutional confinement is explored further in the following section.
**Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice describes the symbiotic relationship between the treatment individuals experience by authorities in regards to procedural fairness and the increased likelihood that the same individuals will perceive the authorities as legitimate (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1984, 1990; Tyler et al., 2007). As an extension of this relationship, these individuals are more likely to: feel satisfied with the services provided by the administrators, staff, and other authorities (Benesh & Howell, 2001; Tyler, 1984); feel obligated to recognize decisions by the authorities and the law in general as valid (Tyler, 2000); and cooperate with authorities when requested (Lind et al., 1993; Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1984, 1990, 2004; Tyler et al., 2007). Said in a different way, according to procedural justice, the satisfaction level related to an authority’s delivery of services could directly influence the perceptions and behavior of those in custody (Greenman, 2010; Lind et al., 1993; Paternoster et al., 1997; Resig & Mesko, 2009; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990).

Procedural justice is a concept that has its roots in law and social psychology (Greenman, 2010; Thibaut & Walker, 1978). The procedural justice definition includes the concept of procedural fairness. To understand procedural justice in full, and the connection between procedural justice and legitimacy, one must first acknowledge the definition of procedural fairness, which follows below.

**Procedural Fairness**

The literature suggests that the perceived obligation to obey the law (Tyler, 1990), comply with the decisions of authorities (Tyler, 2000), and cooperate with authorities when requested is directly affected by the perceived fairness in the application of procedures by authorities (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007). Tyler (1984) conducted a study that investigated the “role of perceived injustice in generating dissatisfaction with legal authorities” (p. 51). By gathering data through telephone interviews with 121 defendants of traffic or misdemeanor violations in Evanston, Illinois, Tyler (1984) concluded that people identify distinctions between procedural fairness, distributive fairness, and level of outcome. The study showed that the people who receive outcomes as being in their favor were more likely to perceive fairness in the outcomes (Tyler, 1984). The research also showed that
individuals who perceived outcomes as poor did not always feel that the outcomes were *unfair* (Tyler, 1984). When the treatment of defendants by authorities was perceived as appropriate and as expected, there was a significantly higher likelihood that the defendants perceived the outcomes as fair regardless of outcome (Tyler, 1984).

Paternoster et al. (1997) expanded the research on procedural fairness in a study on individuals involved in domestic assault. The study-analyzed data from the Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment, conducted in 1987 and 1988, that consisted of approximately 1,200 interviews of suspects arrested for domestic violence (Paternoster et al., 1997). Paternoster and colleagues (1997) investigated the relationship between procedural fairness and domestic violence recidivism taking into consideration six components of procedural justice. These six components include representation, consistency, impartiality, accuracy, correctability, and ethicality (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Paternoster et al., 1997). They found support for the hypothesis that those arrested for spousal abuse would be less likely to reoffend if they perceived their treatment by authorities as fair (Paternoster et al., 1997). The researchers concluded that there was a relationship between procedural fairness and recidivism (Paternoster et al., 1997).

Leventhal referred to *representation* as the perception that an individual participating in the justice process has the opportunity to meaningfully partake in the adjudication process (Greenman, 2010; Paternoster et al., 1997). Tyler (2010) subsequently referred to this concept as possessing a voice in the adjudication process. *Consistency* refers to a state where two separate, unrelated situations are treated in a similar fashion, and where the community members’ expectations are met (Aquino et al., 2006; Paternoster et al., 1997; Tyler, 1990, 2010). Consistency also involves how fairly victims and offenders are treated (Paternoster et al., 1997; Tyler, 1990, 2010). Referred to as “neutrality” by Tyler (2010), *impartiality* is the perception that authorities’ actions, behavior, and decisions are based upon nothing other than guidelines, procedures, rules, and the law (Paternoster et al., 1997). Expectations of proper decision-making and credible intent on the part of authorities make up the concept of *accuracy* in procedural justice (Paternoster et al., 1997). *Correctability* is a reference to the perception that individuals have the opportunity for recourse when they feel an injustice or problem occurred within the process (Aquino et al., 2006; Paternoster et al., 1997). Finally, *ethicality* involves the authorities’ application of dignity, respect, and politeness when
interacting with people in the community (Paternoster et al., 1997). A perception of low ethicality would indicate treatment that is demeaning on the part of authorities (Paternoster et al., 1997). It is these six concepts that are said to influence an individual’s perception of fairness in a procedural process (Aquino et al., 2006; Paternoster et al., 1997; Tyler, 1990, 2010).

Sunshine and Tyler (2003) studied legitimacy of the New York City Police Department by surveying a randomly selected group (n = 586) of New York City voters in the spring and summer of 2001. The self-report surveys focused on two issues that relate to the importance of police legitimacy in influencing the public to support the police and their procedures. The study compared students’ perceived risk of consequences, satisfaction with the police, and the perceptions of “fairness of the distribution of police services” (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003, p. 513). The study also focused on the issue of people’s satisfaction with the police and how it relates to the legitimacy people perceive in the authorities. The interviews revealed two key findings, the first being a strong relationship between perceptions of legitimacy in the police and how people respond to police activities. The second was a relationship between increased levels of legitimacy when the application of police procedures was perceived to be fair. The researchers suggest that perceptions of legitimacy in the police directly impact the likelihood of an individual following the law, supporting the police, and cooperating with police when requested (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

Tyler et al. (2007) studied reintegrative shaming and procedural justice to see how they relate to recidivism amongst a group of Australians arrested for drunk driving between July 1995 and December 1997. The experiment randomly assigned 900 arrestee’s cases to either the normal court process or a restorative justice conference that included reintegrative shaming (Tyler et al., 2007). If the participants complied with the set parameters of the restorative justice component, their charges were dropped and they did not incur a criminal record (Tyler et al., 2007).

The participants were first interviewed by the researchers regarding their experience once they had gone through their prosecution or restorative justice conference; they were then interviewed again two years later (Tyler et al., 2007). The participants’ arrest records were monitored for four years after the initial interview (Tyler et al., 2007). The researchers concluded that traditional means of adjudication might not be as effective as those that
possess restorative justice components in providing reentry candidates tools that protect against recidivism (Tyler et al., 2007). The researchers conclude:

Two years after they experienced the treatment, those participants who were involved in a conference, as opposed to having traditional court processing, indicated that the law was more legitimate (standard regression coefficient = 0.14, \( p<0.001 \)) and said that repeat offending would create greater interpersonal problems in their lives (standardized regression coefficient = 0.11, \( p<0.01 \)). (Tyler et al., 2007, p. 565)

This report offers a look at how procedural fairness, and by extension procedural justice, affects people in confinement in the following section.

**CONFINEMENT AND THE EFFECT OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE**

Procedural justice suggests that people are more likely satisfied with authorities and deem the authorities legitimate when the individuals perceive the authorities as having conducted their procedures fairly (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990; Tyler et al., 2007). Previous research shows that for offenders, an increased perception of fairness on the part of authorities leads to an increased perception of legitimacy (Casper, Tyler, & Fisher, 1988; Tyler, 1984, 1990; Tyler, Rasinski, & Spodick, 1985). An exploration of those in confinement and their perceptions of legitimacy in regards to the staff, authorities, and administrators follows.

**LEGITIMACY IN CONFINEMENT**

*Representational dimension* is a phrase developed by Sparks and Bottoms (1995) to describe how people interpret actions by authorities as representative of the criminal justice system as a whole. The research suggests that prisoners will view their confinement, and the administrators running the facility, as legitimate when the facility has set rules that are intently followed by the staff and authorities (Jackson, Tyler, Bradford, Taylor, & Shiner, 2010; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995). Perceptions of legitimacy relate to the social conditions within confinement (Franke et al., 2010; Jackson et al., 2010). In a study that focused on British adult prisons, Jackson and others (2010) argued that the general order (inmate behavior, relations between inmates and officers, etc.) in prisons was directly affected by the perception of legitimacy inmates held in regards to the prison staff and authorities. They
found that procedural fairness, and its level of application upon inmates by those in control, significantly affects the level of legitimacy the inmates perceive in the prison authorities (Jackson et al., 2010).

Jackson and colleagues (2010) pointed out four main concepts that relate to legitimacy in prisons, which are all in line with the six concepts of procedural justice outlined in the Procedural Fairness section above. These four concepts include voice, consistency in the application of rules, treatment that involves respect in maintaining dignity, and the perception that the authorities actually care about prisoners’ outcomes (Jackson et al., 2010).

In terms of confinement, voice is used as a reference to the prisoners’ ability to participate in the judgment of violation process (Jackson et al., 2010). As Jackson and his colleagues (2010) contend:

One reason why informal dispute resolution mechanisms are popular is that participating in decision-making allows people to voice their own personal concerns, stating what they think the issues involved are and make suggestions for how they should be handled. (p. 7)

The consistency in the application of rules, also referred to as neutrality (Jackson et al., 2010), involves the removal of all personal bias or prejudice from the decision making process on part of the authorities, which should lead to a uniform application of rules and the perception of fairness on part of the prisoners.

The concept that was consistently identified as being the most significant was that of treatment involving respect and dignity (Jackson et al., 2010). When an authority treats someone in confinement in a manner that is perceived as demeaning or disrespectful, the confined individual is far less likely to perceive the authority figure as legitimate (Jackson et al., 2010). The level of care authority figures express in regards to the prisoners’ potential outcomes, also referred to as trust, was also identified as heavily significant in terms of perceptions of legitimacy (Jackson et al., 2010). If an individual in confinement perceives a prison guard’s demeanor as insincere, uncaring, or not convincing concerning the inmate’s prospect at rehabilitation, the likelihood that the inmate will react negatively to that prison guard is strengthened (Jackson et al., 2010).

In terms of juvenile confinement, research shows that the communication of policies, that ensure safety and humane treatment, to juvenile inmates and staff is crucial in maintaining control of the correctional environment (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009). The
legitimacy of these policies and the rules they put in place are dependent upon proper and
effective communication that emphasizes equal and fair treatment (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009).

In a study of youth victimization while in custody, Kupchik and Snyder (2009) analyzed data from the Performance-based Standards (PbS) for Youth Correction and Detention Facilities national project. They focused on the facility and individual level variables that affect victimization in confinement. They found that juveniles understanding of rules and their “perceptions of facility school and staff helpfulness are better predictors than either static individual characteristics or facility characteristics,” (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009, p. 279). The authors conclude that an understanding of how the rules are communicated to the youth is critical in order to develop and maintain legitimacy (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009). How the inmates interact with and are treated by the officers supervising them is also significant (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009). They further suggest that:

Having fair, humane rules designed to enhance security may be unimportant if inmates do not understand these rules; offering a wide array of educational programming may be meaningless if the delivery of these services is not user-friendly; and having high staff-to-inmate rations may be meaningless if staff are not trained in how to deal with inmates respectfully and in a way that helps the inmates (while preserving security). (Kupchik & Snyder, 2009, p. 280)

A look at the procedural justice, legitimacy, and what effect they have on confinement follows in an exploration of adult and juvenile boot camps.

**PROCEDURAL JUSTICE, LEGITIMACY, AND BOOT CAMPS**

A focus on procedural justice, legitimacy, and their affects on the confinement experience in an alternative form of confinement adds beneficial perspective to this literature review. The boot camp alternative for adult offenders and the affects of procedural justice and legitimacy are explored below.

**Adult Confinement and the Boot Camp Alternative**

In terms of adult confinement, research shows that lengthy prison sentences (Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen, 1999) and an increase in the rates of imprisonment (Ashkar & Kenny, 2008; Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner, 1996; Lewis, Yeager, Lovely, Stein, & Cobham-Portorreal, 1994; Winner, Lanza-Kaduce, Bishop, & Frazier, 1997) have
minimal impact on deterring recidivism. Furthermore, expectations of fairness and respect by authorities underlie confinement experiences that are perceived as legitimate (Sparks & Bottoms, 1995). To emphasize this point, Sparks and Bottoms (1995) suggest that:

Every instance of brutality in prisons, every casual racist joke and demeaning remark, every ignored petition, every unwarranted bureaucratic delay, every inedible meal, every arbitrary decision to segregate or transfer without giving clear and well founded reasons, every petty miscarriage of justice, every futile and inactive period of time – is delegitimizing. (p. 60)

Other research suggests that confinement facilities can experience less disruption if their facilitators implement policies that promote procedural and distributive fairness, which helps influence perceptions of legitimacy (Sparks et al., 1996). In an attempt to identify the factors that lead to disruption and disorder in prisons, Sparks and colleagues (1996) found that facilities that are more procedurally and distributively fair experience less violence and rule breaking by inmates (Bottoms, 1999).

In an attempt to alleviate rule breaking by those in confinement and recidivism by those released back into the community, prison administrators sought an alternative to the traditional prison-style model of confinement. As a result, they reintroduced the boot camp alternative, which is distinct from the prison-style model in that it provides a strictly regimented schedule of daily physical activities, drills, exercises, and punishment in the form of physical activity, such as pushups (Armstrong, 2004; Rocque, Bierie, & MacKenzie, 2010). The structure and discipline of boot camps provide a military-style emphasis (Rocque et al., 2010).

Zebulon Brockway first implemented the militaristic structure in a correctional setting in the New York Elmira Reformatory in the late 1800s (Armstrong, 2004). Brockway did so as a means to give the inmates something productive to do, which instituted physical conditioning as a daily routine. Previously, the inmates at the reformatory were used for manual labor in the manufacturing of consumer goods, as was common in prisons across the country in the late 19th century (Armstrong, 2004).

Legislation referred to the Yates law put an end to all inmate labor in 1888 (Armstrong, 2004). This effectively undermined the competition prisons offered private manufacturers and unions and changed the correctional landscape by forcing administrators to come up with something else for the prisoners to do with their time in confinement.
Brockway thought the military structure was a viable answer, which he fully implemented in every aspect of the Elmira Reformatory’s regimen (Armstrong, 2004). The rehabilitative movement did not afford the proliferation of this prison model until the early-1980s when the first military-style boot camps were opened in Georgia and Oklahoma (MacKenzie & Parent, 2004).

Advocates for the boot camp alternative referred to them as “accountability programs” that held prisoners responsible for their crimes through the use of discipline and punishment that is mostly associated with military structure, which at the time of their proliferation fit the “get tough on crime” attitude that was popular (Armstrong, 2004, p. 8). Researchers, such as Cowles and Castellano (1996) suggest that the drug treatment, counseling, and educational services provided in boot camps was critical in the rehabilitation process and crucial for an inmates reintegration back into the community. Since the boot camps were found to provide these services at a higher rate than traditional prisons, Cowles and Castellano (1996) support the use of the boot camp alternative.

Critics of the boot camp-style of confinement, on the other hand, were afraid that the model fell too far away from rehabilitation and treatment, focusing to strongly on punitive elements (Armstrong, 2004). Their fears may be accurate, considering the boot camp alternative does not significantly impact recidivism (Cullen, Blevins, Trager, & Gendreau, 2005; MacKenzie, 1991). Although, as Armstrong (2004) points out, most recidivism-based research involved investigations of first generation boot camps as opposed to second-generation boot camps, the difference of which is distinguished below.

**Second-Generation Boot Camps**

Recently, boot camps started to provide programs and structure that emphasizes treatment and education to a much higher degree. This emphasis on treatment influenced researchers to refer to boot camps providing such structure as second generation boot camps. The second-generation boot camp is characterized as maintaining the military structure and discipline while also emphasizing rehabilitation, treatment, and prosocial skills training (Armstrong, 2004; Rocque et al., 2010). Research suggests that the second-generation boot camp structure may not directly mitigate recidivism, but it does influence the development of prosocial beliefs, which according to Rocque and colleagues (2010), and others (Doherty,
2006; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Horney, Osgood, & Marshall, 1995; Sampson & Laub, 1993), are critical components for an inmate when transitioning into a law-abiding mindset.

Franke and colleagues (2010) applied Tyler’s (1990) theoretical framework of legitimacy to a study that compared the perceptions of adults incarcerated in a typical prison with the perceptions of adults who were sentenced to a second-generation boot camp style correctional facility using data from a previous evaluation of Maryland’s Toulson Correctional Boot Camp for Adults (MacKenzie, Mitchell, et al., 2007). According to Franke and his team (2010), boot camps tend to be more controlling regarding inmates’ daily activities than prisons. Individuals housed in boot camps typically experience more scrutiny, confrontation, and stressors in boot camps compared to a traditional prison experience (Frank et al., 2010). They suggest that these are “signs of enhanced control in an authoritarian setting” and as a result should be recognized as delegitimizing factors by policy makers (Franke et al., 2010, p. 94).

Despite these concerns, researchers suggest that policy makers should consider one factor associated with boot camps that influences perceptions of legitimacy positively: the emotional bonds inmates tend to establish with staff (Gover, Mackenzie, & Styve Armstrong, 2000). The drill instructors at boot camps, according to inmates, seemed to possess caring attitudes and sincere interest in the inmates’ outcomes (Gover et al., 2000). Hence, the “enhanced control” experienced by the inmates might not be delegitimizing should it be wielded by authorities in a caring and fair manner (Franke et al., 2010, pp. 94-95). Franke and colleagues (2010) suggest “it might be less a matter of control or constraint itself and more a matter of the way in which that control is implemented that predicts legitimate views of authority” (p. 95).

Relying on research that depicts the prison experience as delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987) and even criminalizing (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007), Franke and colleagues (2010) reanalyzed the data from the MacKenzie, Mitchell, et al. (2007) study, which surveyed inmates that were randomly assigned to a boot camp (n = 111) and a prison (n = 123). Franke and his team (2010) scaled responses to the survey questions regarding inmates’ experiences. The scale offered scores ranging from zero (not legitimate) to 13 (completely legitimate). The inmates were surveyed once upon entry into the facility and then once again
six months later (MacKenzie, Bierie, et al., 2007). In their study, Franke and colleagues (2010) state that:

Questions in the exit survey (time 2) were used to capture the perceptions of … experiences of inmates while incarcerated. A total of 16 “experience” items were grouped into one of three categories. The first category reflects positive aspects of confinement and includes items such as “My experience here will help me get a job” and “The staff here helped me change.” The remaining dimensions, however, reflect experiences that would more likely be delegitimizing for inmates. The negative experiences scale includes statements such as “I worried about my safety here” or “Inmates fight with other inmates here.” The final scale reflects environmental deprivation. This construct measures other aspects of the facility that might have been problematic for inmates such as a lack of privacy or noise. (p. 105)

Franke and colleagues (2010) compared “mean levels of perceived legitimacy” by using multiple \( t \) tests (p. 105). They explored whether the inmates attitudes improved or worsened between the first and the second surveys, if experiences varied between the two facilities, if there the two facilities did provide differing experiences, and whether the experiences were influential enough to affect the inmates’ perceptions of legitimacy (Franke et al., 2010). The team found that:

Contrary to the prediction that attitudes would worsen at both facilities, results indicate that the mean legitimacy score among boot camp participants did not decline at all…[From police, to courts, to corrections] attitudes were comparatively better at the boot camp. (Franke et al., 2010, p.106)

Furthermore, the team identified boot camp inmates as being more likely to report positive experiences, less likely to report negative experiences, and more likely to perceive that the staff cared about their outcomes (Franke et al., 2010).

Franke and colleagues (2010) discovered that although negative experiences in confinement deteriorated perceptions of legitimacy towards the facilities and its operators, positive experiences strengthened these perceptions of legitimacy. A change in the perception of legitimacy can be predicted according to the type of confinement experienced by an inmate, as negative experiences were more commonly reported in the prison sample compared to the boot camp sample (Franke et al., 2010). Franke and colleagues (2010) concluded that although the boot camp experience did not correlate with perceptions of increased legitimacy concerning the justice system, they did find that the boot camp experience was neutral and not delegitimizing. So although the boot camp experience did not
increase perceptions of legitimacy, it also did not decrease perceptions of legitimacy (Franke et al., 2010).

In sum and in support of Tyler’s (1990) argument, Franke and colleagues’ (2010) findings suggest that the perception of legitimacy can be attained if the justice system’s administrators and authoritative actors convey true concern regarding those for whom they are responsible (Franke et al., 2010). Referred to as “motive-based trust,” this is one of the most significant variables setting the two environments of confinement apart (Frank et al. 2010, p. 112). The findings are significant when one considers that developing environments that value procedural justice and legitimacy influence those that are confined to “buy in” to the rehabilitation program instituted by a facility (Franke et al., 2010; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995; Sparks et al., 1996).

Although Tyler (1990, 2003) and Franke and colleagues (2010) have contributed to the literature regarding the theory of legitimacy and its relation to adults in the criminal justice system, it should be noted that there is research that questions (Resig & Mesko, 2009) the direct relationship between procedural justice and perceptions of legitimacy (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990, 2003, 2010; Tyler et al. 2007). Through a study involving interviews with 103 inmates at a Slovenian prison, Resig and Mesko (2009) explored the relationship between procedural justice and inmate misconduct, procedural justice and “inmates’ sense of obligation to obey prison officers (i.e. legitimacy),” and the relationship between perceptions of legitimacy and inmate rule breaking (Resig & Mesko, 2009, p. 44). Though their conclusions should be considered limited in relation to the current study’s context because of the possible cultural explanations that were not specified by Resig and Mesko (2009), their study provided evidence showing a weak significance between procedural justice’s impact on perceptions of legitimacy among individuals in confinement. According to their results, the inmates’ likelihood to obey the staff was not accurately predicted by their perceptions of procedural justice (Resig & Mesko, 2009). However, they also found that inmates who felt that they were treated fairly by the staff reportedly did not break the rules as often (Resig & Mesko, 2009).

By centering attention on an improvement of facility and program function through the inclusion of confined youths’ perceptions, a practical approach to fighting recidivism, tied to the enrichment of “institutional processes,” is a concept that is gaining momentum
(Ashkar & Kenny, 2008; Schubert et al., 2012). Through an examination of confined adult perceptions, Franke and colleagues (2010) revealed that there are factors involved with the boot camp style incarceration experience that have a neutral effect on the attitudes of its participants, one that is not delegitimizing. Despite research suggesting that the boot camp confinement experience has no effect on recidivism (MacKenzie, 2008), Franke and colleagues (2010) maintain that a neutral confinement experience, one that is not delegitimizing, could potentially reduce recidivism.

**Juvenile Confinement and the Juvenile Boot Camp Alternative**

In an article that analyzed literature investigating the formulation of juvenile crime policy, Scott and Steinberg (2010) solidified the notion that procedural fairness should be considered a significant variable when developing juvenile justice and confinement policies and should be based on scientific evidence. It was their conclusion that the cost of lengthy, adult based sentences for juveniles outweighs the minimal impact these sentences have on juvenile crime (Scott & Steinberg, 2010). Furthermore, the key variable that they identified to explain the minimal drop in juvenile crime was that of incapacitation (Scott & Steinberg, 2010). They agree that the quality of confinement is a stronger, more significant variable that influences a young person’s perception regarding their delinquent behavior than that of the length of confinement (Scott & Steinberg, 2010). Scott and Steinberg (2010) suggest that fairness in procedures is a necessary factor to acknowledge that can help mold the quality of juvenile confinement. The researchers expound on this notion more broadly by concluding that, “Ultimately, the legitimacy of juvenile crime policy depends on public perception that society is subjecting all young offenders to fair punishment” (Scott & Steinberg, 2010, p. 97).

Zachariah (1996) quoted Yitzhak Bakal, the Executive Director of a juvenile boot camp that is funded through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, to offer support for the boot camp model of confinement for juveniles. Bakal was quoted as saying:

> The military structure gives these kids a strong motivation and a sense of control and empowerment. They work from early in the morning to late in the evening. The atmosphere here is quite different from the institutions where 20 or 30 kids sit in a day room and watch TV all day. In the boot camp, the kids are emotional and positive. (Zachariah, 1996, p. 31)
Zachariah (1996) suggests that the boot camp model for juvenile confinement experienced some success regarding costs and the influence the programs had on camp participants, but he qualifies the point by stating that the successes have only been rendered in the short-term. Even so, Zachariah (1996) suggests that the boot camps have potential in helping juveniles avoid further confinement.

Clark and Aziz (1996) echo this sentiment in a study of boot camps in New York State by suggesting that the boot camp alternative is a “credible correctional treatment alternative” for juveniles (p. 63). The alternative, according to Clark and Aziz (1996), affords New York State crucial monetary savings that could be used to house juvenile offenders that are more prone to violence and show less interest in rehabilitation. The authors caution that the boot camp alternative is not a perfect means to address juvenile crime or recidivism, especially considering most boot camps are not run the same and do not provide the same amount of treatment (Clark & Aziz, 1996). In congruence with Zachariah (1996), Clark and Aziz (1996) assert that the boot camp alternative can be effective in mitigating juvenile delinquency.

As previously mentioned, critics of boot camps fear that the military structure negatively influences inmates and hinders rehabilitation (Andrews et al., 1990; Morash & Rucker, 1990). Their fear is just as strong regarding juveniles at boot camps. They contend that boot camps:

...Are expected to be perceived by the juveniles as less caring and less just; to have less individualized planning and fewer programs focusing on reintegration; and, overall, to focus less on therapeutic treatment. Furthermore, the yelling, direct commands, and summary punishments by drill instructors in the boot camps will result in the boot camp youth perceiving themselves to be in more danger from the staff as compared to youth in traditional facilities (Armstrong, 2004, p. 13).

Andrews and Bonta (1998) emphasize that the energy exerted for physical activity would be put to better use when exerted towards treatment and rehabilitation. Doing so would have a stronger impact on the attitudes of inmates than simply focusing on military-style drills and conditioning (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; MacKenzie, Wilson, Armstrong, & Gover, 2001).

Other research shows that the critics of juvenile boot camps might want to reconsider such a strong stance. MacKenzie and colleagues’ (2001) study compared the perceptions of 2,668 juveniles in 26 boot camps across the United States with the perceptions of juveniles in
traditional forms of confinement, such as a juvenile hall (EMJDF, KMJDF). They found that the juveniles in the boot camps did not report any difference in experiencing anxiety or depression compared to the traditional facilities (MacKenzie et al., 2001). However, the study’s participants did report perceptions that the boot camp environment was more “positive” (i.e., therapeutic) even though the participants felt like they had less freedom than traditional juvenile confinement (MacKenzie et al., 2001, p. 279).

In contrast to the fears of critics, the study showed that the strict regimen and structure did not influence negative perceptions of the boot camp environment (MacKenzie et al., 2001). According to researchers, this may be partially explained by the “close and caring relationships…[formed] between youth and staff” that was significantly more evident at boot camps (MacKenzie et al., 2001, p. 304). Peterson-Badali and Koegl (2002) support this contention by suggesting that the interactions between the confinement authorities (prison guards or probation officers) and inmates must be taken into consideration. In a study that involved interviews with 100 Canadian juveniles confined in “secure custody” in Ontario, the authors found that accounting for the “social interaction” between prison authorities and the inmates can provide crucial context and understanding when addressing violence perpetrated by inmates (Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002, p. 43). They suggest that the behavior of prison authorities can directly impact the inmates in both positive and negative ways (Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002). The most significant finding of their study showed that staff behavior influenced inmate violence in a negative manner (Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002). The study revealed that the correctional staff often ignored inmate-on-inmate violence and in some instances even coaxed inmates to attack other inmates (Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002). This illustrates the importance of recognizing the significant negative influence facility staff can have on the inmates’ behavior and, ultimately, their outcomes.

In an investigation of recidivism and boot camps in Pennsylvania, Kempinen and Kurlychek (2003) did not find any difference in recidivism rates amongst participants of the boot camp model and traditional prison. Although some critics would interpret this finding as an indication that the boot camp model is a failure, Kempinen and Kurlychek (2003) suggest that the finding is “encouraging” when one considers that boot camp participants tend to spend less time in confinement and experience more intense supervision and treatment after release. The authors argue that for specific types of juvenile offenders, the boot camp model
could be effective in changing delinquent behavior and mitigating recidivism. (Kempinen & Kurlychek, 2003).

As previously discussed, boot camps were originally developed as an alternative to prison, whose focus was mainly on retribution; although, the militaristic-style of the camps added a secondary focus: discipline (Franke et al., 2010). As authorities began to realize the boot camp alternative was ineffective in curtailing recidivism, some of the boot camps began providing the programming that now makes up much of the second-generation boot camp model (Franke et al., 2010).

As previously described, a second-generation boot camp is one that places a larger emphasis and focus on treatment, rehabilitation, and reentry programming than that of first-generation boot camps (Ashcroft, Daniels, & Hart, 2003). Previously, research indicated that boot camp styles of confinement did not have a significant effect in lowering recidivism rates amongst adults or juveniles; a review of a decade of research indicated as much (Ashcroft et al., 2003). The review did not, however, differentiate between the generations of boot camps when the researchers made the conclusions. Subsequent research shows that second generation boot camps could have a significant impact on lowering recidivism (Meade & Steiner, 2010).

Although Wilson, MacKenzie, and Mitchell (2008) maintain that the militaristic element associated with boot camps does not have any significant impact on reducing recidivism for either adults or juveniles, the delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987; Franke et al., 2010) and pro-criminality consequence (Austin 2001; Gendreau et al., 1999; Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007) associated with prison and juvenile confinement (Mulvey et al., 2010; Schubert et al., 2012) supports Franke and colleague’s (2010) findings that second-generation boot camps can have a significant impact on improving perceptions of legitimacy, and also adds to the research regarding procedural justice (Bottoms, 1999; Kupchik, & Snyder, 2009; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995; Sparks et al., 1996; Tyler, 1990). Unlike traditional boot camps or other means of confinement the risk to reoffend may be mitigated by post-release programs associated with second-generation boot camps that aim to “help provide young offenders with the skills that they need to effect and sustain positive change” (Ashkar & Kenny, 2008, p. 595).
Juvenile Reentry into the Community

Juveniles recently released from incarceration face a multitude of obstacles when reentering and attempting reintegration into their communities (Inderbitzin, 2009). The term reintegration makes reference to a broader sense reentry that includes juveniles’ ability to appropriately interact and participate in their community, family, and acknowledges the effect their reentry has on victims and the general public (Altschuler & Brash, 2004). Altschuler and Brash (2004) described reintegration this way: “Reintegration is the means by which institutional and community corrections can be bridged, for it takes into account both what happens when an offender is incarcerated and afterward,” (p. 74).

Maruna (2001) points out the exacerbated circumstance many of these individuals face considering they were not appropriately “integrated into the mainstream in the first place” (p. 14). The juveniles’ problematic decisions of the past place strain on familial relations during and after their time in confinement (Mears & Travis, 2004). The previous choices that led the juvenile offenders to incarceration often involve modes of revenue generation that are considered illegitimate (Mears & Travis, 2004). Even though these modes are illegitimate, they involve skills nonetheless (Travis, Salomon, & Waul, 2001). These juveniles that have developed such skills face an uphill battle in retraining themselves in revenue generation methods that are fully legitimate (Travis et al., 2001). These obstacles are intensified with the issues juveniles typically face with their transition to adulthood (James, Stams, Asscher, De Roo, & Van der Laan, 2013).

Research has shown that intensive treatment in combination with supervision in the community can be effective in curtailing recidivism amongst probationers (Kurlyckek & Kempinen, 2006; Petersilia & Turner, 1993). Other research points to issues within the community reentry programs for juveniles (Gemignani, 1994), ones that may explain the ineffectiveness associated with them (Chung, Schubert, & Mulvey, 2007). Two main points of issue pointed out by Gemignani (1994) were the lower rates of high school participation upon reentry as well as the even lower rates of graduation amongst those reentering the community. Altschuler, Armstrong, and MacKenzie (1999) suggest that post-release supervision is not enough to curtail recidivism. Extensive programming and an environment that develops hope is necessary to begin addressing the needs of youth recently released from confinement (Chung et al., 2007). This contention is supported by an investigation of
juvenile boot camps conducted by Kurlychek and Kempinen (2006). After following 720 juveniles confined in a Maryland boot camp for two years after their release, Kurlychek and Kempinen (2006) found that those who participated in the aftercare program recidivated less than those who did not. Research supporting this contention also suggests that recidivism can be reduced if reentry programs begin the reintegration process during the time period immediately after release from confinement (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994).

The literature further suggests that the quality of employment for boot camp graduates could pose obstacles during their reentry back into the community (Kurlychek, 2010). If the graduates do find legitimate employment, their earnings often place them well below the poverty line (Kurlychek, 2010). They also often experience other issues that inhibit proper reintegration, such as issues involving housing and difficulty with “reforming familial bonds,” (Kurlychek, 2010, p. 122). Social bonds were identified as significant variables in former inmates’ reintegration back into the community (Doherty, 2006; Horney, Osgood, & Marshall, 1995; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Rocque et al., 2010). Kurlychek (2010, p. 122) indicates that the rehabilitation programs in confinement may not be failing the graduates; instead it may be our lack of “a better understanding of the programs and services necessary to help offenders overcome the obstacles to reentry…”

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention relies on a reentry model, also referred to as an aftercare model, developed by Altschuler and Armstrong (1994) as a reference for guidelines to develop and evaluate reentry and aftercare programs. The Intensive Aftercare Program Model (IAP) was developed using an integration of criminological theories that include social control theory, strain theory, and social learning theory in attempt to offer an explanation for juvenile recidivism (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994). The illustration, provided at the end of this report as Figure 1, shows how the integration of theories relates to underlying principles, program elements, and service areas involved with intensive juvenile aftercare (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994). Altschuler and Armstrong’s (1994) model is based on the argument that:

Serious, chronic delinquency is related to: (1) weak controls produced by inadequate socialization, social disorganization, and strain, (2) strain, which can have a direct effect on delinquency independent of weak controls and which is also produced by social disorganization, and (3) peer group influences that

...A correctional continuum consisting of three distinct, yet overlapping, segments: (1) pre-release and preparatory planning during incarceration; (2) structured transition that requires the participation of institutional and aftercare staff prior to and following community reentry; and (3) long-term, reintegrative activities that ensure adequate service delivery and the necessary level of social control. (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1996, p. 15)

Bullis and Yovanoff (2004) studied a group of juveniles in a reentry program in Oregon. They found that if the youth had participated in mental health treatment and social services, such as vocational training, the participants were twice as likely to be “engaged” (Bullis & Yovanoff, 2004, p. 91). The researchers define engagement as possessing a job, participating in school, or staying out of incarceration (Bullis & Yovanoff, 2004). It should
be noted, however, that the researchers only investigated Caucasian males and consequently the their research should be considered limited in regards to the current study, but their research does support the notion that the sooner probationers released from confinement get involved with reentry programs, the better chance they will not reoffend (Bullis & Yovanoff, 2004).

As part of an extensive study of two facilities under the SDCPD’s jurisdiction, Burke and colleagues (2008) completed 42 interviews with juveniles who were confined at either Camp Barrett or the Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF) one year after release. Those interviewed indicated that they were treated in a fair and respectful manner by the probation officers and other staff (Burke et al., 2008). The research revealed two main concerns on part of the students: the first involved the fear of not being trusted by probation officers and staff; and the second main concern was that the students were not afforded an effective voice, or put another way, were not “being heard by staff” (Burke et al., 2008, p. 7). A key finding of the study was the appreciation the students had for the educational and training opportunities while in confinement. The authors point to an overall increase in GPA amongst the confined students as evidence to support their contention (Burke et al., 2008). The authors also report that the students experienced a strong sense that they had a “lack of freedom” while in confinement (Burke et al., 2008, p. 7), a point that will be explored further in this report’s Discussion section.

Although many of the students interviewed for Burke and colleague’s (2008) study voiced appreciation for the helpful programs provided while in confinement, only about of quarter of them said that they had participated in reentry programming after being released. Budgetary constraints within San Diego County were identified as a possible reason for this low participation rate (Burke et al., 2008). A significant portion of the students also dropped out of school, which the authors point out would only intensify their frustration when seeking employment (Burke et al., 2008). Successful reentry and reintegration into the community, according to the authors, is significantly dependent upon the acquisition of a high school diploma or the passage of the GED (Burke et al., 2008). The latter finding is reflected in the connection between the attainment of employment and the decreased likelihood of reoffending; employment provides legitimate revenue generation that can help reintegrate the individual back into the community and help heal wounds within the family (Duran et al.,
2013). However, there is research that contends the acquisition of a job is not a “silver bullet” in curtailing recidivism (Duran et al., 2013, p. 2).

**Summary of Literature**

In sum, procedural justice influences people’s perceptions of legitimacy and law enforcement (Tyler, 1990). The more legitimate people view law enforcement, the more likely they are to obey the law (Bottoms, 1999; Paternoster et al., 1997; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995; Sparks et al., 1996; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler et al., 2007), follow court orders (Benesh & Howell, 2001; Tyler, 1984), and cooperate with police (Tyler, 1990). In terms of confinement, research exists questioning the direct connection between procedural justice and perceptions of legitimacy in confinement (Resig & Mesko, 2009). Although, the same research also suggests that if inmates are treated fairly, they are less likely to break facility rules (Resig & Mesko, 2009). Since the traditional prison experience can be criminalizing (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007) and delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987) for inmates, alternative forms of confinement should be considered (Armstrong, 2004). Research shows that second-generation boot camp environment does not develop the same delegitimizing effect as a prison environment (Franke et al., 2010).

Juvenile correctional policy should be developed keeping in mind the effect procedural fairness has on behavior while acknowledging that the quality of confinement is more significant than the length of time when fighting juvenile recidivism (Scott & Steinberg, 2010). The current study represents an investigation of Camp Barrett and the Transitions/Pathways to Success reentry program to determine if they are as effective in neutralizing the delegitimizing effect associated with the traditional prison environment (DiIulio, 1987).
CHAPTER 3

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT’S
CAMP BARRETT

Many counties throughout the United States implemented the alternative military-camp style of confinement for both adults and juveniles as a means to address high recidivism rates (National Institute of Justice, 2003). San Diego County’s version, Barrett Honor Camp (commonly referred to as Camp Barrett), is located in Descanso, CA, about an hour drive outside the city of San Diego. It was originally a “conservation and social rehabilitation camp for men” aged 18 to 25 years (San Diego County Grand Jury, 2013, p. 22). The camp was rededicated as an adult honor camp in the early 1960s, the programming of which did not become evident during the research into the facility’s history (San Diego County Grand Jury, 2013). The facility then merged with the San Diego County Probation Department (SDCPD) in 1973, which converted the camp into a facility to house juvenile and young adult offenders in 1989. Since then, the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) was put in charge of the educational and vocational training, also known as the Regional Occupational Program (ROP) (San Diego Grand Jury, 2013), covered in more detail below.

Camp Barrett represents the “only minimum-security, local placement option” for juvenile offenders in San Diego County (Burke et al., 2008, p. v). It stands as an alternative to traditional confinement for juveniles that have lengthy experiences in the justice system. The camp’s population is made up youth who are considered more capable and probable to reoffend. There is now a waiting list for Camp Barrett because SDCPD views the programs at the camp as being successful and because Camp Barrett is currently at maximum capacity. Table 3 provides a description of the average Camp Barrett participant.

Camp Barrett houses a maximum capacity of 135 male juveniles in three dorms (barracks) that consist of bunk beds commonly found on a military base or traditional boot camp. The average daily population of students confined at Camp Barrett is 133 (County of
Table 3. Camp Barrett Youth Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 prior arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 prior sustained petitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 prior commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High number of risk factors (21.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low number of protective factors (3.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay</td>
<td>136.82 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


San Diego - Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012). The students range in ages from 16 to 21, with an average age of 17. The average confinement for a student involves a 20-week commitment with services that include high school education, mental health and substance abuse, social tolerance, and work readiness (Burke et al., 2008). San Diego County Probation Department’s (2012a) annual report for 2011-2012 indicated that the high school at Camp Barrett, Barrett High School, boasted the most high school diploma acquisitions of any San Diego County Probation facility high school (five including Barrett High School). 27 Barrett High School participants acquired a high school diploma compared to East Mesa School at the East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility that had 14 (San Diego County Probation Department, 2012a).

The camp facility is made up of an office building, the aforementioned dorms, a kitchen/mess hall, a high school, and other smaller buildings that are used for vocational training and storage (County of San Diego - Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012). The camp staffs one director, four supervisors, 44 probation officers, and two individuals that make up the office staff. The staffing numbers indicate that there is one staff member for every 15 students during the day and one staff member for every 30 students during the night (County of San Diego - Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012).

Camp Barrett acts as one of the facilitating sites for San Diego County’s Regional Occupational Program (ROP), which involves occupational training and preparation for careers in fields that include technology, construction, horticulture, culinary arts, graphic arts and building maintenance (San Diego County Probation Department, 2012a). At one point, the camp offered a fire science class as a ROP option, but the class was discontinued in 2012 (San Diego County Grand Jury, 2013).
According to the San Diego County Probation Department’s (2012a) annual report for 2011-2012, “173 youth attended resource fairs in the community. 82 youth received internships or paid employment following their release from the camp” (p. 31). Further testament to Camp Barrett’s success, it was proven to be cost effective through an evaluation conducted by Burke and colleagues (2008) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The research showed that Camp Barrett is more practical in terms of a cost-benefit ratio compared to other state confinement alternatives, such as the California Youth Authority (CYA). According to Burke and colleagues (2008), the California Youth Authority, now referred to as Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), would need to be “150-300 times more effective” to reach the level of tax payer benefit realized by Camp Barrett (p. 8).

**THE TRANSITIONS/PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS REENTRY PROGRAM**

Camp Barrett fits within the definition of a second-generation boot camp because of its emphasis on rehabilitation measures such as education, training, and counseling (Franke et al., 2010). It also offers a similar post-release component as that described by Ashkar and Kenny (2008), which is meant to help mitigate the chances of reoffending by the students, once released. This program, known as the Transitions reentry program, is a product of the combined efforts of the SDCPD and the SDCOE Juvenile Courts and Community Schools (JCCS). The program is referred to as and funded under the name Pathways to Success by JCCS. To help aid a student’s transitions from confinement back into the community, the SDCPD and JCCS use a information form called the Camp Barrett Transitions Program Exit Plan (see Figure 2). The form provides the community probation officer and JCCS caseworker information regarding a student’s experience at Camp Barrett so that the two agencies are able to maintain consistency and accuracy in the student’s reintegration back into the community.

The program brings together traditional education, vocational training, substance abuse counseling, work readiness training, and restorative justice into a structure that helps provide the Camp Barrett students guidance and the tools to help their transition from confinement back to their communities. Participation in the program once released from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Camp Barrett Transitions Program Exit Plan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Casework PO:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID#:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phone:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Committed:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anticipated Exit Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Numbers:</strong> Home</td>
<td><strong>Cell</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Address:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs completed at Camp Barrett:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Credits:</strong> Anticipated School:</td>
<td>Contacted Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>GED</strong> Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Readiness</strong> Y N <strong>Completed</strong> Y N <strong>Internship</strong> Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact for Work Readiness:</strong> Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Orders to be Completed:</strong> Curfew:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Service Work</strong> Y N <strong>Hours:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complete at:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fines</strong> Y N <strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restitution</strong> Y N <strong>Amount</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse Treatment</strong> Y N <strong>Complete at:</strong></td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signed:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed by PO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone call made to parent</strong> Y N** Reviewed w/Parent** Y N <strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Hearing Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Camp Barrett Transitions Program exit plan. Source: San Diego County Probation Department. (n.d.). *San Diego County Probation Department’s transitions goals, objectives, and performance measures.* Unpublished manuscript.
confinement is completely voluntary and therefore positively influences the juvenile court to consider a student’s early release from probation. According to the County of San Diego Juvenile Community Supervision website (County of San Diego, n.d.), the SDCPD’s aftercare program fits the IAP model described above in the Juvenile Reentry into the Community section.

Once released, the youth are immediately put on community supervision by the SDCPD and placed in the aftercare portion of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. Aftercare includes post-release services such as drug abuse counseling/treatment, education services that may include the return to high school, continued vocational training, and job placement, all of which tends to last approximately six months (Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission, 2001). The students are assigned to a JCCS caseworker who helps each student find employment, further his education, obtain credentials for employment, or help with other tasks such as obtaining a driver’s license. Probation officers in the community work closely with the students’ caseworkers. Seven students are assigned to every caseworker.

The SDCPD describes the Transitions reentry program as “San Diego’s Re-Entry Model, [which] is based on the fundamental belief that in order to be successful members of the community, youthful offenders must be assisted in their transition from delinquent adolescence to law abiding adulthood” (San Diego County Probation Department, n.d.). The JCCS and SDCOE refer to the program as the Pathways to Success Program. The program is supported by all 27 SDCOE employees that make up the JCCS staff, which includes nine credentialed teachers, a child development specialist, nine teacher assistants, a counselor, a parent liaison, two student support specialists that help with student assessment, a project facilitator, and three work readiness assistants.

Most of the ROP classes that make up the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program are located at Camp Barrett. The Graphic Arts Class is one that is located outside of Camp Barrett at the JCCS Eastern Office. Mr. Anderson, the Work Readiness instructor, conducts one-on-one sessions with students at the JCCS office in down town San Diego. The JCCS case managers provide education, support, and training opportunities in the form of academic
tutoring, further substance abuse counseling, training to obtain a driver’s license,\(^5\) and other opportunities.

There are nine goals of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, each with a specific outcome measure (see Table 4). The first and arguably primary goal of the reentry program is to reduce recidivism. The reentry program aims to reduce probationers’ subsequent arrests and convictions. The other goals include: improvement of educational outcomes; complete employment skills training; improve employment outcomes; increase knowledge about substance abuse, addiction, and recovery; decrease substance abuse; increase life skills; increase positive coping skills; and ensure that each client is integrated into the community (San Diego County Probation Department, n.d.).

SDCOE and JCCS provided the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention a progress report an assessment of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program for the months of July through December 2013. The report indicated that 14 of the 100 students who were participating in the program and released from confinement were charged with new crimes. It also revealed that 28 of the students committed new probation violations.

The goals the current study intended to assess, in a limited way, using qualitative interviews of Camp Barrett students includes improved educational outcomes, completion of substance abuse education, and the whether that the probationers felt that they are successfully integrated into their respective communities (San Diego County Probation Department, n.d.). To do so, I sought to confirm whether: the students interviewed for the current study felt that their educational outcomes had improved; whether the students were participating in or graduated from a substance abuse program; and how interested they were in finding work, interacting with their family, and complying with the terms of their probation.

Lee et al. (2007) suggest that the juvenile courts should use a “scientifically valid risk assessments” when determining juveniles’ sentence, place of confinement, and treatment programming (p. 12). The SDCPD implements a risk assessment

\(^5\) The JCCS Eastern Office provides the opportunity to use a virtual reality training system to help students learn to drive and ultimately obtain a driver’s license.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce recidivism</td>
<td>Decrease number of overall and violent true finds/convictions</td>
<td>Number of new law violations (T/F or conviction - # violent) will be run at 6, 12, 18 months after termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Education Outcomes</td>
<td>Complete GED/HS diploma</td>
<td>High school diploma (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete employment skills training</td>
<td>Complete work readiness program. Complete vocational training program.</td>
<td>Completion of Work Readiness Program (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of Vocation training program (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve employment outcomes</td>
<td>Obtain employment</td>
<td>Employment obtained (Y/N) defined as at least 30 days of continuous employment at time of termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge about substance abuse, addiction and recovery</td>
<td>Complete Substance Abuse Class</td>
<td>Complete in-custody Substance Abuse Class (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete community based Substance Abuse group (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease substance abuse</td>
<td>Maintain abstinence</td>
<td>Number of drug tests % Negative drug tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase life skills</td>
<td>Complete Life Skills program Obtain self-sufficiency</td>
<td>Complete Life Skills Program (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have stable living environment (address) at time of termination from supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have personal identification: • CA ID or drivers license • Social Security card • Birth certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase positive coping skills</td>
<td>Decrease violent behavior</td>
<td>Complete Cognitive-Behavior/Anger Management Class (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Social Tolerance program (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that each client is integrated into community</td>
<td>Complete a reentry case plan</td>
<td>Reentry case plan in place prior to leaving institution Face to face in custody (every 30 days by DPO/SrPO) Face to face within 72 hours after release (DPO/SrPO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego County Probation Department. (n.d.). San Diego County Probation Department’s transitions goals, objectives, and performance measures. Unpublished manuscript.
tool known as the San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up to predict the probability that an offender might reoffend. Pearl, Ashcraft, and Geis (2009) describe the SDRRC as:

...A 60-item measure of risk and protective factors related to a juvenile’s functioning. Risk factors are designed to measure the level of dysfunction in a youth’s life, while protective factors measure the extent to which a minor has “protection” or positive factors in his/her life. The risk and protective items measured on the SDRRC are divided into six domains: individual factors, delinquency factors, family factors, educational factors, substance use factors, and peer factors. The SDRRC is designed to be administered at the time of the initial investigation and then again every six months during the period of community supervision.

The lower the resiliency score, the more likely an individual will be rearrested (Turner, Fain, & Sehgal, 2005). A study conducted by Turner and others (2005) of 1,200 juveniles in Los Angeles County found that the SDRRC scores could be broken out into “low” (12 or less), “medium” (13-33), and “high” (34 or more) categories. As shown in Table 5, the study showed that 35 percent of the juveniles with a low resiliency score were rearrested within 12 months of being released from confinement. Only eight percent of the juveniles with a high resiliency score were rearrested in the same time frame (Turner et al., 2005). The current form of the SDRRC now incorporates the “low,” “medium,” and “high” categories into the assessment. Tables 6, 7, and 8 illustrate SDRRC scores/risk levels based upon age, gender, and ethnicity. The SDRRC is used as an intake assessment for Camp Barrett that is normally completed three months before arrival (Burke et al., 2008). The average risk score for a student at Camp Barrett is 8.8, meaning the average student at the camp scored low on the SDRRC (Burke et al., 2008).

**Table 5. Arrested within 12 Months of Assessment, by Resiliency Score (Weighted)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resiliency Score</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (12 or less)</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (13-33)</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (34+)</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-square = 88.3 (p<.0001)
Table 6. San Diego County Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Scored</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7. San Diego County Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Scored</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 8. San Diego County Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Scored</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr.-Am.</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

THE QUALITATIVE METHOD AND SEMISTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

The qualitative method was implemented using one-on-one interviews that took place in private settings at three JCCS offices. A semistructured protocol was created for the current study. As Wengraf (2001) suggested, semistructured interviews require a strong understanding of a topic because of the high occurrence of improvisation that it requires. This type of interview offers the ability to get “in depth” and by doing so, an investigator can get “more detailed knowledge,” and “a sense of how the apparently straight-forward is actually more complicated” (Wengraf, 2001, p. 6). The goal of the current study was to ascertain participants’ perceptions of legitimacy in confinement. This offered the opportunity to express their points of view, voice their experiences, and describe how they felt about their experiences at Camp Barrett.

The interview protocol (Appendix A) borrowed concepts pertaining to perceptions of confinement inspired by Tyler’s (1990) study on legitimacy and police, the MacKenzie, Mitchell, et al. (2007) study, and from recent research conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Sedlak, 2008). The structure and tone of the questions were mainly influenced by Tyler’s (1990) study, which asked questions such as “How fair was the outcome you received from the police?” (p. 203). MacKenzie, Mitchell, et al. (2007) observations, which included interviews with the boot camp and prison inmates, helped me identify potentially significant topics during my observations, which added to the contextual quality and accuracy of the questions. These topics included perceived treatment by the probation officers, enforcement of rules, procedures allowing inmates voice and representation during the processing of sanctions, and feelings regarding relationships with teachers. A significant topic gleaned from the Mackenzie, Berie, et al. (2007) study was the level of interest inmates perceived probation officers as having regarding the inmates’ progress, success, and overall well being. The Sedlak (2008) study provided a framework for
the structure of the current study’s interview questions that addressed the participants’ perceptions of their surroundings while at Camp Barrett. For instance, the Sedlak (2008) study explored inmates’ feelings regarding staff by determining “How do youth perceive the staff? What percentages of youth say positive versus negative things about staff? What percentage see resident/staff relations as generally good versus poor?” (p. 10).

The questions in the interview protocol mainly focused on the relationships the students had with Transitions/Pathways to Success Program’s teachers, the Camp Barrett probation officers, and the feelings they had about their experiences at Camp Barrett. After a student answered a question, his answer would then be probed using in-depth follow-up questions that were most often guided by the protocol, but occasionally improvised as part of the constant comparative method (explained further in the Interview Procedures section). Once a student finished answering an improvised question, I took note of the question for use in subsequent interviews. My observational notes, taken at Camp Barrett during the fall of 2010 and spring of 2011, also factored into the questions asked. My observations at the camp previewed me to some of the topics that students might have been able to relate to in terms of procedural justice and legitimacy. Observing the students interacting with the probation officers and teachers allowed me to understand the context of topics important to the students, such as earning a position of leadership, referred to as being a “hat.”

The discussions I had with the camp’s staff influenced an attempt to include interviews with the Camp Barrett probation officers in the current study. The failed attempt to gain access to Camp Barrett probation officers for these interviews will be explained further in Chapter Five. Field observations were made prior to the implementation of the study, which are further described in the following section.

**Camp Barrett Observations**

The current study was developed from my curiosity of juvenile confinement through frequent visits to Camp Barrett in the fall of 2010 and spring of 2011. I took part in many discussions with the probation officers and teachers there, as well as received guidance from Camp Barrett directors and SDCPD administration. Dr. Natalie Pearl, the San Diego Probation Department Research Division director, suggested I visit Camp Barrett as a way to develop ideas that could help generate the beginning of a master’s thesis. The initial visit
allowed me to meet Camp Barrett’s vocational teacher, referred to in this report as Mr. Grey, who allowed me to observe his classes on Wednesdays and Saturdays. I spent approximately four hours making observations, conversing with teachers (Mr. Grey introduced me to most of the ROP teachers at Camp Barrett), and spoke with probation officers each day I was there.

The first round of observations (taken in 2010) were twice a week for eight weeks and took place in the classroom and outdoors. Mr. Grey led the students on basic projects that included the students in the building maintenance class (Saturdays) fixing the rain gutter system attached to the probation officer sleeping quarters and students planting a vegetable garden behind one of the dorms in the horticulture class (Wednesdays). The second round of observations (taken in 2011 – once or twice a week for five weeks) mostly consisted of observations of Mr. Grey’s classes. Each class normally started in the classroom where Mr. Grey provided verbal and written instructions for the day’s project. After about 30 to 45 minutes of instruction, the remainder of the two-hour class took place outdoors. Mr. Grey taught two classes two days a week. He was also a vocational teacher at other San Diego County Probation facilities as well as San Diego County Probation’s Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF).

The probation officers were well aware of my presence and the reason for it. Most of them seemed to be accepting of my intentions, although some seemed to be either reserved or uninterested in my project. Those that were interested were more inclined to answer my questions or engage in discussion. It was these conversations that developed my interest in understanding the relationships between probation officers and the students and how those relationships affect the students’ perceptions of their confinement.

The observations were used to help develop the questions for the current study’s interview protocol (research instrument). Since I was unable to obtain the original interview guide used by MacKenzie, Mitchell, et al. (2007) study of adults in boot camp style confinements, I was tasked with creating an original interview protocol for the current study. As further described in the Methods section below, the interview protocol was influenced by questions and points available in Franke and colleague’s (2010) published report on their study, Tom Tyler’s (1990) Why People Obey the Law, and the context derived from my observation notes, taken while at Camp Barrett.
The students that were observed, and those who participated in the current study, offered terms in conversation and their responses to interview questions that were used as colloquialisms at Camp Barrett. Definitions for these colloquialisms are attached to this report as Appendix B.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY IRB PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT AND PROCESS

The Institutional Review Board at San Diego State University approved my protocol for the current study (see Appendix C). The IRB put forth minimal concerns regarding my project, which mainly included improvement of measures to protect participant confidentiality. Those concerns, such as protection of sensitive documents and interview locations, were addressed and the protocol was amended to improve the measures in question.

A significant stipulation in the IRB approval was to obtain permission to gain access to the juvenile probationers from the Juvenile Division of the San Diego County Superior Court, the SDCPD, and the JCCS. The San Diego County Superior Court granted permission by providing an official order “authorizing access to juvenile wards,” which is also labeled as a “protective order.” The order was signed, and permission granted, by the Honorable Cynthia Bashant, Judge of the Juvenile Court (see Appendix D).

The SDCPD granted permission through a letter provided by Dr. Natalie Pearl, Director of the SDCPD’s Research Division. The JCCS administrators would not grant permission to accessing the juvenile probationers without official approval by San Diego State University’s IRB. However, Dr. Wendell Callahan, the Director of Assessment, Research and Pupil Services at JCCS, provided me with a letter assuring that the JCCS IRB would review the project. This letter was deemed sufficient for the San Diego State University IRB to grant conditional approval of the project. The JCCS IRB then approved the project and access to the juvenile probationers with the SDSU conditional IRB approval. The San Diego State University IRB then granted official approval and permission to proceed with the study.
SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT

A description of the current study’s sample and the recruitment procedures involved in finding the participants are described in detail below.

Sample

The sample that was recruited for the current study consisted of eleven male students who participated, or were participating at the time of interview, in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. All of the participants were between 16 and 19 years of age. To qualify for participation in the study, students had to have been a part of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program at Camp Barrett at any time between 2011 and 2013. I was unable to obtain permission to interview the students while they were confined at Camp Barrett, so a secondary qualification was that they had to have been already released from the camp in order to participate in the study.

Recruitment

The students who participated in the current study were recruited with the help of JCCS case managers and teachers at Camp Barrett. The SDCPD’s probation officers (within the community) also helped with recruiting. JCCS teachers at Camp Barrett, such as Mr. Grey and Mr. Anderson, were informed about the current study with the hope that they would be able to stoke interest in participating among the students involved in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program at Camp Barrett. The teachers were given a one-page synopsis that explained the scope and aim of the study and how the study could incentivize the students who participated.

Once released from Camp Barrett, the student would meet with a JCCS case manager within forty-eight to seventy-two hours. The case manager would review the benefits afforded by continued participation in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, as well as the expectations the student would be required to comply with. At the end of the review, the JCCS case manager presented the opportunity for the student to participate in the current study. The student would be given a flyer, which contained my contact information, and if interested, the student would call me to set up an appointment to meet and potentially participate in an interview.
The JCCS case managers were not always the first recruiters that the students would meet upon being released from Camp Barrett. Sometimes a student would first meet with his community probation officer before meeting with a JCCS representative. This process was the same as when presented by a JCCS case manager.

Once a student contacted me, the details, minutia, and implications of the study were explained. I explained potential risks, confidentiality afforded by the use of pseudonyms, the keeping of sensitive information locked in Dr. Alan Mobley’s (thesis chair) filing cabinet in his office at San Diego State University, and erasing of the interview recordings and transcripts upon completion of the current study. If a student agreed to participate, an appointment was made to meet at a JCCS center where the student could review and sign an informed consent document. In the few cases that a student was under the age of 18, the student’s parent/guardian accompanied the student to the appointment to sign a consent form (Appendix E) and the student signed an assent form (Appendix F).

**Interview Procedures**

The interviews took place in private settings at three different JCCS locations. The locations each provided an area that was secluded and offered an environment where the students could feel comfortable in expressing themselves without the risk of a violation of privacy. The interviews took approximately 45 to 60 minutes to complete and were recorded using a traditional tape recorder with the permission of the students. The recordings were transcribed verbatim after each interview. The interview protocol was used only as a guide for the conversations. Most of the questions were asked verbatim from the interview protocol, but not in a specific chronological order. The questions were asked as I felt appropriate during the flow of each conversation eliciting more detailed answers.

The current study benefitted from the use of the constant comparative method as it provided deeper, more significant investigation as the study progressed. The use of the constant comparative method allows for an ongoing development of investigative tools that helps the investigator more effectively prepare for subsequent interviews by helping to elucidate categories that offer description and explanation, as well as investigate in more depth (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest that the constant comparative method can “[Make] it more likely that analysts will discover variation as well
as general patterns” (p. 78). Because the students occasionally provided responses acknowledging topics that I had not considered when initially developing the interview protocol, I decided to implement the constant comparative method to enhance the protocol’s quality. By doing so, I was able to acknowledge topics, such as students engaging in flattery with the probation officers, in the latter seven interviews that helped enrich the analysis.

At the end of each interview, the student received a ten-dollar gift card for Jack in the Box restaurants. Before each interview, I made it clear to each student that the student had the right to end the interview at any point, for any reason, and the student would still be allowed to keep the gift card. Each of the students completed the interview in full.

**QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS**

The data was analyzed using the method of content analysis. Once the interviews were transcribed verbatim, the transcripts were then coded using terms that identified specific themes regarding procedural justice and fairness. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) describe content analysis, and the coding involved with it, as something that “makes it possible to quantify how often specific themes are addressed in a text, and the frequency of themes can then be compared and correlated with other measures” (p. 203). The current study produced responses from students that exemplified themes that were categorized in terms of positive, neutral, and negative experiences and then subsequently interpreted as legitimizing, delegitimizing, or neutral in this regard. The coded themes were categorized and input into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. A positive experience was indicated in the spreadsheet as a one. A negative experience was indicated as a zero. A one with an asterisk indicated a neutral experience. The following chapter provides results of the current study. The names of students, teachers, instructors, and probation officers have all been changed to ensure confidentiality.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

TRANSITIONS/PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS PROGRAM

CLASSES

The classes at Camp Barrett that were associated with the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program were mostly offered only on site. Although some of the classes, such as the Graphic Arts Class, were offered at a few of the JCCS locations. The following offers a description of the classes that make up the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program.

Life Skills Class

Of the eleven students interviewed, six students mentioned that they were enrolled in the Life Skills Class (Table 9). All six had positive responses specific to the Life Skills Class and four of the six specified the class when answering the question: “Can you name some things or people that you respected while at Camp Barrett?” Charles\(^6\) answered by saying, “[The] Life Skills [Class] was a helpful class. [Expressing yourself about] stuff like that is hard to explain sometimes” (Charles, personal communication, August 8, 2013). Two students provided responses that indicated positive perceptions specific to the class instructor, Dr. Banner. There were not any students who provided negative perceptions regarding Dr. Banner.

To answer the question “What was your experience with the Life Skills Class?” one student, John, stated that he enjoyed it because the students were given the option to sit in the back of the class quietly if they did not want to participate. John, who preferred to draw quietly in the back of the class instead of participating in the circle like the other students, also stated that although he did not offer any vocal participation, he did in fact listen to the

\(^6\) All names of students, teachers, instructors, probation officers, and/or staff have been changed with the use of pseudonyms.
Table 9. Students’ Perceptions of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Reentry Program’s Classes in Relation to their Experience and Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitions/Pathways to Success Classes</th>
<th>Positive or fair experience</th>
<th>Neutral experience</th>
<th>Negative or unfair experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance/Horticulture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Tolerance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

conversations that took place. John said that he enjoyed listening to the conversations and was able to take a lot away from the class that he considered helpful.

When answering the same question, Rick specified that although he was never enrolled in the class, he spoke to others that did take the class. After speaking with them, he wanted to take the class, but was told he would not be able to do so.

Horticulture and Building Maintenance Classes

Five of the eleven students interviewed said they had taken part in one the vocational classes, either the Horticulture Class or Building Maintenance Class (Table 9). Mr. Grey’s name was mentioned in a positive manner sixteen times by the five students (Table 10). One student described Mr. Grey as fair, helpful, caring, trustworthy, and someone who the student could put faith in.

Lance specifically named Mr. Grey when answering the following question: “Can you name some people or things that you respected while at Camp Barrett?” The student stated, “I like the Horticulture [Class] too. [Mr. Grey] really helped me out with that” (Lance, personal correspondence, August 2, 2013). Another student, Jack, said, “[Mr. Grey] is amazing. He’s a really cool guy. He was pretty fair with everybody” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). When answering a follow up question regarding whether Mr. Grey’s fairness affected the way he thought about the vocational class, the student indicated Mr. Grey’s influence improved his perspective of the class:
Table 10. Students’ Perceptions of Transitions/Pathways to Success Class Teachers, Instructors, and Counselors in Relation to Positive/Negative Experiences and Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitions/Pathways to Success Class Teachers, Instructors, and Counselors</th>
<th>Positive or fair experience</th>
<th>Neutral experience</th>
<th>Negative or unfair experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance/Horticulture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Readiness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.90%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Tolerance</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett High School Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.64%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I mean yes it did, it made me feel like – feel like I could learn something else. It made me feel like I could learn something new. They kept me interested because I am an active person, I like to move around, [and] I like to fix things. So it really helped me out. (Lance, personal communication, August 5, 2013)

Jack’s subsequent statements suggested that he felt Mr. Grey genuinely cared whether the students in his class succeeded or not. The perception that Mr. Grey cared, according to the student, did not just apply to success in the specific class, but went beyond the confines of Camp Barrett. The student in question, along with many others, received Mr. Grey’s attention outside of Camp Barrett in the form of job referrals and employment counseling.

**Work Readiness Class**

The students who participated in this study mentioned Mr. Anderson and the Work Readiness Class twenty-six times, twenty-five of which were positive. Comments specific to the Work Readiness Class included “[the class] helped me make a plan” and described the class as “helpful.”

The lone comment regarding Mr. Anderson specifically, voiced by John, which was analyzed as neutral (Table 10), indicated the following:

If these guys [JCCS case managers] can’t help me out while I’m getting my certificates, well then hell yeah, I’m going to hit up [Mr. Anderson]. Well, really, I don’t need Mr. Anderson’s help. I don’t need [Mr. Anderson] f---ing help. He’s got a network, that’s the only thing he has. I will give him that, he has a network. He’s got people that have people who have people. I get that. Me, I have people too. But I just don’t have as many of them as him. But I can use Google and the internet to help me. So I’m not really worried about a job, I’m sure I can find a
job easily. Even if it’s something like flipping burgers or go to Sea World. They are always hiring. (John, personal correspondence, September 5, 2013)

The remaining comments regarding Mr. Anderson and the Work Readiness Class were provided indications of positive experiences, exemplified by comments like “[Mr. Anderson] really cares if we succeed” (Tyrone, personal communication, October 9, 2013). When answering a question about how supportive the probation officers were regarding the Work Readiness Class, Ryan spoke highly of Mr. Anderson in this way: “For me it was more about [Mr. Anderson]. Like for me, in my mind, that stuff is not the officers’ job…but for [Mr. Anderson], he gets you really pumped. Having him talk [in class], that made it helpful” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013).

It is clear that Mr. Anderson’s effort and consistency were highly appreciated by the students taking part in this study. Mr. Anderson possesses qualities that were described as “energetic” and “committed.” A few of the participants mentioned that Mr. Anderson’s immediate contact with them once they were released from Camp Barrett was one of the solidifying factors that convinced them of Mr. Anderson’s sincere interest in helping them to find work and to succeed in life.

Charles credited the Work Readiness Class for helping him obtain employment after being released from Camp Barrett. He explained that “Work Readiness was helpful, they helped you fill out applications and stuff. I already got a job too. So all the classes were [helpful] and all the staff and everything” (Charles, personal communication, August 8, 2013). Similarly, Lance answered the question “What was it about the classes that you respected?” by saying “Work Readiness [Class]. It was because [Mr. Anderson] helped us get ready for work. He helped us with the resume/ He helped us do the interviews. That was a good thing in there” (Lance, personal communication, August 2, 2013).

In all, nine of the eleven students interviewed for the current study provided responses that were indicative of positive experiences in relation to the Work Readiness Class (Table 9). Ten of the eleven students provided responses that indicated positive perceptions regarding their experiences with Mr. Anderson.
Graphic Arts Class

Three of the eleven students stated they participated in the Graphic Arts Class. All three suggested that they had positive experiences in the class (Table 9). John responded positively to the question, “Do you think the [Graphic Arts Class], overall, is something that is helpful?” He stated: “Yes, I can see that it is a good thing. But that’s what I’m trying to say. The only [classes] that I really learned anything [were] the Graphic Arts Class and Life Skills Class” (John, personal communication, September 5, 2013).

John further commented on the class by describing it as an environment where he could develop confidence in a skill. He described the class in the following way, “Everybody thought that [my work] was cool because [Mr. Glaser] would give comments like ‘oh, he knows what he is doing.’ And that would make me look really good in front of the POs. It was good to look good in front of the POs” (John, personal communication, September 5, 2013). Mr. Glaser was mentioned positively again by a student who described him as someone that was “just really helpful with all the stuff that takes to work the class” (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013).

Andrew, who responded positively to a question regarding the Graphics Arts Class, described the class as something that provided hope. Referring to the skill set that could be learned in the Graphic Arts Class, he said that the class had “more things [that] are going to help you in life” (Andrew, personal communication, August 1, 2013). All the students who took the class shared positive responses regarding their experience with Mr. Glaser (Table 10) and the Graphics Arts Class.

Culinary Arts Class

Of the eleven students interviewed, seven stated that they took part in Mr. Dillon’s Culinary Arts Class. Each of the seven provided positive responses about Mr. Dillon and his class (Table 9). Jose said that he appreciated the ability to earn legitimate favors when working in the kitchen. He said that he, “liked being in [the class] because you could earn kick-days and you could also get extra food. So it was something that you could earn everyday” (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013).

The staff in the kitchen was also specifically mentioned in a positive light by one of the students. One student said, “in the kitchen…there are like three chefs, they will
encourage you and not be mean to you. They were all pretty much nice” (Edgar, personal communication, October 10, 2013).

The participants spoke of Mr. Dillon positively many times as well. Four of the seven students who participated in the Culinary Arts Class provided positive responses regarding Mr. Dillon (Table 10). When answering the question, “Do you feel that it was important to [Mr. Dillon] that you succeed in the class?” Jose responded by saying:

Yes, because the first time that I saw him, he told us that, ‘We don’t have any time to waste. We need to all get Food Handlers cards.’ So I knew that he really meant business. And I know that I passed the test for the Food Handler’s card, but I just haven’t got [the] card yet. (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013)

In all, the students offered responses that indicated positive or fair experiences with the teachers, instructors, and counselors almost 90 percent of the time during the interviews (Table 10).

**Social Tolerance Class**

Only two of the eleven students interviewed for the current study stated they participated in the Social Tolerance Class. Each of the statements made regarding the Social Tolerance Class were analyzed as positive (Table 9). The class was not specified in any direct questions within the interview guide, which might explain the small number of statements concerning it.

However, Ryan provided statements that suggested strong support for the class. For example, he named the Social Tolerance Class as an example for the question “Do you think the time that you spent at Camp Barrett was a good thing for you, a bad thing for you, or somewhere in the middle?” Ryan expressed his appreciation for the classes by saying “The Social Tolerance Classes are really good” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013).

**Substance Abuse Class and the Voluntary Recovery Class**

Eight of the eleven students interviewed provided statements about the Substance Abuse Class that were analyzed as positive experiences (Table 9). The students provided remarks such as “I learned a lot,” and “When I first got there, it was the Substance Abuse Class that I was taking that I really liked,” to describe the class (George, personal
Jose described the Substance Abuse counselor as “...kind of like a mom” (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013). He subsequently detailed how he felt about the counselor when he answered the question, “How do you feel knowing that you had somebody up there that could fill that kind of role for you?” by stating:

If felt good because you could have somebody to talk to. And so she was always saying that if there is anything we ever needed to just go talk to her...[Like] when she was doing the Parenting Class, the class that she was not getting paid for, she would say, “I hope you respect this class because I’m coming here without getting paid.” It made it seem like she really cared. It was a parenting class that she didn’t even need to do. (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013)

Ryan described the Substance Abuse Class in the following way:

[The class] is somewhat about the future, but it’s also about the feelings stuff. Like for me, I did a lot of drugs. Towards the end, when I almost got out, for some reason, when I would sit on my bunk, I would look at my arms - because I used to inject heroin - and so I looked at my arms and I would see my veins and they were healthy again. You know, they were big and stuff, and so that was big for me to see that. So I would bring that up in class, about how I can use that against the need for instant gratification and the consequences that it will cause down the line. It makes you rethink the decisions that you have made. I now know that - yes - it’s going to give you an instant gratification, but in the long term it’s going to cause more problems...When I would get back to the dorm, I would feel relieved because it gave me a chance to get those thoughts out of my mind. It would be like a stress release, almost. Those urges would go away after I had a chance to explain myself to [the Substance Abuse counselor] and how I was feeling. We would be able to talk about it. Because like I said, it’s in the whole group, so you hear everyone [else’s] story and get feedback about how it affected them. It’s kind of weird because you see these people that are “thug,” you know what I mean? I’m not saying there’s anything wrong with that, but you see them and it’s like, you know that it’s real. You know it’s a place that you can be real about your emotions and feelings regardless of how you are on the streets and how you are at the dorms and stuff. When you’re in [the class], we stay real with each other. We talked about our feelings and how the drugs affected us. So that’s why I [liked] her class, everyone [could go] there and be truthful. (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)

In contrast to Ryan’s description, John suggested that the class was quite ineffective. He answered with an emphatic “No,” to the question of whether or not he was impressed by the classes or the counselor. Although, it should be noted that John suggested that the probation officers, for the most part, were interested in seeing the students succeed in the Substance Abuse Class. He stated that “There are a lot of POs that have that [interest], but
like I said [before], there are quite a few who just wanted a paycheck” (John, personal communication, September 5, 2013).

**Probation Officers’ Perceived Interest in Students’ Classroom Success**

Jack identified a probation officer’s vocal support for the effectiveness of the Building Maintenance Class in improving a student’s ability to succeed in their community as one of the significant factors that influenced his decision to “…take this opportunity to get clean, get out, get healthy, and stop messing around” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). He was one of five students that described a probation officer’s positivity in regards to a class related to the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program (Table 11). Of the ten students who mentioned the probation officers’ support for the classes, eight of the students voiced responses that were analyzed as either reflecting positive or neutral experiences.

Two students offered negative perceptions regarding the probation officers’ interest in the students’ success in the classroom. Ryan, unlike Jack, responded negatively to the question “Do you think it was important to [the probation officers] that you succeeded in the Work Readiness Class?” by stating “not really” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013). He did, however, provide a qualifier to that statement by suggesting:

> But in a way, maybe, because there would be times that they would allow you to do certain things. Like for instance, if you wanted to iron your clothes before Work Readiness, they might let you do that. When they brought some people up for the career fair…the officers would let us iron our clothes before we went, and so they did help with those kinds of things. Like, most officers will let you shower before Work Readiness [class]. But there were some officers out there who really didn’t care. Like [inaudible] they would tell you that showers were after. So you get done with calisthenics and have to go straight to Work Readiness all sweaty. (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)

Eight of the eleven students interviewed for this study mentioned that they perceived specific probation officers as having attitudes that indicated they did care about the students’ classroom success. All of the students’ statements related to this portion of the interview were analyzed as reflecting positive experiences.

Vocal encouragement by probation officers regarding the students’ classroom effort and participation level was mentioned a total of thirteen times during the eleven interviews. Two of the students mentioned statements that were both negative and positive/neural. One
Table 11. Student’s Responses to Interview Questions that Procured Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects positive or fair experience</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects neutral experience</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects negative or unfair experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your general perception of your experience at Camp Barrett?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consistent do you feel the rules are at San Diego County Probation Department’s facilities?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly do you think the Camp Barrett POs treated you?</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>90.90%*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly did the Camp Barrett POs enforce the rules?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly did the East Mesa POs enforce the rules?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.42%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly did the Kearny Mesa POs enforce the rules?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you feel Camp Barrett POs cared about whether or not you succeeded in your classes?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about the Transitions/Pathways to Success Programs in general?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.27%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some students provided responses that indicated both positive/fair perceptions and negative/unfair perceptions.

A student declared that the probation officers did not offer any vocal encouragement in this regard. The remaining responses included six statements that were analyzed as positive and two statements that were analyzed as neutral. Taken as a whole, this portion of the interview can be considered as possessing a neutral, if not legitimizing, effect.

**CONSISTENCY OF RULES AMONGST CAMP BARRETT, KMJDF, AND EMJDF**

The study’s interview protocol explored the students’ perceptions concerning how they felt the rules compared at different San Diego County Probation facilities, specifically East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility (EMJDF) and Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility (KMJDF), to rules at Camp Barrett. All eleven students provided responses that were indicative of either neutral or positive experiences regarding their perception of consistency in the rules among the EMJDF, KMJDF, and Camp Barrett facilities (Table 11). Each student
declared that they had spent time at both EMJDF and KMJDF. One of the students had also experienced time at a facility called Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF) in Campo, which is located on the eastern edge of San Diego County. None of the students provided a response that would indicate a discrepancy between the facilities’ rules.

Enforcement of the rules was perceived as generally consistent across the facilities, except for Jack, who used the term “freedom” to describe the leniency he perceived in regards to the level of rule enforcement at JRF compared to Camp Barrett or to other facilities. He felt that there could have been a difference because students at Camp Barrett are typically older than the students at JRF. He suggested:

Basically, [the facilities all had] the same rules, but when I was at [JRF], it was more of the little kids that were there, so they were a little more easier on us [there] compared to Barrett. At Barrett, it’s mostly older kids, so they’re being more restrictive. You know, it’s just different. (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013)

Although probation officers’ rule enforcement was generally viewed as consistent between the facilities, the students also noted some inconsistencies. Probation officer favoritism was a common theme throughout the interviews. Favoritism was commonly identified as a benefit from “kissing a**,” or engaging in flattery with the probation officers. Seven of eleven participants provided responses, all of which indicated neutral experiences (Table 12). Some of the benefits associated with favoritism by the probation officers included extra soup, extra popcorn during movies, extra soda, or lax enforcement of rules.

Charles stated that he witnessed constant favoritism by a specific probation officer when dealing with students associated with gangs. This was one of the few instances in which a student identified unfair enforcement of rules by probation officers. It was analyzed as neutral because the student experienced favoritism originating from a different probation officer. He also stated that the favoritism he witnessed, not directed at him, did not affect the respect he had for that officer. Partnered with the favoritism theme, specifically voiced by four of the students, was the sentiment that “You got to do what you got to do in there.” The phrase makes reference to the commonly held philosophy amongst the students that self-interest was central to enduring the stressful environment at Camp Barrett.

Another student, George, admitted to engaging in flattery with the probation officers with the intent of obtaining benefits:
Table 12. Trending Topics in Students’ Statements that Led to Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trending topics voiced by students (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects positive or fair experience</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects neutral experience</th>
<th>Student’s response reflects negative or unfair experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by respectful relationship with Camp Barrett POs</td>
<td>3 30%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by the community supervision POs (“on the outs”)</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by the increased sense of freedom at Camp Barrett compared to East Mesa &amp; Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced find the concept of fairness important</td>
<td>6 75.0%</td>
<td>2 25.0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by perception that Camp Barrett POs were “just doing their job”</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 40.0%</td>
<td>3 60.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by the perception that Camp Barrett POs were “just there to collect a paycheck”</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students influenced by the perception that one can benefit from “kissing a** with the POs” at Camp Barrett</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>7 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 59.30%</td>
<td>18 30.50%</td>
<td>6 10.20%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEORGE: Yes, I’m not going to lie. I did a couple times. I kissed a little a** to get some soup or soda from him

BG: So it was worth it?
GEORGE: Oh yea! You got to do what you got to do. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

All ten of the students who answered the question “Was there a difference between the facilities in how probation officers enforced the rules?” provided responses that were analyzed as either positive or neutral (Table 11). For instance, one student suggested that although some probation officers “had favorites” and would treat those individuals differently compared to the other students, it was not a factor that affected them in a significant way. This response was analyzed as neutral based on the student’s admission that he too engaged in flattery (“kissing a**) with the probation officers and was considered a favorite by one of them. The benefits he received through this relationship, he stated, justified his behavior. When favoritism was explicitly inquired about, Tyrone suggested that: “Oh, [the probation officers] had their favorites. I’m not really sure why; maybe it’s because they joked around with them a lot” (Tyrone, personal communication, October 9, 2013).

STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS REGARDING FAIRNESS AND CAMP BARRETT PROBATION OFFICERS

Camp Barrett Probation Officers interacted with the probationers more often than any other group of staff. A focus on the students’ perceptions of fairness and their relationships with the probation officers follows.

Fairness and Camp Barrett Probation Officers in General

All but one of the students interviewed for the current study voiced comments that were interpreted as positive experiences regarding of probation officers’ level fairness in general (Table 11). The one student who was an exception, Tyrone, provided a comment that was interpreted as a neutral. The student answered the question, “Were there times that you saw probation officers treat someone else, another student, unfairly?” by stating:

I didn’t notice it, but I also didn’t pay too much attention to it. I can’t say yes because I didn’t really notice it. Well, there was one time that a hat (dorm leader) and I both got into trouble, but they only gave me consequences. They took my bottom bunk away. But the PO explained to me trying to say that he is trying to teach me a lesson. And the way that it all played out, I kind of understand where [he was] coming from. (Tyrone, personal communication, October 9, 2013)
The above statement shows that he was able to understand the probation officer’s intentions and attitude after some time had passed.

**Fairness and Specific Camp Barrett Probation Officers**

Five of the students interviewed mentioned specific officers who they deemed unfair in their treatment, dissemination of treats (such as popcorn or extra soup), or enforcement of rules. Seven of the students made references to specific probation officers who were fair in treatment, dissemination of treats, or enforcement of rules. John stated that one specific Camp Barrett probation officer had once told a group of probationers, “You guys think I like you? Just because I talk to you? You guys are not my friends. You don’t mean sh** to me. You are simply walking dollar signs to me” (John, personal communication, September 5, 2013). Although the statement indicates equal treatment, it also indicates treatment that John perceived as disrespectful and negative. Another student, Jack, quoted a different officer making the same reference to dollar signs when describing their relationship with the students at the KMJDF facility. This sentiment was interpreted as having the most significant delegitimizing effect upon the students who experienced it of all the variables analyzed for the current study. The following offers an example of this sentiment:

BG: Would there ever be times that you would offer [respect] sarcastically? You know, would you offer that kind of respect but in the back of your head you really didn’t mean it?

ANDREW: Sometimes, for some officers, yes.

BG: Without naming names, which officers are you talking about?

ANDREW: They’re the ones that are just for the job. The ones I just didn’t care [about]. They would tell you to your face that we are just dollar signs to them.

BG: They would tell you that?

ANDREW: Yes. One of them told us one time that “We don’t really care about you. You guys are just dollar signs to us.”

BG: Was this up at [Camp] Barrett?

ANDREW: Yes.

BG: How did that make you feel when he told you that?

ANDREW: Well everybody was like “Well, we don’t care either.” And then we would just make their job harder. (Andrew, personal communication, August 1, 2013)
The reference to dollar signs was a label that the students did not appreciate. It is for this reason that these two specific experiences were analyzed as having delegitimizing effect upon those that experienced the reference in question. As a consequence and evidenced by the above statement, the probation officers that provided such references only made their jobs harder by doing so.

Ryan, in contrast to the aforementioned experiences referencing dollar signs, responded to the question “Did any of the probation officers provide students with treats of some kind unfairly?” by suggesting:

> There are little things, by giving [students] soups and what not, but they are not supposed to do that anymore. But it’s more used as an incentive, so [the students] would actually earn [the treat]. [Inaudible] because people would talk about it, but you’re up there for so long, if you’re doing good, you get on the [probation] officer’s good side - I can understand why they do it. I mean, yeah, it’s bad for other people, but you don’t always get what you want in life. Things are not always fair and that stuff is going to happen. Sometimes they would bring a big bag of chips. But it’s like I can see why they do it; you’re up there for so long, so it’s nice to get something like that. (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)

Ryan subsequently answered the question “In a way it’s their own personal way of keeping you going without giving you a hat or a kick day or something like that?” by stating “Exactly! Because they are not allowed to give out kick days so easily” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013).

**STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROBATION OFFICERS**

As evidenced above, some of the students’ relationships with the probation officers often included reciprocity. They would attempt to flatter the probation officers (also referred to as “kissing a**”) with the intent of influencing how they were treated or in the hopes of receiving tangible benefits, such as extra soup, popcorn, or even soap. Many of the students also talked about the emotional relationships that they had built with specific probation officers.

Five of the students mentioned that they had created a relationship with specific probation officers where each student felt comfortable enough to discuss personal feelings. Each of the students that mentioned such a relationship expressed appreciation that they were
able to do so. For instance, Jack answered the following question “Was there anyone out there (at Camp Barrett) that made you feel like they did care? Speaking more specifically about the POs?” by stating that, “Yeah, there was. This one [probation officer], you know, she seemed like she really cared” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). As a follow-up question, I then asked, “What were some of the things that she would say?” Jack responded, “I talked to her one time about my family. And she really listened -- and seemed like she really cared -- seemed like she really wanted to help me. She did help me; she’s the one that got me into the ROP program” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). Jack went on to describe how that scenario came about after I asked:

BG: So she helped you get into Mr. Grey ‘s (building maintenance) class?
JACK: Yeah, there was one kid who only had five hours left, but she took him out early and gave him his certificate, and put me in his spot.
BG: And she specifically thought of you?
JACK: Yeah, I told her I needed to get in there, because I wanted to get out earlier to go home. I wanted to go home to be with my family. (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013)

Jack’s experience shows that access to classes in the Transitions/Pathways to Success was used as an incentive by probation officers to influence the students to follow the rules.

Respect between the Probation Officers and the Students

In terms of respect and disrespect, ten of the eleven students interviewed for this study voiced comments that indicated a mutual respect between them and the probation officers in a general sense (Table 12). Comments synonymous with the notion that “if you offer them respect, then they will respect you” were offered by all ten students who responded to the question “Do you feel as though the probation officers showed you respect?” Three of the students indicated that they appreciated the mutual respect in a way that indicated a positive influence on their experience at Camp Barrett. The remaining seven provided responses that indicated neutral influences in this regard.

George suggested that the probation officers actually showed disrespect when it was perceived that the probation officers were only “doing their jobs.” He stated:

 Honestly, for me, like what I really think on the inside, there are probably like two or three out of ten [probation officers that] do it straight -- like they respect you
right from their hearts. The rest of them, they are just there for the money. I think most of them just do it for the money; they just do it for a job, not because they want to do it, or that they like what they’re doing. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

When I asked a clarifying question about whether the student felt that the above sentiment displayed by some of the probation officers was disrespectful, George answered by stating: “Yea, that is a lot of disrespect. Like almost a slap in the face” (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013). When asked to compare the sentiment on behalf of the probation officers at Camp Barrett to those at another facility he had been in, George offered the following:

Like there was this person from the church at Kearny Mesa who said ‘I know that you think that the probation officers act like they don’t like you guys, but they don’t just do it for the money. They are here to help you.’ And one of the probation officers that was standing right there raised his hand and said ‘No, no, no -- don’t get it wrong. I don’t care about any of you guys; I just care about my money. Don’t get the wrong impression. I really don’t like any of you. None of you guys are my friends. I just come here for one job and my money.’ … Honestly, that kind of did hurt my feelings. Personally, because I’m like ‘damn, you could have just kept that to yourself, we don’t have to all hear that.’ I was not angry; I didn’t go cry or anything, like we already know that. But we don’t need to hear that. It’s just going to make us feel more bad. We are over here locked up, we are not seeing our families, we are facing our time, just doing our time, just trying to get out, and he’s overheard saying ‘I don’t care, I’m going home…’ It’s like he’s just spitting in your face. Especially for a person locked up, him telling them that. And that’s not the only time. He would be like ‘oh yeah, I’m going to go home and I’m going to go eat the best California burrito,’ like on purpose. Saying it right in front of us, like to mock us. As if he was laughing in our face. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

George further expressed that he experienced racist encounters with a specific probation officer while at EMJDF. The probation officer in question, according to George, would also favor George by giving him extra Kool-Aid or popcorn. George perceived the favors as a means for the probation officer to justify the racist comments she would aim at him. George described the situation this way:

So like she was saying racist comments to me, but I never really took it to heart or offense because she was just like joking…She would [make fun of other students as well], but then she would come at me, saying stuff like ‘camel jockey’, or ‘sand nigger’ or something like that…[At] first I didn’t really care. You know, she would also hook me up [with favors] after saying stuff like that too, but the thing that got to me was that she would say it in front of everybody, which made it
...seem like it was okay. And [the other students were] like, ‘if it’s okay for her to say that, it must be okay for me to say it too.’ But I got mad when they would say it because I knew that they were serious, but I knew that she was joking when she would say it. And that caused more problems with me and the other kids, because who would want to be called that sort of stuff when you’re locked up? Like ‘camel jockey’ or ‘towel head’? Like for her, I really couldn’t do anything, I couldn’t just go up to her and sock her or something. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

The latter portion of the statement is an indication of another theme voiced by many of the students, the feeling that there was no recourse against probation officers who did not obey their own rules. The “lack of recourse against probation officers” theme will be further presented in the section titled “Recourse Against Camp Barrett Probation Officers.”

Although the above description of racism pertained specifically to a single probation officer at a different facility than Camp Barrett, it should still be considered a significant factor in how George developed his perception regarding his experience at Camp Barrett. George expressed appreciation for the probation officers at Camp Barrett who did not engage in the type of racist behavior that he experienced at EMJDF. George’s drastically different experience at Camp Barrett compared to EMJDF was interpreted as a positive reinforcement of Camp Barrett’s policies, goals, and perceived interest in providing a credible educational experience, and should therefore be considered as legitimizing.

Another student suggested that the probation officers at Camp Barrett treated everyone equally and were fair in general, for the most part. When I asked, “Do you think all of the students were treated equally?” Jack responded by suggesting, “I think they treated us all equally” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). He then immediately qualified the statement by saying:

But every once in a while [a probation officer] would say ‘I’m going to hook up this one kid.’ You know, some of them are actually really cool, like the one that took me to get my ID at Kearny. He bought me a hamburger, he bought me some fries, you know -- they’re not supposed to do that. And there [were] four of us, four kids in the van, so he hooked up all of us. (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013)

All of the students interviewed for the current study provided responses similar to the above in regards to their perceptions of Camp Barrett probation officers and general fairness. Although each of them witnessed or experienced times when they perceived a probation...
officer had acted in an unfair manner, all of the students revealed that, in general, the Camp Barrett probation officers treated the students fairly the majority of the time.

**Students’ Respect for Specific Camp Barrett Probation Officers**

Two of the students provided responses that indicated respect for specific probation officers. George put it this way when he answered the question “Can you name a few things that you respected while at Camp Barrett?” by stating:

[Officer Jones]. He, like, he really helped me a lot and he talked to me a lot. [And Officer Sanders], he’s like really strict, but he’s really chill also. He will joke around, have some fun, but at the end you know that he’s looking out for you, trying to make a better you. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

The details regarding why George felt Officer Sanders looked out for him was not entirely clear. But it is clear that as a whole, George’s experience at Camp Barrett was positively influenced by his relationships with both Officer Jones and Officer Sanders. As was previously mentioned, Jack described an incident where a probation officer went above and beyond his obligation to care for the students by buying a group of them hamburgers during a trip “on the outs.” Jack described the probation officer in question by saying that, “…he seems like he understands; he would treat everyone fairly” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013). It was this understanding between Jack and the probation officer that was interpreted as a significant, positive, and legitimizing experience.

**Students’ Relationships with Probation Officers “On the Outs”**

Eight of the eleven students interviewed spoke about their relationship with the probation officers outside of Camp Barrett (Table 12). All eight provided responses that were indicative of positive experiences to questions regarding fairness and respect. Jack provided a response to the question “Is there anything that you would liked her (the probation officer in the community) to do during your transition back to your home?” by stating “No, not really. I see her once every week or every two weeks. She gives me a break at least in the sense that I don’t have to see her everyday; I can do my own thing. So she’s been pretty cool. So far so good” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013).
Likewise, Charles expressed appreciation for the relationship he had with his probation officer ‘on the outs’. The following dialogue exemplifies this appreciation:

BG: Let’s talk a little about your PO ‘on the outs’. Do you feel that he was helpful on your transition back to the outs?

CHARLES: Yeah, he was helpful.

BG: What was it that you appreciated?

CHARLES: Just some of the talks that we would have. (Charles, personal communication, August 8, 2013)

For the most part, the students had not spent too much time with the probation officers in the community when interviewed for the current study. With that said, the students did express appreciation for the efforts their probation officers had made in the short time they had been outside Camp Barrett.

**Juvenile Hall and Camp Barrett Probation Officers and Fairness**

Three students provided statements concerning their perceptions in relation to fairness and EMJDF probation officers compared to Camp Barrett probation officers (Table 11). Two of these students stated that the probation officers at EMJDF were generally fair. Their statements suggested that the fairness they experienced was on par with that of the Camp Barrett probation officers. The students expressed appreciation for the consistency between the facilities’ probation officers. Only one of the three students in this category, Jack, provided a statement that was interpreted as a negative experience. The statement analyzed as negative was the same statement, previously mentioned, that involved an EMJDF probation officer’s use of racist language and labeling.

Two students who were interviewed for the current study provided statements relating to comparisons between KMJDF probation officers and Camp Barrett probation officers regarding fairness (Table 11). One statement was interpreted as a neutral experience. The other was interpreted as a negative experience, meaning it related to an experience that could be analyzed as delegitimizing. The student who provided the neutral statement, George, suggested that there was not any difference between the facilities in regards to probation officers level of fairness. It was Jack who suggested that KMJDF was “the worst” in this regard.
Students’ Perceptions that the Probation Officers were “Just Doing Their Job” or “Just there to Collect a Paycheck”

Five of the eleven students interviewed mentioned that they felt, in general, that the Camp Barrett probation officers were “just doing their jobs” (Table 12). When I prodded deeper into that topic, the five students suggested that the probation officers only did what they were supposed to do; they did not care enough about the students to put forth an effort to really help them change for the better. Two of these five students provided statements that were interpreted as neutral, meaning this did not affect them in a manner that could be considered delegitimizing. However, three of the students suggested that the lack of care afforded by the Camp Barrett probation officers in this regard did have a negative effect on them. For instance, Ryan suggested that:

People like [Officer Hernandez], or [Mr. Grey], or [Mr. Anderson], all of them, they’ll talk to you like you are still a young man. Like they know you messed up, but they want to help you be successful in life and do something with your life. Whereas the officers, and don’t get me wrong because some of them are very enthusiastic with you too; like they are like ‘hey more power to you, I want you to do well.’ But for a lot of the officers, it’s just a job to them and they will be like ‘okay, you want to do good right now, but let’s see where you’re at a couple years from now. If you do good now, good for you, but if you do bad, I’m not surprised.’ (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)

The latter statement, provided by Ryan when quoting a probation officer, is indicative of a form of labeling. Ryan seemed disturbed that a probation officer would be so honest yet callous when describing his assessment of the students’ potential. It is clear that the probation officers at Camp Barrett, many times, witness students exit the facility only to be readmitted later. Even so, it may be worth calling the probation officers’ attention to the reality that such statements can actually produce the behavior that they hope to avoid. In terms of the students’ perceptions of a probation officer’s interest in helping the student, the above sentiment provided by the probation officer could be viewed as negative and therefore delegitimizing.

Three of the eleven students interviewed suggested that Camp Barrett probation officers, in general, were just there to collect a paycheck. The sentiment that “[The students] are nothing more than dollar signs” provided on behalf of the probation officers was acknowledged by each of the three students (Andrew, personal communication, August 1,
2013; George, personal communication, August 6, 2013; John, personal communication, September 5, 2013). All three of these statements were interpreted as negative experiences and possibly delegitimizing because each student felt hurt by the probation officers’ disinterest in the students’ outcomes or viewing them as actual people.

Each of the three students suggested that when they heard a probation officer offer this sort of attitude, that probation officer would be looked at more negatively than all of the rest. For the students in question, their interest in succeeding at Camp Barrett, and eventually in their communities, seemed to be directly affected by these specific experiences with probation officers. The experiences brought into question the intent of the Camp Barrett probation officers, and by extension, the camp’s programs as a whole. It was this honesty on the part of the Camp Barrett probation officers that was analyzed as the most significant variable that influenced the students’ perception of legitimacy and Camp Barrett. Because the three students only identified specific probation officers and not the probation officers in general regarding the above, the students’ overall experience at Camp Barrett did not seem to be defined by the incidences in question.

**STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS REGARDING CAMP BARRETT PROBATION OFFICER CONDUCT**

The students provided in depth responses to questions regarding how the probation officers conducted themselves and how often they disobeyed the rules governing their behavior. What follows is a general assessment provided by the students concerning how they perceived the probation officers’ behavior at Camp Barrett.

**Probation Officers Followed the Rules**

Two of the eleven students noted that Camp Barrett probation officers did not follow their own rules. George went as far as calling the probation officers corrupt:

BG: So you think that there are some that are corrupt?
GEORGE: At Barrett, in general, there is like officers - they just sit there for the money. Like they will see you doing something wrong, but they won’t say anything about it.
BG: When you think about that, how does that make you feel, knowing that there are some POs that are there because they want to help -- they want to progress and help you, as opposed to those who were there just to get a paycheck?
GEORGE: Well honestly it’s like, that’s their way of living I guess. But the same thing, is like if you don’t do the job you’re sworn to do, like abide by the rules [for example], and try to help these kids rehabilitate, I guess you could say -- like before you go to Camp Barrett, they say that rehabilitation will help you get better. Like they say that about all juvenile halls. But if you’re an officer and you don’t feel that way, like if you are just here for the money, why are you working here? It’s like, work somewhere else. If you really trying to, really trying to help they use stay out of trouble, helps them want to stay out and get a job, and all that. Why are you going to say this or that in front of the supervisor and then when you’re alone with the kids, and in the dorms, why are you going to act a different way? Like that’s why I had a hard time at Barrett, because I would call out officers on it, and then I would get in trouble, because obviously they are going to go with the officers word over mine. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

Although George provided the above negative sentiment, he also provided responses that indicated appreciation for the probation officers. He was one of the students that provided statements indicating positive experiences regarding how he perceived probation officers’ interest in students succeeding in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program.

**Recourse Against Camp Barrett Probation Officers**

The SDCPD has rules to which its officers must adhere. Although only two of the students mentioned rule breaking by the probation officers at Camp Barrett, four of the students mentioned that they did not perceive there was adequate recourse against those probation officers who violate the rules. George stated:

[The probation officer] would tell us ‘go ahead and write your grievance, go ahead and complain about me because they are not going to do anything about it.’ So I felt like, the people in the office, the supervisors, the director, they don’t take it seriously. I just feel like they are part of the problem too. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

The statement above was interpreted as a negative and delegitimizing experience.

John also provided a disturbing statement. He noted that he witnessed a probation office abusing not just alcohol, but illicit substances as well. The discussion went like this:

BG: So when it comes to unwarranted stuff like that, does that affect the way they view that officer or even the camp in general?

JOHN: No, that’s this officer was a dick. And I also know something else about him. He does drugs.

BG: That officer?

JOHN: Yeah. For sure - for sure.
BG: He admitted that to you?

JOHN: No but I caught him. And then he tried to get me in trouble after I caught him.

BG: You caught him trying to use?

JOHN: Yes and then he tried to get me in trouble. I actually sent him a note telling him that he needs to be more discreet and telling them that what he’s doing... Because there are these kids that want to get officers and troubles is because they are Dicks to them. And so he tries to deny it saying, ‘what you mean trying to be discreet; I don’t know what you’re talking about. I don’t do drugs.’ And I said ‘why did drugs just pop off your head, all I said was for you to be more discreet.’ And he says, ‘well what else could you be talking about?’ And I said, ‘I could be talking about a whole lot of different things, like talking on your phone. I caught you talking on your phone underneath the tree. Underneath a blind spot of the camera where they know it can’t see. And you’re not allowed to be on your phone. How did you automatically jump to the drugs?’ You see that’s what happens when you’re assuming. I’m very smart, sir. (John, personal communication, September 5, 2013)

John was the only student interviewed for the current study that provided such a serious and direct accusation to this regard.

**STUDENTS’ RELATIONSHIPS WITH BARRETT HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS**

Many of the students provided statements that addressed their relationships with the Barrett High School teachers at Camp Barrett. Of the eleven students interviewed for the current study, eight students provided statements to this regard (Table 10). Six of the students suggested that they appreciated the teachers at Barrett High School using statements that indicated positive experiences concerning fairness and the perceived interest in the students’ success.

Two of the students suggested that, in general, they did not appreciate the teachers’ efforts to educate the students or that the teachers were somehow unfair in their treatment of the students. Andrew suggested that this might have been because the teachers he worked with at Barrett High School were substitute teachers, not the full-time teachers that had gained respect by the students. The following dialogue illustrates this notion:

ANDREW: The only reason [the teachers] would treat us unfair is if you were messing around. Like some people would just make noises to try to make the teacher mad. So the teacher would kick the whole group out. That’s really why that they would treat you unfair. And then staff would see that, the officers would
see that, and they would be like ‘Oh, you’re not going to get free time. You baby sitting on your bunks all night.’

BG: And all that could happen because of one person?

ANDREW: Yes. And people thought it was fun. People start doing it on purpose to really just make them mad. He wanted everyone to get kicked out.

BG: So you really didn’t learn much in that class?

ANDREW: No because everyone was just talking and screaming; you couldn’t really learn anything at all.

BG: Do you would think there would have been a way to convince everybody not to do that?

ANDREW: Nah! They wouldn’t understand. They would be just like “man because we are all locked up, we can do whatever we want. Let’s have fun!” So they would keep doing it and keep doing it.

BG: So there wasn’t any sense of thinking like this person, this teacher is here to help you out?

ANDREW: Yeah, I mean, she would tell us like ‘Hey, I’m here to help you out,’ but then when she would turn around, they would be like ‘F*** you!’

BG: There just wasn’t too much respect for her?

ANDREW: No.

BG: Was that just that one teacher, or was that pretty much everybody? Was that the way it was for all of them?

ANDREW: I figure it was because the main teachers -- when I was there, it was summer, so the main teachers left. So when I was there during the summer time, we had substitutes. And that’s when [the students] really started doing it was when [the substitutes] were there. And then when the teachers came back, for like three weeks, everything was good. But then they left again. And the class went wild all over [again]. (Andrew, personal communication, August 1, 2013)

The revolving door of Barrett High School substitute teachers experienced by Andrew very well could have skewed his perspective regarding his relationship with them. It is clear that when the full-time teachers were present, they received respect from the students. But once these teachers went on vacation or were absent for an extended period of time, the teachers substituting in their place were not afforded the same level of respect.

An example of one student’s appreciation for his relationship with the Barrett High School teachers followed the question: “How fairly do you think you were treated by the camp staff members compared to the other students?” George suggested that:
It was pretty good; it was equal. The teachers, they would treat everyone the same. That was the good thing about the probation officers, [as well]. They were a little like the teachers where they wouldn’t judge you by race. They wouldn’t judge you by how you look, or the way you act; they would just reach you like a student basically, like a regular high school. The teachers would be nice to you; they would try to help you. (George, personal communication, August 6, 2013)

Again, six of the eight students who provided statements regarding the Barrett High School teachers did so using sentiment similar to the above. It was for this reason that the statements provided by the students regarding their relationships with the teachers met the students’ expectations and were interpreted as positive.

**STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF OTHER PROBATION FACILITIES COMPARED TO CAMP BARRETT**

Although direct comparisons between Camp Barrett, KMJDF, and EMJDF were not explicitly investigated, three students did provide statements that suggested the students’ experiences at Camp Barrett were more positive. Jack put it this way:

JACK: Some kids want to be at [juvenile hall]. I don’t know why. They complain and cry because they want to go back to East Mesa. But I mean, the worst is Kearny [Mesa]. Kearny is just sad because you’re in a little room. East Mesa is a little bit better because you get a bigger room; you get your own bathroom. Kearny is just sad. It’s depressing.

BG: So you’d rather be out at Camp Barrett?

JACK: Yeah, I would much rather be at Camp Barrett. (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013)

The reasoning behind why the experience at Camp Barrett might be considered more positive than that of KMJDF or EMJDF was further explored, which is described below.

**Camp Barrett’s Perceived Level of Freedom and the Rural, Nature Component**

Camp Barrett is located in Descanso, CA, just outside of a town called Alpine in San Diego County. To access the facility, one must follow a road that leads into an area that the locals refer to as Snake Canyon. Horse ranches and farmhouses are the closest to anything that resembles civilization in the area. To say the least, the camp is located in a rural environment. Although the camp is surrounded by high, razor wired fencing, the embodiment of nature is inescapable amongst those who visit.
Nature and freedom were perceived as significant variables within the students’ experiences. Specifically, three students referenced nature, but eight of the students made reference to the freedom they felt the outdoors environment provided (Table 12). The students at Camp Barrett spent much of their time outdoors for free time, calisthenics, vocational classes, or when they were traveling from building to building. From my observations of the students at Camp Barrett, it was clear that there was a lot of physical space between the facility’s buildings. Unlike other probation facilities, the students were not constantly under a roof and artificial lighting. This was interpreted as significantly influencing the students’ attitudes toward their reality in confinement. For example, to answering the question “When it comes to your experience at Camp Barrett, what was it that you enjoyed?” Jose suggested that, “Up there, you really don’t feel like you’re locked up. You kind of feel like you’re at camp or just regular camp. [If] you do [well], the officers are cool with you, you still get your free time. At East Mesa and Kearny Mesa, it’s not really like that” (Jose, personal communication, September 12, 2013).

Another student, Andrew, described it this way: “[You] are in an open space. You have so much more freedom than in Kearny because you’re not locked up, you’re not in your room all day” (Andrew, personal communication, August 1, 2013). The statements regarding the camp’s association with nature, outdoors, and freedom were analyzed as a positive part of the students’ experiences at Camp Barrett.

**Students’ Perceptions of Camp Barrett’s Educational and Training Opportunities Compared to KMJDF and EMJDF**

Jack provided comparisons of Camp Barrett’s educational opportunities to those afforded by other facilities. Although he was the only student to do so, he provided statements indicating that the educational opportunities at EMJDF and KMJDF were by no means as expansive as those afforded by Camp Barrett. For this reason, Jack’s statements regarding Camp Barrett’s educational opportunities (those that were specific to comparing the three facilities) were interpreted as being a positive experience.
Family Contact While at Camp Barrett

George provided statements that indicated appreciation for the level of familial contact afforded by the probation facility at EMJDF and was the only student to provide comments in this regard. George’s family lived closer to EMJDF than Camp Barrett. He indicated that the trip to Camp Barrett was too costly for them to make, unlike EMJDF. The lack of family contact at Camp Barrett, in contrast to EMJDF, was a significant factor in the development of George’s perception regarding his experience at Camp Barrett. He was one of two students that provided statements regarding access to family at Camp Barrett. Andrew also suggested that the large distance between his home and Camp Barrett impeded his family from visiting him. I interpreted these students’ experiences at Camp Barrett negatively.

Students’ Perceptions Regarding Transitions/Pathways to Success Program

Seven of the eleven students interviewed for the current study provided statements that indicated positive experiences, in general, with the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program while at Camp Barrett. Charles suggested:

I think that it is good that I have all these programs because it’s something good that I can show the judge to get off probation. I mean like working with them too. Because I’m trying to stay off the streets and stay out of trouble. (Charles, personal communication, August 8, 2013)

Andrew answered a question concerning how he felt about the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program by saying “Good…because they’re helping me out with a lot of things” (Andrew, personal communication, August 1, 2013). He then expressed appreciation for the efforts of those involved.

Three of the students had obtained employment by the time they were interviewed for the current study. Eight were actively searching for employment. The three students with jobs had obtained work with the help of Transitions/Pathways to Success instructors (like Mr. Grey and Mr. Anderson) or community case managers at JCCS, to which the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program is a part. Each of the students expressed appreciation for the help. Jack suggested that “…[The] whole thing, I think, it was a good
thing for me, because I got a job...I got my GED, so I think it was good” (Jack, personal communication, August 5, 2013).

Tyrone expressed that Mr. Grey really encouraged him to do well in his class so that Mr. Grey could help him find work “on the outs” (Tyrone, personal correspondence, October 9, 2013). At the time of the interview, he had not found a job. Tyrone did express sincere enthusiasm about finding employment where he could utilize the training that he received through Mr. Grey’s Horticulture Class. He provided the comment when answering a general question regarding the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. The enthusiasm he expressed was analyzed as a positive experience.

LEGITIMACY AND REVENUE GENERATION

Two of the students interviewed for the current study provided statements that indicated they valued legitimate means of revenue generation. By offering appreciation for the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, Ryan suggested that:

[The] thing with going up to Barrett, it has programs like the Work Readiness, and people like [Mr. Anderson]. He shows you that, just because you messed up, it’s not over for you. He shows you all these people, like he shows you these examples of people who messed up pretty bad, like worst then we messed up, and they are getting another chance. It’s like it’s not the end of the road. And most people who are up there, while they’re up there, they may mess up again, but while they’re up there, their mindset is like ‘Hey, I’m not going to mess up again. I don’t want to. I’m done with this. I want to do good.’ Now whether they keep that mindset when they get out is not always the same, but up there, it’s like [Mr. Anderson] can show you how to get a job. It’s not like it’s going to be easy, but he can show you all the things you need to get a job. So it’s like when you get out, you don’t have to go back to the street and get all the stuff, I don’t have to sell drugs or hustle things, I can get a legitimate job and do something with my life. Where like if you going to Kearny Mesa, or to go to Donovan or something like that, nobody is thinking like that. They’re thinking, ‘Okay, when I get out I’m going to have a felony on my record, what am I going to do with my life? I can get a job anymore. I’m screwed pretty much. I might as well meet with always other people’s that no other ways of getting money illegally or how to support themselves illegally and learned that so that when I get out I can do that.’ So coming out of Barrett you have more of a positive mindset where is coming out of other institutions you are thinking, ‘Okay I’m screwed, I am a criminal so at the start thinking like a criminal.’ (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)
It was clear that Ryan associated his experience at Camp Barrett, and participation in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, as helping solidify his understanding of the importance in finding legitimate means of acquiring revenue.

**Students’ Perceptions of the Value of Honesty**

The discussion surrounding the Substance Abuse Class and the Life Skills Class revealed feelings that showed strong support and value for honesty on the part of the students. This was also a recurring theme that was brought up by some of the students when discussing teachers, counselors, and the probation officers. Ryan answered the follow-up question, “So honesty is something that you appreciated?” by emphatically stating “Exactly!” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013). He was one of four students that voiced appreciation for honesty. The remaining students did not make specific statements in this regard.

**Students’ Perceptions of the Value of Fairness**

Eight of the eleven students who participated in the current study mentioned that fairness was something that they valued (Table 12). Two of the eight students provided responses that were interpreted as neutral regarding their perceptions of fairness. The remaining six students provided statements that were interpreted as positive in regards to their perceptions of fairness and the level fairness afforded by the probation officers. The latter group’s responses suggest that the level of fairness they experienced while at Camp Barrett was appropriate and, therefore, was interpreted as neutral, in the least. For example, Lance suggested that it was a good thing that all of the students at Camp Barrett had a fair chance at earning a hat. When answering the question, “Was it important to you that everyone was treated the same?” Lance answered emphatically by saying “Hell yes!” He suggested that it made him feel good knowing that everyone had the same chance to earn treats (such as extra popcorn, soda, or soup). He also added “Everyone should deserve a chance” (Lance, personal communication, August 2, 2013).

Other students, such as Edgar, were not as detailed in their responses regarding their perceptions in valuing fairness. Edgar simply answered in the affirmative by agreeing with the same question above. He stated that the level of fairness he experienced at Camp Barrett
was something “That made [him] feel good” (Edgar, personal communication, October 10, 2013).

It should be noted that one student, Tyrone, indicated that Camp Barrett had “words of the day” that the students are to focus on. One such “word of the day” was fairness (Tyrone, personal correspondence, October 9, 2013). The following dialogue exemplifies Tyrone’s acknowledgement of value in fairness:

BG: Do you think the rules were applied to you fairly compared to the other students there?
TYRONE: Yes.
BG: What do you think about that? How does that make you feel to know the rules were applied fairly?
TYRONE: It was good because every day in there, they would have a specific word that we had to focus on and one of the days the word was “fairness.” So it was good to have that to focus on. We would focus on treating the POs fairly and also treat each other fairly. (Tyrone, personal communication, October 9, 2013)

Even if all of the students at Camp Barrett did not intrinsically value fairness, Camp Barrett did have a means in place to acknowledge, and help the students understand, the importance of fairness. Tyrone was the only student who mentioned the “word of the day.”

The following Discussion section provides connections between the current study’s most significant results and the existing literature. It will also provide further exploration of legitimacy theory and how it relates to themes within the current study.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESULTS

Even though the present study possesses limitations (explored further in the next section) the findings suggest that the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program may be a neutral, if not legitimizing, experience for students at Camp Barrett. Considering the well established research exposing the delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987), even criminalizing (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007), effect a traditional, prison style confinement experience can have on an individual, alternative means of confinement that offer both justice and rehabilitation for those confined are currently sought after (Ashkar & Kenny, 2008; Franke et al., 2010).

The current study reveals that procedural justice and legitimacy are factors in influencing students’ perceptions of programming experienced while in confinement. One of the four concepts that make up procedural justice that warrants acknowledgment is the perception that the Camp Barrett probation officers, teachers, and counselors actually cared about the students’ outcomes (Jackson et al., 2010). The students believed that they were adept at determining how interested the officers, teachers, counselors, and other staff possessed were regarding the students’ potential outcomes. If they believed that a certain probation officer, for example, did not take interest in their success, the students were less likely to view the probation officer’s authority as legitimate. In general, though, the students seemed to acknowledge the probation officer role as legitimate; hence, the students’ perceptions of legitimacy were associated more with the staff member’s (probation officer, teacher, counselor) behavior and attitude than anything else. This finding supports previous research that shows that the authorities’ attitudes and treatment of inmates can significantly influence the inmates’ behavior and perceptions of legitimacy (Gover et al., 2000; Jackson et al., 2010; Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995).

The current study also investigates the perceptions the students had about the probation officers and their relationships with them. By doing so, the study shows that the
quality of their experience while in confinement affects perceptions of legitimacy and procedural justice, which in turn can influence future behavior (Paternoster et al., 1997; Skogan & Frydl, 2003; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2003, 2010; Tyler & Huo 2002; Tyler et al., 2007). The relationships the students had with the probation officers significantly influenced the perceived quality of experience at Camp Barrett and within the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. Although some of the students identified specific probation officers at Camp Barrett as not expressing sincere interest in the students’ potential outcomes, the students believed that the probation officers generally did care about the students and their outcomes.

For the most part, the probation officers fulfilled the students’ expectations in regards to how they perceived the probation officer role, which helped solidify the notion that the students’ relationships with the probation officers had a neutral effect pertaining to their perceptions of Camp Barrett and legitimacy. The significance of the perception of quality in a given confinement experience compared to the length of that experience is a worthwhile topic for future study, which will also be discussed in the following section.

Of all the variables analyzed for the current study, the references made by probation officers referring to “dollar signs” as a way to describe their relationships with the students was interpreted as having the most significant delegitimizing effect upon the students who experienced it. If an individual in confinement perceives an officer’s demeanor as insincere, uncaring, or not convincing concerning the inmate/student’s prospect at rehabilitation, the likelihood that the confined individual will react negatively to that officer is strengthened (Jackson et al., 2010). The current study discovered specific evidence that supports this notion. One student, Andrew, suggested that the students would “make the [Camp Barrett probation officers’] jobs harder” if the students perceived the officers as being uninterested, insincere, or uncaring towards the students. Other comments concerning respect, and how probation officers earned respect, were offered by the students that parallel this sentiment. The finding supports the idea that insincere or uncaring attitudes on the part of the probation officers could lead to significantly negative effects in terms of their relationships with the students, thereby potentially undermining any of the legitimizing effects the probation officers might have previously developed.
Although the probation officers were viewed generally as individuals “just doing their jobs” as expected, the teachers at Camp Barrett were viewed, in contrast, as individuals who sincerely cared about the students’ outcomes. For instance, Ryan described it this way:

People like [Officer Hernandez], or [Mr. Grey], and [Mr. Anderson] -- all of them. They’ll talk to you like you are still a young man. Like, they know you messed up, but they want to help you be successful in life and do something with your life. [Whereas] the officers, and don’t get me wrong because some of them are very enthusiastic with you too, like, they are like, “Hey, more power to you, I want you to do well.” Before, a lot of the officers -- it’s just a job to them and they will be like, “Okay, you want to do good right now, but let’s see where you’re at in a couple years from now. If you’re good now, good for you, but if you do bad, I’m not surprised.” (Ryan, personal communication, August 26, 2013)

Students noted the Transitions/Pathways to Success teachers, such as the ROP instructors and Work Readiness teacher, provided the most support and positive experiences while at Camp Barrett. The students truly appreciated the time, effort, and interest the teachers and instructors offered to each of them. The above factors seemed to have a positive impact on the students’ overall experience at Camp Barrett. The responses provided by the students for the current study indicate that their experiences with the classes that make up the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program were mostly positive. Plus they indicated that they were treated fairly, which was evidenced by the personal relationships developed between the students and their teachers.

John’s statements about sitting in the back of the Life Skills Class might be evidence that while some of the students did not participate, they still listened to the class’ conversations and were able to take something positive away from their time there even though some of them sat in the back and did not participate. Some of the students identified the Life Skills Class as a one that they wanted to take after speaking with other students that had previously participated. This could be an indication that the Life Skills Class was viewed as a valuable and worthwhile class to take. The attainment of such value is a good indication that the class was not only perceived as being legitimate, but possibly enhanced the perceptions of legitimacy in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program as a whole.

In contrast to MacKenzie and colleagues’ (2001) study, the participants in the current study reported perceptions that Camp Barrett afforded some sense of freedom (Burke et al., 2008). Whether it was the freeing feeling of the outdoor environment of the camp, or some
other subjective variable like it, most of the participants suggested that Camp Barrett was a preferable environment to that of the juvenile halls, like ECJDF or KMJDF.

According to the literature, fair treatment by an authority builds and supports people’s perceptions of legitimacy within that authority (Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990; Tyler et al., 2007). The students’ responses for the current study regarding the Transitions/Pathways to Success teachers reflected positive perceptions of legitimacy. Furthermore, the fair treatment and the students’ positive experiences could explain the current study’s participants’ success in the program and continue participation with the program after release. The best way to investigate the validity of the previous statement would be to interview the students that dropped out or who were unsuccessful in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, which was identified as a significant limitation of the current study (explored further in the following section).

Franke and his collaborators (2010) showed that the second-generation boot camp style of confinement offers an experience that is not quite legitimizing, but one that is not delegitimizing either. In this sense, the second-generation boot camp confinement model was found to be neutral. Researchers suggest that providing such an experience could curtail the criminalizing (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007) and delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987) effects that lead to elevated recidivism levels and disorderly behavior in confinement (Franke et al., 2010; Jackson et al., 2010; Sparks & Bottoms, 1995). The current study’s findings support Franke and colleagues (2010) and their research that suggests second-generational boot camp styles of confinement can offer neutral experiences in terms of legitimacy. The levels of procedural fairness that were experienced by the students interviewed for the current study were analyzed as being on par with, if not better than, the levels identified by Franke and his team (2010) in their study. This finding affirms the current study’s original hypothesis that the students who participated in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program at Camp Barrett would not perceive their experience as delegitimizing, but as neutral or even legitimizing instead.

**STUDY LIMITATIONS**

The participants in this study have all been clients of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program since being released from Camp Barrett. Some of the participants were
interviewed a few months after release while others were interviewed only a few days after release. The current study must therefore be considered limited since the study focused only on the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program clients who were actively participating after release. At the time of our interview, each student was active in the post-release portions of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program.

The study’s small sample size also provides limits. A larger sample size with fully randomized groups of both Transitions/Pathways to Success Program active participants and those who dropped out of the program is preferable for future research. Obtaining a randomized sample would be more time consuming than the recruitment method used for the current study, which was the main reason it was not sought.

Another limitation, in terms of program assessment, involves the lack of context that could have been provided by qualitative interviews with the probation officers at Camp Barrett. It is my opinion that the perceptions and feelings of the Camp Barrett probation officers could provide credible and valuable information pertaining to the improvement of the classes associated with the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program. Access to the Camp Barrett probation officers was requested on my behalf, but the San Diego County Probation Department leadership did not grant it.

**Implications for Future Research**

A more exhaustive study is needed to better identify and acknowledge the perceptions, feelings, and opinions of those students who were not participating in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program after being released from Camp Barrett. The perceptions pertaining to the program, its classes, and teachers could be very different for those students who participated, or who were actively participating, in the program. Also, questions as to why the students dropped out of the program could offer more pertinent information and therefore a better understanding regarding what should be improved or changed within the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program.

As indicated above, a fully randomized experiment of Transitions/Pathways to Success Program active participants, participants that have successfully completed the program, and those who dropped out of the program would be preferable when expanding this research in the future. The ability to compare and contrast responses from students of the
aforementioned categories would be far more effective in evaluating the classes making up the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program, as well as the program as a whole. Secondly, interviews with the Camp Barrett probation officers, Transitions/Pathways to Success teachers, Camp Barrett non-officer staff, and Barrett High School teachers could provide crucial context as a counter-balance to the students’ comments provided in this study.

The literature would strongly benefit from a study of female juveniles’ perceptions of procedural justice, legitimacy, and their experiences in confinement. Even research with similar limitations as the current study would provide worthwhile information and context regarding the confinement of female juveniles. Study’s that explore legitimacy theory and gender within the justice system could reveal variables that should be acknowledged to help improve conditions in confinement that are different for female inmates compared to male inmates.

Lastly, a study that compares the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program to another San Diego County Probation Department juvenile reentry program, such as Breaking Cycles or participation at the Youth Day Center (YDC), would be beneficial. Breaking Cycles provides a multi-layered approach to juvenile probation and reentry with a significant focus on drug and alcohol treatment. The program sets goals similar to traditional reentry programs (reduce crime and delinquency, reduce substance abuse, improve school performance, etc.), but it also aims to influence policy by pushing for the “[redirection of] resources from costly incarceration to a prevention focus” (San Diego Youth Services, 2014). The YDC helps transition the participants of the Juvenile Ranch Rehabilitation Facility (JRF) to the community by tying together the accomplishments experienced at JRF to the programming in Breaking Cycles (County of San Diego, n.d.).

**Policy Implications**

On average nationally, 15% of juveniles on probation were readjudicated while under supervision in 2006⁷ (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2006). At a state level, the California legislature has a direct monetary interest in ensuring the best and most successful outcomes for juvenile offenders. It costs the Department of Juvenile Justice

---

⁷ Most recent year data was available.
approximately $175,000 to house a juvenile in a correctional facility (Lee et al., 2007). Locally, there were 2,218 juveniles released from probation in San Diego County in 2011. Of that number, 29% “committed a new offense” in the same year (San Diego County Probation Department, 2012a, p. 14). This figure cannot be directly compared to the national figure since it is unclear whether “committed a new offense” is synonymous with “readjudicated.” The two figures are, however, able to provide a basis of understanding regarding juveniles on probation and the likelihood of them reoffending.

The San Diego County Probation Department, in coordination with JCCS and the SDCOE, facilitated the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program as a means to help curtail recidivism amongst juveniles on probation, or recently released from probation. This study is not capable of determining whether the probationer’s experiences at Camp Barrett or in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program lead to lower rates of recidivism. Although, the study is capable of articulating the attitudes and perceptions of the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program participants about their experiences at Camp Barrett regarding procedural justice and legitimacy. The study’s findings may help probation administrators provide better training for probation officers and staff in how they treat and interact with probationers. This could help positively influence probationer’s perceptions of not only the probation officers and staff in terms of legitimacy, but the facility administrators, its programs, the criminal justice system, and the law in general.

The way in which a “facility is administered” can have a direct impact on whether those attitudes toward the justice system are negatively impacted or positively impacted (Franke et al., 2010, p. 113). The present study helps to articulate the attitudes of those in confinement so that policy makers can better understand juveniles’ perspectives. Previous research, such as that conducted by Franke and his team (2010), is significant because it could potentially lead policy makers to support confinement policies that mitigate the delegitimizing (DiIulio, 1987) and potentially criminalizing experience associated with adults in prison (Petersilia, 2003; Vieraitis et al., 2007). Although more research needs to be done regarding juvenile confinement, procedural justice, and perceptions of legitimacy, the current study supports Franke and colleagues’ (2010) findings in the context of juvenile confinement.
This was not a study to determine whether juvenile confinement is legitimizing or delegitimizing in general. Also, its aim was not to determine whether the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program is generally legitimizing or delegitimizing. This study sought to explore youths’ perceptions of a local correctional facility for young adults regarding procedural justice, fairness, and legitimacy. The study also intended to determine whether the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program at Camp Barrett was effectively implementing its stated goals, guidelines, and bylaws. Unfortunately, the study was not fully capable of determining the latter based upon the study’s previously mentioned limitations. The study’s findings reveal trends regarding beneficial, neutral, and negative experiences at Camp Barrett that may help policy makers better organize, plan, and implement the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program and other reentry programs.

**CONCLUSION**

Similar to that revealed in Franke and colleague’s (2010) study, a neutral effect was found when procedural justice and legitimacy theory were explored through qualitative interviews of participants within the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program at Camp Barrett. Moreso, the data suggests that those individuals still participating in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program may have experienced a legitimizing effect in their perceptions of the camp and its actors. This was seen to an even larger degree with participants who are currently involved in the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program and who obtained employment with the help of the program’s case managers and teachers. The findings of the current study support Franke and colleague’s (2010) research, further supports the application of Tyler’s (1984, 1990, 2003, 2004, 2008, 2010) legitimacy theory to juveniles incarcerated in the juvenile corrections system, and helps to fill the gap in literature regarding legitimacy, procedural justice, and juvenile confinement (Schubert et al., 2012).
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE – TRANSITIONS
PARTICIPANT
Participant’s ID #: __________________

A. Briefing and General Topics (Glasrud 0)
   a. Introduce: I want you to fully understand who I am and why I am here. I am a student at San Diego State University. I do not work for the police, probation, JCCS, or the courts.
   
   b. Scope of interview – Youths’ Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community.
   
   c. Research question – Do the juvenile participants of the Transitions reentry program perceive the levels of fairness and procedural justice at Camp Barrett as legitimizing, delegitimizing, or neutral?
   
   d. Incentive: Be sure he understands that he gets to keep the incentive even if he ends the interview early.
   
   e. Offer appreciation for his participation.
   
   f. Assurance of objectivity, confidentiality, and researcher identity: I want you to really understand that everything and anything that you tell me will be held in the utmost confidential manner, or in other words, no one will know that it was you who participated in this study or who spoke with me.

   If it is all right with you, I would like to record this conversation. Your name will not be used in any published materials or materials made public. I will assign you a nickname (also known as a pseudonym) whenever referring to or repeating the statements that you make here. There is no chance that anyone will ever know what you have said or even that you have said anything at all.

   **Anything you say here will not have any effect on your case or probation status.**

   Although, as a mandated reporter, I must report any instances of child abuse to the Child Welfare Services. Also, if you reveal any intent to harm yourself or someone else, I am mandated to report this to your probation officer. Beyond that, everything said here will remain anonymous – meaning nobody will ever know you said anything. But, please, also understand that this is a good opportunity for you to share your voice, your opinions, and
your feelings about the criminal justice system, Camp Barrett, and the Transitions reentry program.

Lastly, I need you to understand that you can stop the interview and end your participation in the project at ANY time - and you still get to keep the gift card. Do you have any questions or concerns before we start?

g. Introduction – I will first ask you about your views on the San Diego County Probation. I will then ask you about your experience at Camp Barrett. But before we get to that:

h. Ice-breaker: “I’ve been wondering for a while now, do they let you listen to music at Camp Barrett? (If no) Do you like music? What types of music do you listen to? Were there times when you and the other students would try making your own music in some way? Flowing, beat box, writing, rapping, etc.?” Or for sports, “Do you like football or soccer? Do you have a favorite team? If you were able to follow your team while at Camp Barrett, how were you able to do so?”

1.0 OK. Now on to Camp Barrett. Do you feel that the time you spent at Camp Barrett was a good thing for you, bad thing, or somewhere in the middle?

1.1 [N] Can you explain further?

1.1.1 [AR] Is there anything that you think is good or decent about the camp?

1.2 [Y] Can you name some things or people that you respected while at Camp Barrett? By things I mean programs, classes, activities – those sorts of things.

1.2.1 [N] Was there anything about the camp that you found good or beneficial?

2.0 RULES: Let’s talk a minute about the rules at Camp Barrett. How were the rules first taught to you or, in other words, how did you learn them?

2.1 [AR] Did the rules seem any more or less harsh than some of the other places you been placed, such as juvenile hall? By harsh I mean ‘difficult to deal with’.

2.1.1 [More or less] What was it about the rules that made you feel this way? Was it a specific rule that you had a problem with?

2.1.1.1 [AR] (SKIP TO 2.1.2)
2.1.2 How about the probation officers enforcement of the rules – did you see a difference in the way the rules were enforced at Camp Barrett compared to other places you have been?

*2.1.2.1 [N] Do you feel that the rules were applied to you fairly compared to the other students?

2.1.2.1.1 [AR] What do you think about that? How does that make you feel?

2.1.2.2 [Y] How were they different?

2.1.2.2.1 [AR] So the rules are different depending where you are. How does it make you feel knowing that the same probation rules are applied differently depending where you are?

2.1.2.2.1.1 [AR] (REVERT BACK TO 2.1.2.1)

3.0 POs IN GENERAL: How do you feel the San Diego County Probation officers have treated you in general? Meaning even outside Camp Barrett. Different? The same?

3.1 [AR] Do you feel that the probation officers show you respect?

3.1.1 [N] Why? What experiences have you had that you feel this way?

*3.1.1.1 [AR] Is there a difference between the ways Camp Barrett POs respect you and how the POs on the ‘outs’ respect you?

3.1.2 [Y] What about disrespect? Have you felt disrespected at any time by the POs?

3.1.2.1 [Y] Can you give an example?

3.1.2.1.1 [AR] How did that make you feel?

3.1.2.1.1.1 [AR] (REVERT BACK TO 3.1.1.1)

3.1.2.2 [N] What do you think could be a sign of disrespect coming from a PO?

4.0 TREATED UNFAIRLY: At Camp Barrett, were there times when you saw POs or staff treat someone else, another student, unfairly? And by unfairly I mean that someone, such as a PO or staff, was showing favor for one person over another. Or in other words, that staff or
POs were allowing someone an advantage while not giving someone else the same advantage.

4.1 [Y] You don’t have to name any names if you don’t want to, but could you tell me what happened?
   4.1.1 [AR] How did that make you feel about the PO(s) that were there?
      4.1.1.1 [AR] Why?
   4.1.1.1.1 [AR] Do you think some other, or even many, POs treat students unfairly?
      4.1.1.1.1.1 [AR] Why do you suppose this is so?

4.2 [N] Even though you didn’t see anything like that, do you think the POs treat everyone fairly?
   4.2.1 [AR] What is it that makes you feel this way?

4.3 [AR] How about yourself, do you feel as though you were treated fairly?
   4.3.1 [AR] Can you expand on that a little?

5. POs FAVORED: As you look back on your experience at Camp Barrett, do you think that the POs treated all the students equally or do you think that they favored some students?
   5.1 [Favored] Why do you suppose some people were favored over others?
      5.2.1 [AR] How does that make you feel?
         5.2.1.1 [AR] Does this affect how much respect you have or show towards the POs?
   5.2 [Equal] How does that make you feel about the Camp and what the people there are trying to do for you?

6.0 RESPECT: Other than simply complying with (or obeying) your probation officer, the POs at Camp, and the courts, how might you show respect toward a PO?
   6.1 [AR] Would there ever be times that you would offer that sort of respect sarcastically, where you are showing the respect but, in reality, you don’t really mean it?
7. STAFF FAIR: What about the other Camp Barrett staff? How fairly do you think you were treated by the camp staff members (those who were not officers) compared to the other students?

7.1 ['Very fair' or 'fair'] Do you think there was anyone who was treated less fair by the camp staff than how you were treated?

7.1.1 [N] Was it important to you that everyone was treated fairly by the camp’s staff?

7.1.2 [Follow-up] Why is that?

7.1.2 [Y] How does that make you feel to see someone treated unfairly by a staff member?

7.2 ['Not fair'] Was there more than one occasion where you felt that the camp staff were treating you unfairly?

7.2.1 [AR] How does that make you feel?

8. RULE BREAKING: Did you see any student get caught for rule breaking at the camp? You don’t have to say any names if you don’t want to.

8.1 [Y] How was it handled by the probation officers (or staff)?

8.1.2 [AR] How fairly was the student treated by the POs (and camp staff) compared to other situations you had seen?

8.2 [N] There really wasn’t anything that you saw?

8.2.1 [N] OK. I believe you. Did that affect the way you behaved while at the camp?

8.2.1.1 [Follow-up] Why?

9. HOOK-UPS: Did you witness any favors being given to students by camp staff or the POs? In other words, did you see POs or camp staff ‘hooking up’ any of the other students with ‘kick days’ (days credit for good behavior), goodies, or maybe just by treating them nicer than they would treat you?

9.1 [Y] After seeing this take place, what did you do?

9.1.2 [AR] How did that make you feel?
9.2 [N] How does it make you feel to know that everyone at the camp was able to earn the same amount and types of ‘goodies’ and ‘kick days’? (Was it generally fair?)

10. WORK READINESS: Lets talk a little about the work readiness program at Camp. Do you feel that seeing the students at camp finish the work readiness program was important to the probation officers? Do you feel that the POs wanted to see you succeed?

10.1 [Y] What did the POs do to make you feel this way?

10.1.1 [AR] And that was uplifting for you? Did that help you to want to succeed even more?

10.2 [N] Was there anything specific that they did or didn’t do to make you feel this way?

10.2.1 [Yes] What was it that they said or did that made you feel this way?

10.2.1.1 [AR] (GO TO 10.2.2)

10.2.2 [No] How does that make you feel, knowing that they didn’t care whether you succeeded or not?

11. SUBSTANCE ABUSE: What about the substance abuse classes? Do you think that the POs wanted you to do well?

11.1 [Y] What did the probation officers say or do to convince you that they actually wanted you to do well and get better?

11.1.1 [AR] How did this affect your thinking towards those classes?

11.2 [N] What do you think about that? How does that make you feel?

11.2.1 [AR] How did this affect your thinking towards those classes?

11.2.1.1 [AR] Does this affect the way you feel about how the Transitions reentry program might be able to help you?

   Please explain.

12. VOCATIONAL CLASSES: And how about the vocational classes? How important do you think it was to the POs that you complete the vocational classes?

12.1 [AR] Did this affect your thinking about those classes in any way?

12.1.1 [Y] Why?
12.1.2 [N] Again, does this affect the way you feel about how the Transitions reentry program might be able to help you?

13.0 KURT: How fairly do you feel the vocational teacher, Kurt Farrington, treated each of his students?

13.1 [‘Fairly’] Can you give examples of the things that he did or said that made you feel as though fairness was important to him?

13.2 [‘Unfairly’] What was it that made you feel as though he was treating people unfairly?

13.2.1 [AR] Did this affect the way you felt about the vocational classes?

13.2.1.1 [Y] In what ways?

14.0 KURT SUCCEED: Do you feel that it was important to Kurt that you succeeded in the classes?

14.1 [Y] How did he make you feel this way?

14.1.1 [AR] (GO TO 14.2.1)

14.2 [N] How does that make you feel?

14.2.1 [AR] I know this is sounding repetitive, but does this affect the way you feel about how the Transitions reentry program might be able to help you?

15. TRANSITIONS PO: How about your Transitions program probation officer? Do you feel he or she has been helpful during your move back home, back to the ‘outs’?

15.1 [Y] What has the PO done for you that you appreciate?

15.1.1 [AR] Other than being appreciative, how does that make you feel about the Transitions program?

15.2 [N] How would you have liked your Transitions PO to help you during you move to the outs?

15.2.1 [AR] Knowing that (s)he has not met your expectations, how does this make you feel about the Transitions program?
16. Lastly, I wanted to give you an opportunity to say something that you might have on your mind about Camp Barrett, the probation department or its officers, the courts, or maybe the criminal justice system in general. It can be good or bad – positive or negative – and remember that no one other than me will know that you said anything at all. Do you have something you would like to say?

16.1 [Y] Please be as open and honest as possible.

16.1.1 [RC] Well, that’s about it. Unless you have any questions or anything else you would like to add, I’m going to stop recording now and end the interview. Thank you for your participation.

16.2 [N] Well, that’s about it. Unless you have any questions or anything else you would like to add, I’m going to stop recording now and end the interview. Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX B

CAMP BARRETT COLLOQUIALISMS
Hats

The students at Camp Barrett who performed well in their program were given leadership roles signified by a colored hat. Those with hats were allowed extra benefits such as soup, soda, and popcorn. They were tasked with helping students new to Camp Barrett get acquainted with their environment and its processes.

The Outs

The students at Camp Barrett often referred to their community and the outside world, that beyond the confines of Camp Barrett, as “the outs”. The reference was made as an abstract way to refer to the students’ homes or community in general. It was not uncommon for a student to refer to his community probation officer as his “PO on the outs.”

Kick-days

The students at Camp Barrett were allowed to earn time off of their sentences in the form of “kick days.” The students often referred to completing a “perfect program” as the best way to earn “kick days.” To complete a perfect program meant the avoidance of “RVs,” or rule violations, and succeeding in the classes that make up the Transitions/Pathways to Success Program.
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FORM
Full Committee Approval
Reg: 45 CFR 46.111(a) – Greater than minimal risk
Submit Report of Progress by: 12/8/2013

March 5, 2013

Student Researcher: Bryan Glasrud
Faculty Researcher: Dr. Dana Nurge
Department: Public Administration
Contract/grant number: N/A
IRB Number: N/A

Re: Youth’s Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community

Dear Mr. Glasrud:

The above referenced protocol was reviewed and approved as expeditiously in accordance with SDSU’s Assurance and federal requirements pertaining to human subjects protections within the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46). This approval applies to the conditions and procedures described in your protocol. Please notify the IRB office if your status as an SDSU-affiliate changes while conducting this research study (you are no longer an SDSU faculty member, staff member or student). This approval expires January 8, 2014.

- Please submit a Report of Progress by: 11/8/2013
- The following approved consent form(s) have been uploaded to your protocol file within the IRB system, within the Supporting Documents section:
  - GLASRUD_1183087_ALL CONSENT-ASSENT DOCS_IRB STAMPED.pdf

Graduate Students: This notification may be used as documentation to register in Thesis 799A. Attach a hard copy of this notice to your Appointment of Thesis/Project Committee form prior to submitting the completed form to Graduate and Research Affairs - Student Services Division.

For questions related to this correspondence, please contact the IRB office (619) 594-6622 or e-mail irb@mail.sdsu.edu. To access IRB review application materials, SDSU’s Assurance, the 45 CFR 46, the Belmont Report, and/or any other relevant policies and guidelines related to the involvement of human subjects in research, please visit the IRB web site at http://gra.sdsu.edu/research.php.

Sincerely,
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COURT ORDERED APPROVAL
THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
JUVENILE DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF:  
BRYAN GLASRUD,
PETITIONER.  

ORDER AUTHORIZING ACCESS TO
JUVENILE COURT WARDS; PROTECTIVE
ORDER

Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 827 and rule 5.552 of the California Rules of Court, petitioner Bryan Glasrud has requested a court order granting access to juvenile court wards for the purpose of completing a research project regarding juvenile probationers’ (ages 16-19) perceptions of legitimacy and procedural justice in juvenile corrections.

Juvenile court cases are subject to the confidentiality provisions and privileges of the law and the constitutional right to privacy. (Cal. Const., Art. I, § 1; Welf. & Inst. Code, § 827.) Petitioner has voluntarily agreed that, if this request is granted, petitioner will abide by the terms and conditions of this Order.

FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Bryan Glasrud shall be granted access to juvenile court wards subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Petitioner will obtain the consent and cooperation of the Probation Department before beginning his project. If such consent is obtained, petitioner may have access to juvenile court wards for the purpose of conducting interviews.

ORDER - 1
2. Prior to any ward's participation in the project, petitioner will obtain the written 
assent of the ward and the written consent of the ward's parent or guardian.

3. The information obtained under this Order is to be kept in a confidential manner 
and shall not be released to any person or entity not named herein, except as ordered by the 
Juvenile Court.

4. Use of any information obtained under this Order is limited to petitioner's 
research project. Any person reviewing the information obtained under this Order shall sign and 
file with the Court a declaration acknowledging that he or she is familiar with the terms and 
conditions of this Order.

5. Petitioner may publish the results of his study. However, petitioner will not 
disclose, disseminate, or publish the names of any children or members of their families. Nor 
will petitioner disclose, disseminate, or publish any information about such persons which, taken 
all together, would tend to make them identifiable to the general public, including, but not 
limited to, ages, schools attended, workplaces, and addresses and telephone numbers of families' 
homes.

6. This Order is not intended to replace, nullify, or conflict with any existing policies 
of the San Diego Superior Court, Juvenile Division, the San Diego County Juvenile Probation 
Department, or any other public or private agency.

7. Any unauthorized disclosure of confidential information or failure to comply with 
the terms and conditions of this Order may result in the vacation of this Order and/or may be 
punishable as contempt of court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 2/19/13

CYNTHIA BASHANT
JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT
San Diego State University

Consent to Act as a Research Subject

"Youth's Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community"

You are being asked to join a research study. Before you give your consent to volunteer, it is important that you read the following and ask as many questions as you need to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

Investigators: I, Bryan Glesrud, will be the only researcher for this study. I am a graduate student at San Diego State University in the Master's of Criminal Justice and Criminology program. Dr. Dana Nurgo is the professor overseeing my research.

Purpose of the Study: This study looks to understand the views of Transitions program participants about their time at Camp Barrett. I am looking for about fifteen people to join this study who are willing to be interviewed. In order to join, you must have been sent to San Diego County Probation's Camp Barrett and participated in the Transitions program.

Description of the Study: You are being asked to be interviewed about your experience at Camp Barrett and with the Transitions program. The interview should last no longer than one hour. After that, you will no longer be needed for the study. The interviews will be recorded using a tape recorder. If you are uncomfortable with the interview being recorded, you can let me know on the signing page of this form by marking the box saying so, or just let me know before the interview starts. I can take written notes instead. But using a tape recorder would be much easier for me. A fake name will be used in place of your real name when I report the study's results. This study has been looked over and was given permission by representatives of the Superior Court of California – San Diego County.

The interview will take place at the local Juvenile Court and Community Schools (JCCS) office near your residence.

Risks or Discomforts: You may think about things that make you feel uncomfortable because the interview questions are personal. If you begin to feel uncomfortable, you may stop the interview and leave whenever you like. You will not be in trouble if you stop the interview early. Some of the questions in the interview may involve activities that you have been involved with in the past. Please do not talk about any illegal activities that you were not arrested for.
Participant Consent

Unless you want to talk about things involving your previous arrest or conviction, the interview will take place in private. You and I will be alone during the discussion. If this makes you uncomfortable, please let me know before you sign this document. Please keep in mind that this study’s guidelines require a private setting so that you do not feel inclined to alter your honest views or opinions. You must understand that as a “mandated reporter,” I have to report any intended future violent activity that you talk about in the interview to your probation officer. Also, if you talk about physical or sexual abuse, I am required to report it to the CWS phone hotline and the San Diego County Probation Department.

Your views and opinions of Camp Barrett and the Transitions program are the main focus of my research - not your prior or future criminal behavior. If you feel troubled by the interview process or the questions in the interview, a counselor will be available at any time during the interview by phone. Kurt Farrington, a teacher at Camp Barrett, will also be available by phone for you to speak to if you feel uncomfortable.

Benefits of the Study: This study may help us to better understand Transitions participants’ experiences in the juvenile justice system and could lead to improvements in the programs related to Transitions and at Camp Barrett. You will not directly benefit from taking part in this study.

Confidentiality: Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent allowed by law. I will keep a file for the signed assent forms, consent forms, and any coding (your fake names) in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Dana Nurge’s office at San Diego State University. Only Dr. Nurge and I will have access to the filing cabinet. The audio recordings will also be kept in the same location as the documents. The documents and audio recordings will be held until the end of the study and the completion of a master’s thesis. All audio recordings will be erased upon the study’s conclusion and the master’s thesis completion. Although, consent and assent forms will be kept on file for three years, as required. You will not have an opportunity to review or edit any of the audio prior to the study’s conclusion or publication.

Incentives to Join: If you join the study, you will be given a gift card to a fast food restaurant (worth $10). You will be given the gift card at the end of the interview. Even if you choose to stop the interview while in progress, you will still receive a gift card.

Costs and/or Compensation for Joining: There are no costs in joining this study.

Voluntary Nature of Joining: Joining this study is completely voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to join the study will not impact your probation status or your court case in any way. If you decide to join, you are free to remove your consent and to stop your participation at any time. You will
not be in any trouble for doing so.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study now, please ask. If you have questions later about the study, you may contact Bryan Glasrud at (619) 686-6807 or email at bglasrud@gmail.com. You may also reach Dr. Dana Nurge (619) 594-6877 or email at dananurge2002@yahoo.com.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (telephone: 619-594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu).

Consent to Participate: The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Board’s stamp. The consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Your signature below shows that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the study. Your signature also shows that you agree to be in the study and have been told that you can change your mind and remove your consent to participate at any time. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

If you feel uncomfortable being audio-recorded during the interview, please indicate by marking an X in one of the boxes below:

☐ Audio-recording OK for interview
☐ Prefer written notes for interview

Name of Participant (please print)

______________________________ Date

Signature of Participant ________________________ Date

Bryan Glasrud, Lead Investigator ________________________ Date

Institutional Review Board
Approval Expires: 1/8/2014
Study Number: 1183087
San Diego State University

Parental Permission form

"Youth's Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community"

Your child is being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent for your child to volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what your child will be asked to do.

Investigators: I, Brygan Glasgow, will be the only investigator for this study. I am a graduate student at San Diego State University in the Masters of Criminal Justice and Criminology program. Dr. Dana Nurge is the professor supervising my research.

Purpose of the Study: This study examines the Transitions reentry program participants’ views about the justice system and the handling of their cases. I am recruiting about fifteen individuals to participate in this study. In order to participate in this study, your child must have attended San Diego County Probation’s Camp Barrett and participated in the Transitions reentry program through San Diego County Probation.

Description of the Study: I will be asking your child to be interviewed about his experiences at Camp Barrett. Your child’s full participation in the study should last no longer than one hour. The interviews will be audio-recorded. If your child is uncomfortable with the conversation being recorded, he can indicate so on the assent form and I can take handwritten notes instead. A pseudonym will be used in place of your child’s name when transcribing the audio recording and reporting the findings of this study’s results.

The interview will take place at the local Juvenile Court and Community Schools (JCCS) office near your child’s residence.

Risks or Discomforts: Because of the personal nature of the questions asked, your child may reflect on experiences that make him uncomfortable. If your child begins to feel uncomfortable, he may discontinue his participation in the interview at any time. Some of the questions in the interview may involve activities or behavior that your child has committed in the past. Unless your child’s responses involve information or details relating to his arrests or convictions, he will be asked to not reveal any illegal activities or behavior that did not result in an arrest or charge. The interview will take place in a private setting, where your child and I will be alone to discuss his views privately. If such a setting makes you uncomfortable, please let me know prior to signing this document. Please keep in mind that this study’s guidelines require a private setting so that your child does not feel inclined to alter his honest views, perceptions, or opinions. You must understand that as a mandated reporter, I am required to report any prior or future (intended) illegal activity that your child mentions in the interview to his probation officer. Also, if your child reveals any information regarding physical or sexual abuse I am required to report the information as soon as possible to Child Protection Services and the San Diego County Probation Department. Your child’s views, attitudes, and perceptions of Camp Barrett and the Transitions reentry program are the main focus of my research – not your child’s prior or future criminal behavior. If your child feels troubled by the interview process, a counselor (also known as a youth advocate) will be available at any time during the interview by phone. This study has been reviewed and was given permission by representatives of the Superior Court of California – San Diego County.

Benefits of the Study: This study may help us to better understand Transitions participants’ experiences in the juvenile justice system and the knowledge gained may lead to systemic improvements. There are no direct benefits for participating in this study, besides the incentives mentioned below.

Confidentiality: Confidentiality will be maintained to the extent allowed by law. I will keep a file specifically for the signed assent and consent forms in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Dana Nurge’s office at San Diego State University. Only Dr. Nurge and I will have access to

Institutional Review Board

Approval Expires: 1/8/2014
Study Number: 1183087
Parental Permission

the filing cabinet. The audio materials will also be kept in the same location as the aforementioned documents. The documents and audio materials will be held until the conclusion of the study and the completion of a master’s thesis. Upon the study’s conclusion and the master’s thesis completion, all audio materials will be digitally erased (the recording instrument will be a digital recorder). All signed documents will be held on file for three years, as required, then will be destroyed. Your child will not have an opportunity to review or edit any of the audio material prior to the study’s conclusion or publication.

Incentives to Participate: If your child participates in the study, he will receive a gift card to a fast food restaurant (worth $10). Your child will receive the gift card at the end of the interview. Even if he chooses to stop the interview while in process, your child will still receive a gift card.

Costs and/or Compensation for Participation: There are no costs associated with participating in this study.

Voluntary Nature of Participation: Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your child’s choice of whether or not to participate will not impact your child’s status on probation or with your child’s court case in any way. If your child does decide to participate, he is free to withdraw his assent and to stop his participation at any time without penalty.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the research now, please ask. If you have questions later about the research, you may contact Bryan Glasrud at (819) 594-4807 or email at bgglasrud@gmail.com. You may also reach Dr. Dana Nurge at (619) 594-0877 or email at dananurge2002@yahoo.com.

If you have any questions about your child’s rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at San Diego State University (telephone: 619-594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu).

Consent to Participate: The San Diego State University Institutional Review Board has approved this consent form, as signified by the Board’s stamp. The consent form must be reviewed annually and expires on the date indicated on the stamp.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this document and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about the study. Your signature also indicates that you agree to allow your child to be in the study and you have been told that you can change your mind and withdraw your consent to allow your child to participate at any time. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have been told that by signing this consent form you are not giving up any of your legal rights.

Name of Child (please print)

Signature of Parent/Guardian of Participant Date

Bryan Glasrud, Lead Investigator Date

Institutional Review Board
San Diego State University
Approval Expires: 1/8/2014
Study Number: 1183087
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INFORMED ASSENT
San Diego State University

Assent to Act as a Research Subject

“Youth’s Perceptions of Legitimacy and Procedural Justice in Juvenile Corrections: A Qualitative Study of the Transition from Confinement to Community”

My name is Bryan Glasrud and I am a graduate student at San Diego State University. I am asking you to take part in a research study. I am trying to learn more about your experience with the Transitions reentry program and the vocational training you received at Camp Barrett.

If you agree to be in this study, I will ask you to be interviewed regarding your experience at Camp Barrett (about one hour). Once the interview is over, your participation in the study will end. The interview will take place at the Juvenile Corrections and Community Schools officer near your residence.

I must inform you that there could be risk involved if you choose to participate. Some of the questions I will ask you might make you uncomfortable. If during the interview you feel like you do not want to answer a question, please let me know and we can move past that sensitive information. Kurt Farrington, the ROP Instructor at Camp Barrett, or a licensed counselor (also known as a youth advocate), will be available by phone to speak to you if the questions bring up any feelings or issues you would like to discuss. Also, please understand that your participation in this study is completely voluntary — if you feel that you no longer wish to participate at any time during the interview, please let me know and I will stop the interview immediately. Everything you say during the interview will be completely anonymous — meaning nobody other than I will know what you said during the interview. Your name will not be used when I write about the findings and your probation officer will not be made aware of your responses.

Please understand that if you do mention a circumstance that involves previous criminal behavior that had not been reported, or criminal behavior that you intend to commit, I am required to report these comments to your probation officer. Also, I am required to report any physical or sexual abuse committed by you or upon you to the proper authorities (San Diego County Probation Department and Child Protective Services). Just so you know, this study has been looked over and was given permission by representatives of the Superior Court of California – San Diego County.

There are no direct benefits for you to reasonably expect to be gained from participation in this study, besides the incentives mentioned below.

Please talk to your parent/guardian about this study before you decide whether to participate. I will also ask your parent/guardian if it is okay with him/her for...
Participant Assent

You to take part in this study. If your parent/guardian says that you can participate, you can still decide not to participate. If it is okay with your parent/guardian, you will have the final decision as to whether or not you will participate.

You can ask me any questions that you have about this study and I will try to answer them for you. If you have questions that you think of later, you can call me on my cell phone: (619) 886-6807 or email me at bglaudy@gmail.com. You can also contact this study's supervising professor, Dr. Dana Nurge at (619) 594-6877 or email at dananurge2002@yahoo.com.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Division of Research Affairs San Diego State University (telephone: 619-594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu).

Taking part in this study is totally up to you. No one will be upset if you do not want to participate. Your probation status and court case will not be affected by your decision to participate or your decision not to participate. If you decide to participate, you can also change your mind and stop any time you want.

Please mark one of the boxes below to voluntarily accept or deny participation:
☐ “Yes, I would like to participate in this study.”
☐ “No, I would not like to participate in this study.”

Participant Name (print please)

__________________________
Participant Signature

__________________________
Date

Participant’s Parent/Guardian Name (print please)

__________________________
Participant’s Parent/Guardian Signature

__________________________
Date

Bryan Glaudy, Lead Investigator

__________________________
Date
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Approval Expires: 1/8/2014
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