Juvenile Delinquency and First-Time Detained: An Exploratory Study of Noncognitive Factors

David Coker[1]

[1]Fort Hays State University

October 05, 2020

Abstract

An archival review of records for first-time detained juvenile delinquents was conducted.

Introduction

In 2017, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2017a, 2017b), as administered by the United States Department of Education, found over one and a half million juveniles and young adults arrested per year, with over 43,000 incarcerated on a given day. Juvenile delinquents in the United States were shown to be a diverse group from different cultural, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds, with minority students over-represented in juvenile detention (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2015). Juvenile delinquents showed a multitude of problems which separate delinquents from nondelinquent peers. First-time offenders generally had a long history of problem behavior before escalating to charges and arrest, and first-time juveniles incarcerated displayed much higher rates of mental illness and aggression (Barrett & Katsiyannis, 2017).

In spite of everything known about juvenile delinquents, there is little known about first-time detained juvenile delinquents (Coker, 2020). The research seeks to describe the academic and noncognitive factors of newly incarcerated juvenile delinquents. The academic factors are verbal and mathematics ability. The noncognitive factors are math academic self-concept, English academic self-concept, self-esteem, mental health, and grit. The lack of research has been well documented, making the issue apt for study. There is a review of the literature, and then the data analysis is presented. A discussion follows, with recommendations for policies and future research.

Literature Review

Further compounding the juvenile delinquents' problems was for many, incarceration was the first time juveniles were separated from the youths' parents, and most juvenile detention centers strictly limited parent and guardian contact (Shulman & Cauffman, 2011). Another issue was juvenile delinquents disproportionately suffered from medical problems which go untreated (Balogun, Troisi, Swartz, Lloyd, & Beyda, 2018; Barnert, Perry, & Morris, 2016). Once a juvenile fell behind in school, catching up was nearly impossible to get back on track to graduate high school. Early problems seemed to lead to a lifetime of difficulties. In a large-scale study of delinquent and nondelinquent students, parenting problems and developmental delays were the two major variables which separated the two cohorts (Barrett, Katsiyannis, Zhang, & Zhang, 2014). Several factors contributed to juvenile delinquency, with a meta-analysis of 55 articles revealed criminal history, alcohol and drug abuse, and aggressive behavior being most important, though relationships with the mother and siblings mattered in childhood (Assink et al., 2015).

Adopting a sound behavioral management theory for detention centers can be challenging, as one study found

strict punishments contributed to juvenile delinquency, but lax programs showed similar results (Peguero, Marchbanks, Varela, Eason, & Blake, 2018). Positive behavioral support had been shown to expand opportunities for data collection and focused interventions to improve behavior in juvenile detention facilities. An example included Texas juvenile facilities which adopted positive behavioral supports, and the facilities experienced decreased discipline problems, increased satisfaction with rules and expectations, and improved academic outcomes (Johnson et al., 2013). Intensive, robust social and behavioral supports provided stability for incarcerated students and increased academic achievement. Juveniles who did not receive services to develop prosocial skills showed problems in school and an inability to gain employment after reaching adulthood (Leone, Lockwood, & Gagnon, 2017; Pelcovitz et al., 2017).

Despite the needs of children, many juvenile detention centers still showed little focus on teaching the whole child or developing vocational abilities, and different areas reported graduation rates from 12 to 24% (Eren & Mocan, 2017). Generally, most studies failed to demonstrate effectiveness in instructional outcomes after incarceration or proper referral for educational services, and most teachers did not feel principals were properly prepared (Benner et al., 2016; Hirsch, Dierkhising, & Herz, 2018; Sander, Patall, Amoscato, Fisher, & Funk, 2012). Schools in juvenile correctional facilities had dismal outcomes, with few finding students improved educational ability and reformed behavior.

Self-concept was found to be an important noncognitive factor for successful students, but most juvenile delinquents lacked the necessary prerequisites for success. Self-efficacy was found to be a precondition for development of self-concept, but high levels of self-enhancement correlated to lower self-concept later except when prior academic self-concept was high (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Sticca, Goetz, Nett, Hubbard, & Haag, 2017). A consistent and moderately strong relationship was observed in research between positive academic self-concept and academic achievement, (Hamachek, 1995; Marsh & Shavelson, 1985; Susperreguy, Davis-Kean, Duckworth, & Chen, 2018). Educators could improve instructional practices by promoting a positive academic self-concept and helping students avoid self-handicapping strategies (Marsh et al., 2016).

Low self-esteem at age 15 related to later mental health problems, but other psychological factors, such as ADHD, were necessary to understand low self-esteem was not a standalone factor (Boden, Fergusson, & Horwood, 2008; Harpin, Mazzone, Raynaud, Kahle, & Hodgkins, 2016; Jennings et al., 2018). One suggested factor was self-verification or reflected appraisal, which meant self-esteem formed both within the individual and group context, and a discrepancy was found which negatively impacted emotions and conformity (Cast & Burke, 2002; Keith & Scheuerman, 2018). Like the construct of self-concept, focusing on raising self-esteem without merit did not produce the desired effects and could probably be better served by building resiliency in adolescents (Baumeister, Campbell, Krieger, & Vows, 2003; Martínez-Martí & Ruch, 2017).

Besides self-esteem and self-concept, another noncognitive factor which garnered much research was grit. Grit had shown more prominence in success than cognitive factors in many endeavors. Grit, which is defined as resilience in the face of adversity, influenced preventing substance abuse, improving school behavior and attendance, and improving self-concept and reading skills (Guerrero, Dudovitz, Chung, Dosanjh, & Wong, 2016; Thomas, Davis, Marsh, & Margolis, 2016; West et al., 2016). When teachers push juveniles to be passionate and persevere, but the youth lacked the ability, failure and poor self-concept were two likely possibilities. Measuring grit in relationship to other noncognitive variables led to misleading results, and there were situations where individuals with high grit experienced harm due to failure to overcome adversity (Miller, Yu, Chen, & Brody, 2015; Peterson, 2015).

The history of juvenile delinquents before and after entering a secure detention facility was one of failure; most juveniles, by the time the youths entered the juvenile justice system, were many years behind in reading and math. Testing revealed juvenile delinquents were significantly behind similarly situated peers on all academic achievement batteries (Forsyth, Asmus, Stokes, & Forsyth, 2010). There was a need to determine which interventions improved engagement and academic achievement in juvenile detention centers. Schooling was difficult for juvenile delinquents, with over 80% found to experience chronic failure and over one third expelled from school (Sander, 2010). Students in juvenile justice felt disconnected, had poor self-concept, and were disengaged from school, and reading and studying one's agency might bring about change (Bower,

Carroll, & Ashman, 2012; Seroczynski, Evans, Jobst, Horvath, & Carozza, 2016).

Incarcerated juveniles showed limited prosocial emotions and often appeared apathetic and disengaged because of psychological problems (Pechorro, Jiménez, Hidalgo, & Nunes, 2015). No direct research was found which examined first-time detained juvenile delinquents, and an extensive search of EBSCO, ERIC, and Google Scholar revealed no major policy journals describe short-term juvenile detention centers. The description of newly incarcerated juvenile delinquents could inform instructional practices and assist in developing behavioral management programs. Next, the data analysis procedures are outlined.

Method

A small regional juvenile detention center, with all students incarcerated by the local courts, provided an archival record for the 2016–2017 school year. Permission for access to archival records was granted as long as confidentiality and anonymity would be protected by removing personal information. All Institutional Review Board regulations were followed. An Excel spreadsheet was provided with all requested information. In seeking permission, the data were checked to confirm each student was suitable for the study. The only criteria for inclusion were students were incarcerated for the first time, completed all surveys, and had grades at the three-week mark. Academic scores for the Basic Achievement Skills Inventory-Survey were reviewed. The following noncognitive factors were reviewed: grit (Grit-Short), math academic self-concept (Marsh math academic self-concept scale), English academic self-concept (Marsh academic self-concept scale), self-esteem (State Self-Esteem Scale, and mental health (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire).

All Excel files were checked for missing or erroneous values, and within a week or two, all information was converted to a CSV file for use in JASP (Jeffreys's Amazing Statistics Program). Descriptive statistics are presented for the sample and instruments. Due to normality issues, the Wilcoxon Test was used to compare academic and noncognitive factors to national norms. Using JASP, the data were run within four weeks.

Sample

There were 72 students included in the study from a large geographical area. The facility was a coeducational facility housing students in a residential program. The average age was 15.3 (SD = 1.6; range 10–18), but 73.6% were between the ages of 15–17 (Table 1). Students were incarcerated for offenses which as adults would be a felony or misdemeanor. All students included in the study experienced problems in traditional school. The average length of stay at the detention center was 30.5 days. Race was coded as 3 for Black, 4 for Hispanic, and 5 for White. Students self-reported race. The sample was comparable to the population of juveniles incarcerated in detention nationally (Sedlak & Bruce, 2016).

Table 1 breaks down all students by age. Over 72% of students were aged 15-17, showing most students were high school age. Very few students were at either extremes of middle school or 18 and over. Younger students were relatively rare, with only 5.6% of students aged 10-12. Few students were in middle school compared to the overall population. Older high school students, at the ages 16 and older, predominated. A conclusion from Table 1 suggested the average juvenile in the sample was 15.3 years of age, male, in the 9^{th} grade, and a higher than normal rate of being in special education. Most students had not earned enough credits to be counted as juniors or seniors, placing most students at risk of dropping out of high school.

Table 1

Frequencies for Age

Age	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
10	2	2.778	2.778	2.778
12	2	2.778	2.778	5.556
13	6	8.333	8.333	13.889
14	8	11.111	11.111	25.000
15	17	23.611	23.611	48.611

Age	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
16	14	19.444	19.444	68.056
17	22	30.556	30.556	98.611
18	1	1.389	1.389	100.000
Missing	0	0.000		
Total	72	100.000		

Most students were male (male = 58; female = 14), as the facility was a coeducational juvenile detention center. Most students were males, between the ages of 15-17, and in high school. Females made up 19.4% of the entire population. Females were similar to males in grades and special education status. Both males and females were educated together, though males predominated in juvenile detention. Males were overrepresented as well, which meant the sample mirrored trends seen nationally.

A further breakdown of demographics from was examined. Of the 72 students, 39 (54%) were Black, 2 (2.7%) were Hispanic, and 31 (46%) were White. Students self-reported race upon intake. There were slightly more Black students than White. The Hispanic population was very low.

Though 50% of students were 16 years of age and over, the students as a collective were behind academically and at risk of school failure. The race of students from was further broken down. There were 22 (30%) students 17 years of age, yet only 21% were in 11th and 12th grade. From reviewing Table 2, one sees there was the ninth-grade bulge. Students were over age compared to the students' grade level and lacked sufficient credits to be on track to graduate. Special education was overrepresented, with 32% of students receiving services (seriously emotionally disturbed was most prevalent, comprising 18% of the total population). As Table 2 shows, most students were in high school, and most students, from comparing to Table 1, were not at grade level.

Table 2

Frequencies for Grade Level

Grade level	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
5	2	2.778	2.778	2.778
6	1	1.389	1.389	4.167
7	7	9.722	9.722	13.889
8	9	12.500	12.500	26.389
9	22	30.556	30.556	56.944
10	14	19.444	19.444	76.389
11	9	12.500	12.500	88.889
12	6	8.333	8.333	97.222
13	2	2.778	2.778	100.000
Total	72	100.000		

Special education was overrepresented, with 32% of students receiving services (seriously emotionally disturbed was most prevalent, comprising 18% of the total population). As Table 3 shows, students with special needs made up approximately one third of the facility, and most students were behind academically regardless of disability. Being overaged, undercredited, and disabled were conclusions drawn from Tables 1-3.

Table 3

Frequencies for Special Education

Special education	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
504 Plan	2	2.778	8.696	8.696
Emotional disability/other health impairment	1	1.389	4.348	13.043
Learning disability	2	2.778	8.696	21.739
Other health impairment	6	8.333	26.087	47.826
Seriously emotionally disturbed	11	15.278	47.826	95.652
Seriously emotionally disturbed/hearing impaired	1	1.389	4.348	100.000
Regular education	49	68.056		
Total	72	100.000		

Instruments

The instruments were all standardized across many ages and provided insight into a student's academic, social, and emotional status. Intake procedures required juveniles complete all instruments within five school days of entering school. The instruments all had established validity and reliability: the State Self-Esteem Scale (SSES), which included the subscales of performance, social, and appearance (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991); the Single-item Self-Esteem Scale (SISE) (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001); math academic self-concept (ASC) and English academic self-concept, (ASC) (Marsh, 1990); Basic Achievement Skills Inventory-Survey (BASI–Survey), which included the subscores of math computation, math application, vocabulary, language mechanics, and reading comprehension (Bardos, 2004); Test of Silent Contextual Reading Fluency-2 (TOSCRF–2) (Dumont, Willis, Veizel, & Zibulsky, 2013); Grit–Short Scale (Grit-S) (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009); and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), which included the subscales of emotional, conduct, hyperactivity, peer, and prosocial (Bourdon, Goodman, Rae, Simpson, & Koretz, 2005; Goodman, 2001). All scales, except the Grit–Short Scale, were added for a total; higher scores for all, except the SDQ (excluding the prosocial subscale, which higher is better), were suggestive of a positive measure of the construct measured. High scores on the SDQ were indicative of mental health problems, and low scores were indicative of absence of mental problems.

Data Analysis

Students with disabilities, as shown in Table 3, were overrepresented. For the SSES, subscores of performance (M = 71.9, SD = 15.849), social (M = 71.5, SD = 14.992), and appearance (M = 71.6, SD = 16.742). The SISE revealed similar scores to the SSES, suggesting concurrent reliability. All subscores of the SSES, performance, social, and appearance, were similar.

There was a comparison of noncognitive factors compared to nondelinquent youths. Most students entering juvenile detention have long histories of failure. Alternative school placements, expulsion, and dropping out were common among juvenile delinquents. Table 5 summarizes the findings.

Table 5

Comparison Delinquents Versus Nondelinquents: Wilcoxon Test Results

Measure	Nondelinquents *M*	Statistic & α level	Effect size
State Self-Esteem Scale (SSES) (M = 71.403; SD = 12.972)	67.7	Z = 2.831 p =.005	0.334 Moderate
Performance/SSES (M = 25.196; SD = 5.543)	22.5	Z = 4.973 p = <.001	0.586 High
Social/SSES (M = 24.919; SD = 5.098)	25.0	Z = -0.129 p = .897	-0.015 No effect size
Appearance/SSES (M = 21.483; SD = 5.023)	19.5	Z = 4.315 p = .001	0.509 Moderate

Measure	Nondelinquents M	Statistic & α level	Effect size
SDQ (M = 14.403; SD = 5.296)	7.9	Z = 9.680 p = <.001	1.141 High
SDQ-Emotional (M = 4.139; SD = 2.739)	1.6	Z = 11.968 p = <.001	1.410 High
SDQ-Conduct (M = 3.417; SD = 1.782)	1.3	Z = 11.225 p = <.001	1.323 High
SDQ-Hyperactivity (M = 4.403; SD = 1.866)	2.8	Z = 5.440 p = <.001	0.641 High
SDQ-Peer (M = 3.028; SD = 1.784)	1.4	Z = 9.208 p = <.001	1.085 High
SDQ-Prosocial (M = 7.542; SD = 1.906)	8.6	Z = -8.980 p = <.001	-1.058 High
Grit-Short (M = 3.387; SD = 0.685)	3.4	Z = -0.134 p = .893	-0.016 No effect size
Math ASC (M = 14.111; SD = 4.211)	14.91	Z = -1.779 p = .038	-0.210 Small
English ASC (M = 16.319; SD = 5.046)	16.58	Z = -0.374 p = .708	-0.044 No effect size

Note. N = 72; p = .05 two tailed. Normative data for the SSES from Heatherton & Polivy, 1991; SDQ from Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, 2001; grit from Duckworth & Quinn, 2009; math and English ASC from Marsh, 1990.

Overall, academically, students were far behind academically similar peers, with lower self-esteem and higher prevalence of mental disorders as evidenced by the SDQ. Grit (p = .893) and English academic self-concept (p = .708) were not significantly different from the general population. For SSES (p = .005, ES = 0.334), math ASC (p = .038; ES = -0.210), and performance self-esteem (p = <.001, ES = 0.586), juvenile delinquents first time incarcerated had a low to high effect size compared to nondelinquents. Of 51 high school students, 48 were overaged, undercredited (with 12 being dropouts). Regular education students had a BASI SS verbal score of 88.40 (SD = 11.97) and BASI SS math 82.35 (SD = 12.14), with an average age of 15.33 (SD = 1.55). Special education students were similar, with a BASI SS verbal 82.54 (SD = 14.59) and BASI SS math 77.83 (SD = 13.81), and an average age of 15.38 (SD = 2.00). Combined, all students were significantly behind similarly situated peers.

Besides screening for the SSES, mental health was screened by the SDQ (M = 14.4, SD = 5.296), with five subscores, which suggested over 42% of all juveniles needed further evaluation for psychiatric problems. The SDQ-E and SDQ-H suggested many students had difficulties with emotional regulation and hyperactivity. On the SDQ-PRO, the average and standard deviation suggested a quarter of the population were statistically different in a negative way.

Measures of academic achievement were conducted using BASI–S and the TOSCRF–2. The BASI-S verbal scores, in Table 6, revealed students were behind similarly situated peers. All scores and subscores showed students were behind academically. The standardized scores average was 85.7 (SD = 12.8), which showed most students were between low average to average. The BASI age equivalency suggested students were average age of 11 (SD = 2.7). All subscores were similar and toward the low average end of the scale.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics: Basic Achievement Skills Inventory—Verbal Scores

Statistic	B SS R	B GE R	B AE R	B–VOC	B–LM	B–RDG

Statistic	B SS R	B GE R	B AE R	B–VOC	B–LM	B–RDG
Valid	72	72	72	72	72	72
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	85.681	6.065	11.010	7.264	6.861	7.278
Std. deviation	12.809	2.446	2.714	3.957	2.874	2.894
Minimum	60.000	3.000	3.000	2.000	1.000	4.000
Maximum	114.000	12.900	18.000	18.000	11.000	18.000

Note. Factors: Verbal Standardized Score (B SS R), Verbal Grade Equivalency (B GE R), Verbal Age Equivalency (B AE R), and subscores: Vocabulary (B–VOC), Language Mechanics (B–LM), and Reading Comprehension (B–RDG).

Salient factors were the BASI verbal scores (M = 85.6; SD = 12.8) matched closely with the TOSCRF–2 (M = 85.4; SD = 11.7). As evidenced by the age equivalency on both (approximately 11 years old), these findings showed students were behind compared to an average age of 15.3. Many students were extremely behind, especially when examining the 25^{th} percentile. As a group, juvenile delinquents struggled in reading and verbal abilities. Comparing the age equivalencies to average age, both the reading fluency test and test of verbal ability showed students were about four years behind similarly situated peers.

Students in math were further behind on the BASI math assessment, with a standardized score of 79.1 (SD = 11.7) and age equivalency of 10.7. Compared to reading ability, students were in the low range in mathematics. Overall, students' skills were similar to upper elementary and lower middle school, though most students were in high school. Math computation and application were low average (Bardos, 2004).

Discussion

As early as 8 years of age, many factors, such as conduct disorder, poor academic achievement, and lower IQ, collided to predict later juvenile delinquency (Fergusson & Horwood, 1995; Silver & Nedelec, 2018). Getting along with others was a difficult skill set for most juvenile delinquents. Behavioral problems were common in juvenile delinquents, and the youths scored low on emotional intelligence in peer relations (Mohanty & Nanda, 2018). The same services intended to rehabilitate youths often unwittingly cemented the role of delinquency by housing children with other delinquents, and then there was little concern for the needs of juveniles to overcome barriers to reenter society (Heimer & Matsueda, 1994; Mathur, Clark, Hartzell, LaCroix, & McTier, 2019). The curriculum and educational services in juvenile detention centers were unrealistic, disengaging, and did little to create a successful experience, especially for disabled students (Caldwell & Curtis, 2013; Houchins, Puckett-Patterson, Crosby, Shippen, & Jolivette, 2009).

According to the literature, there were many attributes beyond academic ability affecting success in school and later transition back into society. One major area of impact was the importance of noncognitive attributes. Gutman and Schoon (2013) found self-control, school engagement, and stable personality traits correlated to success in adulthood. After all the programs and research, a multiple-group covariance structure model found students incarcerated for juvenile delinquency as adults at age 27, 30, and 33 were more likely to have substance abuse issues and be a recipient of welfare benefits (Gilman, Hill, & Hawkins, 2015).

Practitioners cannot distill noncognitive factors into a formula or a linear model, but the complex interaction was increasingly seen as important as cognitive ability. When students self-regulated behavior and developed accurate cognitive appraisals, juveniles displayed better mental and physical health (Gardner, Dishion, & Connell, 2008; Raftery-Helmer & Grolnick, 2018; Reynolds & Crea, 2015; Trzesniewski et al., 2006). Yet, the present study found reflected appraisal did not match reality. Students had higher than average self-esteem, average grit, and similar academic self-concept. The major difference was in mental health, with the

possibility of being antisocial and having a conduct disorder much greater.

Grit and academic self-concept were of interest to practitioners in juvenile detention centers, with hope both attributes could improve outcomes for delinquents. Interest in grit offered explanations beyond ability and conscientiousness, which suggested grit was an important trait in academic achievement (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007; Huang & Zhu, 2017). There was the hope improved self-concept would lead to improved academic achievement, though initial studies found while most delinquents had initial negative self-concept, drawing conclusions was much more difficult (Culbertson, 1975; Marsh, Byrne, & Yeung, 1999). For first-time detained juvenile delinquents, with long histories of failure in and out of school, grit and academic self-concept were normal. There was the possibility juvenile delinquents had a protective mechanism of self-affirmation and externalizing failure.

There were many who believed all delinquents have low self-esteem and the deleterious effects of detention can only be harmful. Concomitant with other findings, self-esteem was similar to other studies, showing an increase initially. The stigma of delinquency by formal labeling might be a major factor in peer relations (Adams, 1996; Bernburg, Krohn, & Rivera, 2006). Furthermore, adolescents generally were found with rising self-esteem, and healthy self-esteem depended on one's coping ability and outlook on the future (Greve, EnZmann, & Hosser, 2001; Jackman & MacPhee, 2017).

There are no quick fixes, and juvenile detention educational programs should not believe noncognitive factors are either isolated or malleable. Making students feel better about themselves, improving grittiness, and beliefs about academic self-concept appear misguided. All students in the sample have a lengthy history of failure in school, so even statistical significance might not mean practical significance. Whether high or low on grit, academic self-concept, or self-esteem, there was no recognizable difference in performance at the juvenile detention center.

There is a clear recommendation: Mental health issues, especially prosociality and social self-esteem, have the potential to improve in outcomes for juvenile delinquency. Both concepts, prosociality and social self-esteem, can be operationalized as helpability and coachability. Juvenile delinquents experienced problems with empathy in a quantitative analysis and resisted accepting or giving help to others (Heynen, Van der Helm, Wissink, Stams, & Moonen, 2018). With incarceration, juvenile delinquents were placed in a highly controlled environment with little self-control, and the youths as a group had difficulty coping with the demands of any school environment, which structured programs were shown to improve (van der Stouwe, Asscher, Hoeve, van der Laan, & Stams, 2016). Students need to have strong routines which build safety and predictability.

Limitations

There are three limitations with the present study. First, the sample was small and from one facility, which might make generalizability difficult. Secondly, all instruments were survey in nature, so more extensive research on each variable might lend credibility and confirmability to the results. Finally, future research needs conducted on other lurking variables.

Conclusion

Rocque, Jennings, Piquero, Ozkan, and Farrington (2017) investigated juveniles released from detention in a large longitudinal study and found two salient factors contributed to successful transition: above-average school attendance in public school and above-average academic achievement. Students with social and emotional disabilities, though, were at higher risk of being arrested and dropping out of school, and teachers generally had low expectations after graduation (Cavendish, 2014; Hong, Ryan, Chiu, & Sabri, 2013; Sinclair, Unruh, Clark, & Waintrup, 2016). The importance of school and receiving an education cannot be overstated, and children in juvenile detention who did not matriculate showed diminished employment and stability across the lifespan.

When students entered juvenile detention centers with large academic deficiencies, the results of transitioning back to school and society were generally poor, especially the longer the detention a juvenile experienced

(Fite, Pederson, & DiPierro, 2018). Parsing the results, helpability and coachability mean students are thoughtful of others, mindful of rules, and willing to accept and act on criticism. While teachers are limited on changing these two factors, focusing on the whole child should be a facility-wide endeavor. Current practices for first-time detained juvenile delinquents lack research-based interventions, so future research should look at individual and group levels.

References

Adams, M. S. (1996). Labeling and differential association: Towards a general social learning theory of crime and deviance. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 20* (2), 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02886923

Assink, M., van der Put, C. E., Hoeve, M., de Vries, S. L., Stams, G. J. J., & Oort, F. J. (2015). Risk factors for persistent delinquent behavior among juveniles: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 42,* 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2015.08.002

Balogun, T., Troisi, C., Swartz, M. D., Lloyd, L., & Beyda, R. (2018). Does juvenile detention impact health? *Journal of Correctional Health Care, 24* (2), 137–144. https://doi.org/10 .1177/1078345818763174

Bardos, A. N. (2004). *Manual for the BASI (Basic Achievement Skills Inventory) Comprehensive test* . Pearson.

Barnert, E. S., Perry, R., & Morris, R. E. (2016). Juvenile incarceration and health. *Academic Pediatrics, 16* (2), 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2015.09.004

Barrett, D. E., & Katsiyannis, A. (2017). The Clemson Juvenile Delinquency Project: Major findings from a multi-agency study.*Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26,* 2050–2058. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0714-8

Barrett, D. E., Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Zhang, D. (2014). A structural equation modeling analysis of influences on juvenile delinquency. *Behavioral Disorders, 39* (3), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/019874291303900302

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krieger, J. L., & Vows, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *American Psychological Society, 4* (1), 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1111/1529-1006.01431

Benner, G. J., Zeng, S., Armstrong, A. L., Anderson, C., & Carpenter, E. (2016). *Strengthening education in short-term juvenile detention centers: Final technical report.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/251118.pdf

Bernburg, J. G., Krohn, M. D., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency: A longitudinal test of labeling theory.*Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 43* (1), 67–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427805280068

Boden, J. M., Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2008). Does adolescent self-esteem predict later life outcomes? A test of the causal role of self-esteem. *Development and Psychopathology, 20* (1), 319–339. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579408000151

Bong, M., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: How different are they really? *Educational Psychology Review, 15* (1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1023/A :1021302408382

Bourdon, K. H., Goodman, R., Rae, D. S., Simpson, G., & Koretz, D. S. (2005). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: U.S. normative data and psychometric properties. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 44,* 557–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0084-3970(08)70005-7

Bower, J. M., Carroll, A., & Ashman, A. F. (2012). Adolescent perspectives on schooling experiences: The interplay of risk and protective factors within their lives. *International Journal of Educational Research, 53,* 9–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.12.003

Caldwell, J., & Curtis, J. A. (2013). Incarceration nation: How educational programs in prisons "lockout" incarcerated juveniles. *Journal of Education and Social Justice, 1* (1), 51–60. Retrieved from https://laulima.hawaii.edu/access/content/group/57f376c0-02b7-4497 -a92c-d4655c56485e/ITE%20604/journal_of_education_and_social_justice_final.pdf #page=56

Cast, A. D., & Burke, P. D. (2002). A theory of self-esteem.*Social Forces, 80,* 1041–1068. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2002.0003

Cavendish, W. (2014). Academic attainment during commitment and postrelease education-related outcomes of juvenile justice-involved youth with and without disabilities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 22* (1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1177 /1063426612470516

Coker, D. (2020). Action research in a juvenile detention school: New processes, paradigms, and possibilities. *Education Quarterly Reviews, 3* (3). https://doi:10.31014/aior. 1993.03.03.149

Culbertson, R. G. (1975). The effect of institutionalization on the delinquent inmate's self concept. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 66* (1), 88–93. https://doi.org/10.2307 /1142681

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 1087–1101. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087

Duckworth, A. L., & Quinn, P. D. (2009). Development and validation of the Short Grit Scale (Grit–S). *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91,* 166–174. https://doi.org/10.1080 /00223890802634290

Dumont, R., Willis, J. O., Veizel, K., & Zibulsky, J. (2013). Test of Silent Contextual Reading Fluency (TOSCRF). In C. R. Reynolds, K. J. Vannest, & E. Fletcher-Jonzen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of special education: A reference for the education of children, adolescents, and adults with disabilities and other exceptional individuals* . https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118660584.ese2375

Eren, O., & Mocan, N. (2017). *Juvenile punishment, high school graduation and adult crime: Evidence from idiosyncratic judge harshness*(National Bureau of Economic Research Report No. w23573). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, J. (1995). Early disruptive behavior, IQ, and later school achievement and delinquent behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 23,*183–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01447088

Fite, P. J., Pederson, C., & DiPierro, M. (2018). Individual risk factors associated with increased levels of restricted housing among detained youth. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 35* (2), 139–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/0886571x.2018.1467812

Forsyth, C. J., Asmus, G., Stokes, B. R., & Forsyth, Y. A. (2010). Comparing performance test scores of juvenile delinquents with the general population of students. *Deviant Behavior, 31,* 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639620902855008

Gardner, T. W., Dishion, T. J., & Connell, A. M. (2008). Adolescent self-regulation as resilience: Resistance to antisocial behavior within the deviant peer context. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36,* 273–284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-007-9176-6

Gilman, A. B., Hill, K. G., & Hawkins, J. D. (2015). When is a youth's debt to society paid? Examining the long-term consequences of juvenile incarceration for adult functioning. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, 1* (1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10 .1007/s40865-015-0002-5

Goodman, R. (2001). Psychometric properties of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 40,* 1337–1345. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200111000-00015

Greve, W., EnZmann, D., & Hosser, D. (2001). The stabilization of self-esteem among incarcerated adolescents: Accommodative and immunizing processes. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 45,* 749–768. https://doi.org /10.1177/0306624x01456008

Guerrero, L. R., Dudovitz, R. N., Chung, P. J., Dosanjh, K. K., & Wong, M. D. (2016). A potential protective factor against substance use and other risk behaviors among Latino adolescents. *Academic Pediatrics, 16,* 275–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2015.12 .016

Gutman, L. M., & Schoon, I. (2013). The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people: Literature review. In M. S. Khine & S. Areepattamannil (Eds.),*Non-cognitive skills and factors in educational attainment* (pp. 171–198). https://doi.org/10.1007/978 -94-6300-591-3_9

Hamachek, D. (1995). Self-concept and school achievement: Interaction dynamics and a tool for assessing the self-concept component.*Journal of Counseling & Development, 73* , 419–425. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01775.x

Harpin, V., Mazzone, L., Raynaud, J. P., Kahle, J., & Hodgkins, P. (2016). Long-term outcomes of ADHD: A systematic review of self-esteem and social function. *Journal of Attention Disorders, 20,*295–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054713486516

Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 895. https://doi.org/10 .1037/0022-3514.60.6.895

Heimer, K., & Matsueda, R. L. (1994). Role-taking, role commitment, and delinquency: A theory of differential social control. *American Sociological Review, 59,*365–390. https:// doi.org/10.2307/2095939

Heynen, E. J. E., Van der Helm, G. H. P., Wissink, I. B., Stams, G. J. J. M., & Moonen, X. M. H. (2018). "I don't care about what you want!" The relation between juvenile delinquents' responses to social problem situations and empathy in secure juvenile institutions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33,* 1412–1426. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0886260515618212

Hirsch, R. A., Dierkhising, C. B., & Herz, D. C. (2018). Educational risk, recidivism, and service access among youth involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. *Children and Youth Services Review, 85,* 72–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth .2017.12.001

Hong, J. S., Ryan, J. P., Chiu, Y. L., & Sabri, B. (2013). Re-arrest among juvenile justice-involved youth: An examination of the static and dynamic risk factors. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 30* (2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/0886571x.2013 .785230

Houchins, D. E., Puckett-Patterson, S., Crosby, S., Shippen, M., & Jolivette, K. (2009). Barriers and facilitators to providing incarcerated youth with a quality education. *Preventing School Failure, 53* (3), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.3200/psfl.53.3.159-166

Huang, H., & Zhu, H. (2017). High achievers from low socioeconomic backgrounds: The critical role of disciplinary climate and grit. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 29* (2), 93–116. Retrieved from https://www.mwera.org/

Jackman, D. M., & MacPhee, D. (2017). Self-esteem and future orientation predict adolescents' risk engagement. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 37,* 339–366. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0272431615602756

Jennings, W. G., Maldonado-Molina, M., Fenimore, D. M., Piquero, A. R., Bird, H., & Canino, G. (2018). The linkage between mental health, delinquency, and trajectories of delinquency: Results from the Boricua Youth Study. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 62,* 66–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.08.003

Johnson, L. E., Wang, E. W., Gilinsky, N., He, Z., Carpenter, C., Nelson, C. M., & Scheuermann, B. K. (2013). Youth outcomes following implementation of universal SW-PBIS strategies in a Texas secure juvenile facility. E*ducation and Treatment of Children, 36* (3), 135–145. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2013.0019

Keith, S., & Scheuerman, H. L. (2018). The criminal self-view: How do identity discrepancies affect emotions and projected conformity among offenders? *Sociological Inquiry, 88,* 576–598. https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12222

Leone, P. E., Lockwood, S., & Gagnon, J. C. (2017). Creating and sustaining safe environments in juvenile corrections. In P. Sturmey (Ed.), *The Wiley handbook of violence and aggression* (pp. 1–12). Wiley-Blackwell.

Marsh, H. W. (1990). The structure of academic self-concept: The Marsh/Shavelson model.*Journal of Educational Psychology, 82* (4), 623. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.82.4 .623

Marsh, H. W., Byrne, B. M., & Yeung, A. S. (1999). Causal ordering of academic self-concept and achievement: Reanalysis of a pioneering study and revised recommendations. *Educational Psychologist, 34* (3), 155–167. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3403_2

Marsh, H. W., Pekrun, R., Lichtenfeld, S., Guo, J., Arens, A. K., & Murayama, K. (2016). Breaking the double-edged sword of effort/trying hard: Developmental equilibrium and longitudinal relations among effort, achievement, and academic self-concept. *Developmental Psychology, 52,* 1273. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000146

Marsh, H. W., & Shavelson, R. J. (1985). Self-concept: Its multifaceted, hierarchical structure. *Educational Psychologist, 20* (3), 107–125. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2003_1

Martínez-Martí, M. L., & Ruch, W. (2017). Character strengths predict resilience over and above positive affect, self-efficacy, optimism, social support, self-esteem, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 12* (2), 110–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016 .1163403

Mathur, S. R., Clark, H. G., Hartzell, R. I., LaCroix, L., & McTier, T. S., Jr. (2019). What youth with special needs in juvenile justice say about reentry: Listening to their voice. *Youth & Society* . https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118x19826423

Miller, G. E., Yu, T., Chen, E., & Brody, G. H. (2015). Self-control forecasts better psychosocial outcomes but faster epigenetic aging in low-SES youth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States, 112,* 10325–10330. https://doi.org/10.1073 /pnas.1505063112

Mohanty, A., & Nanda, H. (2018). Emotional intelligence and juvenile delinquency: A nexus with crime.*Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development, 9* (1), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00018.9

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2015).*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention statistical briefing book.* Retrieved from http://www.ojjdp.gov /ojstatbb/corrections/qa08203.asp?qaDate=2013

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2017a).*Arrest characteristics of juveniles and older adults.* Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/snapshots /DataSnapshot_UCR2017.pdf

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2017b).*Trends and characteristics of youths in residential placement, 2017.* Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb /snapshots/DataSnapshot_CJRP2017.pdf

Pechorro, P., Jiménez, L., Hidalgo, V., & Nunes, C. (2015). The*DSM–5* Limited Prosocial Emotions subtype of Conduct Disorder in incarcerated male and female juvenile delinquents. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 39,* 77–82. https://doi.org/10 .1016/j.ijlp.2015.01.024

Peguero, A. A., Marchbanks, M. P. T., III, Varela, K. S., Eason, J. M., & Blake, J. (2018). Too strict or too lenient?: Examining the role of school strictness with educational and juvenile justice outcomes.*Sociological Spectrum, 38,* 223–242. https://doi.org/10.1080 /02732173.2018.1478350

Pelcovitz, D., Pelcovitz, M., Sunday, S., Labrunad, V., Lehrman, D., Kline, M., . . . Kaplan, S. (2017). Academic achievement in young adults with a history of adolescent physical abuse. *Adolescent Psychiatry, 7,* 286–299. https://doi.org/10.2174 /221067660866180222124009

Peterson, D. (2015). Putting measurement first: Understanding "grit" in educational policy and practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 49,* 571–589. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467 -9752.12128

Raftery-Helmer, J. N., & Grolnick, W. S. (2018). Parent and teacher effects on academic coping and classroom engagement: Testing a motivational model. *Motivation and Emotion, 42* (5), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9676-4

Reynolds, A. D., & Crea, T. M. (2015). Peer influence processes for youth delinquency and depression. *Journal of Adolescence, 43,* 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence .2015.05.013

Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27* (2), 151–161. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0146167201272002

Rocque, M., Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., Ozkan, T., & Farrington, D. P. (2017). The importance of school attendance: Findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development on the life-course effects of truancy. *Crime & Delinquency, 63,* 592–612. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128716660520

Sander, J. B. (2010). School psychology, juvenile justice, and the school to prison pipeline. *Communique, 39* (4), 4–6. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ907241

Sander, J. B., Patall, E. A., Amoscato, L. A., Fisher, A. L., & Funk, C. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effect of juvenile delinquency interventions on academic outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34,* 1695–1708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.04.005

Sedlak, A. J., & Bruce, C. (2016). *Survey of youth in residential placement: Youth's characteristics and backgrounds* (SYRP Report). Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov /pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/250753.pdf

Seroczynski, A. D., Evans, W. N., Jobst, A. D., Horvath, L., & Carozza, G. (2016). Reading for life and adolescent re-arrest: Evaluating a unique juvenile diversion program. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 35,* 662–682. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21916

Shulman, E., & Cauffman, E. (2011). Coping while incarcerated: A study of male juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21,* 818–826. https://doi.org/10.1111/j .1532-7795.2011.00740.x

Silver, I. A., & Nedelec, J. L. (2018). The moderating effects of intelligence: An examination of how IQ influences the association between environmental factors and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 54,* 62–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.12.001

Sinclair, J. S., Unruh, D. K., Clark, H. G., & Waintrup, M. G. (2016). School personnel perceptions of youth with disabilities returning to high school from the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Special Education, 51* (2), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0022466916676089

Sticca, F., Goetz, T., Nett, U. E., Hubbard, K., & Haag, L. (2017). Short- and long-term effects of overreporting of grades on academic self-concept and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109,* 842. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000174

Susperreguy, M. I., Davis-Kean, P. E., Duckworth, K., & Chen, M. (2018). Self-concept predicts academic achievement across levels of the achievement distribution: Domain specificity for math and reading. *Child Development, 89,* 2196–2214. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev .12924

Thomas, L. V., Davis, K., Marsh, R., & Margolis, A. (2016). Grit is a protective factor in children with reading disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 55* (10), S150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2016.09.157

Trzesniewski, H., Donnellan, M. B., Moffitt, T. E., Robins, R. W., Poulton, R., & Caspi, A. (2006). Low self-esteem during adolescence predicts poor health, criminal behavior, and limited economic prospects during adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 42,* 381–390. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.381

van der Stouwe, T., Asscher, J. J., Hoeve, M., van der Laan, P. H., & Stams, G. J. J. (2016). Social skills training for juvenile delinquents: Post-treatment changes. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12,*515–536. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9262-2

West, M. R., Kraft, M. A., Finn, A. S., Martin, R., Duckworth, A. L., Gabrieli, C. F., . . . Gabrieli, J. D. (2016). Promise and paradox measuring students' non-cognitive skills and the impact of schooling.*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38* (1), 148–170. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715597298