

**Youth Correctional Officer Orientation and Opinions on Relationships
with Youth**

by

Korri Bickle

A dissertation submitted to the
School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Forensic Psychology

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities

University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University)

Oshawa, Ontario, Canada

August 2021

© Korri Bickle, 2021

THESIS EXAMINATION INFORMATION

Submitted by: **Korri Bickle**

Doctor of Philosophy in Forensic Psychology

Thesis title: Youth Correctional Officer Orientation and Opinions on Relationships with Youth

An oral defense of this thesis took place on July 6, 2021 in front of the following examining committee:

Examining Committee:

Chair of Examining Committee

Research Supervisor Dr. Carla Cesaroni

Examining Committee Member Dr. Leigh Harkins

Examining Committee Member Dr. Matthew Shane

University Examiner Dr. Karla Dhungana Sainju

External Examiner Dr. Susan Reid, St Thomas University

The above committee determined that the thesis is acceptable in form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field covered by the thesis was demonstrated by the candidate during an oral examination. A signed copy of the Certificate of Approval is available from the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

Abstract

This study explored the personal perspectives of current and past youth correctional officers within secure and open custody facilities in Ontario. A multi-methods design was used to examine officers' orientation to their work, how they view their interactions with youth and their opinions on relationships with youth in custody. Quantitative data was collected to assess demographics, correctional orientation, and officer typology. Qualitative open-ended survey responses probed exploratory areas of interest such as participants' descriptions of their day, their thoughts on relationships with youth, and their general approach to their work. Although there was a small sample size (N=26), the results indicated that there may be some important relationships between correctional orientation and beliefs around relationships in youth correctional officers. As suggested in previous literature, youth correctional workers report their job as including various tasks ranging from supervision and security to cleaning and preparing meals. There are also indications of differences in correctional orientation and endorsements for relationship development with youth for those who see treatment as part of their role in rehabilitation and those who do not. Additionally, there does not appear to be the groupings of officer types in this youth correctional worker sample as is seen in adult correctional workers. This exploratory study provides a starting point for understanding the unique experiences and duties of youth correctional workers, their correctional orientation, and their views on relationship development with youth. Future research will focus on replicating these findings with a larger sample size.

Keywords: youth; custody; correctional officer; correctional orientation; relationship

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis consists of original work of which I have authored. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University) to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I further authorize University of Ontario Institute of Technology (Ontario Tech University) to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I understand that my thesis will be made electronically available to the public.

The research work in this thesis that was performed in compliance with the regulations of Ontario Tech's Research Ethics Board under **REB Certificate #15-132**.

KORRI BICKLE

Statement of Contributions

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication. I have used standard referencing practices to acknowledge ideas, research techniques, or other materials that belong to others. Furthermore, I hereby certify that I am the sole source of the creative works and/or inventive knowledge described in this thesis.

Acknowledgements

To my supervisor, Dr. Carla Cesaroni. Thank you. Thank you for teaching me so much, for presenting me with opportunity after opportunity, for taking my weekend calls, for allowing me to be me, and for accepting me fully and completely as I am. I will be forever grateful to you and your kind soul. Thank you for treating me always as your equal and for showing me your care and concern. This could not have happened without you.

To my committee, Dr. Leigh Harkins and Dr. Matthew Shane. Thank you for your support, for your kind words and for your encouragement. Thank you for the meetings, the suggestions, and the numerous reads of my longwinded writing. This has been a learning opportunity like none other, and I appreciate your guidance and your encouragement.

To the participants in my study. Thank you for the important work that you do. For persevering through the challenges and the struggles, and for making a difference. Thank you for taking the time to engage in this research and for providing insight into the work that you do.

To my family, Elijah, Kadence, and Skyla, thank you for putting up with me. For giving me quiet when I needed it and even more for the hugs when you knew I needed them. Kadence and Skyla, remember that you can do anything that you put your mind to, reach for the stars. You, more than anyone, can do it all. Elijah, with you, I can do anything too. Thank you.

To my parents (all of you), thank you for your unending love and encouragement, for listening, for watching my children, for reading, for being there. Knowing that I could do this came from you. From you showing me that anything is possible and from your rock-solid support, never doubting me – not even for one second.

To my sister, there is not one thing I have done in this life without running it by you first. Even when my ideas are wild, and you know it, you support me anyway. Thank you for that, for telling me how it is and for being there regardless. Thank you for showing Kadence and Skyla that sisters are stronger together and that family is where it's at.

To my mentors, Karen and Liz, thank you for teaching me so much of what I know, for pushing me to do more, to do better, and to believe in myself. Thank you for the opportunities you have presented me with and for the support. Thank you for taking me away for the weekend when I needed it, for feeding me the best food, and for always lending an ear.

To my friends (Nicolle, Danielle, Carley, and Kaitlin). I choose you. Thank you for choosing me, too. You are the ultimate of girl power; always holding each other up and being there when we feel like it is all falling apart. I cannot express enough how much this would not have happened without you.

Table of Contents

Thesis Examination Information	ii
Abstract	iii
Authors Declaration	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	xi
List of Abbreviations and Symbols	xxvi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Importance of Staff in Custody Facilities	2
Unique Aspects of Working with Youth Custody	3
Important Considerations in Working with Youth in Custody	6
Correctional Officer Orientation.....	6
The Importance of Relationships and the Therapeutic Alliance.....	8
The Current Study.....	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
Correctional Officer Work	11
The Difference Between Youth and Adult Correctional Officer Work.....	15
Correctional Officer Orientation	17
Youth Correctional Officer Orientation.....	24
Correctional Officer Typology	28
Relationship Custody and The Therapeutic Relationship	35
Research Questions	49
Chapter 3: Methodology	51
Participants	51
Participant Recruitment	51
Research Survey and Measures	52
Procedure.....	52
Scales.....	53
Professional Orientation Scale (POS).....	54

Correctional Orientation Scale (COS).....	54
Correctional Officer Typology Scale (COTS).....	55
Relationship Orientation Scale (ROS).....	55
Open-ended Questions.....	56
Informed Consent.....	56
Ethical Concerns.....	56
Data Analysis.....	57
Chapter 4: Results	59
Demographics	59
Psychometric Measures for Orientation and Type	61
Open-Ended Survey Questions	62
Officers Views in Their Duties and Responsibilities.....	62
Supervision and Security.....	63
Relationships and Support.....	65
Treatment.....	66
General Duties and Administrative Tasks.....	67
Differences among Groups.....	68
Gender.....	68
Supervision and Security.....	69
Relationships and Support.....	69
Treatment.....	70
Adult Corrections Experience.....	70
Supervision and Security.....	71
Relationships and Support.....	71
Treatment.....	71
Type of Youth Custody Experience.....	72
Supervision and Security.....	73
Relationships and Support.....	74
Treatment.....	75
Interactions with Youth	75
Role in Rehabilitation.....	76

Supervision and Security.....	76
Relationships and Support.....	77
Treatment.....	79
Group Differences in Supervision and Security.....	79
Effective Rehabilitation.....	80
Supervision and Security.....	80
Relationships and Support.....	81
Treatment.....	82
Group Differences.....	83
Escalation.....	84
Supervision and Security.....	84
Relationships and Support.....	85
Treatment.....	86
Behavioural Approaches.....	87
Group Differences.....	88
Views on Relationships.....	89
Is There a Place for Youth-Officer Relationships in a Custody Setting?.....	90
Group Differences for Building Relationships.....	93
What does an Ideal Relationship Look Like?.....	93
Group Differences in Ideal Relationships.....	95
What are the Benefits and Concerns of Relationships?.....	95
Benefits of Relationships.....	97
Group Differences in Benefits of Relationships.....	97
Concerns with Relationships.....	98
Group Differences in Concerns of Relationships.....	99
Is There a Relationships Between Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation or Officer Type and Relationship Scores?.....	99
Chapter 5: Discussion	102
Study Aims	102
Main Findings	103
Type of Youth Custody Experience.....	103

Officer Typology.....	103
Orientation, Relationships and Youth Worker’s Role in Rehabilitation for Youth.....	106
Adult vs. Youth Only Experience.....	108
Contribution to Youth Justice Literature	109
Limitations	110
Future Directions	112
Conclusion	113
References	115
Appendices	128
Appendix A. A Note on Methods.....	128
Appendix B. Information for the Participant.....	130
Appendix C. Survey.....	133
Appendix D. Additional Tables.....	138

List of Tables

Chapter 4

Table 4.1: Demographic Information.....	60
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics.....	62
Table 4.3: Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Supervision and Security.....	60
Table 4.4: Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Relationships and Support.....	66
Table 4.5: Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Treatment.....	67
Table 4.6: Summary of t-tests: Group Differences – Gender.....	68
Table 4.7: Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Support.....	70
Table 4.8: Summary of t-tests: Group Differences – Adult Corrections Experience.....	71
Table 4.9: ANOVA: Group Differences – Type of Youth Custody Facility.....	72
Table 4.10: Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship between facility type and Supervision and Security Responses.....	77
Table 4.11: Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Supervision and Security.....	77
Table 4.12: Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Relationships and Support.....	78
Table 4.13: Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Treatment.....	79
Table 4.14: Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation – Supervision and Security.....	81
Table 4.15: Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation – Relationships and Support.....	82
Table 4.16: Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation – Treatment.....	82
Table 4.17: Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Most Effective Rehabilitation.....	83
Table 4.18: Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Supervision and Security.....	85
Table 4.19: Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Relationships and Support	85
Table 4.20: Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Treatment.....	87
Table 4.21: Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Behavioural Approaches.....	88
Table 4.22: Summary of t-tests: Place for Relationships.....	90
Table 4.23: Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Facility Type and Place for Relationships.....	91
Table 4.24: Summary of t-tests: Place for Relationships – Reasons.....	92

Table 4.25: Summary of t-tests: Ideal Relationship with Youth.....	94
Table 4.26: Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Ideal Relationships...	95
Table 4.27: Summary of t-tests: Benefits of Relationships with Youth.....	97
Table 4.28: Summary of t-tests: Concerns with Relationships.....	92
Table 4.29: Correlations – Orientation and Relationships.....	98
Table 4.30: ANOVA: Differences in orientation or Relationships and Officer type.....	99
Table 4.31: Multiple Comparisons – Bonferroni.....	100

Appendix D

Tables for Duties and Responsibilities.....	138
Table A1: Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Supervision and Security.....	138
Table A2: Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Relationships and Support.....	138
Table A3: Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Treatment.....	139
Table A4: Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Supervision and Security.....	139
Table A5: Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Relationships and Support.....	140
Table A6: Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Treatment.....	141
Table A7: Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Supervision and Security.....	141
Table A8: Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Relationships and Support.....	142
Table A9: Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Treatment.....	143
Tables for Interactions with youth.....	143
<i>Role in Rehabilitation</i>	143
Table A10: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Supervision and Security.....	143
Table A11: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and support	144
Table A12: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment.....	145
<i>Effective Rehabilitation</i>	146
Table A13: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Security and Supervision.....	146
Table A14: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and Support.....	146

Table A15: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment.....	147
<i>Escalation</i>	147
Table A16: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Supervision and Security.....	147
Table A17: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and Support.....	148
Table A18: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment.....	150
Table A19: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Behavioural Approaches.....	150
Tables for Views on Relationships.....	151
Table A20: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – A Place for Relationships.....	151
Table A21: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Reasons for Building Relationships.....	151
Table A22: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – The Ideal Relationship with Youth.....	153
Tables for Benefits and Concerns of Relationships.....	154
Table A23: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Benefits of Relationships.....	154
Table A24: Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Concerns of Relationships.....	156

List of Abbreviations

YCJA	Youth Criminal Justice Act
POS	Professional Orientation Scale
COS	Correctional Orientation Scale
COTS	Correctional Officer Typology Scale
ROS	Relationship Orientation Scale

Chapter 1: Introduction

Incarceration is the most invasive sentence a young person can receive in Canada. Research suggests that custody can have negative impacts on vulnerable young people, and arguably should be used only as the last resort (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2010). The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) in 2003 was in part enacted to reduce Canada's high rate of youth custody (Bala et al., 2009). Since the implementation of the YCJA, the use of youth custody has been reduced by 40% (Bala et al., 2009). Despite this, roughly 20% of youth judgments in Canada still result in a custodial sentence for youth (Statistics Canada, 2013). Youth officers have recognized this decrease in the number of youth in their care and also noted that those youth that they are seeing in custody under the YCJA are charged with more serious offences (Ricciardelli et al., 2019).

There is some question regarding whether a custodial sentence can play a part in a young person's rehabilitation, or whether it is simply about denunciation and deterrence (Bala, 2004). Given the number of incarcerated youth in the system, there has been increased attention placed on the positive role that relationships with staff may play in their rehabilitation. Although the importance of relationships in treatment in general has been known for decades, there has been a heightened awareness around the value of relationships as an approach to working with justice involved youth in Canada in the recent past (Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, 2013).

Youth in custody facilities are supervised 24 hours a day by youth correctional officers. As such, these officers play an integral role in the day-to-day well-being of inmates and their overall rehabilitative experience. This study aimed to investigate the youth correctional officer role from an officer's perspective. Using the therapeutic alliance as a theoretical foundation,

correctional officers were asked about their roles, their responsibilities and their general philosophy of working with youth. This project aimed to understand the extent to which youth correctional officers take a treatment or custodial approach to their work and how much they value the development of relationships with youth. Although there is very little research on this topic, there is literature about staff attitudes in adult facilities. The adult literature was used as a framework for this study.

Importance of Staff in Custody Facilities

Correctional officers have a significant role to play in the lives of incarcerated youth, and in the day-to-day functioning, operation and climate of the institution (Crewe, 2012; Liebling, 2006; Sparks et al., 1996). They are responsible for safety and security, program delivery (Jacobs & Retsky, 1975), supervising chores, transporting inmates and monitoring compliance with rules and regulations, i.e., body searches (Farkas & Manning 1997; Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Lombardo, 1989; McCleery, 1960). Finally, there is a human service component of this work that involves interactions with inmates, behaviour management and rehabilitation (Farkas & Manning, 1997; Gilbert, 1997; Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Johnson, 1987; Williamson, 1990). Given the integral role that correctional officers play, developing a thorough understanding of their job duties and their philosophy around their work with young offenders will lead to improved training and recruitment to ensure alignment between correctional workers and the philosophy of the organization.

Although the role of youth correctional officers is similar to that of officers in adult institutions, there is little research investigating what may be unique to their job. Inderbitzin

(2007) suggested that youth correctional work includes a number of roles including counsellor, corrections officer, coach and parental figure. Canadian research by Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali (2013) suggested that youth correctional officers play a role in a youth's adjustment to custody facilities. This is in part because staff may provide emotional support to youth, acting as someone they can talk to, and who can provide physical support and the creation of a safe environment (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2013). The extent to which these relationships differ from those with adult inmates has not been explored.

Unique Aspects of Working with Youth Custody

Young people in custody represent a vulnerable population whose behaviour may be impacted by their stage of development, including poor coping mechanisms and increased levels of anxiety (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2017). Owing to this difference between adults and youth, the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* is in place in Canada to ensure that youth are treated differently than adults with respect to consequence, rehabilitation and incarceration. Youths' emotional reaction to the circumstances of prison may be stronger than adults. The loss of their freedom and being isolated from friends and family can be particularly hard for young inmates (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2005, 2010). In general, research suggests that youth are at a different stage developmentally than adults. Their brain is maturing in areas such as impulse control, future oriented thinking, and understanding of right and wrong (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2012; Lee, 2016; Mulvey, 2014). Youth make decisions using the amygdala, the area of the brain that is associated with primitive impulses including anger, aggression and fear (Lee, 2016). In addition, executive functioning, the processes that are responsible for emotion management and self-regulation resources, are not fully developed until the mid-twenties (Lee, 2016), suggesting

that they may require an alternative approach to adults to account for the continued development of their brain.

Officers in a study by Crawley (2006) noted some of the differences between adults and youth. They reported that the young offenders seem to want more attention from staff, that they are “needy” and that they can be emotional. Officers noted that youth are more tiring to work with, that they are emotionally and physically demanding and that the emotional climate in youth prisons is ever changing (Crawley, 2006). The officers also recognized that the experience of being in custody is one that is quite difficult for youth, that they may be lonely, scared and anxious.

It is important that youth workers in youth custody facilities have a clear understanding of their role and the aims of the YCJA. There are differences in the culture of youth and adult institutions that make an approach taken with an adult inmate inappropriate for youth. Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali (2017) note that adult correctional institutions have an enforcement and authority-oriented climate that focuses on security and order; the maintenance of order is achieved through demonstrations of correctional power. Whereas youth facilities tend to be more supportive, offer a more kind milieu, and they aim to have workers who care about youth and are adept at providing guidance, modelling, support and a greater emphasis on relationships (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2017).

The Canadian inquest into the death of James Lonnee resulted in several recommendations, two of which are relevant here: (a) adult correctional officers should not be used to supervise young offenders, as they may ‘contaminate’ youth with adult correctional

attitudes, philosophy, and culture and (b) all aspects of youth corrections administration, staffing, and delivery should be youth-centred and should require special expertise to establish a youth-focused system (Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General 1999). Here there is an acknowledgement by the Provincial Government that the values and beliefs present in the adult system have no place in a youth custody facility.

Few studies have looked directly at the correctional orientation of youth officers and its influence on young peoples' experience in custody. Findings thus far indicate that although many youth corrections officers enter the field motivated to rehabilitate, they still express some support for a punitive orientation (Bazemore et al., 1994). This orientation appears to be influenced by organizational, structural, and training factors (Bazemore et al., 1994; Marsh & Evans, 2006). Similar to adult correctional workers, there may be an influence of factors such as age, minority status, gender and tenure for youth correctional workers as well (Bazemore, Dicker & Al-Gadheeb, 1994; Marsh & Evans, 2006).

A correctional officer's orientation may influence how the officer interacts with youth in custody. Given the significance of the youth's developmental factors, (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2012; Lee, 2016; Mulvey, 2014) and an officer's role in youth adjustment to prison (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2007), it is feasible that youth correctional officers' orientation may mediate staff-youth relationships and therefore, impact treatment outcomes (Inderbitzin, 2007).

This information points to the idea that having a youth worker that holds adult correctional beliefs and values in a youth custody facility would be problematic, and there are currently no quantitative screening tools that exist to measure youth correctional officer

orientation. One of the aims of the current study is to validate a new scale (the Correctional Orientation Scale) that would assess the correctional orientation of youth correctional officers. Having a screening tool available to the ministry would be useful for screening and hiring practices as well as for targeted training for current youth workers.

Important Considerations in Working with Youth in Custody

A number of considerations impact work with youth in custody. These include recognizing the differences that exist between youth and adults as well as the differences in institutional culture between the two groups, the correctional orientation of the correctional workers, the development of relationships with youth in custody as well as the therapeutic alliance. These various aspects of work with youth in custody will be discussed below.

Correctional Officer Orientation and Type

The performance of a prison relies heavily on correctional officers (Liebling, 2004). Thus, an understanding of an officer's perception of their job is critical to understanding the functioning of prisons. The way that officers interact with inmates can be related to correctional orientation and the literature reveals two types of correctional officer orientations. First, a treatment orientation, characterized by officers that are non-authoritarian, less punitive and see inmates as not so different from themselves. And second, a security orientation, including officers that tend to be more authoritarian and punitive in their approach and see themselves and inmates as unequal (Cullen et al, 1993; Farkas, 1999; Kassebaum et al., 1962; Kauffman, 1981; Kelly, 2013; Klofas & Toch, 1982; Lerman & Page, 2012). These two contrasting orientations are a reflection of the seemingly contradictory expectations of what incarceration is supposed to

achieve. Officers are expected to ensure the safety and security (Crewe et al., 2011; Cullen et al., 1993) and provide treatment and rehabilitation (Crewe et al., 2009; Cullen et al., 1993; Kassebaum et al., 1962).

Research has explored individual and demographic factors (e.g., gender) that may be related to each correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1993; Farkas, 1999), and likely officer type. Additionally, institutional Factors (e.g., perceived support) have been found to impact officers' approach to their work (Blau et al., 1986; Crewe et al., 2011; Hepburn, 1987; Lambert et al., 2004; Lindberg, 2005; Reisig & Lovrich, 1998; Worley & Worley, 2011). Correctional orientation and officer type are therefore linked to an officer's day-to-day experience of their job and their interactions with inmates.

There is also evidence to suggest that adult correctional officers may fall into groupings or "types". A number of researchers in this area have developed officer typologies. For example, Gilbert (1997), Tait (2011), and Farkas (2000) will be discussed in a later chapter; these researchers have developed several types of officers and outline the similarities in how officers within a group interact with inmates. There has been no research to this point that has investigated this same typology in youth correctional workers, this study will work with the Farkas (2000) typology to explore the fit of correctional officer types with a youth worker sample.

Though the literature on adult correctional officers may provide some insight into how correctional orientation, officer attitudes, and officer type may shape the interactions of inmates and staff, incarcerated young people pose unique challenges to those working with them. The

specific experiences of staff in the youth system will be reviewed below in terms of the importance of relationships.

The Importance of Relationships and the Therapeutic Alliance

The literature on correctional officers and their development of relationships with inmates is not extensive. However, the literature on the work of probation officers that has considered the orientation of officers, and their willingness to build relationships with community-based offenders may be useful. The first theory of probation supervision was introduced by Klockars (1979) who suggested that there is both a treatment and a surveillance approach to probation work. This work, outlined in Chapter 2, provides some insight into the effective use of relationships with adult offenders in the community.

Considering the relevance of the relationship in the supervision of offenders in the community and taking into account the more treatment-focused environment provided to youth in custody facilities, it is important to further explore the value of the therapeutic alliance in youth rehabilitation. Doing this would improve our understanding of relationships with youth in custody and the value these relationships might have for youth outcomes. It is possible that youth correctional officers share similar values to their probation colleagues; however, no research has been conducted in this area. Although this study aims to gather some of this information, the literature on the benefits of a positive working relationship in treatment could provide insight into the value of developing relationships with incarcerated young offenders.

Although there has been considerable conversation around the term “relationship custody” in Ontario over the last ten years, the Ministry has failed to effectively root this concept

in theory, define it, or explain how officers are to implement it. This conversation does bring to light the importance of relationships in youth custody facilities and points to the adoption of this by the Ministry, however, owing to the lack of information available, the therapeutic alliance rather than relationship custody will act as the theoretical framework for this project.

The importance of building therapeutic relationships with clients has been a topic of concern in psychology for many years. Original theorists such as Freud (1912), Adler (1931), and Rogers (1946) began the conversation regarding building a therapeutic alliance with clients in the early 20th century. The significance of the therapeutic alliance has been discussed in relation to not only adult populations, but also children, adolescents and families (Bhola & Kapur, 2013; Green, 2009; Hintikka et al, 2006; Hogue et al., 2006). The development of a therapeutic alliance with children and adolescents (Bhola & Kapur, 2013; Digiuseppe et al., 1996; Everall & Paulson, 2002) and an understanding of early predictors of alliance development with adolescents (Garner et al., 2008) have important implications for workers in the youth justice field in terms of building relationships with youth.

It is important to note that although there is some evidence to suggest that correctional officers might take on a counselling role (Schaefer, 2018), they are not therapists, nor does this research aim to suggest that youth workers should be taking on this role. A therapeutic alliance can be formed between two individuals in various settings and roles, and youth workers can be trained to have effective relationships with the youth in their care. For the purpose of this study, the term “effective relationship” will be defined as *a pattern of purposeful and professional interactions with youth that fosters mutual respect and encouragement, and that acts as a tool for staff to aid in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts.*

The Current Study

This study utilized findings from the adult prison literature on the importance of correctional orientation, inclination to punitive behavior and relationship building in order to explore these factors in youth custody. This study explored youth correctional officer perceptions of their work with an emphasis on how they view relationships with incarcerated youth. The therapeutic alliance, as understood in psychotherapy, served as the theoretical framework for this research.

This study specifically explored the following research questions: How do correctional officers view their duties and responsibilities within a youth custody facility? How do correctional officers view their interactions with youth as part of these duties and responsibilities? What do staff feel (if any) are the positive outcomes that may be derived from an effective relationship with a youth?

To provide the background literature on these topics, Chapter 2 outlines the available literature on correctional officer work, their orientation and officer type as well as the importance of the therapeutic relationships. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used in the current study including a description of participants, data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 focuses the results of this study and Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the main findings as well as the limitations to the study and future directions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This Chapter outlines the relevant literature on correctional officer work, officer orientation and the therapeutic alliance. There is limited research available on youth correctional officers worldwide, and specifically in in Canada. As such, the literature review below draws primarily on research in adult corrections. This study aimed to act as a starting place to fill this gap in literature in the youth justice field.

Correctional Officer Work

As noted in Chapter 1, the prison environment cannot be understood without acknowledging the important role that correctional officers play in its everyday functioning. Although there is agreement that the primary role of the correctional officer is security and custody (Crawley, 2006; Hepburn, 1985; Inderbitzin, 2007; Jacobs & Retsky, 1978; Liebling, 2000; Sykes, 1958), the other tasks of correctional officers should not be overlooked. From custody to day-to-day operations and maintenance, the prison could not operate without the execution of many of the tasks performed by correctional officers.

The role of the correctional officer and their day-to-day tasks have not been paid as much attention as have issues such as their job stress, attitude toward their work and their correctional orientation. Although the correctional officer is responsible for safety and security, there are many other duties that receive less attention. Crawley (2006) noted that correctional officers are also tasked with changing prisoners' outlooks and behaviours and providing them with care. Similarly, Gilbert (1997) wrote that "on a daily basis they [correctional officers] must translate vague philosophical notions into concerted actions and specific work behaviours" (p.51), highlighting their difficult and varied work duties. Sykes (1958) was among the first to explore

the inner workings of a maximum-security prison, discussing the main tasks of prison workers and highlighting the importance of maintaining custody and preventing escape. Sykes (1958) noted that it is difficult for correctional officers to remain completely aloof from inmates they work with every day. He argues that order is created by a relationship of compromise and negotiation between officers and prisoners. Correctional officers are required to be constantly on the lookout for behaviour associated with a planned escape: they are required to conduct head counts, room searches, uncover contraband, preview mail and ensure the building is well-maintained to prevent avenues for escape (Sykes, 1958). In addition, correctional officers are responsible for maintaining order in a group of individuals who are being held against their will. They are required to use their authority and their interactions with inmates to ensure work assignments are being completed, rules are obeyed, and routines are followed. Further, correctional officers are responsible for ensuring that prisoners have access to food, medication and have hygiene needs met (Sykes, 1958), as well as ensuring custody, safety, surveillance, compliance and productivity within the prison.

Jacobs and Retsky (1978) reported that, in addition to the primary goal of custody, correctional officers are responsible for the general maintenance duties that keep a prison functioning. These authors noted that the correctional officer role includes processing new intakes, completing laundry, administering medication, organizing meals and ensuring proper maintenance and cleanliness standards (Jacobs & Retsky, 1978). Although Farkas and Manning (1997) acknowledged these types of roles, they further acknowledged the people-oriented work aspect of a correctional officer's job. One of the key tasks of correctional officers is to effectively read human behavior in order to foresee possible problems and use good judgment in managing inmates (Farkas & Manning, 1997). In addition to this, Farkas and Manning (1997)

suggested that correctional officers are forced to manage their tasks with the underlying culture of secrecy that is apparent in correctional institutions. There is a lack of communication between inmates and officers and a strong inmate code of silence that makes correctional officer intuition and understanding of human behavior an essential part of their work and their safety.

More recently, Liebling (2000) began looking at some of the similarities between correctional officer work and police officer work, specifically with respect to the use of discretion on the job. She recognized that the human work aspect of the job relies heavily on the relationships between officers and inmates, and that the two groups may not be as disparate as previously thought. Not only do both officers and inmates have many of the same goals, they want the environment to be calm and safe, but they may also have similar life experiences, share a religion or come from similar communities. All these commonalities play into the relationships that correctional officers build with inmates (Liebling, 2000). Liebling (2000) described how officers use these relationships to manage the day-to-day tasks of their work.

Liebling (1998) outlined four main aspects of correctional officer work: maintaining security and custody; providing prisoners with care and with humanity; providing prisoners with the opportunity to address their offending behaviour; and assisting with the day-to-day management of the facility (pg. 334). According to Liebling (1998), part of the role of the correctional officer is to use relationships as a form of power, labelled “quiet power”, in order to attain the above goals. She argued that correctional officers are able to use discretion in how they manage inmates, and as such can exert their authority rather than strictly adhering to rules. Using professional judgment to determine how to manage a situation, and at times under-enforcing rules, can assist in a more smoothly operating facility.

Finally, Liebling (2000) did not underestimate the work roles discussed by Sykes (1958), Jacobs and Retsky (1978) or Farkas and Manning (1997) outlined above. However, she did introduce the role of interpersonal relations in prison order and supervision. She mentioned that officers are faced with two competing roles. The rule-following/compliance model is strictly guided by policy, whereas the negotiation model more readily describes correctional officer practice. The ideal officer in her study was described as someone who had justifiable boundaries, a strong moral fibre, was aware of their own power and was able to use their good judgment to decide when to adhere to policy and when to make exceptions (Liebling, 2000).

More recently, Schaefer (2018) made several recommendations with regard to correctional officer work. Along with maintaining the foundational goals of custody, such as maintaining a focus on corrections, Schaefer noted the value of communicating with inmates using a cognitive-behavioural approach, providing intervention in times of crisis, especially keeping in mind the initial adjustment to the prison environment, and being aware of important health indicators for inmates. They should also be able to provide informal counselling, act as life coaches, help inmates to develop new identities and new routines and facilitate the development and maintenance of relationships that deter inmates from further involvement with crime (Schaefer, 2018). This work further demonstrates the complex role that correctional officers fill. However, these studies outline the specific tasks of workers in adult facilities.

There is little research on the work of youth correctional officers. Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali (2013) outlined the important role that staff play in the adjustment of youth who are entering custody facilities. Further, Canadian researchers Peterson-Badali and Koegl (2002)

discussed the fact that staff are essential in the sense of safety that youth feel in custody, however these two studies do not address the specific job duties of youth correctional officers.

Inderbitzin (2007) provided some insight into the role of youth correctional officers. Looking at staff members at a maximum-security adolescent training school, Inderbitzin (2007) suggested that although the roles of correctional officers in youth facilities have many similarities to their counterparts in the adult system, there are some distinct differences. According to Inderbitzin (2007), staff roles include security, punishment, counselling, role modelling, coaching, and parenting. In addition to acting as a correctional officer, each worker had individual caseloads where they were responsible for monitoring a youth's progress, planning for their future, and delivering programming to the youth in their cottages. The same correctional officers were also responsible for head counts, room searches, maintaining order, ensuring safety, and administering group treatment that addressed issues such as anger management and life skills training (Inderbitzin, 2007). This study introduced the reader to the complex and multiple roles that youth correctional officers play in the rehabilitation of youth in custody and pointed to the need for further research in the area of youth correctional officer work.

With this understanding of correctional officer work, in both adult and youth facilities, as well as the important role that these workers play in the smooth operation of the facility, it is essential to examine the correctional orientations of the officers tasked with these duties. It is possible that an officer's orientation to their work affects the way they interact with inmates and the extent to which they prioritize some aspects of their job over others.

The Difference Between Youth and Adult Correctional Officer Work

The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* indicates that youth must be considered different from adults in the justice system and recognizes that as such, they need to be treated differently. The preamble to the YCJA highlights society's shared responsibility to address the needs of youth who act out criminally and to guide them to adulthood. It notes that crime prevention is the society's responsibility and that when crime is committed that the youth criminal justice system should foster responsibility and ensure accountability "through meaningful consequences and effective rehabilitation and reintegration". Importantly, it also notes that it "reserves its most serious intervention for the most serious crimes and reduces the over-reliance on incarceration for non-violent young persons". This approach of reducing incarceration, providing treatment, and preparing for reintegration is important for youth correctional workers to understand and endorse.

The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* itself highlights the role of youth workers; it notes that "When a youth sentence is imposed committing a young person to custody, the provincial director of the province in which the young person received the youth sentence and was placed in custody shall, without delay, designate a youth worker to work with the young person to plan for his or her reintegration into the community, including the preparation and implementation of a reintegration plan that sets out the most effective programs for the young person in order to maximize his or her chances for reintegration into the community (s 90.1)." Further, a Youth Worker is defined in the YCJA as "any person appointed or designated, whether by title of youth worker or probation officer or by any other title, by or under an Act of the legislature of a province or by the lieutenant governor in council of a province or his or her delegate to perform in that province, either generally or in a specific case, any of the duties or functions of a youth worker under this Act." (YCJA, s 2.1, 2019).

In a different tone, the adult *Ministry of Correctional Services Act* (1990, s. 16.2) notes that “A person who has been sentenced to imprisonment in a correctional institution may be detained in any correctional institution, as directed by the Ministry, or in the custody of a provincial bailiff or other person employed in a correctional institution.” And, although it does not outline the role of the correctional officer the Superintendent of the institution is tasked with the following duties “The superintendent shall receive into the institution every person delivered under lawful authority for detention in the institution and is responsible for the custody and supervision of such person until his or her term of imprisonment is completed or until the person is transferred or otherwise discharged in due course of law” (MCSA, s. 20.2, 1996).

The MCSA does not mention reintegration as part of the role of the Superintendent whereas this is clearly outlined in the YCJA. The various ways in which roles are defined and rehabilitation is discussed outlines the importance of youth workers approaching their work in a different way than adult correctional officers. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge the role of participants in the current study. For the purpose of this research a youth worker will be defined as an individual who is (or has been) employed by a youth custody facility and as a result of their position has (or had) a direct role in supervising and/or engaging in their rehabilitation and reintegration.

By exploring youth workers orientation and views on relationships, the current research will provide some insight into the extent to which the culture and beliefs of adult correctional work has made its way into youth correctional facilities and interactions with youth.

Correctional Officer Orientation

Prison work can be very difficult. It involves a demanding process whereby staff are required to manage the safety and security of an institution as well as providing treatment and rehabilitation to the inmates, all while working long shifts in a stressful environment (Crewe et al., 2011; Cullen et al., 1993; Kassebaum et al., 1962). There are two general orientations by which correctional officers tend to approach their work: the custody orientation and the treatment orientation (Kassebaum et al., 1962; Lindberg, 2005). It can be difficult to manage these dual roles and understandably, each staff tends to prioritize one orientation over the other (Kassebaum et al., 1962). The orientation that staff are inclined toward may be related to their overall attitude concerning inmates and it may influence their interactions with them.

Characteristics of the custodial orientation include authoritarianism, punitive reaction, a self-responsible view of criminal behavior, and an underlying belief that the inmate is not an equal. In contrast, the treatment orientation is non-authoritarian, is less punitive, has a deterministic view of criminal behavior and has a psychological acceptance of the fact that the inmates are just like themselves (Cullen et al, 1993; Farkas, 1999; Kassebaum et al., 1962; Kauffman, 1981; Kelly, 2013; Klofas & Toch, 1982; Lerman & Page, 2012). However, similarities can also be noted between these two orientations. In their study of officers in a California women's prison, Kassebaum et al. (1962) found the majority of officers in both treatment and custody groups felt that the rehabilitation of the offender was the main aim of the institution. Officers believed that treatment itself was a good idea but was not carried out in an effective manner. In this study, both groups agreed that the main reason for criminal behaviour was deep-seated emotional problems. Staff with a custody orientation were more apt to feel that crime was also related to selfishness and more treatment-oriented staff felt it was related to limited work skills (Kassebaum et al., 1962). The authors also found major differences between

the two groups. Custody oriented staff reported that if security was compromised then no treatment was acceptable. Treatment oriented staff felt that custody was always secondary to rehabilitation (Kassebaum et al., 1962). The custody-oriented staff reported a general preference for increased severity of the law compared to the treatment-oriented staff. In addition, they expressed more caution in the development of staff/inmate relationships than did the treatment-oriented staff. Finally, the custody-oriented staff believed that there was a benefit to using firmness in their interactions with inmates and “get tough” policies in the prison (Kassebaum et al., 1962).

Additionally, a study in Sweden indicated that when staff are asked to take on both roles (custodial and treatment) it can cause role-conflict (Lindberg, 2005). Staff members were conflicted between the expectation that they be tough on inmates and apply the rules firmly, *and* the expectation that they develop some kind of relationship with them and act as a support person (Lindberg, 2005). These feelings of role conflict increased the difficulty of creating supportive relationships between staff and inmates and increased the disparity between these groups (Lindberg, 2005).

In considering prison work it is essential to explore the correctional orientation of staff and where these orientations may originate. Currently, there are two main models that explain where approaches to work come from: the individual experience importation model (Cullen et al. 1993; Farkas, 1999; Jurik, 1985; Lambert et al., 2004) and the work-role model (Crewe & Liebling, 2011; Cullen et al., 1993; Jurik, 1985; Lerman, 2012; Reisig, 1998). In addition to these models, there is some evidence to suggest that staff have intrinsic (Jurik, 1985) and theoretical (Kelly, 2013) bases for their correctional orientation.

The individual experience importation or differential experiences model suggests that there are a number of factors that an individual brings to the job (age, race, education etc.). This model suggests that these factors influence officer attitudes toward work and their interactions with others (Cullen et al., 1993; Farkas, 1999). The work-role model, on the other hand, suggests that worker's reactions to their work are based on organizational conditions and the nature of their jobs (Cullen et al., 1993; Farkas, 1999). There has been conflicting evidence in terms of which of these models best explains the orientations of correctional workers and some evidence suggests that perhaps they have equal importance. For instance, Jurik (1985) found that both individual and organizational factors had influence on predicting the attitudes of officers, with neither one providing more insight than the other.

Staff attitudes and prison culture are important to consider as they impact the quality of life for inmates. Crewe et al., (2011) found that in public sector prisons in England, staff reported feeling overwhelmed by the magnitude of their jobs and did not feel supported by the administration. These workers reported feeling held back by their lack of knowledge around administrative policies and procedures and resultant low confidence in decision-making. Prisoners described staff as being easy to manipulate, intimidate, and ignore. Prisoners reported frustration with the way officers used their power, stating that at times it was used inappropriately (Crewe et al., 2011). Additionally, prisoners wanted clarity regarding the rules and penalties when they were violated. Inmates reported that the environment in these prisons was both "over-permissive" and it was "too easy to get in trouble" they wanted there to be limits and expectations for their behaviour. This seems contradictory, however; prisoners were suggesting that depending on the situation, they can experience both extremes. Crewe et al. (2011) reported that prisoners preferred staff that were predictable, reliable, competent, and

confident as it makes their day more predictable – even if the staff are harsher and more authoritative.

To further explore the relationship between orientation and correctional officer work, Farkas (1999), and Cullen and colleagues (1993) investigated correctional officer orientation and whether individual or organizational factors induced more influence over officers' attitude. Farkas (1999) found that in a study of 125 correctional workers in Midwestern US, work variables explained more of the variance in attitudes than individual factors. Farkas (1999) reported that increased seniority was related to a greater interest in counselling roles for correctional officers. Those officers with higher job satisfaction showed less support for counselling roles and increased desire for social distance from inmates (Farkas, 1999). Finally, high role conflict in officers was associated with increased punitive action and decreased support for counselling and rehabilitation (Farkas, 1999). Regardless of correctional orientation, the majority of officers reported that although they did not believe that counselling was a waste of time, they did not believe it was an appropriate role for correctional workers (Farkas, 1999).

Although there was a greater impact of organizational variables, individual differences also played a role (Farkas, 1999). Older correctional officers were more favorable to counselling roles and rehabilitation than younger officers. Additionally, female officers were more favorable toward counselling roles and rehabilitation (but also more favorable toward a punitive orientation and more concerned with corruption of authority) than their male counterparts.

In a recent qualitative study, Ricciardelli and Perry (2016) found that many correctional officers in Canadian adult facilities seemed to take an approach that was more relationship

oriented, but still upheld the need for security, where others took a traditional more security-oriented approach. Many officers took a “relational but secure” approach to their communication and interactions with inmates. These interactions centered on ideas such as listening to inmates and being honest, consistent, and patient (Ricciardelli & Perry, 2016). Officers saw this approach as a fair balance between the security and rehabilitation aims of their work. Although, there was also evidence that there were officers that continued to take a more traditional approach to their work that included intimidation and dominance.

Correctional orientation is an important concept to consider with regard to prison wardens as well. Cullen et al. (1993) found that overall wardens placed value in custodial/prison order, but also saw rehabilitation as an important aspect of the prison. With regard to individual factors, visible minority wardens placed emphasis on both custody and treatment. Wardens with more advanced education were more apt to believe that inmates would be amenable to treatment (Cullen et al., 1993). For wardens, an increased number of years in correctional work and more time in the current facility led to greater support for rehabilitation and custody. Interestingly, Cullen et al. found that a warden who had previously been a correctional officer placed greater emphasis on rehabilitation; whereas those having been a treatment provider placed increased emphasis on custody (Cullen et al., 1993).

The overwhelming view of wardens was that maintaining order and preventing escape was top priority, suggesting an overarching orientation toward custody (Cullen et al., 1993). However, within these views, wardens also recognized the importance of treatment and rehabilitation. Wardens supported rehabilitation, in part because of the benefit of “keeping inmates busy” (p. 82). This support for rehabilitation did appear to be genuine as wardens also

reported a desire to expand programming in areas such as education, vocation, and counselling (Cullen et al., 1993). The orientation of the warden, and the administration in general, is essential to the functioning of staff and the institution as a whole. It is possible that the degree to which correctional officers feel supported by senior administration may be connected to how aligned they feel their views are to management's views.

It is not uncommon for correctional officers to feel overwhelmed by their work and unsupported by the administration (Crewe et al., 2011; Hepburn, 1987). This lack of support, and perceived lack of control, can produce job stress and dissatisfaction (Hepburn, 1987). However, not all prisons operate this way; a study conducted in Connecticut, USA found that staff who work in private sector prisons seemed to be more positive about their work and felt more supported by their managers than did public sector workers (Kassebaum et al., 1962). They also reported having greater respect and admiration for their supervisors (Kassebaum et al., 1962). Further, in a high-security state prison in the United States, men and women varied on their perception of supportive supervision, with men feeling less support (Lambert et al., 2004). Level of perceived support is important because feeling supported can increase job satisfaction and performance (Worley & Worley, 2011). Liebling (2004) asserts that more attention should be given to the feelings and behaviours of prison staff as they play an important role in the performance of prisons. In one prison, Liebling (2004) found a strong divide between staff and management and a sense that officers were "better than the security manual" (p. 407). This outlook created a lack of attention to officers' own attitudes toward prisoners and how those attitudes affected inmates (Liebling, 2004).

In addition to support, correctional officers have reported a lack of control in their work, and in some cases have even noted that they feel the inmates have more control over the prison than they do (Hepburn, 1987), that management cares more about prisoners than staff, and that prisoners have more rights than officers do (Crawley, 2006). This sense of control, and the proper use of power and control, is important for job safety and prison security. The proper balance of using enough power to ensure safety and control, but not so much that it has a negative effect on prisoners, is an important part of prison work (Kauffman, 1981).

The extent to which officers' orientation affects their own quality of life is important to consider. Correctional officer quality of life can impact the quality of life of inmates (Crewe et al., 2011). Although one might believe that prisoner quality of life would be lower in organizations where staff hold more traditional attitudes, Crewe et al. (2011) found that inmates reported staff that hold traditional beliefs increase the overall quality of life for inmates. Staff who hold traditional views tended to be more professional, confident and had good boundaries, potentially leading to increased safety and positive outcomes for prisoners (Kauffman, 1981). However, these more traditional and often custody-oriented beliefs can also lead to staff attitudes that are cynical and anti-prisoner (Kauffman, 1981).

Youth Correctional Officer Orientation

All of the studies reported above were conducted with adult correctional officers. Although the literature with adults is much more extensive than the literature with youth correctional officers, there is some research that indicates that youth correctional officers have many of the same duties, orientations, and struggles in their work. Recent work by Brubaker and

Cleary (2021) suggests that there are inconsistent operationalizations of treatment orientation and that the current model of viewing orientation as a dichotomy may not reflect the true nature of an individual's work, or approach. Correctional officers may hold varying orientations depending on the task at hand. For example, a study by Adjoran and Ricciardelli (2018) found through qualitative methods that most youth correctional officers in their sample saw their role with youth as being more oriented toward rehabilitation than control. However, they also noted that even those officers who were treatment oriented recognized they engage in punishment-oriented behaviour at times, perhaps as an expression of authority. Some also noted that there are youth who have committed serious offences and should have to deal with the consequences, suggesting a more punishment orientation. Additionally, although not focused on correctional orientation, a Canadian study by Ricciardelli et al. (2019) found that some youth officers felt that making youth comfortable, although part of their role, should not be a main focus. They felt that although youth should have some level of comfort, it was still important that custody acts as a deterrent. Some felt that custody should be less lenient and perhaps less comfortable for youth (Ricciardelli et al., 2019).

Research in youth corrections was a topic of interest in the 1980's and, as a result, Dembo and Dertke (1986) explored staff experiences of stress in youth facilities. They interviewed 53 correctional officers in a youth detention center regarding their at-work stress levels. Correctional officers reported their stress was related to the acting-out behaviours of the youth in the facility. Additionally, their level of belief in the ability of the detention centre to reduce youth crime was related to stress (Dembo & Dertke, 1986). Staff who held stronger beliefs in the detention centre's ability to affect change felt more stress in their position. Staff

levels of stress were also related to their perception of how often youth attempted to escape, as well as to their belief that youth required more services related to education, substance abuse, and recreation (Dembo & Dertke, 1986). Although this study was not directly interested in orientation, it sheds light on the differing views and beliefs such as the possibility of rehabilitation in youth settings and the support for additional services for youth.

Following Dembo and Dertke (1986), a study by Liou (1994) continued the exploration of youth officer stress and treatment orientation of youth correctional officers, collecting questionnaires from 109 youth correctional officers from two detention centres. The results indicated that both age and gender were related to a punitive orientation. Those staff who were younger and male were more punishment oriented. On the other hand, correctional officer level of education was reported to be positively related to a treatment orientation; those with higher levels of education also had a greater treatment orientation. Finally, Liou (1994) reported that some officers took a mixed treatment-punishment approach. These officers tended to be male and had greater trust in their supervisor (Liou, 1994). The author found that individual factors (age, gender, race and education) were not related to job stress but having a treatment orientation was related to increased job stress for officers (Liou, 1994).

Subsequent to this study, Liou (1998) studied staff turnover in detention settings and its possible role in officer orientation. An officer's intention to leave their job at the detention centre was associated with an increased orientation toward punitiveness (Liou, 1998). It was also reported that a tendency toward a treatment orientation was related to age, education and job satisfaction; those who were older, more highly educated and more satisfied with their jobs were

more oriented toward treatment than punishment (Liou, 1998). Interestingly, having a punitive orientation related to a positive perception of job security.

Later, Leiber (2002) recognized a continued need for attention to the orientation of youth workers. This study looked at probation officers, correctional officers, and teachers to explore differences among the professions and the effect of differing levels of education on their views. Results indicated that probation officers held less punitive views than both correctional officers and teachers (Leiber, 2002). Similar to Liou (1994), Leiber found that education played a role. Higher levels of education, and education in the social sciences particularly, was related to less punitive views. In contrast to Liou (1994), Leiber found that gender and age were not related to a punitive orientation for any of the participants. Leiber (2002) suggested that it is the occupational role, above other variables, that shapes an officer's orientation toward punitive behavior.

The goal of the current study with regard to correctional orientation was twofold. First, because the majority of the information provided in this review of literature came from adult corrections facilities, this study aimed to examine whether similar effects are found in youth custody facilities. This was accomplished by inquiring about the views and beliefs of youth correctional officers in an online survey. The second aim of this study, with specific regard to correctional orientation, was to explore orientation as a continuum where individuals are scored on a scale rather than conceptualized as a dichotomy, belonging to one group or the other. As noted by Kassenbaum et al., (1962), there are overlapping beliefs between custody and treatment orientated officers; they tend to agree on issues such as the role of emotional issues in criminal behavior and rehabilitation as a main aim of a correctional institution. Perhaps continuing to view correctional officers as falling into dichotomous categories does not provide a clear picture

of correctional officer work. It may be less problematic to conceptualize correctional officer orientation as falling on a continuum ranging from highly treatment-oriented to highly custody-oriented. This study utilized a scale (discussed in more detail in the Methodology) that scored officers on a continuous scale to explore viewing correctional orientation in this way.

Correctional Officer Typology

As discussed previously, there are many consistencies in correctional officer work, such as an emphasis on safety and security, an obligation to assist in the day to day functioning of the organization, and a mandate to maintain order (Farkas & Manning 1997; Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Kauffman, 1981; Lindberg, 2005; Lombardo, 1989; McCleery, 1960). However, along with these expectations comes a great deal of discretion (Farkas & Manning, 1997; Inderbitzin, 2007; Liebling, 2000). Correctional officers decide when to impose rules, how to enforce the rules and to whom the rules are applied. It is possible that factors such as correctional officer orientation and beliefs about prisoners shape the way correctional staff interact with inmates and how they use their professional discretion. As such, it would seem reasonable that a model or typology of correctional officers could be created.

Gilbert (1997) acknowledged that there are many similarities between police officer work and correctional officer work believed that a model developed by Muir (1997) could be modified to explain correctional officer behaviour. Both correctional officers and police officers are directly responsible for safety, security, and control; both have a high amount of discretion in their work; and both have interactions that require coercion and force. Gilbert (1997) thus adapted Muir's (1977) model to fit correctional officer work as outlined below.

The *professional* correctional officer, according to Gilbert (1997) works to develop the unit or range that they supervise, they think about their decisions and are willing to take risks. They interact with inmates and provide them with information and advice on the rules and regulations. These officers increase their pressure or authority over time as needed, using a formal citation as a last resort (Gilbert, 1997). Professional correctional officers try to maintain the dignity of the inmates and view them as not so different from themselves. They use force and coercion as needed and in a thoughtful manner. Their demeanor is calm, relaxed, open, and approachable. The professional correctional officer sees most other officers as simply being rule enforcers (Gilbert, 1997).

According to Gilbert (1997), the *reciprocator* is aware that there are leaders within the inmates and allows them to manage the unit. They choose those inmates who are “worthy” of their help and take on more clinical roles with them. Gilbert (1997) suggests that they become easily frustrated when inmates do not want their help. They tend to rationalize situations and behaviors and use education or teaching to solve problems on the unit. Gilbert (1997) describes these officer as shying away from the use of coercion, even in situations where it is warranted, and often having an air of superiority about them. Gilbert (1997) proposes that their behavior results in inconsistent application of the rules and unreliable job performance, in general.

In Gilbert’s (1997) conceptualization of correctional officers, the *enforcer* is aggressive in their application of the rules. They often write inmates up and are always looking for transgressions (Gilbert, 1997). These officers are very rigid and sway from policy on only the very rare occasion. Enforcers not only use force, they use excessive force in their interactions with offenders and they take unnecessary risks in their work (Gilbert, 1997). The enforcer’s view

of treatment is that it is for others to take on that task. They believe correctional officers are responsible for safety and security, not treatment. These officers lack empathy for the human condition, see the world in dualistic terms, and are often complained about by inmates (Gilbert, 1997). They tend to have issues with their supervisors and see most other officers as just like themselves, anyone who is different is soft or weak.

Finally, Gilbert (1997) defines the *avoider* as a correctional officer who prefers to have minimal contact with inmates. These officers see interaction as unnecessary for the mandate of security and control, and they especially try to avoid confrontation with inmates (Gilbert, 1997). They prefer mechanical aspects of security, such as tower duty, and tend to be the last officers that arrive in an emergency situation. In contrast to enforcers, they deliberately try *not* to see transgressions in order to avoid the use of coercion. These officers tend to blame others for inadequacies and put on a tough persona only to shy away in tense situations (Gilbert, 1997).

In creating this typology, Gilbert (1997) recognized that Muir's (1977) model of police officers acted as a good foundation for a typology of correctional officer work. Unfortunately, in his work he did not empirically test this typology with correctional officers. However, Farkas (2000) was also interested in correctional officer typology and conducted a qualitative analysis with 79 correctional officers in the USA with the goal of developing a typology that fits correctional officer work. Interestingly, Farkas' (2000) typology aligns rather well with the work of Muir (1977) and Gilbert (1997); however, neither are cited in her work. Below is an overview of Farkas' correctional officer typology and a description of how it corresponds with Muir and Gilbert's work.

Following qualitative interviews and observation, Farkas' developed a typology of correctional officer work that included five core categories: the rule enforcer, the hardliner, the people worker, the synthetic officer and the loner (Farkas, 2000). In Farkas' model, the "rule enforcer", which made up 43% of her sample, were officers who were bound by rules. They strictly adhered to policy, procedure, the mandate of safety and security. They see human service roles as inappropriate and compromising (p. 443). These officers tended to be those who were less experienced and worked later shifts. These officers tended to enter into the field for extrinsic reasons such as job security and benefit packages (Farkas, 2000). These officers also held rank and chain of command in high regard. They took a militaristic approach to their work. Rule enforcers felt that learning the rules and strictly adhering to them was important as it ensured that inmates did not manipulate officers or get away with things. These officers did not negotiate with inmates as they saw this as relinquishing their control. Farkas (2000) reports that rule enforcers have a strong sense of loyalty to their co-workers. They will always support their fellow officers and will not contradict them in front of inmates, co-workers or management (Farkas, 2000).

The hardliner according to Farkas (2000), was similar to the rule enforcer in that these officers tended to work later shifts and preferred postings with little inmate contact, such as segregation or maximum-security units. Hardliners made up 14% of Farkas' sample and were described as the extreme version of the rule enforcer. They are aggressive, hard, driven for power, extremely inflexible about policies, and lack effective interpersonal skills (Farkas, 2000). These workers strongly support policies, procedures, mandate of the institution, and defer to chain of command. Hardliners identify themselves as correctional officers that are militaristic, and at times they become aggressive toward inmates (Farkas, 2000). Unlike rule enforcers, the

hardliner enforces rules not simply to maintain order, but more to punish inmates and assert their authority (Farkas, 2000). These officers have extremely and overtly negative attitudes toward inmates. They believe that inmates have too many privileges and that staff are too soft on them (Farkas, 2000). Hardliners will not negotiate with inmates on rules or policies, as it is considered a sign of weakness and does not fit with their understanding of a correctional officer.

The “people worker”, represented by 22% of the correctional officers in Farkas’ (2000) study, were individuals who entered into the field for intrinsic reasons; they wanted to help others (p. 440). These officers tend to be white, older, more experienced and work the day shift (Farkas, 2000). They are flexible with the rules and work with their own modified version of the formal goals of the institution. People workers tend to develop a more comfortable and relatable way of working with inmates (Farkas, 2000). They tend to be more flexible in rule enforcement and have their own informal punishment and reward system. In addition, they rely on interaction and communication with inmates, not strict adherence to policy, to gain compliance (Farkas, 2000). People workers will look to understand the cause of a rule violation and, depending on the inmate’s response, they vary their degree of discipline. These officers use communication in attempt to help inmates settle disputes and rarely rely on formal punishment for minor rule violations. Unlike the officers described previously, these workers do not feel the same sense of obligation to their co-workers and will intervene in inmate-officer interactions to deescalate the situation; they are more concerned with conflict resolution than assertion of authority (Farkas, 2000). Finally, people workers rely on verbal skills and common sense to do their work rather than violence and force. They enjoy the challenge of working with inmates and as such, enjoy postings that involve inmate contact (Farkas, 2000).

The *synthetic officer* accounted for 14% of Farkas' (2000, p. 442) correctional officer sample. These officers were the fusion of the people worker and the rule enforcer. They tended to be older, more experienced and worked on regular units in the prison. Like the people worker, the synthetic officer modified their understanding of formal policies and procedures of the institution to focus on both the goals of the organization, as well as the interpersonal relations that are inherent in their work (Farkas, 2000). These officers closely follow the rules; however, they also consider the circumstances. Although they do not stray too far from procedures, they are not bound by them either. Like the rule enforcer, they tend to have a general mistrust for the inmates; however, they believe that an officer should treat inmates fairly and with respect (Farkas, 2000).

Finally, Farkas (2000) identified a group of correctional officers titled *the loner* that represented a small number of officers (8%) who were mostly female and ethnic minorities (p. 443). These officers were much like the rule enforcer, except they varied in their motivation to adhere strictly to policies and procedures. Those officers in the loner group followed the rules in order to validate their authority and to avoid criticism from their co-workers. Loners did not identify with their co-workers, felt no sense of loyalty to them, and felt highly supervised because of their gender or minority status (Farkas, 2000). The loners preferred to have minimal contact with inmates and with other officers. They had a mistrust and fear of inmates, as such they were not willing to negotiate with them; they did not want to give inmates the opportunity to manipulate them (Farkas, 2000).

In more recent years, Tait (2011) has identified that the model presented by Farkas (2000) is based on the typical custody/human service orientation and posits that correctional

officer work may better represented by a model that revolves around the officer's approach to care. Like Farkas (2000), Tait (2011) describes five approaches to correctional officer work. The first type is the *true carer*, these officers are confident, caring, and engaged in their work (Tait, 2011, p. 444). They view relationship development as an important part of their work. True carers spend time getting to know the inmates and their circumstances in order to provide support and guidance. Inmates see true carers as people they can approach for practical help. Similar to the "reciprocator" or the "people worker" discussed above, they manage the facility and maintain order and security *through* their relationships with inmates (Tait, 2011). The inmates reciprocate the officer's assistance by following rules and taking direction. The true carers entered this field out of a desire to work with people and to help. They are not interested in identifying with the other correctional officers and will challenge institutional norms, such as the use of negative or disrespectful discussion of inmates (Tait, 2011).

The *conflicted officer* is similar to the true carer in their interaction with inmates and in their desire to help (Tait, 2011, p. 447). They have a focus on interactions with inmates and want to help, but at times become frustrated and make decisions for the inmates (e.g., "I said no for their own good"). Tait (2011) reports that conflicted officers believe they can help people make meaningful change simply through their influence. They also express less empathy toward inmates and appear motivated to help only those they believe are deserving. Their support is conditional on the inmate's respect and their response to a situation depends on inmate behavior (Tait, 2011). These officers struggle with their dual role of custody and care, and as a result can experience conflict in relating to inmates.

The *limited carer* in Tait's (2011) model represents the officer who follows through with institutional policies and procedures, assists inmates with their requests and diffuses situations by attempting to break the issue down into a practical problem that can be solved (p. 445). These officers are sympathetic to the circumstances and experiences of the inmates and see them as being socially vulnerable (Tait, 2011). They like to help inmates to achieve their goals, but at times felt frustrated by a lack of gratitude. Limited carers communicated their indifference toward inmates in their behavior such as cutting them off or closing the cell door. Tait (2011) reported that these officers defer to more experienced staff to ensure safety; they often do not agree with institutional norms but are not comfortable voicing their concern.

The *old school* officer is confident and experienced (Tait, 2011, p. 446). These officers provide care in return for inmate compliance. They are focused on the rules and are watching for exploitation and rule violations (Tait, 2011). Old school officers are not interested in developing relationships with inmates but do understand their vulnerability and want to ensure their safety. Similar to the rule enforcer (Farkas, 2000) or the enforcer (Gilbert, 1997), they follow the rules as a means of fulfilling the mandate and do not see building relationships as an effective means to further this goal (Tait, 2011).

Finally, Tait (2011) describes the *damaged* officer (p. 448). These individuals, in many cases, used to care about prisoners. Damaged officers have lost interest in inmates, most often after a traumatic event at work that was not properly addressed or managed by the administration (Tait, 2011). These officers tended to prefer less contact with inmates, used their discretion to punish inmates more often than helping and had an extremely negative view of inmates.

Although there are differences in the perspective of each of the typologies above, there are many points of convergence. The *professional correctional officer*, as suggested by Gilbert (1997), seems to be well aligned with the *synthetic officer* in Farkas' (2000) study. These groups utilize both human relations and adhere to policy to complete their work. They respect the inmates and treat them with dignity, all while upholding the standards and values of the organization. Farkas' (2000) description of the *people worker* is similar to Gilbert's (1997) conceptualization of the *reciprocator* and Tait's (2011) representation of the *true carer*. All of these groups prioritize interaction, communication and flexibility in the rules. They understand the mutual obligation and reciprocal relationships that exists between inmate and officer. Finally, they choose to use relations and understanding of circumstance to guide their behavior.

The *old school officer* as reported by Tait (2011) and the *enforcer*, in Gilbert's estimation, are similar to Farkas' (2000) rule enforcer, hardliner and loner groups. Although the rule enforcer, the hardliner and the loner have different motivations for their approach there are many similarities in their interactions with inmates and how they complete work tasks. All five of these categories highlight strict adherence to policies and procedures, inflexibility in application of the law and preference for decreased inmate contact. Similar to these groups as well, is the *damaged officer* (Tait, 2011). This group is similar to the *hardliner* in terms of overt distaste for inmates and punishment for personal emotional gain. The addition of the work by Farkas (2000) and Tait (2011) to the literature was important as they appear to begin the teasing out process to better understand the larger group of "*enforcer*" as noted by Muir (1977) and Gilbert (1997). Farkas (2000) and Tait (2011) introduce the concept of motivation behind deference to rules and the enforcement of policies.

The avoider, as described by Gilbert (1997) appears to have no match in Farkas' (2000) typology; however, she does mention three residual types of officers in her dataset. The residual officers include the *lax officer*, *officer friendly* and the *wishy-washy officer* (p. 444). Although no officers in the sample identified as these types of officers in their interviews, they were discussed as officer types by correctional officers in the study. The lax officer appears to be the closest approximation of Gilbert's (1997) "avoider". The lax officer is characterized by their passiveness and their apathy. These officers like to avoid arguments with inmates and the paperwork that goes along with rule violations and citations (Farkas, 2000). Lax officers are just trying to get through the day with as little effort as possible; they are "doing their time". The lax officer feels no obligation to their coworkers and are often described as making others work more difficult (Farkas, 2000). Similar to Gilbert's (1997) avoider, it appears that the lax officer is simply trying to get through their shift with as little work and as little trouble as possible.

These similarities indicate some consensus in the field with regard to the general characteristics of correctional officers. This implies that a typology of officers may be a better representation of correctional workers than one stereotypical image. For the purpose of the current study, Farkas' (2000) typology was utilized as the basis for investigation. Farkas (2000) shares many similarities with other researchers in the field and provides a solid outline for the various approaches to correctional officer work. Although the work of Tait (2011) provides valuable insight, it does not provide as broad of a spectrum for officer types. The Farkas typology acted as an important aspect of this research. The model by which an officer operates and the philosophy they use to approach their job may influence their interactions with inmates.

It is also possible that typology influences officers' willingness to develop therapeutic relationships with prisoners, as described in the following section.

As mentioned above, viewing correctional officers' orientation as a dichotomy may represent an overly simplistic way of conceptualizing a complex approach to work. Similarly, as can be seen in the review of Farkas' work above, officers do not always fit into neatly and clearly defined categories. One of the aims of this study was thus to look at both the officer orientation and the officer type, to ascertain whether there is a way to consider both of these classification systems together to develop a clearer view of correctional officer work.

Relationship Custody and the Therapeutic Relationship

In recent years, particularly after the release of the document "It Depends Who's Working" by the provincial advocate in Ontario in 2012, there has been increased conversation around the development of relationships with youth in custody. This document refers to the concept of "Relationship Custody" in youth justice; a term that surfaced in Ontario around the same time. The Ministry of Children and Youth Services (now Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services), Youth Justice division first used this term as part of a program framework statement (Youth Justice Services, 2012, p. 1). When discussing this approach, they stated that relationship custody is "evidence-informed and identifies the role of staff in creating a positive and safe environment, maintaining appropriate interactions with youth and supporting rehabilitation and reintegration for youth" (Youth Justice Services, 2012, p. 1). Although this is an important statement and a step in the direction of a relationship-oriented youth justice system, there was very little discussion around the logistics of this approach. There is an important

acknowledgement of the value of relationships and the potential to meet the rehabilitative tasks of the YCJA using a relationship-based approach, however there is no conversation or direction around *how* relationship custody achieves these goals.

As the discussion around relationship custody continued in Ontario, the term came up in two important documents, the first (mentioned above) “It Depends Who’s Working” (Provincial Advocate, 2013) and the second “Because Young People Matter” (Residential Services Review Panel, 2016). Both documents discuss the potential benefits of a relationship custody approach, however, do not operationalize the term. There is also a recognition of the barriers to its use that had not been discussed in Ministry documents; issues around facility size and greater numbers of high-risk youth within facilities were recognized as potential barriers.

In addition to the deficiencies in definition and information around the operationalization of the relationship custody approach, there is also a complete lack of explanation of the theory that underlies this evidence-informed practice. Work by Bickle and Shon (2017) suggests that relationship custody appears to be rooted in a positive psychology and a strengths-based approach that is ultimately founded in Adler’s humanistic psychology. Specifically in his ideas around social feeling, cooperation, and collaboration (Adler, 2011/1938). However, without this connection to theory explicitly outlined by the Ministry, it is unclear what the foundation of this approach is.

Although it is significant that the Ministry has recognized the importance of relationships and there has been increased conversation around Relationship Custody, owing to the lack of clear theoretical framework and information available on the implementation of relationship

custody the current study will be grounded in the therapeutic alliance as a theoretical framework. The importance of the therapeutic relationship in treatment and analysis has been a topic of concern in psychology for many years (Adler, 1931; Freud, 1912 & Rogers, 1946). In this early phase of psychotherapy, there were three prominent schools of thought: Freudian Psychoanalysis, Adlerian Individual Psychology, and Rogerian Client-Centered therapy. Although each agreed that the development of a relationship with each client was essential, what this relationship looked like and how the therapist was to use this relationship was debated (

Although Freud and Rogers discussed the use of the therapeutic alliance differently, based on their school of thought, both recognized that the first goal of therapy is to develop the relationship. Further support for the importance of the therapeutic alliance in psychotherapy came from Zetzel (1956) and Horney (1946). Zetzel (1956) discussed the importance of having a satisfactory relationship before addressing any unconscious material, and Horney (1946) posited that an effective relationship allows for the emergence of unconscious material into the conscious. Interestingly, Fred Fiedler, in his work in the early 1950's, empirically demonstrated that the understanding of the ideal therapeutic relationship was actually not all that different across disciplines. Fiedler conducted a series of studies that attempted to determine whether the ideal therapeutic relationship was determined by discipline or by expertise.

Fiedler (1950a) collected 119 qualitative statements that described a therapeutic relationship. Therapists from varying schools were asked to sort the statements on a continuum with characteristics most descriptive of an ideal relationship on one end and least descriptive on the other. Results indicated that all therapists were correlated with each other, regardless of their school of thought. These results suggest that although therapists from differing schools have

varying opinions on the way in which a therapist should use the relationships, the quality and characteristics of the relationships that they create are similar (Fiedler, 1950a). Characteristics such as understanding the patient's feelings, making remarks that fit the patient's mood, and using tone of voice that indicate the therapist is able to share the patient's feelings were aspects of the ideal relationship reported by all disciplines.

A follow-up study by Fiedler (1950b) involved 10 tape recorded sessions of novice and expert therapists from psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian schools of thought. Four judges, one trained in each school of thought and one psychology student, listened to the recordings and sorted 75 statement cards describing the characteristics of the therapeutic relationship evident in each session. The results were similar to the previous study. School of thought did not seem to determine the type or quality of the relationship (Fiedler, 1950b). Experts in each of the three fields were more alike than with the novices of their field. Further, the experts were more highly correlated with the ideal relationship than the novice therapists. Finally, the results indicated that all three schools were very similar in their ability to understand the client, and were more dissimilar in their use of status in the relationship and their emotional distance from the client (Fiedler, 1950b).

Lastly, Fiedler (1951) conducted a study to further investigate the role of expertise over school. He found that non-experts are more similar to novices of different schools than experts from their own school of thought in the characteristics of their therapeutic relationship. Fiedler (1951) suggests that the ability to demonstrate understanding, create warmth, show interest, and develop security without becoming overinvolved are characteristics that set experts apart from novices. These findings by (Fiedler, 1950a, 1950b, & 1951) support the above contention by

both Freud and Rogers that displaying sympathetic understanding in the therapeutic relationship is essential.

These studies drew attention to the importance of the therapeutic relationship, regardless of how it was being used in therapy. As such, research on relationship characteristics, development and usefulness in counseling has continued. For example, Bordin (1979) described the therapeutic relationship as being comprised of three essential components. The working alliance, in Bordin's opinion, consists of an understanding of the goals, the obligation of tasks and the development of a bond. More specifically, Bordin (1979) recognized that every person who enters into psychotherapy has a goal. The goal may be self- or other directed, and the therapist must agree to work on this goal with client for the work to continue. Further, depending on the therapist's style and theoretical orientation, there will be tasks for both the client and the therapist. It is essential that both parties agree to engage in their tasks (Bordin, 1979). Finally, the bond itself is an important aspect in the process of change as basic, and at times, deeper bonds of trust are what allow the client to be vulnerable and explore contentious topics (Bordin, 1979).

The alliance is a result of a collaboration of the counselor and the client whereby an attachment is developed, including a shared commitment to the goals and responsibilities of the treatment (Lustig et al. 2002, p. 25). The quality of this alliance relies on characteristics of both the client and the therapist (Horvath, 2001). Further, the severity of the client's problem, the specific set of impairments that the client is facing, and the quality of their attachments can impact the relationship (Horvath, 2001). The therapist, along with their experience, personality, empathy, communication skills, and perspective taking all moderate the quality of the therapeutic alliance (Horvath, 2001). Evidently, the ability of the client and the therapist to collaborate

effectively is an important aspect of the alliance. It is through the development of an effective and good quality working alliance that treatment is delivered and change is facilitated.

Subsequent research studies examining the effect of relationships on treatment outcomes have been conducted. Research has shown that therapeutic relationships lead to positive outcomes in terms of quality of life and rehabilitation. For example, Horvath and Symonds (1991) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the effect of client-professional relationships for those involved in treatment. They reported an association between positive therapeutic outcomes and the development of a positive relationship with a helping professional (Horvath & Symonds, 1991). As a follow-up, Horvath (2001) made additions to this meta-analysis. More than half of the positive effects of psychotherapy in the previous research could be linked to the quality of the therapeutic alliance (Horvath, 2001). These findings highlight the significant power of this relationship and its role in effecting positive change. Horvath (2001) suggested the alliance is important in all helping relationships and not just those specific to psychotherapy. Further to this notion, research has looked at the role of the relationship in other types of helping professionals, such as offender-helper relationships, specifically discussed below.

More recently, research has indicated that therapeutic relationships lead to positive outcomes in terms of quality of life, rehabilitation and the making of positive change for clients (Bordin, 1979; Horvath & Symonds; 1991; Ross, 2008; Ulrich et al., 2012). The importance of the therapeutic alliance is highlighted in its effects on treatment outcomes for a variety of disorders including depression, schizophrenia and other mental health concerns (Hansson, 1999; Krupnick et al. 1996; Martin et al. 2000; McCabe & Priebe, 2004). The development of the

therapeutic alliance is important not only in individual work, but in group treatment as well (Joyce et al., 2007).

Further, Ross (2008) studied the development of relationships between offenders and helping professionals. Results indicated that positive relationships may lead to decreased recidivism over time. Ross (2008) found a significant association between the therapeutic relationship and positive outcomes for the offender. Moreover, Ulrich et al. (2012) found that for Canadian adult offenders, the quality of the therapeutic alliance could play an important role in predicting future outcomes. A study by Crawley (2006) reported that although most officers recognized the importance of relationships with inmates as an aspect of control and order in a prison, not all of them were in favour of developing these relationships. This highlights that the relationship between a prisoner and correctional worker is a complex one and that the degree of relationship building varies from officer to officer and prison to prison (Crawley, 2006).

More recently, the role of the therapeutic relationship in regard to youth has been the topic of research interest. Canadian researchers Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali (2016) reported that the quality of staff-youth relationships can have significant impacts on the overall quality of a youth's entire rehabilitative experience at the facility. Further, the therapeutic relationship between custody staff and youth can influence the sense of safety and comfort that youth feel in a custody facility (Peterson-Badali & Koegl, 2002), suggesting the importance of relationships in youth custody. Maslow (1943) recognized that in order for individuals to move toward self-actualization, they must first meet their basic needs. Physiological needs take priority, followed by safety needs (Maslow, 1943). Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs reinforces the importance of custody staff using their relationships with youth to ensure they feel safe in their environment

and, thus, are responsive to treatment. Additionally, Adjoran and Ricciardelli (2018) found that in their conversations with Canadian youth correctional officers, the importance of developing trust and being nonjudgmental came up when discussing their work.

Karver et al. (2006) reported that the quality of the therapeutic alliance between offenders and staff was more predictive of positive treatment outcomes (for both adults and youth) than the specific intervention used in their treatment. Further, Ulrich et al. (2012) suggested that treatment programs that adhere to strict manuals for cognitive behavioral treatment did not appear to be effective in offender success and community integration. In fact, Marshall (2009) reported concern with the heavy reliance on manualized programs in treatment because this format can interfere with developing a strong therapeutic alliance.

To further discover the relationships between delinquent youth and staff, Florsheim, et al. (2000) explored relationships in youth community programs. They reported that the development of a relationship over-time could help to mediate the effects of treatment on long-term outcomes for youth (Florsheim et al., 2000). This literature supports the need for increased attention to relationships in youth custody facilities. Outside of these studies, there is little research on correctional officer relationships with inmates. As such, it is within reason to look to the probation literature on a relationship approach to supervision.

The probation field recognizes the importance of the relationship between offender and probation officer. An important difference to keep in mind is that the probation field has more widely accepted the value of interpersonal relationships with offenders and their influence on rehabilitation (Delude et al., 2012; Kennealy et al., 2012; Skeem & Manchack, 2008), thus

further exploration of this literature provides valuable insight into the importance of building relationships with offenders in prisons as well.

Klockars (1979), one of the first to explore relationships in probation, suggested that there are two type of approaches to probation supervision (a treatment approach and a supervision approach) and four distinct officer types. First, the *Law Enforcer* who tends to focus on the legal authority and enforcement aspects of their job. Next, the *Time-Server* who sees their job as a means to end (e.g., retirement) and adheres to rules and guidelines with little aspiration to excel, learn or grow. Third, the *Therapeutic Agent* who emphasizes the treatment aspect of their work and strives to teach their probationers how to attain a better way of life. Finally, there is the *Synthetic Officer* who acknowledges both the law enforcement and treatment aspects of their work. Later work in the field has pointed to the benefits of a treatment-oriented approach to work with offenders in the community.

The adoption of a surveillance approach to work with offenders is considered a limitation to the ability to achieve the therapeutic goals of the probationer; the focus on control acts as a deterrent for probationers to fully engage and be open with their probation officer (Skeem & Manchack, 2008). The importance of the genuine belief that a person can change, (Lewis, 2014), and the relationship with offenders in probation work, are core components of intervention (Burnett & McNeill, 2005). Probation officers themselves recognize the central role that relationships play in their work and characterize them as one of the more satisfying aspects of their job, along with bringing about positive change (Annison et al., 2008; Worrall & Mawby, 2014). As such, surveillance is paramount, but the utility of a dual role relationship whereby officers are firm, fair and caring is also important (Kennealy et al, 2012). This dual-role approach

has been reported to protect against re-arrest in community-supervised offenders (Kennealy et al, 2012). The development of a positive working relationship and the skills used by probation officers can have an impact on the reconviction rates of their probationers (Raynor & Vanstone, 2016). Skilled probation officers tend to have offenders with substantially lower reconviction rates (Raynor & Vanstone, 2016).

Many of the skills used in relationship development and the techniques associated with lower reconviction rates have social work roots (e.g., motivational interviewing, cognitive restructuring, expressing empathy etc.). These findings suggest a greater link between social work and probation than may be currently recognized (Raynor & Vanstone, 2016). Probationers themselves reported that expression of empathy on the part of the probation officer was an important aspect in the development of positive working relationships (Lewis, 2014).

Probation officers and practitioners in a study by Drake et al. (2014) also recognized the importance of the relationship with young offenders. They noted the benefits of youth feeling heard and having an adult outside of their family they can talk to and learn from. The benefit of probation officers having increased relationship skills is highlighted in the recidivism rates of offenders. Raynor and Vanstone (2016) report that probation officers skilled in relationship development had probationers with long-term desistance. Similarly, Canadian youth correctional officers, in a study by Ricciardelli et al. (2019), mentioned that the decreased number of youth in custody since the enactment of the YCJA has allowed more time for youth interaction. They noted an increased opportunity to build relationships with youth and believed that the youth seemed interested in these relationships. Officers felt that the number of issues on the units had

decreased, and that the youth seemed to appreciate having someone to talk to (Ricciardelli et al., 2019).

Also important to consider, just as in correctional officer orientation discussed above, is the probation officer's underlying values and beliefs in the ability of offenders to change (see Mawby & Worrall, 2013). Further, Lewis (2014) found that probationers recognized probation officer's positive attitudes and acceptance of them as individuals. This was noted as an important part of relationship development (Lewis, 2014). In addition, the sense that the probation officer actually had a belief in the probationer's ability to change is cited as one of the most important aspects in the development of positive working relationships (Lewis, 2014). Similarly, Drake et al. (2014) found that probation officers and practitioners noted the importance of instilling hope in young people and helping them to see that they can do things differently. A further study that inquired about probationer's experiences found a significant relationship between the probation officer-offender working alliance and their perceived success of probation (Hart & Collins, 2014). Overall, and importantly, the relationship is the beginning of a long road to desistance. It is the relationship that builds the foundation for positive change (Drake et al., 2014).

The above review of literature suggests that although custody is not treatment in and of itself, the overall goal of rehabilitation can be fostered through the development of therapeutic relationships between youth and correctional officers. As noted above, the therapeutic relationship is not unique to psychotherapy (Horvath, 2001), all helping relationships can benefit from a strong alliance. In order to further explore the value of relationships in youth custody, it is important to consider how correctional officer orientation and typology contribute to

relationships. Expanding knowledge in these areas may allow for improved understanding of officer's willingness to engage in deeper and more meaningful interactions with youth.

Owing to the great potential of positive working youth-officer relationships, this research aimed to explore the current state of youth officer culture regarding relationship development. The purpose of this study was to understand the orientation of youth correctional officers in Ontario along with their beliefs around the benefits and/or concerns with incorporating relationship-development with detained youth as part of their day-to-day work. If youth officers are able to develop good quality relationships with youth, it may, possibly act as a catalyst for positive change.

Research Questions

- 1) How do correctional officers view their duties and responsibilities within a youth custody facility, does orientation, typology or endorsement for relationships impact how participants describe their work?
 - a. How do correctional officers describe their typical day and what do they see as their duties and responsibilities?
- 2) How do correctional officers view their interactions with youth as part of these duties and responsibilities, does orientation, typology or endorsement for relationships impact how participants view their interactions with youth?
 - a. How do correctional officers describe their role in rehabilitation, what do they feel is the most effective for rehabilitation and how do they manage escalated behaviour?

- 3) Do youth correctional officers believe there are positive outcomes that may result from an effective relationship with a youth does orientation, typology or endorsement for relationships impact how participants view relationships with youth?
 - a. Do correctional officers believe that there is a place for relationships in youth custody, and what are the concerns and benefits of developing relationships with youth?

Chapter 3: Methodology¹

This chapter will outline the specific methodology for this study. The participants for the study as well as the strategies for recruitment and the measures will be reviewed. Issues such as informed consent and the ethical considerations for this study will also be discussed.

Participants

Participants for this study were 27 front-line youth correctional workers and management (unit managers, supervisors and superintendents). Front-line workers were essential for the current study as they have the most direct contact with the youth. They are involved with the youth on a day-to-day basis and are responsible for the basic safety and security of the institution. The managers are also important because, as noted in Cullen et al. (1993), administrators tend toward one orientation or the other in the same way the correctional officers do. Their orientation may influence their expectations for the operation of the facility and the institutional factors that contribute to workplace stress.

Participant Recruitment

A ‘snowball’ method of recruitment was utilized, which was initiated via an email sent to managers, personal contacts and network heads encouraging them to forward the email to their contacts and coworkers (see Appendix B). The email itself also invited those who received it to forward it to anyone they believed to be eligible for the study. Participants were also recruited at a Youth Justice Ontario conference in September 2019, where a table was set up to discuss the project. All correspondence regarding this study clearly outlined that participants needed to have

¹ This methodology does not reflect the original intent of the study. Please see Appendix A, “A Note on Methods” for a thorough understanding of the methods used.

youth corrections experience (past or present) and that participation was voluntary, anonymous and could be terminated without cause at any time.

Research Survey and Measures

The survey consists of 92 open and closed questions that were designed to assess correctional officer orientation, typology and beliefs around the development of relationships with youth. Farkas' (2000) conceptualization of typology was utilized for this study. The structure of the survey will be further discussed in the data collection section below and a copy of the measures can be found in Appendix C.

Procedure. An email was sent to the administrators of all youth custody transfer payment agencies in Ontario who had contact information available. The same email was also sent to the President of the board of directors of Youth Justice Ontario, an association in Ontario that represents over 50 youth justice service providers in Ontario (Youth Justice Ontario, 2020) who forwarded the email to its youth custody members as well as to the head of a youth justice network in Ontario and to personal contacts. The email contained information about the study (see Appendix B) and a link to participate. This study used a multi-method design in which participants responded to a number of quantitative questions based on Likert scales that addressed demographics, correctional orientation and officer typology (See Appendix C). Participants also answered qualitative, free-answer questions that required individualized responses. These qualitative questions were used to gather information on exploratory areas of interest, such as how participants would describe their day, their thoughts on relationships with youth and their general approach to their work. In this sense, participants were valued as experts in their own experience.

Online surveys were chosen for a number of reasons. First, as outlined in greater detail in Appendix A, access to face-to-face interviews was limited due to transitional, operational and health-related issues. Second, there is some evidence to suggest that social desirability can impact the responses provided in face-to-face interviews. For health-related questions, Norton et al. (2017) found that individuals are more apt to report poor health in an online survey than in a face-to-face interview. Along the same lines, Henderson (2012) found that when people were asked about their knowledge with regard to stigma-related mental health, social desirability played a role in face-to-face data collection, suggesting that online surveys for this information may be more accurate. It is possible that a similar effect may be found when participants are asked face-to-face to report their views on their work with youth who are in conflict with the law. Additionally, providing the survey in an online format allowed for participants to engage in the survey in a place of their choosing rather than at work, which would have been the option had face-to-face data collection taken place.

For the qualitative questions, participants had the option to include as much or as little information as they deemed appropriate and were able to skip any questions that they did not want to answer. No one other than the participant was aware of his or her participation (their name, workplace, or location were not collected), and involvement in the study had no effect on the participant's workplace environment. All participants were made aware that their participation was voluntary and anonymous and that they would not be identified in any way in any formal report of the research. To ensure participant anonymity, analyses were conducted on an aggregate basis.

Scales

Professional Orientation Scale (POS). The POS scale was developed by Toch and Klofas (1982) to assess correctional officer orientation. Although there have been some concerns with the explained variance with this scale, it is a commonly used and reliable scale. Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) were unable to explain variation in officers' attitudes towards inmates, however; they did offer some suggestions as to why this might be, including the need for understanding personality and institutional factors as well. With these reported issues, the Professional Orientation Scale was determined to be the best scale for this purpose and provided a solid foundation for the development of a new scale to measure correctional orientation in youth correctional officers. Therefore, this study utilized four subscales: social distance, punitive orientation, counselling roles and concern with corruption of authority. The scale was used to assess officer orientation; however owing to its use with adult populations an additional orientation scale was developed for this project that aims to tap into areas not explored in this scale (see Correctional Orientation Scale below). The questions to participants were presented in their original form, but the response options were adjusted. The scale was originally a four-point Likert scale (1 – strongly agree, 2 – agree, 3 – disagree, 4 – strongly disagree); however, owing to an error in survey development the scale in the present study gave participants a “neither agree or disagree” option and a five-point Likert scale. This error presents challenges for utilizing the scale in the manner originally intended; however, exploratory analyses will be presented. The scores on this scale were totaled, the range of possible total scores on this scale is 17 – 85, with higher scores indicating greater agreement with custody values. The Cronbach's alpha indicated that this scale has good internal consistency ($\alpha=.89$).

Correctional orientation scale (COS). The COS scale is a 21-item scale that was developed for use in this study. It was adapted from several other scales (Bazemore & Dicker,

1994; Cullen et al., 1989; Melvin et al., 1985) and was intended to assess youth correctional officer orientation. Some of the questions were used in their original form, others were adapted to fit with the language and responsibilities of youth correctional officers. This scale was designed with treatment and custody orientations at opposite poles, to assess correctional officer orientation along a continuum. The scale was a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Data analyses indicated that this scale has good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .82).

Correctional officer typology scale (COTS). The CPTS scale was developed for the purpose of this project and was used to classify participants as an officer type. The scale was created after careful review of Farkas' (2000) study, a qualitative analysis of adult correctional officers. Using the data, Farkas created clear outlines for the types of behaviours and beliefs of individuals in each category (Hard Liner, Rule Enforcer, People Worker, Synthetic Officer and Loner). These outlines were used to develop questions that would rate officers on their endorsement of the beliefs or values present in each officer types using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). The total scores for each officer type were calculated, the mean score was calculated and used to determine fit with each officer type.

Relationship orientation scale (ROS). The ROS is a 5-item Likert-scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) developed for the purpose of this study to assess participants endorsement of relationship development with youth in custody. The total score on this scale can range from 5 (does not at all endorse relationships with youth) to 25 (strongly endorses relationships with youth). The aim of this scale was to explore the (in)consistencies of officers qualitative and quantitative responses and explore any relationships between orientation and

endorsement of relationships with youth. Cronbach's alpha indicated that the scale has good internal consistency ($\alpha=.77$).

Open-ended Questions

Participants were asked to respond to 13 free response questions that aimed to have participants reflect on various aspects of their work roles and environment (e.g., their role in rehabilitation, their approach to their work, and their views on the benefits and concerns of relationship development with youth, among other questions, see Appendix C). Participants were able to provide as much or as little information as they liked or could completely skip these questions if desired.

Informed Consent

Prior to participation in the study, all participants were fully informed about the study methods and consented to take part in the study by selecting "I consent" on a google form and moving to the online survey (see Appendix B for a copy of the participant consent). The consent form included the contact information (email and telephone number) of the researcher and outlined the option to contact the researcher to ask any questions they may have regarding the study. They were informed of the limits of confidentiality, and about their ability to skip any questions they are uncomfortable answering or conclude their participation should they not wish to complete it (without any repercussions).

Ethical Concerns

Participation in this study carried no risk beyond that which participants encounter in their everyday life and those associated with their line of work. While completing the survey,

sharing of personal experiences and perspectives was requested, but there were many safety precautions, such as confidentiality and ethical considerations, that are in place to protect participants.

To ensure participant comfort, they were able to choose not to answer any or all of the questions posed. If they chose to withdraw during the study, all data collected from them was destroyed, and none was used in the study. Names of the participants and their workplace were not collected, thus the data is completely anonymous. There was absolutely no penalty for withdrawing from the study. All information collected was strictly confidential. Only the researcher and research team have access to any collected information. The results of this study may be reported in psychological journal articles and/or presented at conferences; however, no identifying information will be reported. As per guidelines put forth by the American Psychological Association, data will be kept for a five-year period after publication date and then destroyed. Data is kept in an encrypted file on the researcher's computer.

Data Analysis

Free responses were qualitatively coded to discover themes and meta-themes within the data. Owing to the fact that this was exploratory research and was the first of its kind, there were no hypotheses with regard to the themes. The analysis of qualitative data was conducted using the broad method of Thematic Analysis. Thematic Analysis allows the researcher to go beyond a basic description of the data to an analysis of the themes, topics or groupings of information provided by participants. Researchers group the information into larger clusters of material and then use details from the data to support the development of such groupings (Creswell, 2007).

In this case data was extracted from Google Forms and grouped by question in Excel. The author reviewed the data to develop an overall understanding of the information provided. After an initial read of the survey responses, the author began reviewing each question in turn. As an idea came up in the responses an initial sub theme was developed (and a column created in Excel with the theme title). If an interviewee made a comment within the sub theme a score of one was given in the corresponding Excel column. After all data had been analyzed, any sub theme that had 2 or less mentions was removed and the remaining sub themes were grouped into larger meta-themes, discussed in the results section.

All quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS software. Quantitative questions were analyzed using correlations and exploring trends in descriptive statistics. Unfortunately, owing to the small sample size, additional quantitative analyses were not possible. Considering that both the correctional orientation and relationship scales were created for this project, that this is a youth population, and the previous literature is inconsistent, these quantitative analyses were exploratory in nature. The findings of both the quantitative and qualitative data were used in a complimentary fashion and were reported based on aggregate findings.

Chapter 4: Results

As indicated in Chapter 2, there were several research questions outlined for this project. The aim was to explore youth correctional officer's experience of their work, their orientation to their work and their officer type, as well as their views on building relationships with the youth in their care. The results below outline the findings of this study and provide insight to the above noted research questions.

These results represent an exploration of the trends and contrasts within the sample. It is important to note that, at times, the groups have quite small n's. This information is being presented as this is an exploratory study, however, caution is warranted in extrapolating this information or making strong assumptions based on these findings. It is encouraged that these results act as clues to the types of questions that could use further exploration in future research and the possible trends in the data.

Demographics

The demographics, outlined in Table 4.1, indicate that twenty-seven youth correctional officers completed the survey; of those, there was demographic information for 26. One of the participants declined to answer many of the survey questions, including demographics, but provided no explanation as to why. The majority of the sample (66%) were female, the average age was 41.2 years ($SD=13.36$), and 89% reported their ethnicity as white. Additionally, most participants had either a college diploma or university degree (88.8%). The largest percentage of participants reported studying corrections (29.6%) and participants had experience in either an open custody facility (59.3%), a secure custody facility (11.1%) or both (25.9%). Five participants (18.5%) reported previous experience as an adult correctional officer. Finally,

although the length of service varied, the largest group (40.7%) reported more than ten years' experience.

Table 4.1

Demographic Information

Variable	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	8	29.6
Female	18	66.7
Ethnicity		
White	24	88.9
Black	1	3.7
Asian	1	3.7
Education		
College	12	44.4
University	12	44.4
High School	1	3.7
Grad School	1	3.7
Area of Study		
Corrections	8	29.6
Criminology	3	11.1
Psychology	3	11.1
Social Work	4	14.8
Child and Youth	3	11.1
Other	4	14.8
Type of Facility		
Open	16	59.3
Secure	3	11.1
Both	7	25.9
Adult Corrections?		
Yes	5	18.5
No	21	77.8
Years of Experience		
6 months – 1 year	2	7.4
1 – 5 years	9	33.3
6 – 10 years	2	7.4
10 + years	11	40.7
Officer Type		
Loner	7	25.93
Synthetic	8	37.04
People Worker	9	33.33
Loner/Synthetic	2	11.11

Psychometric Measures for Orientation and Type

Results for the Professional Orientation Scale indicated a propensity toward a treatment orientation ($M=38.24$, $SD=8.85$) for participants in this study. Scores on this scale can range from 17-85, with higher scores indicating greater agreement with custody/security values. (see Table 4.2). Similarly, the Correctional Orientation Scale indicated that overall, the entire sample leaned toward a treatment orientation, with a mean score of 47.73 ($SD=9.35$) (scores can range from 21 – 105, with higher scores indicating a greater agreement with custody/security views), as shown in Table 4.2. There was a significant correlation between the correctional orientation scale and the professional orientation scale, $r=.74$, $p<0.01$, suggesting that there is agreement between the two scales but indicating that they are tapping into different aspects of orientation, namely the youth specific aspects of work with young people.

The Typology Scale categorized individuals into an officer type based on the type that they had the highest score for (i.e., the score indicating the highest endorsement for items consistent with that type). Overall scores indicated that officers most strongly endorsed items that were consistent with the Synthetic type ($M = 3.98$, $SD=.50$) and that they agreed least with items consistent with the Hard Liner ($M=1.98$, $SD=.67$), see Table 2. When categorizing participants, none fell into the Rule Enforcer or a Hardliner group. The largest number of participants identified as People Workers ($n=9$, 33.33%), followed by Synthetic officers ($n=8$, 29.63%) and Loners ($n=7$, 25.93%). Note that two participants fell into a “mixed group” where they scored equally high on the Synthetic and Loner types (see Table 4.2). Note that Cronbach’s Alpha revealed that there may be some issues with internal consistency for these subscales (see Table 4.2). Finally, the Relationship Orientation Scale (scores can range from 5-25 with higher

scores indicating greater endorsement for relationships) indicated that participants tended to support relationships with youth ($M=20.27$, $SD=2.78$), see Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	SD	α
Age	26	41.32	13.36	
Correctional Orientation	26	47.73	9.35	.82
Professional Orientation	25	38.24	8.85	.89
Typology				
Rule Enforcer	26	3.10	0.73	.81
Hard Liner	26	1.98	0.67	.73
People Worker	26	3.93	0.36	.20
Synthetic	26	3.98	0.50	.12
Relationship	26	20.27	2.78	.77

Open-Ended Survey Questions

Among all the open-ended questions, thematic analysis revealed that four general themes emerge from the data: Supervision and Security, Relationships and Support, Treatment, and General Duties and Administrative Tasks. These groupings were used to organize the data in the results below, further sub-themes are also referenced throughout. A sub-theme refers to similar groupings of qualitative data that emerged within the four broader themes discovered.

Officers Views on Their Duties and Responsibilities

One of the objectives of this study was to examine how youth correctional officers view their duties and responsibilities. This question was explored by looking at participants' responses to three questions within the survey. The first question asked participants about their approach to their work, the second asked them to outline their responsibilities at work and the third asked them to walk the reader through a typical day at work (e.g., Q76. How do you work with youth?

What is your approach?). The responses to these questions were then grouped into themes that emerged from the data. Four main duties/responsibilities emerged: supervision and security, developing relationships and providing support, treatment duties such as helping youth to learn new skills to manage their emotions, and general duties including cleaning, managing daily routines and administrative tasks. Each will be discussed below in turn.

Supervision and security

Participants discussed the aspect of their work that was centered around safety, for the number of participants reporting each subtheme (supervision, security, consistency, checks/counts, behaviour management and supervision and monitoring), see Table 4.3. Within this general topic, youth workers discussed supervision of youth and maintaining the safety and security of the youth and the facility when asked about their work responsibilities. In response to how they approach their work, officers mentioned safety/security as well as rules and consistency, along with a firm but fair approach. Although not all the officers mentioned supervision or security as one of their responsibilities at work, or as the way that they see their role in rehabilitation, when asked about a typical workday, security aspects of the job came up in a number of ways. Checks and counts (head counts, bed checks, searches, and cutlery and key counts) were mentioned, along with de-escalating youth and behavior management (including serious occurrences, assaults and restraints). Finally, supervising and/or monitoring youth was reported by some participants as part of their typical day. There were no significant differences found on Relationship, Professional Orientation or Correctional Orientation scores between those who noted these security/supervision aspects of their work and those that did not (see Table 4.3).

When responding to this survey question, one participant, a female youth worker with secure custody and adult experience noted that their responsibilities included “Custody care & control of youth in custody” (P 6). Whereas a female participant with both open and secure experience and no adult experience notes that their responsibilities included “Supervising youth during daily routines, one to one supervision for youth with mental health issues, suicide watch, behavior management, day to day requirements of operating the facility (cleaning, meal prep, scheduling etc.) (P. 7)”. These two notes highlight the role of supervision and security in the youth worker role.

Table 4.3

Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Responsibilities (Supervision)								
Professional Orientation	8	39.63	11.45	17	37.59	7.66	.53	.60
Correctional Orientation	8	50.50	9.34	18	46.50	9.35	1.01	.32
Relationship	8	20.88	3.36	18	20.00	2.54	.73	.47
Responsibilities (Security)								
Professional Orientation	5	43.00	5.79	20	37.05	9.19	1.37	.18
Correctional Orientation	5	54.40	6.58	21	46.14	9.31	1.86	.08
Relationship	5	19.80	2.77	21	20.38	2.84	-.41	.68
Approach (Safety/Security)								
Professional Orientation	3	30.67	9.07	22	39.27	8.50	-1.64	.12
Correctional Orientation	3	41.67	4.04	23	48.52	9.60	-1.21	.24
Relationship	3	22.33	3.79	23	20.00	2.61	1.39	.18
Approach (Consistency)								
Professional Orientation	8	41.75	5.20	17	36.59	9.82	1.39	.18
Correctional Orientation	8	52.25	8.94	18	45.72	9.04	1.71	.10
Relationship	8	19.75	2.55	18	20.50	2.92	-.63	.54
Typical Day (Checks/Counts)								
Professional Orientation	10	40.00	10.23	15	37.07	7.95	.81	.43
Correctional Orientation	10	47.80	10.57	16	47.69	8.86	.03	.98
Relationship	10	19.90	3.03	16	20.50	2.68	-.53	.60

Typical Day (Behaviour Mgmt)								
Professional Orientation	6	40.67	11.94	19	37.47	7.88	.76	.43
Correctional Orientation	6	48.67	11.50	20	47.45	8.93	.27	.79
Relationship	6	19.67	3.67	20	20.45	2.54	-.60	.56
Typical Day (Supervise/Monitor)								
Professional Orientation	11	40.64	9.79	14	36.36	7.88	1.21	.24
Correctional Orientation	11	49.82	9.44	15	46.20	9.29	.97	.34
Relationship	11	20.18	2.99	15	20.33	2.72	-.14	.89

Relationships and support

Connecting with youth, supporting them, and building relationships with them was something officers discussed when writing about their approach to their work, their responsibilities at work, and as part of a typical workday. Some participants noted building relationships with youth as part of their approach and more than half reported providing support as their approach to their work. When asked to reflect on their responsibilities at work, providing support to youth was reported by four participants. There were no differences found on Relationship, Correctional Orientation or Professional Orientation scores for those who did and did not report providing support as part of their responsibilities (See Table 4.4). Descriptions of a typical day included interacting with youth, providing support, and building relationships/rapport. An independent t-test indicated that those who noted interacting with youth as part of their typical day had significantly lower scores on the Correctional Orientation scale (($t=-2.19$, $p=.04$) indicating that they lean toward a treatment approach to their work), than those who did not (see Table 4.4).

With regard to qualitative responses, relationships and support were mentioned within the duties and responsibilities in several ways. One male open custody worker with no adult

experience noted that their responsibilities included “Working directly with the youth on a day-to-day basis. Helping youth access resources to reintegrate them back into the community. Offer skill building and programming to youth” (P. 22). Additionally, a female participant with open custody experience and no adult experience reported that her duties included “helping and supporting youth. assisting youth with their individualized programs” (P. 4).

Table 4.4

Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Approach (Relationships)								
Professional Orientation	6	34.33	7.42	19	39.37	9.08	-1.26	.22
Correctional Orientation	6	43.83	3.43	20	48.90	10.28	-1.88	.07
Relationship	6	19.67	2.94	20	20.45	2.78	-.60	.56
Approach (Support)								
Professional Orientation	14	37.21	8.28	11	39.55	9.77	-.65	.53
Correctional Orientation	15	46.60	7.17	11	49.27	11.91	-.66	.52
Relationship	15	20.33	2.66	11	20.18	3.06	.14	.89
Role in Rehab (Support)								
Professional Orientation	9	38.22	6.83	16	38.25	10.20	-.01	.99
Correctional Orientation	10	47.50	4.70	16	47.88	11.50	-.12	.91
Relationship	10	20.60	2.88	16	20.06	2.79	.47	.64
Typical Day (Support)								
Professional Orientation	2	44.50	2.12	23	37.70	9.02	1.05	.31
Correctional Orientation	3	51.00	8.89	23	47.30	9.51	.64	.53
Relationship	3	18.00	1.73	23	20.57	2.78	-1.55	.14
Typical Day (Interacting)								
Professional Orientation	10	36.20	8.79	15	39.60	8.92	-.94	.36
Correctional Orientation	10	43.00	6.94	16	50.69	9.61	-2.19	.04*
Relationship	10	20.80	2.78	16	19.94	2.82	.76	.45
Typical Day (Relationships)								
Professional Orientation	3	41.00	5.29	22	37.86	9.25	.57	.58
Correctional Orientation	3	47.33	11.02	23	47.78	9.39	-.08	.94
Relationship	3	17.33	1.53	23	20.65	2.69	-2.07	.05

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Treatment

In addition to relationships and support, treatment aspects of the work came up in descriptions of work responsibilities (see Table 4.5). Participants reported assisting youth with creating goals and helping with programming as part of their responsibilities at work. Additionally, when asked to describe a typical day, programming was something that came up for several participants. For example, Participant 3, a female youth worker with open custody, and youth only experience noted that her responsibilities included “Connecting youth with their community, helping youth to set goals so the youth can make productive use of their time in custody, working for the youth, advocating for youth to meet their needs”. There were no differences found on the Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation or Relationship scores for those who did (Yes) and did not (No) report programming as part of their work responsibilities or their typical day (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Summary of t-tests: Duties and Responsibilities – Treatment

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Responsibilities (Programme and Goals)								
Professional Orientation	10	41.00	9.94	15	36.40	7.84	1.29	.21
Correctional Orientation	10	45.30	10.65	16	49.25	8.43	-1.05	.30
Relationship	10	19.10	2.77	16	21.00	2.61	-1.77	.09
Typical Day (Programme)								
Professional Orientation	7	37.14	6.96	18	38.67	9.63	-.38	.71
Correctional Orientation	7	47.29	9.12	19	47.89	9.67	-.14	.89
Relationship	7	20.71	2.29	19	20.11	2.98	.49	.63

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

General Duties and Administrative Tasks

Along with the topics above, participants mentioned the general tasks that are part of their work. When asked about their typical day participants reflected on the note/report writing

($n=9$) helping youth with routines ($n=4$), assisting youth throughout the day (including getting youth to school/programme and helping them fill out paperwork), ($n=10$), facilitating phone calls and appointments ($n=8$), cleaning the facility ($n=6$), and meal prep ($n=7$). Although this area will not be further explored below, it is included here to demonstrate that there are many aspects to this job.

Differences among Groups

There were some notable differences found among our groups within the sample (gender, experience with adult corrections and facility type) with regard to orientation and the three main themes above (*supervision and security, relationships and support and treatment*). The general trends will be reported below, and when significant, Chi-squared analyses, although underpowered, will be presented. All of the non-significant Chi-square results can be found in Appendix D.

Gender. Overall, there was a significant difference found between males and females on their Professional Orientation scores ($t=-2.66, p=.01$) and Correctional Orientations scores ($t=-2.15, p=.04$). Males scored higher on both scales (see Table 4.6), indicating a greater lean toward a custody orientation. There were no significant differences found between males and females on the Relationship scale (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
Summary of t-tests: Group Differences – Gender

Variable	Male			Female			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	T	P
Professional Orientation	8	44.38	6.91	17	35.35	8.30	-2.66	.01*
Correctional Orientation	8	53.25	9.59	18	45.28	8.36	-2.15	.04*
Relationship	8	19.63	2.72	18	20.56	2.83	.78	.44

* $p<.05$

Supervision and Security. When asked about their responsibilities at work, participants discussed supervision and security as part of their responsibilities. The most cited of any responsibility for male participants was supervision, whereas females reported this at lower rates. With regard to security, one male participant and four female participants mentioned this as part of their responsibilities at work (see Table A1).

When asked about their approach to their work, no male participants reported safety and security, however three females did. Additionally, consistency was reported by a higher percentage of males (37.5%) than females (30.77%). Finally, when asked about their typical day, both male and female participants reported checks and counts, behaviour management and supervision/monitoring. Although females reported checks and counts and behaviour management at higher percentages than males, chi-square analyses indicated no significant relationships among these groups (see Table A1).

Relationships and Support. When asked about their responsibilities at work, support was mentioned by a small amount of both males and females (less than 20%). A lower percentage of males than females discussed building relationships as part of their approach to their work. There were no relationships found between gender and reporting these variables (see Table A2). More females than males brought up ideas around supporting youth, and although underpowered, the Chi-square results indicated that there was a significant relationship between gender and reporting providing support to youth, with females being more apt to discuss this as part of their approach ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 5.06, p=.02$). When asked about their typical day, both male and female participants reported providing support to youth, interacting with youth and building relationships, none of these relationships were significant (see Table A2).

Table 4.7

Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Approach (Support)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = 5.06$
Female	13 (72.2)	5 (27.8)	$p = .02^*$
			$n=26$

Treatment. Helping youth set goals/programming was the most cited response for females when asked about their responsibilities at work (38.89%). Males reported goal setting and programming at similar rates (37.5%) although it was not their most reported responsibility. Programming also came up when participants were describing a typical day. Males and Females tended to report programming at similar rates. No significant differences were found between gender and any of the treatment variables (see Table A3).

Adult Corrections Experience

As with gender, there were some differences between those who have adult corrections experience and those who do not with regard to Correctional and Professional Orientation and Relationship scores as well as in their levels of reporting the three main themes above (*supervision and security, relationships and support and treatment*). Overall, there was a significant difference found between those with adult corrections experience and those with youth only experience on their Professional orientation scores ($t=2.32, p=.03$), Correctional Orientations scores ($t=2.32, p=.04$), and Relationship scores ($t=-2.42, p=.02$) with those with adult experience scoring higher on both orientation scales (more security oriented) and lower on the relationship scale (less endorsement for relationships) (see Table 4.8).

Table 4.8*Summary of t-tests: Group Differences – Adult Corrections Experience*

Variable	Adult			Youth Only			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	T	P
Professional Orientation	5	45.80	8.79	20	36.35	7.99	2.32	.03*
Correctional Orientation	5	55.20	8.76	21	45.95	8.75	2.12	.04*
Relationship	5	17.80	1.92	21	20.85	2.65	-2.42	.02*

* $p < .05$

Supervision and Security. When asked about their work responsibilities, participants with adult experience reported supervision and security as part of their responses. Similarly, when discussing the approach they take to their work, participants reported safety/security and consistency as part of their approach. Finally, when asked about a typical day, participants reported checks/counts behaviour management and monitoring and supervising the youth. Both those with adult experience and those without reported these at similar levels, and as such, no relationships were found between experience and reporting supervision and security variables (see Table A4).

Relationships and Support. Participants were asked to report on their responsibilities at work. In the responses, support came up as a responsibility in responses from both groups. Relationships and support also came up in participant responses to how they approach their work. Finally, when reporting their typical day, participants in both groups mentioned providing support. However, interacting with youth was mentioned only by those who have youth custody only experience (47.6%), none of those with experience in both facility types mentioned interacting with youth. Both groups discussed building relationships, however no significant relationships were found between reporting these variables and work experience (see Table A5).

Treatment. Participants reported treatment aspects of their work when they were asked about their responsibilities on the job and when they discussed a typical day. Helping youth set goals/programming were brought up when discussing job responsibilities and programming came up as part of a typical day. For example, participant 27, a female open custody youth worker, with no adult experience, included both programming and mindfulness as part of their typical day. When discussing responsibilities, less participants with adult and youth experience mentioned helping youth develop goals and complete programming than those with youth only experience. However, when discussing their typical day about two thirds of those with youth only experience brought up programming and all of those with adult and youth experience mentioned programming. Although we see some differences in reporting here, chi-square analyses indicate that none of these relationships are significant (see Table A6).

Type of Youth Custody Experience.

Participants in this study had experience with youth custody facilities that could be broken down into three groups: open custody experience, secure custody experience and both. Although descriptive statistics may suggest slight differences on Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation and Relationship scores, ANOVA analyses indicate no significant differences between the three groups on any of these scales (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9

ANOVA: Group Differences – Type of Youth Custody Facility

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Professional Orientation	Between Groups	85.25	2	42.623	.523	.60
	Within Groups	1793.31	22	81.514		
	Total	1878.56	24			

Correctional Orientation	Between Groups	276.73	2	138.367	1.669	.21
	Within Groups	1906.38	23	82.886		
	Total	2183.12	25			
Relationship	Between Groups	5.27	2	2.635	.323	.723
	Within Groups	187.85	23	8.167		
	Total	193.12	25			

* $p < .05$

Supervision and Security. When asked about their work responsibilities, participants with experience in open and both types of facilities reported supervision, whereas those with experience in secure and both types of facilities reported security. Chi-square analyses indicated a significant relationship between the type of facility participants have worked in and level of reporting security as part of their work responsibilities ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 10.76, p = .01$) (see Table 4.10). Those with open custody experience only were less apt to note security as part of their job, in fact of the 16 participants in this category, none provided security as an answer to this question.

When discussing their approach, participants with experience in open and both facility types reported safety/security and all three groups reported consistency as part of their approach. A significant relationship was found between type of facility and reporting consistency as part of their approach ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 9.74, p = .01$) (see Table 4.10). Those with secure custody experience only were more apt to report consistency as part of their approach; with all of these participants mentioning it. For example, one male youth worker with secure and adult experience noted that their approach is to be “professional, consistent and fair” (P. 9). Finally, when asked about a typical day, participants from all groups reported checks/counts, behaviour management, and monitoring and supervising the youth. Chi-Square analyses indicated a significant relationship between type of facility and reporting behaviour management as part of their typical day ($\chi^2_{(2)} =$

7.31, $p=.02$), those with secure only experience were more apt to report behaviour management as part of their typical day than those with open only or experience at both (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10

Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship between facility type and Supervision and Security Responses

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Security)			
Open	0 (0)	16 (100)	$\chi^2 = 10.76$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .01^*$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Approach (Consistency)			
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 9.74$
Secure	3 (100)	0 (0)	$p = .01^*$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Behaviour Mgmt)			
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 7.31$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .03^*$
Both	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	$n=26$

Relationships and Support. When asked about their responsibilities at work, support was mentioned by participants in the open custody only experience group and those in the both facility types group, none by those with secure only experience noted support. Similarly, only the secure group has no participants that mentioned building relationships as part of their approach to their work. When discussing their approach to their work, participants in all three groups brought up ideas around supporting youth. Finally, when asked about their typical day, some participants in the open and secure only groups reported providing support to youth, where none of those in experience with both did. Interacting with youth was mentioned by about a third of those in the open group, and just under two thirds of those with experience in both types of facilities, however none of those with secure experience reported it. Finally, building relationships was discussed by some of those in the secure and both facilities groups but by none of those in the open groups. Although we see some differences in levels of reporting here, no

relationships were found among group membership and reporting these relationship and support variables (see Table A8).

Treatment. Participants reported treatment aspects of their work when they were asked about their responsibilities at work and when they discussed a typical day. Helping youth set goals/programming were brought up by some of those with open custody and both experience when discussing job responsibilities. Participant 14, a female with open custody experience reported that her responsibilities were “too many to list, mostly facilitating programs to youth”. Similarly, members of these two groups discussed programming as part of a typical day. No significant relationships were found between level of reporting these treatment variables and group membership (see Table A9).

The results in this section indicate that although there is a general disposition toward a treatment approach and an endorsement of building relationships with youth, there are some differences among the groups within this sample with regard to how they see *Supervision and Security, Relationships and Support and Treatment* as part of their duties and responsibilities at work.

Interactions with Youth

The second area of interest in this study was the way in which staff people understand and view the interactions they have with youth as part of their work. As noted above, Participants see their work as involving several things, many of which inherently involve interacting with youth. These responsibilities include assisting with rehabilitation and managing behaviour, among others. Of interest is how participants see their role in these rehabilitation interactions and what they view as the most effective way of contributing to rehabilitation. This information came

from the participants responses to two survey questions: the first “What do you see as your role in rehabilitation?” and second “What do you believe is the most effective method of rehabilitation for youth?”. Further, any differences in scores in Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation and Relationships, or any relationships between group membership (gender, adult custody experience and facility type), for those who discuss supervision and security, relationships and support, and treatment in their responses to specific questions regarding their role in rehabilitation, their beliefs around the most effective method of rehabilitation and their views on how to best manage youth escalation were of interest.

Role in Rehabilitation

One of the survey questions asked participants to comment on how they see their role in rehabilitation for youth. A variety of answers were provided and were grouped into eight sub-themes. These sub-themes included providing discipline for rule violations ($n = 3$), creating a safe environment ($n = 4$), providing support ($n = 10$), building relationships ($n = 9$), connecting youth to resources ($n = 7$), role modelling ($n = 10$), helping youth make different choices ($n = 7$) and teaching skills to better manage emotions ($n = 5$). These themes fit into the three general themes discussed above (*supervision and security, relationships and support, and treatment*) and will be discussed in these groupings below.

Supervision and Security. Participants were asked about their role in rehabilitation. When responding to this question two supervision/security responses arose. Three officers mentioned discipline for rule violations/aggressive behaviour and four mentioned ensuring a safe environment. Participant 17, a female youth worker with open custody experience notes that her was to “provide a predictable, safe environment within which inadequate or mistaken

assumptions about life are no longer reaffirmed”. There were no significant differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported discipline and those who did not (for means and standard deviations see Table 4.11). Similarly, there was no difference found on Relationship Scores for those who reported and those who did not, but there was a significant difference found on Relationship scores between those who did report ensuring a safe environment and those who did not ($t=2.62, p=.03$) (see Table 4.11). Those individuals who reported providing a safe environment as part of their role in rehabilitation had significantly higher relationship scores than those who did not.

Table 14.11

Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Role in Rehab (Discipline)								
Professional Orientation	3	35.00	8.00	22	38.68	9.04	-.67	.51
Correctional Orientation	3	44.00	9.85	22	48.22	9.40	-.73	.47
Relationship	3	20.00	3.61	23	20.30	2.75	-.18	.86
Role in Rehab (Safe Environment)								
Professional Orientation	4	32.00	10.74	21	39.43	8.21	-1.59	.13
Correctional Orientation	4	41.50	5.57	22	48.86	9.53	-1.49	.15
Relationship	4	23.00	2.16	22	19.77	2.62	2.34	.03*

* $p < .05$

Relationships and support. When asked about their role in rehabilitation, officers mentioned relationships or a relationship custody approach ($n=9$) as well as providing support and listening to youth ($n=10$), role modelling ($n=10$) and advocating for youth and connecting them to resources ($n=7$). There were no significant differences in relationship, Correctional Orientation, or Professional orientation scores for those who reported relationships as part of their responsibilities and those who did not, or for those who brought up support and listening to

youth and those who did not. There was a significant difference found on Correctional Orientation ($t=2.50, p=.02$) and Professional Orientation ($t=3.25, p=.00$) scores for those who reported role modelling and those who did not, with those reporting role modelling having higher Correctional and Professional Orientation Scores than those who did not (see Table 4.12). The difference between those who did and did not report role modelling on Relationship scores was approaching significance ($t=2.13, p=.05$) with those reporting role modelling having lower relationships scores (see Table 4.12). Finally, there were no significant differences found between those who reported advocating for youth and connecting them to resources and those who did not for Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation or Relationship Scores (see Table 4.12).

Table 4.12

Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Role in Rehab (Support)								
Professional Orientation	9	38.22	6.83	16	38.25	10.20	-.01	.99
Correctional Orientation	10	47.50	4.70	16	47.88	11.50	-.12	.91
Relationship	10	20.60	2.88	16	20.06	2.79	.47	.64
Role in Rehab (Relationship)								
Professional Orientation	7	36.43	9.02	18	38.94	8.94	-.63	.54
Correctional Orientation	7	47.14	7.76	19	47.95	10.01	-1.91	.85
Relationship	7	20.85	3.44	19	20.05	2.57	-1.65	.52
Role in Rehab (Advocate/Connect)								
Professional Orientation	6	36.17	8.04	19	38.89	9.19	-.65	.52
Correctional Orientation	7	46.43	9.03	19	48.21	9.65	-.42	.68
Relationship	7	21.14	2.79	19	19.95	2.78	.97	.34
Role in Rehab (Role Model)								
Professional Orientation	10	44.20	7.42	15	34.27	7.52	3.25	.00**
Correctional Orientation	10	53.00	8.89	16	44.44	8.25	2.50	.02*
Relationship	10	18.90	2.64	16	21.13	2.58	-2.12	.05

Treatment. When asked about their role in rehabilitation for youth, aspects of treatment were brought forward. Some participants mentioned teaching youth new skills to manage their emotions (see Table 4.13), Participant 27 noted that providing programming and teaching life skills was part of their role. Participants who noted teaching emotion management scored significantly lower on the Correctional Orientation and Professional Orientation scales and significantly higher on Relationship scales than those who did not report this ($t=3.41, p=.00$; $t=2.84, p=.01$; $t=-2.25, p=.03$). Others noted helping youth to build motivation to change and to make different choices. Participants who noted helping youth to make different choices scored significantly lower on the Correctional Orientation and Professional Orientation scales and significantly higher on the Relationship scale than those who did not report this ($t=4.13, p=.00$; $t=3.01, p=.01$; $t=-2.25, p=.03$).

Table 4.13

Summary of t-tests: Role in Rehabilitation – Treatment

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Role in Rehab (Different Choices)								
Professional Orientation	7	30.86	7.22	18	41.11	7.81	-3.01	.01*
Correctional Orientation	7	38.00	4.36	19	51.32	8.04	-4.13	.00**
Relationship	7	22.14	2.67	19	19.58	2.55	2.25	.03*
Role in Rehab (Emotion Management)								
Professional Orientation	5	29.40	7.89	20	40.45	7.75	-2.84	.01*
Correctional Orientation	5	37.00	2.65	21	50.29	8.49	-3.41	.00**
Relationship	5	22.60	3.36	21	19.71	2.39	2.25	.03*

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

Group differences in supervision and security. Relationships between gender, experience with adult corrections, type of youth custody experience and levels of reporting

supervision/security, relationships and support, and treatment variables were explored using Chi-square analyses. There were no significant relationships found among any of the groups and level of reporting discipline or creating a safe environment as part of their role in rehabilitation (see Table A10). Similarly, there were no significant relationships found among any of the groups and level of reporting support, relationships, advocacy/connecting or role modelling (see Table A11). Finally, when asked about their role in rehabilitation, treatment responses included helping youth make different choices and teaching skills to enhance emotion management. Although we do see some variation in responses, there were no significant relationships found between any of our groups and reporting the above treatment aspects of rehabilitation (see Table A12).

Effective Rehabilitation

Participants were asked about their views on the most effective method of rehabilitation for youth in custody. Within these responses, four themes emerged: structure and consistency ($n = 6$), building relationships ($n = 11$), connecting youth to resources and advocating ($n = 2$), and engaging youth in programming ($n = 8$). These themes were separated into the three broad groupings discussed (*Supervision and security, relationships and support, and treatment*) and will be presented in this way below.

Supervision and Security. Participants were asked about what they believe to be the most effective method of rehabilitation for youth in custody. There was one answer that was connected to the idea of supervision and security: structure and consistency. There were no significant differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported structure and consistency and those who did not. Similarly, there was no difference

found on Relationship Scores for those who reported structure and consistency and those who did not (see Table 4.14).

Table 4.14

Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Most Effective Rehab (Structure/Consistency)								
Professional Orientation	6	43.17	9.68	19	36.68	8.23	1.62	.12
Correctional Orientation	6	52.50	10.39	20	46.30	8.79	1.46	.16
Relationship	6	19.00	3.35	20	20.65	2.56	-1.29	.21

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Relationships and Support. When discussing the most effective rehabilitation for youth in custody participants brought up two aspects of relationship building and support. First, they discussed the broad idea of building relationships. This came in the form of some participants mentioning relationships specifically; the idea of getting to know youth as well and sharing with them and talking with them. A female participant with secure custody experience suggested that the best method of rehabilitation was “building genuine relationships with healthy boundaries. Structure, predictability and support” (P. 13). There were no significant differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported relationships and those who did not (see Table 4.15). Similarly, there was no difference found on Relationship Scores for those who reported relationships and those who did not (see table 4.15).

Participants also discussed advocating for youth and working to help connect them to resources to help with reintegration ($n = 2$). Similarly, there were no differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported connecting and

advocating for youth and those who did not (see Table 4.15), and there was no difference found on Relationship Scores for those who reported connecting and advocating and those who did not (see Table 15).

Table 4.15

Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Most Effective Rehab (Relationships)								
Professional Orientation	10	34.60	9.01	15	40.67	8.14	-1.75	.09
Correctional Orientation	11	45.64	7.47	15	49.27	10.49	-.09	.34
Relationship	11	21.09	3.05	15	19.67	2.50	1.31	.20
Most Effective Rehab (Connect/Advocate)								
Professional Orientation	2	37.5	3.54	23	38.30	9.21	-.12	.91
Correctional Orientation	2	36.00	0.00	24	48.71	9.05	-1.95	.06
Relationship	2	19.50	3.54	24	20.33	2.79	-.40	.69

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Treatment. Participants discussed programming as treatment related aspect of rehabilitation that are most effective ($n = 8$). There were no differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported programming for youth and those who did not (see Table 4.16), and was no difference found on Relationship Scores for those who reported programming and those who did not (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16

Summary of t-tests: Most Effective Rehabilitation - Treatment

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Most Effective Rehab (Program)								
Professional Orientation	8	39.38	10.70	17	37.71	8.15	.43	.67
Correctional Orientation	8	48.13	12.24	18	47.56	8.16	.14	.89
Relationship	8	20.38	3.20	18	20.22	2.67	-1.23	.90

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Differences. When asked about their views on the most effective rehabilitation, six participants noted consistency and structure in their response. Although there were no differences found in orientation or relationship scores, there was a statistical relationship between gender and reporting this variable. More males (50%) than females (11.1%) brought up structure and consistency. For example, one male participant with secure and adult noted that the most effective rehabilitation for youth involved “Structure, common sense, and good programing.” (P.9). Chi-square analysis indicated that there was a significant relationship between gender and reporting gender and consistency as part of their approach to their work ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 4.72, p = .03$) (see Table 4.17).

When participants were asked to comment on the most effective method of rehabilitation, two relationship and support responses came up: building relationships with youth and advocating for them and connecting them to resources (see Table A15). Finally, one treatment aspect came up. Participants noted engaging youth in programming as an effective method of rehabilitation (see Table A16). However, there were no significant relationships found between any of our groups and reporting these relationship and support and treatment responses.

Table 4.17

Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Most Effective Rehabilitation

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Most Effective Rehab (Structure/Consistency)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = 4.72$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .03^*$
			$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Escalation

Finally, participants were asked about their interactions with youth in the way that they manage escalated behavior. There was no definition of escalated behavior provided to participants; in general escalation tends to include, becoming loud, rude, inappropriate, aggressive, violent etc. Ten themes emerged within the responses to this question: communicating ($n = 16$), providing support ($n = 7$), being aware of triggers ($n = 10$), removing the other youth ($n = 10$), using de-escalation techniques ($n = 5$), providing time and space ($n = 8$), remaining calm ($n = 7$), being firm and consistent ($n = 3$), utilizing the relationship ($n = 4$), and issuing consequences or removing privileges ($n = 2$). These themes fit into the *supervision/security and relationship/support, and treatment* groups; however, there was also a fourth group *behavioural approaches*. The addition of this fourth group makes sense within the context of the question as participants were being asked how to manage an escalated youth.

Supervision and Security. When asked about managing escalated behaviour, participants provided two responses that fit within the supervision and security category. First, separating the escalated youth from the other youth was mentioned and remaining firm and consistent to manage the situation was also brought up. A female officer with both open and secure experience noted that her approach is to “Remain calm, separate from group, offer space in their rooms to calm down, remind them of expectations and what they need to comply with these. Ensure ample staffing to keep staff and youth safe as risk of violence is always possible” (P. 23). There were no significant differences found on Correctional or Professional Orientation scores for those who reported separating youth and those who did not. Similarly, there was no difference found on Relationship Scores for those who reported separating youth and those who did not (see Table

4.18). Similarly, there were no significant differences found on Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation or Relationship Scores for those who did and did not report remaining firm and consistent with escalated youth (see Table 4.18).

Table 4.18

Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Manage Escalation (Remove)								
Professional Orientation	9	39.78	8.56	16	37.38	9.16	.64	.53
Correctional Orientation	10	50.40	9.61	16	46.06	9.08	1.16	.26
Relationship	10	20.00	3.09	16	20.44	2.66	-.38	.71
Manage Escalation (Firm)								
Professional Orientation	3	37.00	5.20	22	38.41	9.31	-.25	.80
Correctional Orientation	3	47.33	14.50	23	47.78	8.95	-.08	.94
Relationship	3	22.00	1.00	23	20.04	2.87	1.15	.26

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Relationships and Support. When asked about how they manage escalated behaviour, participants noted five strategies that fit within the relationship and support category: communicating with youth, providing support, ensuring they had time and space utilizing their relationship, and remaining calm and non-judgmental. A female youth worker with open custody experience suggested that the “Relationship is the most effective way to manage” (P. 15). There were no significant differences found between those who reported these relationship and support variables and those that did not on Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation scores or Relationship scores (see Table 4.19).

Table 4.19

Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P

Manage Escalation (Communicate)								
Professional Orientation	15	37.07	7.45	10	40.00	10.58	-.81	.43
Correctional Orientation	16	47.13	8.19	10	48.70	11.36	-.41	.69
Relationship	16	20.81	2.74	10	19.40	2.76	1.28	.21
Manage Escalation (Support)								
Professional Orientation	7	33.29	7.91	18	40.17	8.62	-1.83	.08
Correctional Orientation	7	43.57	8.73	19	29.26	9.31	-1.40	.17
Relationship	7	21.71	2.56	19	19.74	2.73	1.67	.11
Manage Escalation (Time/Space)								
Professional Orientation	8	38.50	8.86	17	38.12	9.11	.10	.92
Correctional Orientation	8	46.13	9.82	18	48.44	9.33	-.58	.57
Relationship	8	19.75	2.55	18	20.50	2.92	-.63	.54
Manage Escalation (Relationship)								
Professional Orientation	3	40.33	2.31	22	37.95	9.39	.43	.67
Correctional Orientation	4	51.25	7.27	22	47.09	9.68	.81	.42
Relationship	4	19.75	2.06	22	20.36	2.92	-.40	.69
Manage Escalation (Calm)								
Professional Orientation	6	35.83	9.81	19	39.00	8.67	-.76	.46
Correctional Orientation	7	45.14	6.26	19	48.68	10.23	-.85	.40
Relationship	7	20.71	2.93	19	20.11	2.79	.49	.63

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Treatment. When discussing how they manage escalated behaviour, officers mentioned a variety of strategies, most of which were not connected to treatment; however, one treatment related strategy did come up. Some participants noted trying to understand or recognize the triggers that were associated with the situation and remove or address them if possible. Participant 18, a female with experience in both open and secure facilities noted that she will “redirect to an area where you can let them vent in safety, listen try to figure out triggers to anger”. There were no significant differences found between scores on Professional Orientation or Relationship scores for those who reported looking out for triggers and those who didn’t (see Table 4.20), but there was a significant difference found on Correctional Orientation scores between those who did report looking for triggers and those who did not ($t=1.36$, $p=.03$). Those

individuals who reported providing being aware of triggers as part of their strategy to manage escalated behaviour had significantly lower Correctional Orientation scores than those who did not (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20

Summary of t-tests: Escalation - Treatment

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Manage Escalation (Triggers)								
Professional Orientation	10	35.00	6.86	15	40.40	9.56	-1.54	.14
Correctional Orientation	10	42.70	7.21	16	50.88	9.32	-1.36	.03*
Relationship	10	20.50	2.95	16	20.13	2.75	.33	.75

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Behavioural Approaches. Finally, when asked about how they manage situations where a youth is becoming escalated, participants noted two strategies that didn't fall into any of the three categories discussed thus far. Removing privileges or providing consequences ($n = 2$) and using de-escalation strategies ($n = 5$) were discussed in response to this question, these two strategies are being referred to as behavioural approaches to addressing escalated behaviour. One male participant with both open and secure as well as adult experience noted that "Removal of outings, privileges. Concrete consequences, of which we are not provided many options. When the youth have less restrictions, they lose any incentive to follow staff direction or facility expectations" is how they manage escalated behaviour (P. 25). Although there was no difference found between those who did and did not report providing consequences on Relationship scores (see Table 4.21), there was a significant difference found on Professional ($t = -2.54$, $p = .02$) and Correctional Orientation scores ($t = -2.84$, $p = .01$). Those that reported providing consequences had higher scores on both than those who did not (see Table 4.21). There were no significant differences found between those who did and did not report using de-escalation techniques in

response to youth escalation on Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation, or Relationship scores (see Table 4.21).

Table 4.21

Summary of t-tests: Escalation – Behavioural Approaches

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Manage Escalation (Consequences)								
Professional Orientation	2	52.00	12.73	23	37.04	7.70	2.54	.02*
Correctional Orientation	2	63.50	2.12	24	46.42	8.44	2.84	.01*
Relationship	2	18.5	4.95	24	20.42	2.65	-.94	.36
Manage Escalation (Techniques)								
Professional Orientation	4	39.50	3.42	21	38.00	9.58	.31	.76
Correctional Orientation	5	45.40	5.64	21	48.29	10.06	-.61	.55
Relationship	5	19.00	2.55	21	20.57	2.80	-1.14	.26

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Differences. When asked about their approach to managing escalated behaviour, participants discussed supervision and security responses. Three participants noted remaining firm and consistent while ten noted the need to remove the escalated individual from other youth. Chi-square analysis indicated that there was a significant relationship between the type of facility participants have worked in and levels of reporting removing escalated youth from others ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 6.85, p = .03$) with those having open custody experience only being less apt to report removing youth. There were no other significant relationships found between our and security/supervision responses (see Table A16).

As mentioned above, five relationship and support responses were found in the comments that participants made on how they manage escalated behaviour. Chi-square analysis indicated that of these responses, there was a significant relationship between gender and level of reporting

that they remain calm and/or non-judgmental while managing escalated behaviour ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 4.26$, $p = .04$, $\phi = .41$) female participants reporting this at greater levels than males, in fact, nearly 40% of female participants mentioned this strategy while none of the male participants did. Female participant 13 noted that her approach is to “remain calm and in control, allow for venting and be supportive”. There were no other significant relationships found between gender, experience and type of facility worked in and reporting relationship and support variables (see Table A14). There was one treatment oriented response, removing triggers, and two behaviour management responses: using techniques to de-escalate youth as well as providing consequences for escalated behaviour. There were no differences among reporting these treatment or behaviour management variables for any of the three groups (see Table A15).

The above analyses indicate that when officers are asked about their interactions with youth, their responses fall within four general categories of interactions (*supervision and security, relationships and support, treatment and behavioral* approaches). It is also shown that there are some differences on the three scales, Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation and Relationships, for those that do report specific variables and those that do not. Finally, there are relationships between group membership (gender, experience with adult corrections and type of custody experience) and levels of reporting some variables.

Views on Relationships

The final area of interest in this study was to explore how participants view relationships with youth. Specifically of interest are participants’ thoughts about whether or not there is a place for relationships with youth in a custody setting, what the ideal youth-officer relationship might look like, and the benefits and concerns around relationships with youth. Statistical

analyses were conducted to determine if there were any differences in orientation and relationship scores for those who report various aspects of relationships and those that do not. Further Chi-square analyses were conducted to look at relationships between levels of reporting each variable and group membership. Finally, whether or not there were any significant correlations between participants Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation, Relationship scores and their scores for each Officer Type (Loner, Hardliner, Rule Enforcer, People Worker and Synthetic).

Is There a Place for Youth-Officer Relationships in a Custody Setting?

Participants were asked whether or not they believe there is a place for the development of working relationships between officers and youth in a custody setting. Twenty-two (81.5%) of participants noted that there is a place for relationships and 4 (14.8%) noted that they did not know, none of the participants said that there was *not* a place for relationships. There were no significant differences found between scores on Correctional Orientation or Relationship scales for those who reported that they did feel there was a place for relationships and those who were not sure (see Table 4.22), but there was a significant difference found on Professional Orientation scores between those who reported that there was a place for relationships and those who did not know ($t=-2.80, p=.01$). Those who did not know if there was a place for relationships with youth had significantly higher scores on Professional orientation than those who thought there was a place for relationships (see Table 4.22).

Table 4.22

Summary of t-tests: Place for Relationships

Yes	Don't Know	t-test
-----	------------	--------

Variable	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Place for Relationships								
Professional Orientation	21	36.33	7.65	4	48.25	8.77	2.80	.01*
Correctional Orientation	22	46.73	9.10	4	53.25	9.98	1.30	.21
Relationship	22	20.68	2.71	4	18.00	2.16	-1.86	.08

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

When looking at the three groups within the sample (gender, adult corrections experience and type of custody facility) there was a relationship found between experience and level of reporting ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 9.47, p = .00, \phi = .60$). Those who had adult corrections experience were more apt to note that they did not know if there was a place for relationships with youth in custody than those who have only worked with youth (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.23

Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Facility Type and Place for Relationships

Variable	Yes	Don't Know	Chi-Square
Place for Relationships			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 9.47$
Youth Only	20 (95.2)	1 (4.8)	$p = .00^{**}$
Both	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)	$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

When asked to explain their answer, a number of reasons for making a place for relationships emerged, although none of the participants who responded “don’t know” elaborated. The explanations for feeling that there is a place for relationships with youth included: modelling healthy relationships ($n=5$), relationships help you get to know youth ($n=5$), it helps to build trust and respect ($n=5$), and relationships are essential/important ($n=7$). Additionally, four participants discussed the concept of ensuring appropriate boundaries within these relationships.

One male participant with open custody and adult experience noted there is a place for relationships with youth because “In order for a youth to want to make positive changes in their life you have to connect with them in a professional but friendly manner” (P. 22). A second male participant with open custody and adult experience shared that there is a place for relationships because “Positive rapport and healthy relationships will always get better results than negative ones” (P.19). Similarly, a female participant with secure custody and adult experience suggested that “[relationships are] essential for authentic growth” (P. 13).

Independent samples t-tests indicated that overall there were no significant differences on Correctional Orientation or Professional Orientation and that for most variables no significant differences on Relationships scores between those who did and did not report various reasons for the importance of building relationships (see Table 4.24). There was, however, one significant difference found. Those participants who reported that relationships are essential or important had significantly higher Relationship scores than those who did not cite this as an explanation for there being a place for relationships with youth ($t=-2.69, p=.01$).

Table 4.24

Summary of t-tests: Place for Relationships – Reasons

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Place for Relationships (Model Healthy Relationships)								
Professional Orientation	4	33.5	7.14	21	39.14	9.00	-1.18	.25
Correctional Orientation	5	45.60	10.21	21	48.24	9.32	-.56	.58
Relationship	5	19.2	2.59	21	20.52	2.81	-.96	.35
Place for Relationships (Get to Know Youth)								
Professional Orientation	5	40.60	8.44	20	37.65	9.06	.66	.52
Correctional Orientation	5	47.00	8.40	20	47.90	9.74	-.19	.85
Relationship	5	21.40	2.30	20	20.00	2.84	1.01	.32

Place for Relationships (Build Respect/Trust)								
Professional Orientation	5	32.00	6.75	21	39.80	8.75	-1.85	.08
Correctional Orientation	5	41.40	6.54	21	49.24	9.39	-1.75	.09
Relationship	5	21.60	2.30	21	19.95	2.84	1.20	.24
Place for Relationships (Essential/Important)								
Professional Orientation	7	32.86	9.93	18	40.33	7.69	-2.01	.06
Correctional Orientation	7	44.86	7.86	19	48.79	9.81	-.95	.35
Relationship	7	22.43	2.44	19	19.47	2.50	2.69	.01*
Place for Relationships (Boundaries)								
Professional Orientation	4	35.25	8.96	21	38.81	8.93	-.73	.47
Correctional Orientation	4	49	10.71	22	47.5	9.34	.29	.77
Relationship	4	19.50	3.11	22	20.41	2.77	-.59	.61

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Differences in Reasons for Building Relationships. There were no relationships found between level of reporting any of the reasons explaining participants support for making a place for relationships with youth and any of our groups (gender, adult experience, and facility experience; see Table A21).

What Does an Ideal Relationship Look like?

Participants were asked what an ideal youth-Youth Services Officer relationship would look like. Of the 27 participants, 22 (81.5%) answered this question. Five types of responses were provided by participants; Relationships should be supportive/caring/trusting ($n=17$), should include respect ($n=10$), should have boundaries ($n=11$), should be predictable ($n=4$) and should model healthy relationships ($n=2$). For example, participant 2, a female with open custody experience, noted that the ideal relationship includes “the ability to establish rapport, supportive, great communication skills, empathy skills, ability to establish professional boundaries”.

Although there were no significant differences found between Correctional Orientation or

relationship scores and reporting any of the variables, there was one significant difference found for Professional Orientation Scores (see Table 2.25). Participants who reported that an ideal relationship with a youth would look like a model of a healthy relationship had significantly lower scores than those who did not ($t=2.30, p=.03$).

The responses of youth workers here indicate that there is some interest and understanding of the value of developing effective relationships with youth. As noted earlier, the definition of an effective relationship for this study was “a pattern of purposeful and professional interactions with youth that fosters mutual respect and encouragement, that acts as a tool for staff to aid in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts”. Officers in this study recognized the importance of being professional in their interactions with youth, providing support that aids in treatment and rehabilitation, and recognized that developing trust is an essential aspect of relationship development.

Table 4.25

Summary of t-tests: Ideal Relationship with Youth

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Ideal Relationships (Support)								
Professional Orientation	16	36.75	8.53	5	41.60	12.72	-.99	.34
Correctional Orientation	17	46.12	7.87	5	50.20	11.90	-.91	.37
Relationship	17	20.76	2.68	5	20.20	3.42	.39	.70
Ideal Relationships (Respect)								
Professional Orientation	10	38.30	4.79	11	37.55	12.72	.18	.86
Correctional Orientation	10	48.40	7.89	12	45.92	9.67	.65	.52
Relationship	10	21.20	1.75	12	20.17	3.43	.91	.38
Ideal Relationships (Boundaries)								
Professional Orientation	11	38.27	11.90	10	37.50	6.74	.18	.86
Correctional Orientation	11	46.27	11.48	11	47.82	5.40	-.40	.69

Relationship	11	20.64	2.84	11	20.64	2.87	-.00	1.00
Ideal Relationships (Model)								
Professional Orientation	2	24.50	4.95	19	39.32	8.84	-2.30	.03*
Correctional Orientation	2	36.50	3.54	20	48.10	8.48	-1.88	.08
Relationship	2	21.50	4.95	20	20.55	2.68	.45	.66
Ideal Relationships (Predictable)								
Professional Orientation	4	44.25	11.76	17	36.41	8.71	1.52	.14
Correctional Orientation	4	52.25	8.77	18	45.89	8.61	1.33	.20
Relationship	4	20.25	3.77	18	20.72	2.65	-.30	.77

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Differences in Ideal Relationships. Chi-square analysis indicated that males are more apt to report the ideal relationship as being predictable than females ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 4.20, p = .04, \phi = -.44$). It was also found that those with adult custody experience are more apt to report the ideal relationship as being predictable than those with youth only experience ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 5.49, p = .02, V = .50$; see Table 4.26). Although the relationship between adult experience and noting support as part of the ideal relationship was approaching significance, there were no other relationships found between level of reporting any of the descriptions of ideal relationships with youth and any of our groups (gender, adult experience, and facility experience), (see Table A22).

Table 4.26

Summary of Chi-Square: Relationship Between Gender and Ideal Relationships

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Ideal Relationships (Predictable)			
Male	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$\chi^2 = 4.20$
Female	1 (6.7)	14 (93.3)	$p = .04^*$
			$n = 22$
Adult/Youth	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$\chi^2 = 5.49$
Youth Only	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)	$p = .02^*$
			$n = 22$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

What are the Benefits and Concerns with Relationships?

Benefits of Relationships. Participants were asked to comment on both the benefits of relationships with youth as well as any concerns that might be connected with the development of these relationships. When asked about the benefits of these relationships six responses emerged: there's a positive impact on the job (work is safer/easier/better, $n=13$), it helps to motivate them toward goals ($n=9$), it builds trust ($n=6$), it builds respect ($n=5$), teaching healthy relationships ($n=4$), and youth feel supported ($n=4$). A female youth worker with both open and secure custody experience shared the following with regard to benefits "It's all benefits! The youth will be more motivated to work towards their goals, they'll be more respectful, my shift will be easier because they'll be better behaved, I'll feel more fulfilled because the kids will come to me for help, I'll be in a better position to actually provide that help because the kids will already trust that I have their best interests at heart. Honestly, the benefits are too numerous to list; I can't imagine doing this job without having a positive working relationship with the youth" (P. 7).

Independent samples t-tests indicated that there were no differences on Correctional Orientation scores for those who did and did not cite any of the benefit variables (see Table 4.27). It was, however found that Relationship scores differed for two groups. Those who cited teaching healthy relationships as a benefit had significantly lower Relationship scores than those who did not ($t=-2.63, p=.01$); additionally, participants who cited youth building motivation as a benefit had significantly higher Relationship scores than those who did not ($t=3.78, p=.00$; see Table 4.27 for means and standard deviations). There were also two differences found on Professional Orientation scores. Those who cited youth building motivation as a benefit had significantly lower Professional Orientation scores than those who did not ($t=2.44, p=.02$); additionally, participants noted that the youth feel support as a result of relationships as a benefit

had significantly higher Professional Orientation scores than those who did not ($t=2.44, p=.02$; see Table 4.27).

Table 4.27

Summary of t-tests: Benefits of Relationships with Youth

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Benefits (Healthy Relationships)								
Professional Orientation	4	42.25	14.31	21	37.48	7.70	.99	.33
Correctional Orientation	4	49.50	14.20	22	47.41	8.63	.40	.70
Relationship	4	17.25	1.71	22	20.82	2.59	-2.63	.01*
Benefits (Positive Impacts)								
Professional Orientation	13	39.38	6.79	12	37.00	10.83	.67	.51
Correctional Orientation	13	50.69	9.02	13	44.77	9.03	1.67	.11
Relationship	13	20.92	2.25	13	19.62	3.18	1.21	.24
Benefits (Respect)								
Professional Orientation	5	38.20	10.18	20	38.25	8.78	-.01	.99
Correctional Orientation	5	47.60	7.47	21	47.76	9.90	-.03	.97
Relationship	5	20.60	2.70	21	20.19	2.86	.29	.77
Benefits (Motivation)								
Professional Orientation	9	33.00	7.52	16	41.19	8.33	-2.44	.02*
Correctional Orientation	9	43.11	9.41	17	50.18	8.59	-1.93	.07
Relationship	9	22.56	1.81	17	19.06	2.44	3.78	.00**
Benefits (Support)								
Professional Orientation	4	43.00	1.63	21	37.33	9.39	2.57	.02*
Correctional Orientation	4	55.00	6.78	22	46.41	9.25	1.76	.09
Relationship	4	19.75	2.99	22	20.36	2.80	-.40	.69
Benefits (Trust)								
Professional Orientation	6	40.17	6.82	19	37.63	9.48	.60	.55
Correctional Orientation	6	50.33	7.58	20	46.95	9.85	.77	.45
Relationship	6	21.33	1.97	20	19.95	2.95	1.07	.29

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

Group Differences in Benefits of Relationships. There were no relationships found between level of reporting any of the benefits of relationships variables and any of our groups (gender, adult experience, and facility experience; see Table A23).

Concerns with Relationships. When asked about the concerns with building relationships with youth twenty-three participants entered a response; of those who answered, 15 reported that there were no concerns with developing relationships with youth. The four concerns that were mentioned were: blurring boundaries ($n=12$), it can be hard when youth are released ($n=5$), it can lead to favouritism ($n=3$), and manipulation by youth ($n=2$). For example, two female youth workers with open custody experience noted that concerns for them included “remembering roles. Make sure you maintain clear boundaries and don't be manipulated” (P. 8) and “[Staff] need to be aware of professional boundaries, you are a helper, not a friend” (P. 17).

Independent samples t-tests indicated that there were no significant differences on Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation, or Relationships scores for those who cited concerns and those who noted that there were no, there were also no differences found between those who did and didn't report any of the individual; concern variables (see Table 4.28).

Table 4.28

Summary of t-tests: Concerns with Relationships

Variable	Yes			No			t-test	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	t	P
Concerns (None)								
Professional Orientation	7	36.00	7.44	15	38.87	10.32	-.66	.52
Correctional Orientation	8	49.75	8.65	15	45.67	9.73	.99	.33
Relationship	8	21.50	3.02	15	19.73	2.76	1.41	.17
Concerns (Manipulate)								
Professional Orientation	2	39.50	7.78	20	37.80	9.72	.24	.81
Correctional Orientation	2	45.50	17.68	21	47.24	8.99	-.25	.81
Relationship	2	20.00	1.41	21	20.38	3.04	-.17	.87
Concerns (Boundaries)								
Professional Orientation	12	37.92	11.37	10	38.00	6.98	-.02	.98
Correctional Orientation	12	45.25	9.87	11	49.09	8.83	-.98	.34
Relationship	12	19.92	2.81	11	20.82	3.09	-.73	.47
Concerns (Hard)								
Professional Orientation	5	38.20	10.18	17	37.88	9.51	.07	.95

Correctional Orientation	5	47.00	7.25	18	47.11	10.08	-.02	.98
Relationship	5	19.20	2.95	18	20.67	2.91	-.99	.33
Concerns (Favouritism)								
Professional Orientation	3	44.33	5.13	19	36.95	9.62	1.28	.21
Correctional Orientation	3	49.33	11.59	20	46.75	9.32	.44	.67
Relationship	3	20.00	1.73	20	20.40	3.08	-.28	.83

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Differences in Concerns of Relationships. There were no relationships found between level of reporting any of the concerns of relationships variables and any of our groups (gender, adult experience, and facility experience; see Table A24).

Is There a Relationships Between Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation or Officer Type and Relationship Scores?

The results above indicate that none of the officers reported that there was no place for relationships with youth in a custody facility, but there were those who were also not willing to say that there *was* a place for relationships. These results indicate that there may be varying levels of tolerance for, or comfort with, developing relationships with the youth in their care. To further investigate the possible connections between orientation and endorsement of relationships, correlation analyses were conducted to explore the relationships between these variables. The correlations indicate that there is a significant, positive relationship between Professional orientation and Correctional Orientation ($r = .74$, $p = .00$), as scores on Professional Orientation increase so do scores on Correctional Orientation. Additionally, there were significant, negative correlations between Relationship scores and Professional ($r = -.68$, $p = .00$) and Correctional ($r = -.41$, $p = .04$) Orientation scores (see Table 4.29). As scores on the Orientation scales increased, participants scores on the Relationship scale decreased.

Table 4.29

Correlations – Orientation and Relationships

Variable	Correctional	
	Orientation	Relationship
Professional Orientation	.74**	-.68**
Correctional Orientation		-.41*
Relationship		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

As mentioned previously, officers were assigned an officer type based on their score on the Typology Scale (see Table 4.2). Of interest was whether or not there was a relationship between officer type and Orientation and Relationship Scores. A one-way between subjects ANOVA indicated that although there were no differences on the Professional or Correctional Orientation scores among our officer types (see Table 4.30), there was a significant difference found on Relationships Scores ($F_{(2,21)}=3.86, p=.04$). A Bonferroni post hoc analysis indicated that People Workers have a significantly higher Relationship score than Loners, with a mean difference of 3.37, (see Table 4.31).

Table 4.30

ANOVA: Differences in orientation or Relationships and Officer type

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Professional Orientation	Between Groups	402.130	2	3.26	3.26	.06
	Within Groups	1233.175	20			
	Total	1635.304	22			
Correctional Orientation	Between Groups	53.337	2	.29	.29	.76
	Within Groups	1967.621	21			
	Total	2020.958	23			
Relationship	Between Groups	49.921	2	3.86	3.89	.04*
	Within Groups	135.913	21			
	Total	185.833	23			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4.31*Multiple Comparisons - Bonferroni*

Dependent Variable	Officer Type	Officer Type	Mean Difference	<i>p</i>
Toch and Klofas total	People Worker	Synthetic	-7.03	.272
		Loner	-9.60	.074
	Synthetic	People Worker	7.03	.272
		Loner	-2.57	1.00
	Loner	People Worker	9.60	.074
		Synthetic	2.57	1.00
Correctional Orientation Score total	People Worker	Synthetic	-3.49	1.00
		Loner	-2.25	1.00
	Synthetic	People Worker	3.49	1.00
		Loner	1.23	1.00
	Loner	People Worker	2.25	1.00
		Synthetic	-1.23	1.00
Relationship total score	People Worker	Synthetic	2.47	.176
		Loner	3.37	.047*
	Synthetic	People Worker	-2.47	.176
		Loner	.89	1.00
	Loner	People Worker	-3.37	.047*
		Synthetic	-.89	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter will outline the main findings of this project as well as their implications. It must be noted that owing to the small sample size, the findings of this work must be viewed as an introduction to this topic. The results indicate that further research into youth correctional officer work is warranted. It is hoped that these exploratory results will act as a starting point to understanding this unique role and will act as a call to future research in an underexplored field.

Study Aims

This research aimed to develop an understanding of how youth correctional officers view their work and their responsibilities, as well as their views on their interactions with youth as part of their work, and how they view relationships with the youth in their care. It also aimed to assess participants' correctional orientation, officer type and endorsement for relationship development with youth. Any relationships among these variables were explored in order to gain insight and understanding into youth correctional officer work. The literature available on these topics is sparse in the field of youth justice in Ontario. The research that is available in these areas is typically from an adult corrections population or from other countries where the youth justice philosophy is quite different from Canada, and thus makes the information difficult to generalize to work in Ontario.

The information collected in this study was used to identify any differences in youth workers and their correctional orientation and relationship development with youth. Using various groupings (e.g., gender and work experience) the data was explored to identify any differences in these groups of workers and their orientation toward their work and views on relationships. As mentioned, there is a general lack of research in youth correctional officer work, and particularly

a lack of Canadian research in this area. The current study aimed to offer a starting point to fill this gap.

Main Findings

Several notable findings emerged from the data. First, there are some indications of differences in thoughts around security and supervision based on type of youth custody experience. Second, in this limited sample, the Farkas (2000) typology doesn't seem to fit as well as it does with adult correctional workers. Third, there are general trends that identify possible differences in orientation and relationship scores for those who see treatment as part of their role in rehabilitation and those who do not. Finally, exploratory results with a small sample indicate that there may be differences in how those with experience in adult corrections facilities approach and talk about their work compared to those with youth only experience.

Type of Youth Custody Experience

There were no differences found on Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation or Relationship scores for those with experience in open custody, secure custody or both facility types. There were however, some notable relationships between these groups and how they see supervision and security as part of their work. Those who have only worked in an open custody facility did not mention security at all as part of their work responsibilities, where both other groups did. Similarly, where all of the secure group and about half of the group with experience in both settings mentioned consistency as part of their approach to their job, only 12.5% of those in the open group mentioned this. Finally, as part of their typical day, only 6.3% of the open group mentioned behaviour management whereas the majority of the other two groups noted this task as part of their typical day. These differences may be connected to the individual's personal

views on what correctional work should involve and may lead to officers choosing the work that best suits their approach.

Similar to the job descriptions above, we can see a difference in the postings for secure and open custody youth work. The posting for a direct operated, secure custody position notes that “you support and deliver programs and services in custody/detention facilities intended to keep youth active and engaged, focus on specific risks and needs of youth related to reoffending, teach new skills, keep youth safe, resolve conflict and help youth make better choices upon their return to the community” (Ontario Public Service, 2019). Whereas the description for youth custody and detention worker (either an open facility or transfer payment secure facility) notes that they will “Provide direct and on-going therapeutic supervision and care to residents including but not limited to: basic daily care of residents, including health care and safety, behaviour management of residents through cognitive behavioural methods, modeling, positive reinforcement, utilizing therapeutic relationship and education, group work and individualized case management planning, work cooperatively as part of a team” (Kennedy House Youth Services, 2021). Using this as a starting point, it provides insight into the philosophy and the culture of the varying youth justice environments.

It would be useful to review the policies and procedures as well as the training materials of the varying types of custody facilities to develop an understanding of where the differences of focus on supervision and security might come from. A recent study by Ricciardelli et al. (2019) asked Canadian youth correctional officers about their work in secure custody facilities. One of their findings noted that officers in secure facilities perceive the youth as being less violent and less disruptive than youth under the YOA, but that their offences are more aggressive. It is

possible that this view of youth in secure custody leads to a natural heightened sense of the need for increased security and supervision for those working in secure facilities.

Officer Typology

When exploring typology, none of the participants in this study were categorized as hardliners or rule enforcers. These are the officers that Farkas (1999) noted as rigid and rule-bound, they may act in aggressive ways toward inmates and view them negatively. There are a few possibilities as to why none of the participants in this study identified with those officer types. First, it is important to consider any possible effects of social desirability. Although the survey was anonymous, some participants may have been hesitant to acknowledge and report their more negative feelings toward the youth in their care. Another possibility is that the youth custody environment is not one that fits well with individuals who identify as hardliners and rule enforcers. There is literature to suggest that the climates of adult and youth facilities are different and that adult facilities tend to center on security where youth facilities focus on rehabilitation (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2017). Perhaps those with a harder approach are drawn to adult facilities with a similar philosophy. There may be an effect of the experience importation model (Cullen et al. 1993; Farkas, 1999; Jurik, 1985; Lambert et al., 2004) where individuals' personal factors and experiences influence their approach to their work, and possibly the workplaces that they are drawn to.

Additionally, the Farkas (1999) study looked at a sample of adult correctional officers and utilized thematic analysis to develop groups. In the current study participants were youth correctional workers and completed a Likert scale survey designed to assess officer type using Farkas' results as a guide. As mentioned above, there are differences in the culture of adult and

youth institutions and as such it is reasonable to assume that rule enforcer and hardliner types may be more drawn to an adult, more institutionalized and militaristic setting than a youth facility. These differences in findings between the current study and the Farkas' study could also indicate that the scale developed for this study could use some adjustment. It would be useful to ask similar qualitative questions that Farkas' asked as well as have the participants complete the scale to validate the qualitative responses and quantitative measure.

Orientation, Relationships and Youth Worker's Role in Rehabilitation for Youth

Building relationships and providing support to youth in custody facilities were concepts that were endorsed to varying degrees by the participants in this study, with some leaning more toward a custody or security approach than others. There were some differences in group membership and orientation toward treatment. Males and females differed on both the orientation scales, with females scoring further toward the treatment orientation. Males and females also differed in their reporting of providing support to youth as part of their duties and responsibilities at work. Females mentioned providing support in their free responses more often than males. Similar results were found in a study of adult correctional officers in the US. Tewksbury and Ehrhardt Mustaine (2008) found that female staff were more supportive of rehabilitation in general than male staff. Further investigation into these differences, especially with a larger sample size, could lead to valuable insights.

Differences were found in Correctional Orientation, Professional Orientation and Relationship scores for those who discussed treatment aspects of the job, such as teaching skills to manage emotions and helping youth to build motivation to change. These exploratory results show that those who mentioned these treatment aspects as part of their day-to-day work were

more treatment oriented and showed greater endorsement for building relationships with youth. Notably, these differences were not found in the mention of programming, a quite typical conduit for treatment. It may be that engaging in programming with youth is not a choice for many of these participants, but a required aspect of their job; however, engaging youth in the process of building motivation and helping with emotion management could be something that an officer *chooses* to do outside of program requirements. These are the treatment aspects of custody that occur in everyday interactions; they are by-products of teachable moments that officers can choose to engage in or not.

Although participants were not asked about relationships specifically when inquiring about their role in rehabilitation and their approach to their work, all but one of the participants reported building relationships or providing support as part of their approach to their work or as part of their role in rehabilitation. Similar results were found in a study by Ricciardelli et al. (2019), who found that Canadian officers felt that the shift from the YOA to the YCJA has allowed them more time to develop these relationships with youth and that from their perspective, these relationships are valued by the youth in their care.

Even the participant in the current study who did not note relationships with youth in the open-ended questions reported, when asked directly, they reported that they felt there is a place for relationships with youth in their work. This is an important clue to the philosophy of youth correctional workers, as it points to the value of relationships with youth in everyday work. Similarly, a review of open detention and custody settings in Ontario in 2006 found that in 80% of the facilities they reviewed the youth felt that most of the staff cared about them (Cooke & Finlay, 2007). This suggests that staff and youth may have a shared experience of the value of

relationships in open custody facilities and shows support for the relationship custody approach from both perspectives. If most youth workers inherently understand the value of relationships and providing support, which arguably cannot be done without using the relationship as an intermediary, it is possible to leverage this understanding to foster a more relationship-oriented approach to youth custody work. It is important to explore these same perspectives in secure custody facilities in Ontario.

Adult vs. Youth Only Experience

Taking a closer look at the differences in those with adult corrections experience and those without, there were differences in their scores on the Professional Orientation, Correctional Orientation and Relationship scales. Although these results must be interpreted with caution as there were only 5 participants with adult experience, the trends are noteworthy. There is a general trend toward a treatment orientation for all participants in this study, however those with youth only experience lean farther toward a treatment orientation than those with adult experience. The Relationship scale results also indicate that those with youth only experience have higher endorsements for building relationships with youth than those with adult corrections experience.

There were also differences in the way that these two groups talk about their work. Participants with adult corrections experience cited programming most often as an effective method of rehabilitation where those without adult experience noted relationships as effective rehabilitation most often in their responses. The differing perspectives of those with adult corrections experience and those without may provide further insight into the differences found on the orientation scales. These differences may be due to the varying philosophies and

approaches taken in adult and youth facilities. Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali (2017) note that there are differences in the climate of youth and adult facilities, with youth custody offering a kinder tone and a focus on rehabilitation whereas adult facilities focus on security and order.

Additionally, the messaging to youth versus adult officers varies even from the first step in the career, applying for a job. In the job description for a correctional officer in Ontario, included is this statement on the work: “duties vary and include supervision of inmate activities and control of their movement throughout the institution” (Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2021), whereas a similar job ad for a transfer payment youth custody facility notes work responsibilities as “Provide direct and on-going therapeutic supervision and care to residents” (Kennedy House Youth Services, 2021). Note here the difference in language and tone in the two ads, one leaning much more toward treatment and the other to supervision and security.

Contribution to Youth Justice Literature

There are notable contributions to the literature that arise from this project. First, this project adds to the limited research in the area of youth correctional work in Canada. This information provides insight into Canadian youth workers views on relationships, orientation and their approach to their work, an area with very little previous data to draw on. Next, the results appear to indicate that there may be some differences in the attitudes of youth correctional officers. Namely, those with adult corrections experience and those with secure custody youth experience may approach their work from a different perspective or philosophy than those without adult or secure youth experience. This can provide insight into hiring practices that align with the values and mission of an organization. It can also provide direction for training officers who may be transitioning from one type of facility or population to another.

Additionally, there seems to be a connection between correctional orientation and views on relationships with youth. Although all of the participants in this study expressed an understanding of the value of building relationships with youth at least once in their survey, it was found that those who have a more treatment-oriented attitude toward their work are more apt to believe in the importance of relationships with youth. When hiring staff to work with youth within a Relationship Custody model, this information provides insight into how to identify those who are more open to this approach and where to target training efforts. It may not be enough to educate youth workers in the benefits of relationships, training may need to be coupled with an effort to shift custody-oriented workers toward a more treatment styled approach to their work overall.

Additionally, it would be important to consider the implications that this work can have on the youth that are incarcerated in Ontario. Having a better understanding of the approach that youth workers take to their work with youth can help to implement relevant policies, procedures, and training to mediate some of the negative implications of imprisonment. If youth workers can be taught to approach youth with a relationship lens, they may be better equipped to help youth with aspects of imprisonment such as adjustment, development of skills and reintegration. Youth may be able to make important connections with well-intentioned adults who can assist them to develop the confidence and ability to reorient themselves in society and in their relationships outside of the facility.

Limitations

This research is not without limitations. In addition to the limitations noted throughout this document regarding the limited access to participants (e.g., not having access to secure custody

facilities) and the inability for the research to take place in the intended format (in-person interviews), there are some other limitations to this work. Although the study was sent out via multiple platforms and likely reached many youth workers email inboxes, there is a small sample size in this study. It is possible that there are a number of factors that reduced participants interest in taking part in a study of this nature during the time of data collection. As noted above, there have been many changes in the youth justice system in Ontario over the last couple of years with facility closures and funding cuts, anecdotal evidence suggests that youth workers are concerned with losing their jobs and may have their focus in areas other than research. With rich qualitative data a sample of this size would not be a concern, however, this data was collected electronically and there was no opportunity for discussion and further probing of responses which lead to less fulsome data. The ability to explore the data quantitatively was also reduced as the sample size made many analyses inaccessible and others underpowered. Additionally, the fact that participants in this study were lacking diversity (i.e., the majority of the participants were female, white, and from open custody facilities), means that the generalizability of the data is constrained. This limitation could be connected to the sampling technique used. It should be acknowledged that snowball sampling can be linked to a sample that lacks in diversity and as a result, validity of the findings. In the future, it would be useful to recruit youth workers directly from all youth custody facilities in Ontario to ensure that everyone has equal access to the study.

In addition to the above noted limitations, the qualitative data collected for this project was not as rich as had been expected with the original methodology. It was expected that there would be nearly 100 in person interviews conducted for this study (25 from each of four secure custody locations). As such, more qualitative data is needed in this area. However, the qualitative data that was collected, provides insight into what general themes may be present in a larger sample.

There are indicators that qualitative data collected via semi-structured interviews could be rich and may lead to further insight into the issue.

Future Directions

As noted above, one of the major limitations to this study was the sample, both in size and diversity. In order to complete a comparative analysis between the beliefs and approaches of those who work in secure and open custody facilities it is imperative that there be a better sample of youth workers in secure facilities. Additionally, it is likely that there are differences between the operational policies and procedures between secure custody facilities operated by the ministry and transfer payment agencies that may influence the way youth workers approach their jobs. Although there was an indication in the data that there are some differences between participants with secure vs. open custody experience, it is possible that these differences would be more noteworthy if there were also a sample of youth workers from direct operated facilities, which was not possible in the current study.

To better understand the various officer types in the youth justice system it may be useful to conduct a mixed-methods study that explores using an in-depth semi-structured interview with officers how they approach their work using Farkas' (1999) study as guide. This interview coupled with the scale used in the current study may offer more insight into the officer types in youth custody and whether they are similar to those in the adult system. It would also provide a better opportunity to validate the Typology scale used in this study as it could be cross referenced with the qualitative results.

Finally, it does appear that those with a history working in adult corrections and those with secure custody experience may have some differences in how they approach their work and

how they view their responsibilities. It would be useful for future research to explore the similarities/differences between adult correctional worker attitudes and secure youth worker attitudes. It would also be relevant to explore with youth workers in secure facilities what led them to a career in youth justice rather than adult corrections. It is possible that there are circumstances that led them to a youth facility, or an open rather than secure facility, even though it may not have been their first choice as a career option. There is evidence to suggest that officers move around within the system based on where the need is, and not necessarily where they prefer to work. For example, the recent closure of Brookside Youth Centre in Cobourg, Ontario had the union negotiating exit/transfer options for the staff (Davis, 2021). In these situations, youth workers may be transferred to similar facilities with different values or philosophies. Since the closure of Brookside, 26 more youth custody facilities in Ontario have been scheduled to close on April 30, 2021 (Artuso, 2021). With these shifts in structure and displacement of youth workers across Ontario, having a better understanding of the orientations and beliefs of youth workers is paramount.

Conclusion

Owing to the lack of literature on youth justice in Canada, this study provides much needed insight into the orientations, and approaches of youth workers in Ontario. This project brought to light some of the differing views of workers based on adult and youth corrections experiences as well as differing approaches to the work in general, and varied beliefs on the value of relationships with youth in custody. In the current and ever changing youth justice environment, it is important to continue to gather rich data on youth officer work and update and modify policy and procedure to ensure that evidence-based best practice is not overridden by

personal values and beliefs. Most officers in this study entered the field out of a desire to help youth. Future work needs to harness that desire to help, educate youth workers on how to best do that, and provide the supervision and oversight to ensure that youth are provided with the best quality care; the very care that youth workers want to provide.

References

- Adler, A. (1992). *What life could mean to you*. Boston, MA: Little Brown (1931).
- Adler, A. (2011). *Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind*. (J. Linton and R. Vaughn Trans.) Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing (1938).
- Adorjan, M., & Ricciardelli, R. (2018). The Last Bastion of Rehabilitation: Contextualizing Youth Correctionalism in Canada. *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.)*, 98(6), 655–677. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518811807>
- Annison, J., Eadie, T., & Knight, C. (2008). People first: Probation officer perspectives on probation work. *Probation Journal*, 55, 259-271.
- Artuso, A. (2021, March 2). Ontario closing 26 youth jails: Government source. *Toronto Sun*. Retrieved March 19, 2021, from <https://torontosun.com/news/provincial/ontario-closes-26-youth-jails-government-source>
- Bala, N. C. (2004). *Canadian child welfare law: Children, families, and the state*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Pub.
- Bala, N., Carrington, P.J., & Roberts, J.V. (2009). Evaluating the youth criminal justice act after five years: A qualified study. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51(2), 131-167.
- Bazemore, G. and Dicker, T. J. (1994). Explaining detention worker orientation: Individual characteristics, occupational conditions, and organizational environment. *Prison Journal*, 76(1), 297-311.
- Bazemore, G., T. J. Dicker & H. Al-Gadheeb. (1994). The treatment ideal and detention reality: Demographic, professional/occupational and organizational influence on detention worker punitiveness. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 22-41.

- Becoming a correctional officer. (2020, November 4). Retrieved March 22, 2021, from https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/corr_serv/careers_in_corr/become_corr_off/careers_corr_become_off.html
- Bhola, P., & Kapur, M. (2013). The development and role of the therapeutic alliance in supportive psychotherapy with adolescents. *Psychological Studies*, 58(3), 207- 215.
- Blau, J. R., Light, S. C., & Chamlin, M. (1986). Individual and Contextual Effects on Stress and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Prison Staff. *Work and Occupations*, 13(1), 131-156.
- Bordin, E. S., (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 16(3), 252-260.
- Burnett, R., & McNeill, F. (2005) The place of the officer–offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *Probation Journal* 52(3): 247–68.
- Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)maturity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18, 741–760.
- Cesaroni, C., & Peterson-Badali, M. (2010). Understanding the adjustment of incarcerated young offenders: A Canadian example. *Youth Justice*, 10(2): 1-19. doi: 10.1177/1473225410369290
- Cesaroni, C. & Peterson-Badali, M. (2013). Report to the Office of the Provincial Advocate for Children & Youth concerning the Death of Ashley Smith. Retrieved from http://provincialadvocate.on.ca/documents/en/Expert_report-defacted-Nov8_2013.pdf
- Cesaroni, C., & Peterson-Badali, M. (2016). The Role of Fairness in the Adjustment of Adolescent Boys to Pretrial Detention. *The Prison Journal*, 96(4), 534-553.
- Cesaroni, C., & Peterson-Badali, M. (2017). Ashley Smith and Incarcerated Young Women:

- Marginalized at Any Age. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit Et Société*, 32(2), 249-267. doi:10.1017/cls.2017.11
- Cooke, D., Finlay, J., & Ontario. (2007). *Open detention and open custody in Ontario*. Toronto, Ont. Office of Child and Family Service Advocacy.
- Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., Burton, V. S., & Lombardo, L. X. (1993). The Correctional Orientation Of Prison Wardens: Is The Rehabilitative Ideal Supported?*. *Criminology*, 31(1), 69-92.
- Cullen, F. T., Lutze, F. E., Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1989). The correctional orientation of prison Correctional officers: Do officers support rehabilitation? *Federal Probation*, 53, 34-41.
- Crawley, E. (2006). Doing prison work: The public and private lives of prison officers³. In Y. Jewkes & H. Johnston (Eds.) *Prison Readings*. pp. 209 – 221. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. California: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Crewe, B. (2012). *The prisoner society: Power, adaptation, and social life in an English prison*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crewe, B., Liebling, A., & Hulley, S. (2011). Staff culture, use of authority and prisoner quality of life in public and private sector prisons. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44(1), 94-115.
- Davis, G. (2021, February 15). Ontario shuts down 'heavily UNDERUTILIZED' Brookside

- youth centre in Cobourg. *Global News*. Retrieved March 19, 2021, from <https://globalnews.ca/news/7641415/ontario-shuts-down-heavily-underutilized-brookside-youth-centre-in-cobourg/>
- DeLude, B., Mitchell, D., & Barber, C., (2012). Probationer's perspective on the probation officer probationer relationship and satisfaction with probation. *Federal Probation* 76(1). 35–39.
- Dembo, R., & Dertke, M. (1986). Work environment correlates of staff stress in a youth detention facility. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 328 – 344.
- Dervan, L. E. (2011). American prison culture in an international context: An examination of prisons in America, the Netherlands, and Israel. *Stanford Law and Policy Review*, 22(2), 413-428.
- DiGiuseppe, R., Linscott, J., & Jilton, R. (1996). The therapeutic alliance in adolescent psychotherapy. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 5, 85–100.
- Drake, D., Fergusson, R & Briggs, D. B. (2014). Hearing new voices: Re-viewing Youth Justice Policy through Practitioners relationships with young people. *Youth Justice*, 14(1): 22-39.
- Employment opportunities. (n.d.). Retrieved March 22, 2021, from <http://www.khys.org/employment-youth-workers/>
- Estes, S. G. (1948). Concerning the therapeutic relationship in the dynamics of cure. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 12, 76-81.
- Everall, R. D., & Paulson, B. L. (2002). The therapeutic alliance: Adolescent perspectives. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research*, 2(2), 78–87.
- Farkas, M. A. (1999). Correctional officer attitudes toward inmates and working with inmates in a “get tough” era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(6), 495-506.

- Farkas, M. A. (2000). A typology of correctional officers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44(4), 431-449.
- Farkas, M. A., & Manning, P. K. (1997) The occupational culture of corrections and police officers. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 20(2), 51-68. DOI: 10.1080/0735648X.1997.9721581
- Fiedler, F. E. (1950a) The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14, 239-245.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1950b) A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psychoanalytic, nondirective and Adlerian therapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14, 436-445.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1951). Factor Analysis of Psychoanalytic, Non-directive, And Adlerian Therapeutic Relationships. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 15, 32-38.
- Florsheim, P., Shotorbani, S., Guest-Warnick, G., Barratt, T., & Wei-Chin, H. (2000). Role of the working alliance in the treatment of delinquent boys in community-based programs. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 29(1), 94-107.
- Freud, S. (1912). *The Dynamics of Transference. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume XII (1911-1913).
- Garner, B. R., Godley, S. H., & Funk, R. R. (2008). Predictors of early therapeutic alliance among adolescents in substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 40, 55-65.
- Gilbert, M. (1997). The Illusion of Structure: A Critique of the Classical Model of Organisation and the Discretionary Power of Correctional Officers, *Criminal Justice Review* 22(1): 49-64.
- Green, J. (2009). The therapeutic alliance. *Child: Care Health and Development*, 35(3), 298-301.
- Hart, J., & Collins, K. (2014). A 'back to basics' approach to offender supervision: Does

- working alliance contribute towards success of probation? *European Journal of Probation*, 6(2), 112-125.
- Henderson, E. (2012). Responses to Mental Health Stigma Questions: The Importance of Social Desirability and Data Collection Method. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 57(3), 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371205700304>
- Hepburn, J. R. (1987). The prison control structure and its effects on work attitudes: The perceptions and attitudes of prison correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15(1), 49-64.
- Hintikka, U., Laukkanen, E., Marttunen, M., & Lehtonen, J. (2006). Good working alliance and psychotherapy are associated with positive changes in cognitive performance among adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 70(4), 316-335.
- Hogue , A. , Dauber , S. , Stambaugh , L. F. , Cecero , J. J. , & Liddle , H. A. (2006). Early therapeutic alliance and treatment outcome in individual and family therapy for adolescent problem behaviors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* , 74, 121 – 129.
- Horney, K. (1946). *Are you considering psychoanalysis?* New York: Norton.
- Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(2), 139.
- Horvath, A. O. (2001). The alliance. *Psychotherapy*, 38, 365–372
- Hougaard, E. (1994). The therapeutic alliance: A conceptual analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 35(1), 67-85.
- Hubner, J. (2005). *Last chance in Texas: The redemption of criminal youth*. New York: Random House.

- Inderbitzin, M. (2007). Inside a maximum-security juvenile training school: Institutional attempts to redefine the American Dream and normalize incarcerated youth. *Punishment & Society*, 9, 235-251.
- Jacobs, J. B., & Retsky, H. G. (1975). Prison Correctional officer. *Urban Life*, 4(1)
- Johnson, R. (2002). *Hard time: Understanding and reforming the prison* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. *Criminology*, 23(3), 523-540.
- Karver, M. S., Handelsman, J. B., Fields, S., & Bickman, L. (2006). Meta-analysis of therapeutic relationship variables in youth and family therapy: The evidence for different relationship variables in the child and adolescent treatment outcome literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26(1), 50-65.
- Kassebaum, G. G., Ward, D. A., Wilner, D. M., & Kennedy, W. C. (1962). Job Related Differences in Staff Attitudes toward Treatment in a Women's Prison. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 5(2), 83-88.
- Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison Officers' Attitudes and Perceptions of Attitudes: A Case of Pluralistic Ignorance. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18(2), 272-294.
- Kelly, D. (2013). Punish or Reform? Predicting Prison Staff Punitiveness. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 53(1), 49-68.
- Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., & Eno Louden, J. (2012). Firm, fair, and caring officer offender relationships protect against supervision failure. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36, 496-505.
- Kjelsberg E, Skoglund TH, Rustad AB (2007). Attitudes towards prisoners, as reported by prison

- inmates, prison employees, and college students. *BMC Public Health* 7:71–79
- Klockars, C. (1972). A theory of probation supervision. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 63, 550–557.
- Klofas, J. M., & Klofas, J. M. (1984). Reconsidering Prison Personnel: New Views of the Correctional Officer Subculture. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 28(3), 169-175.
- Klofas, J., & H. Toch. (1982). The Correctional officer Subculture Myth. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19(2), 238-54.
- framework: A continuum of evidence-based, evidence-informed programs and services.* 9 March 2012.
- Krupnick, J. L., Sotsky, S. M., Simmens, S., Moyer, J., Elkin, I., Watkins, J., Pilkonis, P. A. (1996). The role of the therapeutic alliance in psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy outcome: Findings in the national institute of mental health treatment of depression collaborative research program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63(3), 532-539.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2004). The nature of work-family conflict among correctional staff: An exploratory examination. *Criminal Justice Review*, 29, 145–172.
- Lee, J. (2016). Lonely too long: Redefining and reforming juvenile solitary confinement. *Fordman Law Review*, 85: 845 – 856.
- Leiber, M. J. (2002). Disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) of youth: An analysis of state and federal efforts to address the issue. *Crime & Delinquency*, 48, 3–45.
- Lerman, A. E., & J. Page. (2012). The State of the Job: An Embedded Work Role Perspective on Prison Officer Attitudes. *Punishment & Society* 14(5), 503-29.

- Lewis, S. (2014). Exploring positive working relationships in light of the aims of Probation, using a collaborative approach. *Probation Journal* 61(4) 334–34.
- Liebling, A. assisted by H. Arnold (2004). Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality and Prison Life. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liebling, A. (2006). Prisons in Transition. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 29: 422-430.
- Lindberg, O. (2005). Prison cultures and social representations: The case of Hinseberg, a women's prison in Sweden. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 1(2/3/4), 143-161.
- Liou, K.T. (1994). The effect of professional orientation on job stress: The case of detention care workers. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 14(1) (Winter), 52-63.
- Liou, K. T. (1998). Employee turnover intention and professional orientation: A study of detention workers. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 22 (2), 161-175.
- Lombardo, L. X. (2016). Routledge Revivals: Correctional officers Imprisoned (1989): Correctional Officers at Work. Routledge.
- Lustig DC, Strauser DR, Rice ND et al. (2002). The relationship between working alliance and rehabilitation outcomes. *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin* 46(1): 25–33.
- Marsh, S. C., & Evans, W. P. (2009). Youth perspectives on their relationships with staff in juvenile correction settings and perceived likelihood of success on release. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7, 46-67
- Marshall, W. L. (2009). Manualization: A blessing or a curse? *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 15(2), 109-120.
- Martin, D. J., Garske, J. P., & Davis, M. K (2000). Relation of the therapeutic Alliance with

- outcome and other variables: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(3), 438-450.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- McCabe, R. & Priebe, S. (2004). The Therapeutic Relationship in the Treatment of Severe Mental Illness A Review of Methods and Findings. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 50(2), 115–128.
- McCleery, R. (1960) ‘Communication Patterns as Bases of Systems of Authority and Power’, in R. Cloward (ed). *Theoretical Studies in the Social Organisation of the Prison*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2012). *Youth Justice Services Program*.
- Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2015). *Published Plan*.
- Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2016). *Because Young People Matter: Report of the Residential Services Review Panel*.
- Ministry of Correctional Services. (1990). *Ministry of Correctional Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.22*. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90m22?search=correctional+officer#BK15>
- Muir, W. K. (1977). *Police: Street corner politicians*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mulvey, E.P, (2014). Using developmental science to reorient our thinking about criminal offending in adolescence. *Delinquency*, 51 (4): 467-479.
- Norton, T. (2018). Agreement between pre-exercise screening questionnaires completed online versus face-to-face. *PloS One*, 13(6), e0199836–e0199836.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199836>
- Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General. (1999). *Verdict of the Jury at the Inquest in the Death*

- of James Preston Lonnee. Toronto: Ministry of the Solicitor General.
- Peterson-Badali, M., & Koegl, C. J. (2002). Juveniles' experiences of incarceration: The role of correctional staff in peer violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(1), 41-49.
- Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth. (2013). "It depends who's working." The reality at Roy McMurtry Youth Centre. http://www.garthgoodwin.info/files/RMYC_report_en.pdf
- Raynor, P., & Vanstone, M. (2016). Moving Away from Social Work and Half Way Back Again: New Research on Skills in Probation. *British Journal of Social Work 46*(4), 1131–47.
- Reid, K, Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2005). Exploring Lived Experience. *The Psychologist 18*(1), 20-23.
- Reisig, M. D., & Lovrich, N. P. (1998). Job attitudes among higher-custody state prison management personnel: A cross-sectional comparative assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 26*(3), 213-226.
- Ricciardelli, R., Adorjan, M., & Peters, A. (2019). Increased clarity or continued ambiguity? Correctional officers' experiences of the evolving Canadian youth justice legislation. *Crime, Law, and Social Change, 71*(5), 503–523. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-018-9801-z>
- Rogers, C. R. (1946). Significant aspects of client-centered therapy. *American Psychologist, 1*, 415-422.
- Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21*, 95-103.
- Ross, E. C. (2008). Investigating the relationship between the therapeutic alliance and treatment outcome in violent offender treatment.

- Ross, E. C., Polaschek, D. L. L., & Ward, T. (2008). The Therapeutic Alliance: A theoretical revision for offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 462-480.
- Simpson, T.P., Frick, P.J., Kahn, R.E., & Evans, L.J. (2013). Therapeutic alliance in justice involved adolescents undergoing mental health treatment: The role of callous unemotional traits. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 12*, 83-92.
- Skeem, J. L., & Manchak, S. M. (2008). Back to the future: From Klockar's model of effective supervision to evidence-based practice in probation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, Special Issue, 47*, 1-28.
- Sparks J. R., Bottoms A. E., Hay W. (1996). *Prisons and the problem of order*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2013). *Youth Court Statistics in Canada. 2011/2012*. Catalogue Number 85-002-X. Retrieved October 28, 2016 from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2013001/article/11803-eng.htm>.
- Svesson, B. & Hansson, L. (1999). Therapeutic alliance in cognitive therapy for schizophrenic and other long-term mentally ill patients: Development and relationship to outcome in an in-patient programme. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 99*, 281-287.
- Sykes, G. (1966). *Society of Captives*. New York: Random House
- Tait, S. (2011). A typology of prison officer approaches to care. *European Journal of Criminology, 8*, 440-454.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. (2008). Correctional Orientations of Prison Staff. *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.)*, 88(2), 207–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885508319163>
- Thorne, F. (1948). Principles of directive counseling and psychotherapy. *American Psychologist, 3*, 160-165.

- Ulrich, M., Ricciardelli, R., & Brown, A. (2012) Offender rehabilitation: Toward an understanding of therapeutic alliance in successful transition and reintegration efforts—the Canadian day reporting centre experience. *The Journal of Community Corrections*, 21(4):4-11(8).
- Williamson, H. E. (1990). *The Corrections Profession*. United States of America: SAGE Publications.
- Worrall, A, Mawby, R (2014) Probation worker cultures and relationships with offenders. *Probation Journal* 61(4): 346–357.
- Worley, R. M., & Worley, V. B. (2011). Correctional officers Gone Wild: A Self-Report Study of Correctional Officer Misconduct and the Effect of Institutional Deviance on “care” within the Texas Prison System. *Deviant Behavior*, 32(4), 293-319.
- Youth services officer. (2019, August 9). Retrieved March 22, 2021, from <https://www.gojobs.gov.on.ca/Preview.aspx?Language=English&JobID=134798>
- Zetzel, E. R. (1956). Current concepts of transference. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 37, 369-376

Appendix A

A Note on Methods

The methods for this project changed considerably over the course of the study. Originally, it was proposed that this study would take place in four direct-operated secure custody youth institutions in Ontario. It was proposed that data would be collected via semi-structured interviews with youth corrections workers. This project had initial support from the ministry and the planning for implementation began in 2017. We were delayed with our original application due to a hold placed on new research following a change in government in 2018. Our first formal application to the Ministry was submitted in April 2019 after receiving REB approval from Ontario Tech University. Unfortunately, a number of issues arose throughout this process; first, on June 21, 2019 we received notice that “The Division is currently in a period of transition and is not able to facilitate your project at this point in time. However, we would like to keep the lines of communication open to explore facilitating your project in the future” (J. Scott, personal communication, June 21, 2019). This provided an opportunity to expand our participant pool and adapt our data collection strategy. With REB approval, we invited individuals who currently work in (or have past experience in) open and secure transfer payment agencies to take part in our study, via an online survey. Since it seemed hopeful that we would still be able to collect data in the direct operated facilities in the future, this strategy would allow for comparisons between open and secure youth workers as well as between direct operated and transfer payment agencies. This strategy was effective in gaining responses from 27 individuals.

On January 24, 2020, I was contacted by the ministry to inquire if I was still interested in moving forward with my project and began the process of engaging with the Ministry research

committee (L. Freedman, personal communication, January 24, 2020). On April 14, 2020 I was updated that my project proposal was still under review and had been delayed due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and on September 1, 2020 I was contacted again with the confirmation that there were no updates (L. Freedman, personal communication, April 14, 2020). Finally, on October 14, 2020 I received a letter noting that “Due to operational reasons, your project cannot be facilitated at this point in time” (P. Wheeler, personal communication, October 14, 2020). Upon consultation with my PhD committee, it was decided that the direct-operated portion of my study would not move forward and I will focus my dissertation on the 27 participants I received via snowball sampling.

As a result of the above events, the research questions as they were originally outlined could not be addressed in the manner that we had hoped. Due to a small sample size and a largely heterogenous sample (mostly open custody workers) we were unable to run the analyses that we had planned. A modified set of research questions and the plan for data analysis are outlined below.

Appendix B

INFORMATION FOR THE PARTICIPANT

Principal Investigator: Korri Bickle M.A.: (289)-600-0912 or Korri.bickle@uoit.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Carla Cesaroni, PhD: (905) 721-8668 Ext. 2517 or Carla.cesaroni@uoit.ca

Dear Participant:

I am a student at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology studying how youth services officers/ youth workers experience their work. I would like to ask Youth Services Officers/ Youth Workers about how they perceive their work and how they go about their duties. The survey should take about one hour to complete. I would like to ask you a variety of questions about your work experience, your current job and how you go about your work. As part of this exploration, the survey will involve questions about your experiences regarding your education, work experience, and day-to-day work experiences.

Please note, no one in your workplace or in the Ministry will have access to your information, or be aware that you participated in this study. This survey is anonymous. Your name or any information that could identify you, will not be recorded. It will be completely anonymous and confidential, which means that no one will be able to trace your answers back to you. Your answers may be used in scientific research papers conferences, but will be reported in a group manner and never in a way in which you could be identified. During the survey, you are free to refuse to answer any questions, and are free to stop the survey at anytime. Your participation is on a volunteer basis.

If you have any questions about the study, or you would like to hear about the results of the study, please feel free to contact myself, the researcher, Korri Bickle, at korri.bickle@uoit.ca. You can also contact my research supervisor, Dr. Carla Cesaroni, at Carla.cesaroni@uoit.ca for study information. The study should be completed by June 2020.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Study Name: Youth Justice Worker Orientation and Opinions on Relationships with Youth

Principal Investigator: Korri Bickle M.A.: (289)-600-0912 or Korri.bickle@uoit.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Carla Cesaroni, PhD: (905) 721-8668 Ext. 2517 or Carla.cesaroni@uoit.ca

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

(905) 721-8668 (Research Services)

compliance@uoit.ca REB file #: 15132

You have been asked to participate in a study called, “Youth Justice Worker Orientation and Opinions on Relationships with Youth”. This study has been reviewed by the University of Ontario Institute of Technology Research Ethics Board [REB #15132] and originally approved on February 21, 2019.

Please read this consent form carefully, and feel free to ask the Researcher any questions that you might have about the study. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Research Ethics Coordinator at 905 721 8668 ext. 3693 or researchethics@uoit.ca. This form is provided to assist you in making an informed decision on whether or not you would like to participate in this study. If you have any questions about the information presented in this form, please do not hesitate to ask.

Researcher

This study is being carried out by Korri Bickle. If necessary, you can contact me at the above email address. The telephone number for our research services (compliance) office is also listed above, should any ethical concerns be raised.

Reason for Study

This study is being conducted in an attempt to understand how youth services officers/ youth workers experience their work and how they go about their work duties.

What’s Involved

This study will involve an electronic survey that will take about an hour to complete. The questions will focus on your education, work experience, your interactions with others, how you go about your work and your thoughts around your occupation in general.

Confidentiality

I (Korri Bickle) do not work for The Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services. No one other than myself and my supervisor (Carla Cesaroni) will have direct access to information you

provide. We recognize the information collected can be sensitive, however, we take confidentiality seriously; your privacy will be protected, and you can be sure that the information you provide can never be traced back to you. The information collected will be anonymous and reported as a group. The information you provide may be included in scientific research journals, scientific conferences, public talks, teaching opportunities, community engagement and reports, but never in a way in which you could be identified.

Statement of Disclosure

I (the participant) understand that the information I provide is confidential and will never be revealed to anyone.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal

It is your choice to participate in this study. At any time, you may feel free to refuse to continue to participate, or stop answering the survey questions without explanation. If you choose to withdraw from the survey, all data will be deleted and will not be used in the study in any way. You can also choose not to answer any particular question. Your refusal to participate will not impact your work in any way.

Potential Risks

Some of the questions in the survey are personal and may make you feel uncomfortable or distressed. If you experience any sense of unease or discomfort, you do not need to answer the question or continue with the survey. You can exit the survey at any time without penalty. If you experience distress as a result of engaging in this survey, you may be interested in the following services: www.crisisline.ca (1-866-996-0991); www.connexontario.ca (1-866-531-2600); www.crisistextline.ca (Text HOME to 686868 from Canada, anytime, about any type of crisis).

Potential Benefits

Your help could provide understanding and insight into how youth services officers/ youth workers experience their work. Further, the information gathered through this interview has potential to inform policy and decision makers with regard to possible change within the youth justice system.

I am voluntarily choosing whether or not to participate in this study. By clicking on “I CONSENT” to begin the survey I am providing my consent and this action certifies that the information presented in this consent form is understood by me, and that I have decided to participate in this study. By giving consent, I do not waive any legal right or recourse.

Appendix C

Survey

Subject #: Click or tap here to enter text. Date: Click or tap here to enter text. Facility: Click or tap here to enter text.

Demographics

1. How old are you Click or tap here to enter text.
2. How would you describe your racial background Choose an item.
3. How would you describe your gender identity Choose an item.
4. Level of education Choose an item.
 - a. Area of Study Choose an item.

Work History

5. What is your position within this facility? Choose an item.
6. How long have you worked here? Choose an item.
7. Have you worked at any other youth custody facilities? Choose an item.
 - a. Which ones? (note open or secure) Click or tap here to enter text.
8. Have you ever worked in adult facility? Choose an item.
 - a. Which ones? Click or tap here to enter text.
9. Have you held any other youth justice positions (ex. Probation, attendance centre, CST etc.) Choose an item.
 - a. Which ones? Click or tap here to enter text.
10. Have you ever been employed in another social service occupation? Choose an item.
 - a. If yes, what was your role? Click or tap here to enter text.
11. How long have you been in the corrections field? Choose an item.
12. Why did you choose a job in corrections? Click or tap here to enter text.
13. What are your responsibilities as a _____? Click or tap here to enter text.
14. Can you describe a typical work day to me, from the time you arrive until you leave what are the kinds of things you do? Click or tap here to enter text.
15. What type of shifts do you work? Click or tap here to enter text.

Correctional Orientation

Now I am going to spend some time talking with you about your thoughts on this facility and your work. Remember that you are free to answer as many or as few questions as you would like

and that your answers will not be made available to anyone other than those working on this project.

How much do you agree with the following statements (1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree or disagree, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree):

16. A correctional officer's primary responsibility is to maintain the safety and security of the institution Choose an item.
17. The majority of officers in this facility, correctly prioritize treatment over security Choose an item.
18. My role as an officer is to maintain order Choose an item.
19. I took this job because I wanted to help youth in custody Choose an item.
20. I believe that with support, youth can change Choose an item.
21. Trying to rehabilitate these youth is a waste of time and money Choose an item.
22. Our first priority is punishment, custody is a consequence of youth's actions, treatment is always second to punishment Choose an item.
23. Youth in custody need strict discipline Choose an item.
24. A correctional officer's primary role is to provide treatment to youth in custody Choose an item.
25. Treatment and rehabilitative services should not be a priority in custody Choose an item.
26. Youth in custody have not been taught respect Choose an item.
27. Rehabilitation often fails because the programs are underfunded, with more funding they would be more effective Choose an item.
28. Showing them who's "boss" is the most effective way to manage these youth Choose an item.
29. Keeping youth in custody from causing trouble is my focus when I am on the job Choose an item.
30. Many people don't realize it, but the youth system is too soft on youth in custody Choose an item.
31. Rehabilitation is just as important as consequences for youth crime Choose an item.
32. We should stop viewing these youth as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of their crimes Choose an item.
33. Rehabilitation of youth in custody does not work Choose an item.
34. An important part of my job is modelling appropriate behaviour for youth in custody Choose an item.
35. Many youth in custody have not had the benefit of proper parenting Choose an item.
36. Correctional officers are not trained to be counsellors, nor should they be Choose an item.

Toch and Klofas (1982)

How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 – strongly agree, 2 – agree, 3 – disagree, 4 – strongly disagree

37. An officer should work hard to earn trust from youth in custody Choose an item.

38. It's important for an officer to have compassion Choose an item.
39. The way to get respect from youth in custody is to take an interest in them Choose an item.
40. You get to like the youth in custody you work with Choose an item.
41. Sometimes an officer should be an advocate for an youth in custody Choose an item.
42. There would be much less crime if custody facilities were uncomfortable Choose an item.
43. Improving custody facilities for youth in custody makes them worse for officers Choose an item.
44. A military regime is the best way of running a custody facilities Choose an item.
45. Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money Choose an item.
46. Rehabilitation programs should be left to mental health professionals Choose an item.
47. Counselling is a job for counsellors, not officers Choose an item.
48. If an officer wants to do counselling, he or she should change jobs Choose an item.
49. You can't ever completely trust an youth in custody Choose an item.
50. A good principle is not to get "close" to youth in custody Choose an item.
51. A personal relationship with an youth in custody invites the crossing of boundaries Choose an item.
52. You must keep conversations with youth in custody short and professional Choose an item.
53. If an officer is lenient with youth in custody, they will take advantage of him Choose an item.

Correctional Officer Typology

How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree or disagree, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

54. It is important that youth counsellors adhere strictly to policies and procedures, with no exceptions Choose an item.
55. Youth in custody are expected to obey CO's at all times Choose an item.
56. Maintaining order and ensuring custody and control are my primary responsibility Choose an item.
57. I prefer working with officers who enforce the rules Choose an item.
58. Human service or counselling is not the role of a correctional officer Choose an item.
59. It is important to enforce rules and adhere to policies and procedures to assert your authority to youth in custody Choose an item.
60. Sometimes extreme physical force is required in order to assert my authority Choose an item.
61. It is important that officers show youth in custody how tough they are Choose an item.
62. Any negotiation with youth in custody regarding rules is a sign of CO weakness Choose an item.
63. These youth have it way too easy in here, they have far too many privileges Choose an item.
64. It is a CO's responsibility to play a role in rehabilitation Choose an item.

65. It is acceptable to modify the rules for youth in custody Choose an item.
66. Strict adherence to rules leads to youth in custody compliance Choose an item.
67. CO driven incentives or reward systems are useful for youth in custody compliance Choose an item.
68. Interacting with and building relationships with youth in custody is an important part of my job Choose an item.
69. Minor rule violations can be solved with communication and reason rather than punishment Choose an item.
70. Although adherence to rules and policies and procedures is important, an officer should consider the circumstances before choosing how to respond Choose an item.
71. It is important to adhere to policies and procedures in order to avoid reprimand Choose an item.
72. It is important to strictly adhere to the policies and procedures in order to maintain a positive working relationship with coworkers Choose an item.
73. I can trust and rely on my coworkers Choose an item.
74. Rules and regulations are an important part of my job as they insure that I do not make mistakes at work Choose an item.

Therapeutic Alliance and Relationship Custody

75. What do you see as your role in rehabilitation? Click or tap here to enter text.
76. How do you work with youth? What is your approach? Click or tap here to enter text.
77. Does your approach to working with youth come from your own training and philosophy or is directed by the organization? Click or tap here to enter text.
78. Are there any experiences that you have had in your life that you feel influence the way that you relate with youth in custody? Would you share these experiences with me? Click or tap here to enter text.
79. How would you describe the organizational climate here? Click or tap here to enter text.
80. What would say is the philosophy of the organization? Click or tap here to enter text.
81. What do you see as the biggest challenge to rehabilitation? Click or tap here to enter text.
82. What do you believe is the most effective method of rehabilitation for youth? Click or tap here to enter text.
83. Can you describe for me the best way for a Correctional Officer to manage a youth who is escalating in their unit (i.e. being disrespectful to staff and residents, not physical but disruptive)? Click or tap here to enter text.
84. Do you believe that there is a place for the development of working relationships with youth in a custody setting? Choose an item.
 - a. Please explain Click or tap here to enter text.
85. Can you describe for me the ideal Correctional Officer – Youth in custody relationship? Click or tap here to enter text.
86. What, if any would be the concerns with building a working, or collaborative, relationships with youth? Click or tap here to enter text.

87. What, if any would be the benefits of building a working relationship with youth Click or tap here to enter text.

How much do you agree with the following statements? 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree or disagree, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree

88. A correctional officer should keep their distance from youth in custody Choose an item.

89. Developing relationships with youth puts a CO at risk Choose an item.

90. Youth respond well to a supportive environment, strong Youth – CO relationships mean less rule violations from youth Choose an item.

91. Youth see relationships with CO's as an opportunity to manipulate or get away with things Choose an item.

92. Correctional Officer relationships with youth play an important part in rehabilitation Choose an item.

Appendix D
Additional Tables

Tables for Duties and Responsibilities

Table A1

Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Supervision and Security

Variable	n Yes (%)	n No (%)	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Supervision)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = 2.01$
Female	4 (22.2)	14 (78.8)	$p = .16$ $n=26$
Responsibilities (Security)			
Male	1 (87.5)	7 (12.5)	$\chi^2 = .34$
Female	4 (77.8)	14 (22.2)	$p = .56$ $n=26$
Approach (Safety/Security)			
Male	0 (0)	8 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.51$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .22$ $n=26$
Approach (Consistency)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .62$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Checks/Counts)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Female	8 (44.4)	10 (55.6)	$p = .35$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Behaviour Mgmt)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .73$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .39$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Supervise/Monitor)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = .28$
Female	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	$p = .60$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A2

Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Support)			

Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .07$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .79$ $n=26$
Approach (Relationships)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .73$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .39$ $n=26$
Approach (Support)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = 5.06$
Female	13 (72.2)	5 (27.8)	$p = .02^*$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Support)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .92$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Interaction)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Female	8 (44.4)	10 (55.6)	$p = .35$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Relationships)			
Male	0 (0)	8 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.51$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .22$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A3

Summary of Chi-Square: Gender – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Goals/Prog)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	$p = .95$ $n=26$
Typical Day (program)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .02$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .88$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A4

Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Supervision)			

Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Youth Only	6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)	$p = .62$ $n=26$
Responsibilities (Security)			
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .00$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	$p = .96$ $n=26$
Approach (Safety/Security)			
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .43$
Youth Only	2 (9.5)	19 (90.5)	$p = .51$ $n=26$
Approach (Consistency)			
Adult/Youth	3 (60)	2 (40)	$\chi^2 = 2.48$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .12$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Checks/Counts)			
Adult/Youth	3 (60)	2 (40)	$\chi^2 = 1.21$
Youth Only	7 (33.3)	14 (66.7)	$p = .27$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Behaviour Mgmt)			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 1.00$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	$p = .32$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Supervise/Monitor)			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Youth Only	9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)	$p = .91$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A5

Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Support)			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 2.88$
Youth Only	2(9.5)	19 (90.5)	$p = .09$ $n=26$
Approach (Relationships)			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 1.00$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	$p = .31$ $n=26$
Approach (Support)			
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 1.00$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	$p = .31$ $n=26$

Typical Day (Support)			
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .43$
Youth Only	2 (9.5)	19 (90.5)	$p = .51$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Interaction)			
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 3.87$
Youth Only	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	$p = .05$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Relationships)			
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .43$
Youth Only	2 (9.5)	19 (90.5)	$p = .51$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A6

Summary of Chi-Square: Adult Corrections Experience – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Goals/Prog)			
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4(80)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Youth Only	9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)	$p = .34$ $n=26$
Typical Day (Programming)			
Adult/Youth	14 (66.7)	7 (33.3)	$\chi^2 = 2.28$
Youth Only	5 (100)	0 (0)	$p = .13$ $n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A7

Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Supervision)			
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 3.87$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .14$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$
Responsibilities (Security)			
Open	0 (0)	16 (100)	$\chi^2 = 10.76$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .01^*$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Approach (Safety/Security)			
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 2.82$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .24$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$

Approach (Consistency)			
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 9.74$
Secure	3 (100)	0 (0)	$p = .01^*$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Checks/Counts)			
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 3.72$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .20$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Behaviour Mgmt)			
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 7.31$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .03^*$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Supervise/Monitor)			
Open	5 (31.3)	11 (68.8)	$\chi^2 = 3.33$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .19$
Both	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A8

Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Support)			
Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = .69$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .71$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (87.5)	$n=26$
Approach (Relationships)			
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.05$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .59$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$
Approach (Support)			
Open	9 (56.30)	7 (43.8)	$\chi^2 = .11$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .94$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Support)			
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.91$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .23$
Both	0 (0)	7(100)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Interaction)			
Open	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.91$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .23$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Relationships)			

Open	0 (0)	16 (100)	$\chi^2 = 5.47$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .07$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (51.4)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A9

Summary of Chi-Square: Facility Type – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Responsibilities (Goals/Prog)			
Open	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.91$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .23$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$
Typical Day (Programming)			
Open	5 (31.3)	11 (68.7)	$\chi^2 = 1.27$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .53$
Both	7 (26.9)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Tables for Interactions with youth

Role in Rehabilitation

Table A10

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Role in Rehab (Discipline)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .92$
			$n=26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = .81$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	$p = .37$
			$n=26$
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 2.82$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .24$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$
Role in Rehab (Safe Environment)			
Male	0 (0)	8 (100)	$\chi^2 = 2.10$
Female	4 (22.2)	14 (77.8)	$p = .15$
			$n=26$

Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.13$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	$p = .29$ $n=26$
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .85$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .65$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A11

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Role in Rehab (Support)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	$p = .95$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	5 (100)	0 (0)	$\chi^2 = 3.87$
Youth Only	11 (52.4)	10 (47.6)	$p = .05$ $n=26$
Open	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)	$\chi^2 = .69$
Secure	3 (100)	0 (0)	$p = .71$
Both	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)	$n=26$
Role in Rehab (Relationships)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .02$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .88$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	4 (80)	1 (20)	$\chi^2 = .15$
Youth Only	15 (71.4)	6 (28.6)	$p = .70$ $n=26$
Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = 1.51$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .47$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Role in Rehab (Advocate/Connect)			
Male	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	16 88.9	2 (11.1)	$p = .92$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (8)	$\chi^2 = .15$

Youth Only	6 (28.6)	15 (71.4)	$p = .70$ $n=26$
Open	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.58$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .28$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$
Role in Rehab (Role Model)			
Male	5 (62.5)	3 (37.5)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .35$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Youth Only	8 (38.1)	13 (61.9)	$p = .94$ $n=26$
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 4.47$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .11$
Both	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A12

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Role in Rehab (Choices)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .02$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .88$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .15$
Youth Only	6 (28.6)	15 (71.4)	$p = .70$ $n=26$
Open	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.58$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .28$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$
Role in Rehab (Emotion Magmt)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .34$
Female	4 (22.2)	14 (77.8)	$p = .56$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.47$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .23$

			<i>n</i> =26
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 3.70$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	<i>p</i> = .16
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	<i>n</i> =26

* *p*<.05, ***p*<.01

Effective Rehabilitation

Table A13

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Security and Supervision

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Most Effective Rehab (Structure/Consistency)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = 4.72$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	<i>p</i> = .03* <i>n</i> = 26
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 1.00$
Youth Only	4 (19)	17 (81)	<i>p</i> = .31 <i>n</i> = 26
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 4.34$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	<i>p</i> = .11
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	<i>n</i> = 26

* *p*<.05, ***p*<.01

Table A14

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Most Effective Rehab (Relationship)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.42$
Female	9 (50)	9 (50)	<i>p</i> = .23 <i>n</i> = 26
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = 1.26$
Youth Only	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	<i>p</i> = .26 <i>n</i> = 26
Open	7 (43.8)	9 (56.3)	$\chi^2 = .11$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	<i>p</i> = .95
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	<i>n</i> = 26

Most Effective Rehab (Connect/Advocate)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .37$
Female	1 (5.6)	17 (94.4)	$p = .54$ $n = 26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = .52$
Youth Only	2 (9.5)	19 (90.5)	$p = .47$ $n = 26$
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = .73$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .70$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A15

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Most Effective Rehab (Program)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .62$ $n = 26$
Adult/Youth	3 (60)	2 (40)	$\chi^2 = .248$
Youth Only	5(23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .12$ $n = 26$
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 2.08$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .35$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Escalation

Table A16

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Supervision and Security

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Manage Escalation (Remove)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = .65$
Female	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	$p = .42$

			<i>n</i> = 26
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Youth Only	8 (38.1)	13 (61.9)	<i>p</i> = .94
			<i>n</i> = 26
Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = 6.85$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	<i>p</i> = .03*
Both	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	<i>n</i> = 26
Manage Escalation (Firm)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	<i>p</i> = .92
			<i>n</i> = 26
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	23 (88.5)	$\chi^2 = .81$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	<i>p</i> = .37
			<i>n</i> = 26
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 1.89$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (67.7)	<i>p</i> = .39
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	<i>n</i> = 26

* *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01

Table A17

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Relationships and Support

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Manage Escalation (Communicate)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = .65$
Female	12 (66.7)	6 (33.3)	<i>p</i> = .42
			<i>n</i> = 26
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 1.21$
Youth Only	14 (66.7)	7 (33.3)	<i>p</i> = .27
			<i>n</i> = 26
Open	10 (62.5)	6 (37.5)	$\chi^2 = .10$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	<i>p</i> = .95
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	<i>n</i> = 26
Manage Escalation (Support)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 1.22$
Female	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	<i>p</i> = .27
			<i>n</i> = 26

Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .15$
Youth Only	6 (28.6)	15 (71.4)	$p = .70$ $n=26$
Open	5 (31.2)	11 (68.6)	$\chi^2 = 5.14$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .08$
Both	0 (0)	7 (100)	$n=26$
Manage Escalation (Time/Space)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Female	5 (27.8)	13 (72.2)	$p = .62$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .34$
Youth Only	7 (33.3)	14 (66.7)	$p = .56$ $n=26$
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = .74$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .69$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Manage Escalation (Relationship)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .82$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .37$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .10$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	$p = .75$ $n=26$
Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.2)	$\chi^2 = .69$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .71$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$
Manage Escalation (Calm)			
Male	0 (0)	8(100)	$\chi^2 = 4.26$
Female	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	$p = .04^*$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 2.28$
Youth Only	7 (33.3)	14 (66.7)	$p = .13$ $n=26$
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = .10$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .95$

Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	n=26
------	----------	----------	------

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A18

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Treatment

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Manage Escalation (Triggers)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Female	8 (44.4)	10 (55.6)	$p = .35$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .89$
Youth Only	9 (42.9)	12 (57.1)	$p = .35$ $n=26$
Open	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.91$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .23$
Both	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A19

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Behavioural Approaches

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Manage Escalation (Techniques)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .62$ $n= 26$
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .172$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	$p = .19$ $n= 26$
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.17$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .56$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n= 26$
Manage Escalation (Consequences)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = 4.88$
Female	0 (0)	18 (100)	$p = .03^*$ $n= 26$

Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = 1.32$
Youth Only	1 (4.8)	20 (95.2)	$p = .25$ $n = 26$
Open	0 (0)	16 (100)	$\chi^2 = 5.88$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .05$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Tables for Views on Relationships

Table A20

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – A Place for Relationships

Variable	Yes	Don't Know	Chi-Square
Place for Relationships			
Male	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	$\chi^2 = .07$
Female	15 (83.3)	3 (16.7)	$p = .79$ $n = 26$
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 9.47$
Youth Only	20 (95.2)	1 (4.8)	$p = .00^{**}$ $n = 26$
Open	14 (87.5)	2 (12.5)	$\chi^2 = .85$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .65$
Both	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)	$n = 26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A21

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences - Reasons for Building Relationships

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Place for Relationships (Model Healthy Relationships)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .34$
Female	4 (22.2)	14 (77.8)	$p = .56$ $n = 26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.47$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .23$ $n = 26$

Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = 1.11$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .57$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$

Place for Relationships (Get to Know Youth)

Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 2.48$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .12$
			$n=26$

Adult/Youth	0(0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.46$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .23$
			$n=26$

Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 =$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = 1.11$
.57Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$

Place for Relationships (Build Respect/Trust)

Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .34$
Female	4 (22.2)	14 (77.8)	$p = .56$
			$n=26$

Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.47$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .23$
			$n=26$

Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.17$
Secure	0 (0)	5 (100)	$p = .56$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$

Place for Relationships (Essential/Important)

Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = 1.22$
Female	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	$p = .27$
			$n=26$

Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 =$
Youth Only	6 (28.6)	15 (71.4)	$p =$
			$n=26$

Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = 1.51$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .47$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$

Place for Relationships (Boundaries)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .82$
Female	2 (11.1)	16 (88.9)	$p = .37$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .10$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	$p = .75$ $n=26$
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .85$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .65$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=26$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table A22

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – The Ideal Relationship with Youth

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Ideal Relationships (Support)			
Male	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$\chi^2 = .20$
Female	3 (20)	12 (80)	$p = .66$ $n=22$
Adult/Youth	16 (84.2)	3 (15.8)	$\chi^2 = 3.82$
Youth Only	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .05$ $n=22$
Open	12 (85.7)	2 (14.3)	$\chi^2 = 1.80$
Secure	1 (50)	1 (50)	$p = .41$
Both	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	$n=22$
Ideal Relationships (Respect)			
Male	5 (71.4)	2 (26.8)	$\chi^2 = 2.79$
Female	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)	$p = .10$ $n=22$
Adult/Youth	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$\chi^2 = .21$
Youth Only	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)	$p = .65$ $n=22$
Open	8 (57.1)	6 (42.9)	$\chi^2 = 2.79$
Secure	1 (50)	1 (50)	$p = .25$
Both	1 (16.7)	3 (83.3)	$n=22$

Ideal Relationships (Boundaries)			
Male	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$\chi^2 = .21$
Female	7 (46.7)	8 (53.3)	$p = .65$ $n=22$
Adult/Youth	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$\chi^2 = .39$
Youth Only	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)	$p = .53$ $n=22$
Open	7 (50)	7 (50)	$\chi^2 = 2.67$
Secure	2 (100)	0 (0)	$p = .26$
Both	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	$n=22$
Ideal Relationships (Model)			
Male	0 (0)	7 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.03$
Female	2 (13.3)	13 (86.7)	$p = .31$ $n=22$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	3 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.03$
Youth Only	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)	$p = .31$ $n=22$
Open	2 (14.3)	12 (85.7)	$\chi^2 = 1.26$
Secure	0 (0)	2 (100)	$p = .53$
Both	0 (0)	6 (100)	$n=22$
Ideal Relationships (Predictable)			
Male	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$\chi^2 = 4.20$
Female	1 (6.7)	14 (93.3)	$p = .04^*$ $n=22$
Adult/Youth	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$\chi^2 = 5.49$
Youth Only	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)	$p = .02^*$ $n=22$
Open	2 (14.3)	12 (85.7)	$\chi^2 = 1.51$
Secure	1 (50)	1 (50)	$p = .47$
Both	1 (16.7)	5 (83.3)	$n=22$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Tables for Benefits and Concerns of Relationships

Table A23

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Benefits of Relationships

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Benefits (Healthy Relationships)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .07$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .79$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	2 (9.5)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = 2.88$
Youth Only	2 (40)	19 (90.5)	$p = .09$ $n=26$
Open	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	$\chi^2 = 2.70$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	$p = .26$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$
Benefits (Positive Impacts)			
Male	6 (75)	2 (25)	$\chi^2 = 2.89$
Female	7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	$p = .09$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	2 (40)	3 (60)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Youth Only	11 (52.4)	10 (47.6)	$p = .62$ $n=26$
Open	8 (50)	8 (50)	$\chi^2 = .48$
Secure	2 (66.7)	3 (33.3)	$p = .79$
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=26$
Benefits (Respect)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = .25$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	$p = .62$ $n=26$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	5 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.47$
Youth Only	5 (23.8)	16 (76.2)	$p = .23$ $n=26$
Open	3 (18.8)	13 (81.3)	$\chi^2 = 1.11$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .57$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=26$
Benefits (Motivate)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .04$
Female	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	$p = .84$

			<i>n</i> =26
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .58$
Youth Only	8 (38.1)	13 (61.9)	<i>p</i> = .45 <i>n</i> =26
Open	5 (31.3)	11 (68.8)	$\chi^2 = .29$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	<i>p</i> = .86
Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	<i>n</i> =26
Benefits (Support)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .07$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	<i>p</i> = .79 <i>n</i> =26
Adult/Youth	1 (20)	4 (80)	$\chi^2 = .10$
Youth Only	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	<i>p</i> = .75 <i>n</i> =26
Open	2 (12.5)	14 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .85$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	<i>p</i> = .65
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	<i>n</i> =26
Benefits (Trust)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = 1.35$
Female	3 (16.7)	15 (83.3)	<i>p</i> = .25 <i>n</i> =26
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	3 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.86$
Youth Only	6 (28.6)	15 (71.4)	<i>p</i> = .17 <i>n</i> =26
Open	4 (25)	12 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.05$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	<i>p</i> = .59
Both	6 (23.1)	5 (71.4)	<i>n</i> =26

* *p*<.05, ***p*<.01

Table A24

Summary of Chi-Square: Group Differences – Concerns of Relationships

Variable	Yes	No	Chi-Square
Concerns (none)			
Male	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	$\chi^2 = .04$
Female	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)	<i>p</i> = .84 <i>n</i> =23

Adult/Youth	1 (25)	3 (75)	$\chi^2 = .20$
Youth Only	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)	$p = .65$ $n=23$
Open	4 (30.8)	9 (69.2)	$\chi^2 = 1.56$
Secure	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	$p = .46$
Both	2 (28.6)	5 (71.4)	$n=23$
Concerns (Manipulate)			
Male	0 (0)	8 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.17$
Female	2 (13.3)	13 (86.7)	$p = .28$ $n=23$
Adult/Youth	1 (25)	3 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.62$
Youth Only	1 (5.3)	18 (94.7)	$p = .20$ $n=23$
Open	1 (7.7)	12 (92.3)	$\chi^2 = 2.98$
Secure	1 (33.3)	2 (66.6)	$p = .23$
Both	0 (0)	7 (100)	$n=23$
Concerns (Boundaries)			
Male	4 (50)	4 (50)	$\chi^2 = .02$
Female	8 (53.3)	7 (46.7)	$p = .88$ $n=23$
Adult/Youth	2 (50)	2 (50)	$\chi^2 = .01$
Youth Only	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)	$p = .92$ $n=23$
Open	8 (61.5)	5 (38.5)	$\chi^2 = 3.80$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .15$
Both	5 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	$n=23$
Concerns (Hard)			
Male	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	$\chi^2 = .62$
Female	4 (26.7)	11 (73.3)	$p = .43$ $n=23$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	4 (100)	$\chi^2 = 1.35$
Youth Only	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)	$p = .25$ $n=23$
Open	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	$\chi^2 = 2.98$
Secure	0 (100)	3 (100)	$p = .23$

Both	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	$n=23$
Concerns (Favouritism)			
Male	2 (25)	6 (75)	$\chi^2 = 1.55$
Female	1 (6.7)	14 (93.3)	$p = .21$ $n=23$
Adult/Youth	0 (0)	4 (100)	$\chi^2 = .73$
Youth Only	3 (15.8)	16 (84.2)	$p = .39$ $n=23$
Open	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	$\chi^2 = .52$
Secure	0 (0)	3 (100)	$p = .77$
Both	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	$n=23$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$