

The Pennsylvania State University
The Graduate School
Department of Education Policy Studies

**A COMPARISON STUDY OF THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
BETWEEN A JUVENILE JUSTICE FACILITY AND A PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL**

A Dissertation in
Education Leadership
by
Christen Elizabeth Clemson

© 2016 *Christen Elizabeth Clemson*

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

May 2016

The dissertation of Christen E. Clemson was reviewed and approved by the following:*

*Jacqueline A. Stefkovich
Professor of Education
Dissertation Advisor
Chair of Committee*

*John Henry Kramer
Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Criminology*

*Edward J. Fuller
Associate Professor of Education*

*Maria M. Lewis
Assistant Professor of Education*

*Anthony H. Normore
Professor of Education
Chair for Division of Graduate Education
Special Member*

*Kai A. Schafft
Program Head, Education Policy Studies*

** Signatures are on file in the Graduate School*

ABSTRACT

This case study examined the use of informal and formal protocols by two different institutions, a public high school and a juvenile justice facility. Examining the similarities and differences in the use of both types of protocols in these institutions could provide insight into the school-to-prison pipeline that plagues at-risk youth. Literature that examines the labeling of at-risk youth, especially African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Native American boys, sheds light on problematic zero tolerance policies that were put in place during the 1990s and early 2000s to curb perceived school violence by males. These procedures are part of the greater policy set that helps guide and direct these organizations toward achieving their institutional mission.

During this study, it was found that an Ohio public high school and a juvenile justice facility share many similar informal and formal protocols, especially with regard to these institutions' dependents, namely, students and juvenile delinquents. However, numerous policies also differ between the two institutions, many of which are related to their unique missions and goals. Using interviews, observations, and literature, this research examined the most common issues arising from the use of informal and formal protocols, as well as their daily impact on the institutional missions of both the public school and the juvenile facility. Second, the implications for policy and practice in both institutions are provided, focusing on key points found in the study's data and the education leadership literature. Finally, possibilities for future research are explored with an emphasis on discipline, race, gender, education, and time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Research Questions	4
Background	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance	6
The Prison Dilemma	7
The Education Dilemma	9
Glossary of Terms	11
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Education in the Modern Era	14
National Education Policies	18
Criminal Justice Theory	31
Juvenile Justice	35
Organizational Theory	45
Structural Components of Organizations	47
Goffman: Framework for the Study.....	57
Front Line Supervisors: Correction vs. Education	63
Discretionary Decision Making	67

Theoretical Framework	69
Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY	71
Justification for a Qualitative Case Study	71
Research Design	72
Site Selection	73
Sample Selection	79
Confidentiality	80
Data Collection	81
Data Analysis	86
Credibility and Dependability	89
Limitations	90
Delimitations	91
Chapter 4: DATA RESULTS	93
Formal Protocol Similarities	93
Formal Protocol Differences	106
Schools	107
Juvenile Justice Facility	114
Informal Protocol Similarities	118
Informal Protocol Differences	134
Summary	144
Chapter 5: DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS.....	146
School	146

Juvenile Facility	164
Relationship to Institutional Functioning	172
Unexpected Issues	175
Summary	184
Chapter 6: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	187
Review of the Study	187
Implications.....	189
Implications for Policy	189
Implications for Practice	195
Future Research	203
REFERENCES	208
APPENDICES	223
Appendix A, Expected Behavior 1	223
Appendix B, Expected Behavior 2	224
Appendix C, Student Behavior Form.....	225
Appendix D, Formal Protocol Chart	226
Appendix E, Informal Protocol Chart	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Formal Protocol Chart	226
Table 2. Informal Protocol Chart	227

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank my mother, Barbara, for her unwavering support, love, guidance, patience, and forgiveness. Her steadfast support helped me grow and persevere during the difficult, lonely, painful and joyous parts of this dissertation process.

Secondly, I would like to thank my Grandma Dodo (Mary) and my dearly departed Dodo (Joe). Without your love, support, guidance, and small gifts, I would be lost. Thank you for believing in my dreams even when I did not, and for encouraging me to continue when the road got bumpy. My third thank you goes to my brother, Craig; without your love, common sense, support and belief in me, I would never have been able to finish this process. You always knew when I needed a fun break or a nice text, and you never failed to make me smile and reassure me that I can do anything I put my mind to. You are my best friend and partner in crime. I love you more than all the molecules of water in the Mississippi. Finally, to Grandma Babe and Grandpa Dick, thank you for all your help throughout the years. Without your sweet gifts and thoughtful communications, life would not have been as nice.

To Helen and Josh Schubert-I'm not sure how to even go about thanking you. You have become like family to me and I owe you more than you will ever know. It's hard to put into words how lucky I am to have such amazing friends that have become family. You two will be the most amazing parents to your little girl and I cannot wait to watch her grow up. To the Higgins and Woods families, thank you so much for making me one of your own. I love you all and appreciate your support throughout the years. I cannot wait to see what the future holds for us.

To all the rest of my friends, who also supported me in this process, the Patio Party Group, Teresa Payton, Charlotte M., Dr. Jeannette Brelsford, Dr. Barbara Wade, Courtney Taft, Dr. Michelle Salopek, Hend Dhkeel, Dr. Stephanie Cardona, Gina H, Joe D., Alex W., Mark L., Carwyn S., Jamie P., Meg B., Diana B., Sara and Kevin M., Lisa H., Heidi and Ken G., Kim H., Jeff and Kirsten B., Jason M., and many more that I did not mention, thank you. You are truly an invaluable group and I am lucky and blessed to know all of you.

My family has supported me emotionally, physically, and spiritually, through thick and thin; nothing can replace them and I am so lucky that they are my family. We may not always see eye to eye, but they have been there through every moment of this process and supported me through the writing of this dissertation and my book, *The Prison Path: School Practices That Hurt Our Youth*. For that, I am eternally grateful and thankful. I love you all!

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Public schools and juvenile justice facilities are two institutions in today's society that educate youth. From the outside it would seem that they are polar opposites: one educates and molds youth and the other restrains and retrains youths who are social deviants. Yet, from the research regarding each institution separately, it appears that juvenile facilities and schools contend with the same types of issues. While this alone would make an interesting study and is one possible area of future research, a more pressing question took center stage for this study.

The question for this research, which focused on the protocols used in a juvenile facility and a public school in the state of Ohio, examined if there was a deeper link between the two. Is it possible that teachers are more like correctional officers than society would like to admit? What policies and practices does each follow that make them comparable? This study examined these questions through interviews with juvenile facility teachers, a juvenile facility superintendent, high school teachers, and high school principals. By gaining a deeper understanding of how juvenile facilities and school personnel keep order in their respective institutions, the impact of the protocols and control mechanisms used on juvenile delinquents and students can be analyzed to determine whether the "school-to-prison pipeline" goes beyond race, socioeconomic status, discipline issues, or indicates other problems.

Statement of the Problem

Some 39.7% of inmates in state prisons compared to 18.4% of the general population of the United States have not completed a high school education (Harlow, 2003). When asked, 34.9% of inmates compared to 17.2% of the general population cited behavioral or academic problems as their reason for dropping out of school (Harlow, 2003). Zero tolerance policies do not help these statistics because

The use of preventative detention promotes a system of social control that relies on the labeling of youths as dangerous when they violate school codes of conduct. Once they are so identified, the sanctions imposed—suspension, expulsion, and assignment to alternative programs—accelerate youths' movement to outplacements, sometimes boot camps and lockdown facilities, and finally to prison. (Casella, 2003, p. 56)

According to Casella, schools have felt the need to tighten security because of the fear generated by school shootings and other violence. One way to do this has been to remove any student who shows the slightest indication of acting dangerously or violently (Casella, 2003). To meet their zero tolerance policies, schools have formed partnerships with police departments, alternative schools, juvenile psychiatric hospitals, and technical schools (Casella, 2003). Many of the students who are labeled dangerous are African-American or Latino, male and young, and are suspended from school at a much higher rate than their Caucasian counterparts. While African-American students made up only 17% of the total school population, Black students accounted for 34% of the suspensions in 2000 (Archer, 2009-2010).

Suspensions, expulsions, and emergency removals lead students who have been removed to perform poorly in their classes. Students who are also suspended have less parental supervision at home and often spend their out-of-school time on the streets, further contributing to the violent and delinquent mentality attributed to students who are suspended or expelled. Academically, Balfanz et al. found that a “typical ninth grader who went to prison had previously attended school only 58% of the time, failed at least one quarter of their classes, and read at a sixth grade level at the end of either grade” (Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, Legters, 2003, p. 76). Such poor performance can lead to more class absence, behavioral problems, and eventually possible dropout. Students who are successful in school rarely encounter the criminal justice system and are less likely to find themselves in prison. School achievement, attendance, and graduation play key roles in whether or not a youth becomes incarcerated in the criminal justice system (Winters, 1997).

According to the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, “5% of White students are suspended, compared to 16% of Black students. American Indian and Native-Alaskan student are also disproportionately suspended and expelled, representing less than 1% of the student population but 2% of out-of-school suspensions and 3% of expulsions” (2014). Students who are diagnosed with a disability are almost twice as likely to receive an out-of-school suspension (13% compared to 6%). While most research has focused on the suspension and expulsion rates for minority boys, these rates for Black girls are also rising rapidly. The U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights found that “Black girls [were] suspended at higher rates (12%) than girls of any

other race or ethnicity and most boys” (2014). Many of these students do not receive adequate services during their suspensions and expulsions, putting them at higher risk for falling behind in school, displaying behavioral problems, and eventually dropping out of school.

Research Questions

The overarching research question that drives this inquiry asked, What are the similarities and differences in the daily protocols of juvenile justice facilities and schools? Protocols are defined in this study as the daily routines, both formal and informal, that guide a student’s day in a juvenile facility or a school. The main question was broken down into four others: a) Which informal protocols in a juvenile facility and a school are similar? b) Which formal protocols are similar between juvenile facilities and schools? c) Which juvenile facility and school informal protocols are different? and d) Which formal protocols are different between a juvenile facility and a school?

Combinations of formal and informal protocols are important to the functioning of both institutions. These rules allow for daily monitoring, creation of stability, and routines that are necessary for maintaining control, keeping order, and ensuring a safe institution. These research questions stem from an interest in how juvenile facility teachers and public school teachers run their days, what their daily goals are, how they hope to accomplish them, by what means they accomplish them, and which tools are used to accomplish them. These questions arose from research on the school-to-prison pipeline. The next section will provide more information on the aforementioned research

Background

The school-to-prison pipeline is a recent phenomenon that has emerged to explain the high rate of student incarceration. Although the school-to-prison pipeline is a relatively new phenomenon, key factors have been identified that lead students into this pipeline. Zero tolerance policies (Casella, 2003; Hirschfield, 2008; Noguera, 2003a), special education labels (Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Maauser, 1974), and minority status (Patton, 1998; Togut, 2011; 2012; Wald & Losen, 2003) are three major contributors to the school-to-prison pipeline.

The American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense Fund (LDF) have been active in gathering, organizing, and promoting the research that has been conducted on the school-to-prison pipeline. In 2010, the issue of the school-to-prison pipeline was brought to the floor of the U.S. Senate when a joint agency committee created the Supportive School Discipline Initiative, the purpose of which was to supply schools with alternative discipline policies. The initiative began with the best of intentions, but little work has been done since its inception. Currently, the school-to-prison pipeline still exists in many schools, but the focus has turned to accountability with the passing of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the similarities and differences in how juvenile facility teachers and public school teachers, as well as juvenile supervisors and public school principals manage their daily activities and maintain control of their youth.

Understanding the control mechanisms used in each location and then conducting a comparison between these institutions could provide a deeper insight into whether the school-to-prison pipeline is influenced by the structure of daily control in each institution. As the school-to-prison pipeline continues to exist and the number of students entering it even grows, this research could start a significant conversation on the role that institutional control plays in the school-to-prison pipeline.

Significance

The importance of this study resides in what is left unsaid. Society is comfortable believing that socioeconomic status, life circumstances, and inadequate education are responsible for the rise in prison populations. This view stems from the belief that youth who are incarcerated or performing poorly in school are victims of their own poor decisions, not from overwhelming structural bias or institutional racism. Attention has turned towards schools to fix the inadequacies attributed to education, since it is assumed that this is the factor that society can control. New reforms have been implemented that promise to raise education levels, hold schools accountable, and give every student a basic education, which has been in response to a rise in incarceration and recidivism numbers. Yet, what has not been taken into account is that for incarcerated adults and youth such changes do nothing. Many youth are incarcerated because of problems in school that have little to do with the issues that the reforms try to address. A young minority male with a history of discipline problems is more likely to end up incarcerated than to graduate from high school. Reforming curriculums, adding high stakes tests, then

punishing schools for their students' inadequate performances on these tests will do little to prevent these minority males from being incarcerated.

Building on these ideas, there is a distinct possibility that schools are setting a certain type of student up for failure. What happens if teachers unwittingly run their classrooms more like jails? Could juvenile facilities and public schools then be more alike than different? Could it be possible that juvenile facility protocols mirror school protocols more than society should be comfortable with? A discussion with any school teacher or school administrator will include vague references to prisons. Jokes have even been made about schools resembling prisons, yet the reforms that arise seem to focus on what a student should know, rather than on changing the protocols that would assist with their learning process. This study was one of the first to compare juvenile facility protocols and school protocols in relationship to the functioning of each institution.

The Prison Dilemma

This section on the prison dilemma includes many juveniles who spend time in juvenile facilities and become incarcerated in adult facilities when they turn 18. Currently, prisons face issues of overcrowding, security, and funding, which are part of the consequences of the school-to-prison pipeline. The overall imprisonment rate for the U.S. dropped to 480 prisoners per 100,000 residents, but as state rates decreased, federal inmate numbers increased by 7% (McCarthy, 2013). In 2011, Black inmates accounted for 38% of state inmates. White inmates accounted for 35% and Hispanics were at 21% (McCarthy, 2013). As of October 26, 2013, the Bureau of Prisons held 211,195 federal inmates (U.S. Department of Justice, 2013).

The consequences of incarceration are harsh; but for an inmate who regains his or her freedom, obtaining gainful employment, staying sober, and adapting to life on the outside are difficult. In 2007, the national recidivism rate—recidivism meaning those who return to prison on either a parole violation or a new charge—was 16%; however, this view is not complete (Langan & Levin, 2002). Recidivism rates are tracked over the first three years of an parolee's release and the data are not promising. In a 10-year study of 11 states conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, between 1983 and 1994, it was found that out of 108, 580 released inmates, 63% were re-arrested within three years (Langan & Levin, 2002). Of those re-arrested, 47% were for a new crime and 41% returned to prison or jail (Langan & Levin, 2002). In a larger study in 1994 that encompassed 15 states and 300,000 released inmates, 68% were arrested again after three years; of those, 47% were convicted for a new crime (Lagan & Levin, 2002).

For inmates who are released and become parolees, the first year of freedom poses the highest risk for recidivism. A national study found that the first year of release is the riskiest for inmates; most violate parole and recidivate during this first year (Bell et al., 2013). Young inmates faced an increased risk of recidivism. An inmate who is under the age of 21 when released is twice as likely to recidivate versus an inmate who is over 50 at the time of release (Bell et al., 2013). These young inmates are especially problematic because they are often high school dropouts who have few skills and almost no training or education for legal employment.

The Education Dilemma

The number of high school graduations nationally in 2009-2010 were at their highest since 1974, with 78.2% of high school students receiving a diploma (Brenchley, 2013). Nationally, in 2011, 5% of White students, 7% of Black students, and 14% of Hispanic students dropped out of high school (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Another study during the 2009-2010 school year found that 1.9% of Asian/Pacific Islanders and 6.7% of American Indian/Alaska Native students did not graduate from high school (Brenchley, 2013). Although these numbers represent a significant decline from previous years—in 1990, Blacks dropped out at a 13% rate and Hispanics at 32%—the numbers are still alarmingly high. A fact sheet compiled by the National Education Association (NEA) on attendance, graduation, completion rates and dropouts, cited a survey by the Department of Justice in the early 1990s that found that a Black man in 1991 stood a 28% chance of going to prison. In 2003 that statistic rose to 33% (McKeon, 2006). This same study found that 53% of high school dropouts were unemployed and almost 80% of those in prison did not have a high school diploma (McKeon, 2006). While there may not be a direct link between dropping out and incarceration, those who are unemployed may turn to illegal activities to support themselves and their families, putting them at risk for incarceration, for lack of an education and job skills.

In 2012-2013, 73.6% of Ohio students were White, 15.9% were Black, 4.3% were multi-racial, 4.2% were Hispanic, 1.8% were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.1% were Alaskan or American Indian (Ohio Department of Education, 2012-2013). Ohio's

graduation rate in 2010-2011 was 80%; broken down by race: Native Alaskans and Native Americans graduated at 71%, Asian/Pacific Islanders at 88%, Blacks at 59%, Hispanics at 66%, Multiracials at 71%, and Whites at 85% (U.S. Department of Education, 2010-2011). Students With Disabilities graduated at 67%; those with Limited English Proficiency at 53%, and Economically Disadvantaged at 65% (U.S. Department of Education, 2010-2011). Ohio recently went to the Value Added System, where 50% of a teacher's or principal's evaluation is based on student growth measures (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). The impact of this system has not yet been seen on the newest round of graduation and dropout statistics, but should be available in the 2018 Department of Education report. It is believed that the Value Added System will further reduce the dropout rates since teachers will be penalized when a student leaves high school.

According to a study by the U.S. Department of Labor in 2003, high school dropouts are almost 80% more likely to be unemployed than high school graduates (McKeon, 2006). This lack of employment can lead to a vicious cycle for young adults in the lowest 20% of the income bracket who were six times more likely to drop out of high school than young adults from the top 20% (McKeon, 2006). To cite the gap between high school graduates and dropouts, graduates make almost \$10,000 more per year than students who drop out (McKeon, 2006). The factors associated with dropping out of high school, such as poverty, limited skill sets, restricted income, and race, all play a role in who becomes a prison inmate. The dilemma associated with these factors is that

the majority of African American, Hispanic, and Native American boys and girls are finding themselves trapped in the school-to-prison pipeline.

Glossary of Terms

The following is a glossary of the terms used throughout this dissertation.

Correctional Officer. The term correctional officer (CO) refers to a person with training who is responsible for maintaining the day-to-day, hands-on security, safety, and supervision of juveniles in the juvenile facility.

Formal Protocols. The term formal protocols refers to the official rules that govern the organization that are issued to dependents and staff by the administration or the higher governing authorities of each institution. In this study, the formal protocols included the Student Handbook, General Rules, A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior, and Classroom Rules. An example of a formal protocol is "no student shall display or use electronic communication devices in the school during classroom instruction or during an assembly or other gathering part of the instructional day" (Student Handbook, p. 7).

Informal Protocols. The term informal protocols refers to the unofficial rules of the institution that staff and administrators use to provide balance between the formal protocols of the institution and the needs of the dependents. Examples of these types of protocols include: a) the classroom policies that teachers use to keep order in their classrooms and b) the policies used by the administration to make sure that teachers meet the organization goals. Classroom policies include, for example, being quiet during classroom lessons, being seated during lessons, and showing respect for the teachers.

Examples of administration policies that informally assess teachers include: tallying the total number of students sent to the behavior pullout room, or criticism of teaching management skills.

Juvenile Justice Facility. The term juvenile justice facility refers to the physical location of an institution in the United States where juveniles are sent for punishment. In this research, a juvenile justice facility refers to an incarceration facility run by individual states, but does not include private or for-profit incarceration facilities.

Supervisor. The term superintendent refers to a person who is in charge of running a juvenile justice facility.

Recidivism. The term recidivism refers to either a new arrest or a conviction.

Parole Violation. The term parole violation refers to a parole violation rather than a new arrest or conviction.

Juvenile. The term juvenile refers to a youth under the age of 18 who has violated either state or federal law and is currently serving time in a state or federal institution. In this study, juvenile refers to a youth who is serving time in a juvenile facility, unless otherwise specified.

Teacher. The term teacher refers to a person with a four-year college degree who instructs youth in the K-12 school system in subjects required by individual states, such as math, English, science, and social studies.

Principal. The term principal refers to the educator who is in charge of the school. Principals are required to have additional education, often in the form of a master's degree.

High school graduate. The term high school graduate refers to a person who has successfully met and completed the requirements for high school and has graduated.

Dropout. The term dropout refers to a person who has not met or completed the requirements for graduating from high school and has left the care of the school.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Extensive literature has been published on public schools and juvenile justice facilities in the United States, including their use of formal and informal policies that affect their day-to-day operations. Therefore, to structure this study, an overview of important public school and education policies, juvenile facilities, and other related topics are presented in this literature review. This chapter is not meant to be an extensive review of all the literature in the selected areas, but an overview of important topics, authors, and works that situate this study in a relevant context.

Education in the Modern Era

In 2002, when the No Child Left Behind Act was signed by President George W. Bush, half of all Republicans and almost 35% of Democrats thought home schooling was a good idea, yet very few families could afford to live well on one salary (Reese, 2005). “In the 1999-2000 school year, there were over fourteen thousand school districts legally responsible for over ninety-two thousand public school” (Reese, 2005, pg. 329). These schools included children with disabilities, minority children, wealthy children, poor children, native English speakers and limited English proficient students, all with the opportunity to attend school, receive an education, and go on to college. With the federal government providing only approximately 6% of the funding for schools, the majority of funding came from state and local taxes; thus the financial disparity between school districts was distinct. Furthermore, in the first years of the implementation of NCLB, the testing requirements led to some unscrupulous practices as poor, underachieving districts

worried that inadequate performances on the tests would reduce their already limited school funding. Many schools sent their poor test takers to special education classes, where students were exempt from taking the high-stakes tests. An additional graduation test employed in the majority of states, a provision of the NCLB, failed a high percentage of poor, minority, and special needs children (Reese, 2005).

The ultimate goal of No Child Left Behind, with its focus on testing and accountability, was intended to eliminate differences in school performance based on race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status (Congress, 2002). This bill was reauthorized in 2007 with stricter punishments for schools that did not meet the requirements. The target date for the completion of this goal was 2014, but President Obama attempted to make changes to NCLB while it was in the reauthorization process in Congress. The NCLB has been highly unpopular with educators, and some states have even lowered their standards to achieve the national minimum. The reality that test scores of “poor and minority children [have] remain[ed] relatively low is not particularly surprising, given the collapse of urban infrastructure, the rise of single-parent households, persistent poverty, and the widespread faith of parents in equal educational opportunity for all and extra for their own” (Reese, 2005, p. 331). While high school dropouts once had the ability to join the workforce or the military, the stakes have risen to the point where there are few jobs available to those without a high school diploma.

Schools were supposed to be the great equalizer of society, promoting excellence for all, as well as teaching democracy, tradition, and giving all children the chance to succeed in society (Reese, 2005). Many Americans still hold this strong belief, but,

At the same time, reformers from every side of the political spectrum periodically demand that teachers accused of teaching their subjects so poorly, solve grave social ills that adults, not students, created, such as racial segregation, sexism and xenophobia, and also teach the young delayed gratification, honesty, the golden rule and other values not always honored in practice by their elders. (Reese, 2005, p. 336)

Society's expectations for schools to create well-rounded pupils places the responsibility on schools to provide the best teachers, breakfast and lunch programs, after school programs, clubs, sports, and other recreational activities for all. While polls have shown that Americans are split on how well they believe the schools are educating their children, parents and society still expect their schools to address the divisive social and political issues of society, as well as teach academics and fill in the gaps that social agencies may have missed (Reese, 2005). Schools are expected to do it all and do it well.

Little has changed from the original purposes of public schooling. Americans expect their schools to solve social ills, educate students, protect society, form moral adults, elevate the poor, Americanize immigrants, encourage the unique talents of each individual, create a homogenous society, and instill values in every student. This is a burden for schools as polls show that few Americans want to remove the social obligations of schools in order to concentrate on teaching academics (Reese, 2005). This has put teachers and administrators in the difficult position of needing "to raise achievement scores, produce well-behaved, model citizens, and a winning team on Friday night" (Reese, 2005, p. 323). John Dewey wrote that "education is the fundamental

means by which Americans try to improve individuals and society,” a belief that has not weakened throughout the years (Reese, 2005, p. 322). In fact, with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, the federal government for the first time attempted to guarantee that each child learn the minimum and, if schools fail, they are to be held accountable. In fact within the next few generations, schools will most likely be faced with a set of national standards, national tests, and a federal curriculum.

As of 2013, NCLB still pertained only to schools in the United States. Testing still dominated the educational landscape with state tests, proficiency tests, graduation tests, and benchmark tests occupying most of the educational instruction time. Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) have become the foundation upon which most schools’ curriculum is built, because the testing related to NCLB is primarily focused on mathematics, science, reading, and writing. In 2009, President Obama also introduced an educational initiative called Race to the Top, which provided funding to states that were implementing innovative, compelling, competitive, and comprehensive education reforms.

On December 10th 2015, President Obama signed a new K-12 education bill that removed a majority of the federal presence from public schools, returning control to local school districts (Layton, 2015). The new act, called The Every Student Succeeds Act, which ensures every student an equal opportunity, received strong support from Congress and allowed states to develop their own standards for their public schools (Layton, 2015). States are still required to test students annually in grades three through eight in math and reading, and to report scores based on race, income, ethnicity, disability, and English

language learner (Layton, 2015). Power to fix the most troubled of state schools was also to be turned over to the states, that is, schools defined as those having scores in the lowest 5%, large achievement gaps, or less than two thirds of students graduating from high school (Layton, 2015). States would also receive the power to weight test scores and evaluate teachers, dismantling the power of NCLB. However, change is slow and many states have yet to develop and implement new standards.

National Education Policies

Currently, the goal of both public schools and juvenile justice facilities is the education and re-education of the young people within these institutions. In order to understand the enormous tasks faced by each, an examination of the current state of each institution is needed. In the following sections, each institution is addressed as well as issues relevant to this study. Due to the decentralized nature of education in the United States, it is hard to declare that there is one specific type of policy or practice in all schools. However, the following policies and practices can be found in almost every school district in the United States.

Zero tolerance.

Today students are more likely to be suspended from school than a generation ago; 1.7 million students were suspended in 1974. In 2000, 3.1 million were suspended, and “in 2006, one in every fourteen students was suspended at least once during the year” (Archer, 2009; 2010, p. 868). Yet, suspension is not the only way that students come into contact with zero tolerance policies. Schools that impose these policies, employ police officers, and install metal detectors, conduct searches and other safety features to

“transform our schools from nurturing learning environments into virtual detention centers” (Archer, 2009; 2010, p. 868). No longer are students only subjected to punishment within their schools, but because of the presence of police and peace officers, what was once handled within the school may become a criminal issue that results in a student’s time away from school and exposure to the criminal justice system. African-American youth are disproportionately affected by these zero tolerance policies. While “African-American students represented only 17% of public school enrollment nationwide, they accounted for 34% of school suspensions in 2000” (Archer, 2009; 2010, p. 869). According to Archer, African-American and Latino male youths in high-poverty, high-minority schools are more likely to enter the school-to-prison pipeline, because these schools are perceived as having more discipline problems and are allegedly more dangerous than non-minority, middle class schools.

The inequities that are often found in schools are also part of the problem. As Wald and Losen (2003) found, dropout rates, discipline rates, and zero tolerance policies target minority students, especially African-American young men. “Between 1972 and 2000, the percentage of White students suspended annually for more than one day rose from 3.1 percent to 5.09 percent. During the same period, the percentage for Black students rose from 6.0 percent to 13.2 percent” (Wald & Losen, 2003, p. 10), an increase that has continued to the present year. This increase has been followed by a new, get tough, perspective on students who get in trouble. “Since 1992, forty-five states have passed laws making it easier to try juveniles as adults, and thirty-one have stiffened sanctions against youths for a variety of offenses,” meaning that youth who get in trouble,

whether at school or in their communities, face penalties that will send them to jail rather than to school (Wald & Losen, 2003, p. 10). Once incarcerated, suspended or expelled, as Wald and Losen explained, these youth face a whole new set of challenges to reenter school, decreasing their chances of earning a high school diploma.

American schools are criminalizing school youth who get into trouble.

Hirschfield (2008) built a theory that takes into account the three dimensions of school criminalization that encompass school discipline policies. Hirschfield believes that, first, schools' punishments are becoming more mechanized in nature, focusing on guidelines rather than the discretion of the teachers and administrators who know the children (Hirschfield, 2008). Schools took their discipline cue from the criminal justice system, where strict adherence to the letter of the law is routine. The second dimension is that discipline is being transferred from the discretion of the school faculty to an adherence to the discipline policy, without regard for extenuating circumstances (Hirschfield, 2008). The third dimension is the tools that are used in schools to keep them safe and running in an orderly fashion, which includes metal detectors, cameras, zero tolerance policies, police, and searches. Four explanations are often used as to why these phenomena are occurring. Hirschfield (2008) claimed that moral panic, school accountability, the due process narrative, and "governing-through-crime" mentalities (p. 87) help to continue and perpetuate the growing cycle of stricter schools.

Observations of problem youth conducted by Pedro A. Noguera (2003a) begin with a vignette of one of his trips to an elementary school. When an assistant principal showed Noguera around the school, a young boy was sitting by the principal's office.

Noguera asked why he was sitting there. The assistant principal told Noguera that the young boy was going to end up in prison. When Noguera (2003a) asked how the assistant principal could be so sure, the principal commented that the boy's father and uncle were already in prison and the entire family was nothing but trouble. When Noguera asked the principal what the school was doing to stop this cycle, the principal was flabbergasted that Noguera believed the school should be responsible for stopping the prison cycle (Noguera, 2003a). Noguera likened deviant behavior to a cycle. Once a student is labeled a deviant, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy; the behavior increases and becomes more problematic, eventually resulting in the student permanently leaving school. As Noguera (2003a) stated,

Students who get into trouble frequently are typically not passive victims; many of them understand that the consequences for violating schools rules can be severe, particularly as they grow older. However, as they internalize the labels that have been affixed to them, and as they begin to realize that the trajectory their education has placed them on is leading to nowhere, many simply lose the incentive to adhere to school norms. (p. 343)

Once labeled, the youngster's ability to shed the label is almost non-existent and may lead to removal from school because of their perceived dangerousness.

Two prominent researchers on zero tolerance policies are Daniel Losen and Russell Skiba. Both have focused on the use of school discipline polices on Black and White students, students with disabilities, and students in poverty. Their research has paved the way for changes in zero tolerance policies as well as brought attention to the

disproportionality of race, gender, and socioeconomic status in school discipline. For example, Skiba, Michael, Nardo and Peterson (2002) found that there were differences in the types of punishment meted out to lower income students and that these consequences were “sometimes delivered in a less-than-professional manner (e.g., yelled at in front of class, made to stand in the hall all day, search of their personal belongings) (p. 319).

Skiba and Peterson (2000), in their study “School Discipline at a Crossroads: From Zero Tolerance to Early Response,” found that the gap between research and practice “in the areas of school discipline and behavior, [leave] schools with insufficient resources to cope with current serious problems of disruption and violence (p. 336).

Because of insufficient policies for dealing with school violence, “well over three million children, K-12, are estimated to have lost instructional ‘seat time’ in 2009-2010 because they were suspended from school, often with no guarantee of adult supervision outside the school” (Losen & Gillespie, 2012, p. 6). This can put students at-risk for getting into further trouble as they spend time unsupervised, and get behind in their education careers. Exclusionary discipline policies also do not correct the behavior of students, nor do they make the classroom a more smoothly run place. Losen (2011) found that “when teachers [sought] to remove a seriously disruptive student, they generally believed the removal would help them be more effective with the students who remain” (p. 10). However, Noguera (2001) found this was not the case; when a poorly behaving student was removed; other students began to act out.

Dangerousness and preventative punishment.

Ronnie Casella (2003) conducted an ethnographic study of two high schools and a prison, examining preventative detention for students who were deemed dangerous. As he explained,

Preventative detention is a means of crime control that relies on detaining and isolating potentially dangerous offenders, sometimes referred to as ‘punishing dangerousness.’ The use of preventative detention in schools—in tandem with the practice of assigning students to school outplacement programs, increased presence of school police officers, and adoption of zero-tolerance policies—can prompt actions that restrict and isolate youths in programs and facilities that do not meet their social and academic needs and that have clear institutional links to the criminal justice system. (p. 55)

During his time observing, Casella noted that students who would normally be either suspended from school or put in detention were now facing more serious changes because of the presence of police and peace officers in their schools. As Casella observed, students who were perceived as dangerous were being placed on a track that led them to the juvenile or adult criminal justice system.

Casella’s study of the two high schools, one in New York and one in Connecticut, compared them to a medium security prison in Connecticut. Both high schools had relatively high populations of minority students; the Connecticut high school had a large population of Puerto Rican students, while the New York school had a large population of

African-American students. Security in the Connecticut school was provided by a police officer, a private security firm, a camera circuit, and zero tolerance policies; the school also had outplacement options, including an alternative high school, psychiatric ward, and a lockdown facility (Casella, 2003). The New York high school had a police officer, security guards, peer mediation, a DARE program, student support team and a crisis intervention system (Casella, 2003). Within the prison, two violence prevention programs were run, serving approximately 1100 inmates at the time of Casella's study. This program used lectures, group work, role playing, and activities to help inmates. Casella (2003) interviewed 21 inmates who had completed the prison violence prevention program to learn about their experiences with schools, violence, and the criminal justice system.

In both high schools, Casella (2003) found that African-American and Latino boys were labeled dangerous by judgments of their character, rather than their involvement in actual dangerous incidents. With the rash of school shootings and other school based violence nationally, schools have been placed under tremendous pressure to remove students who could be potentially dangerous. Schools are succumbing to societal pressure that begins with media interviews that describe the student shooter as a loner, isolated, weird, or a host of other adjectives that suggest their dangerousness. By placing these students in outplacements or isolated programs, schools can show that they are doing something about the problem and meeting society's demand for safer schools.

Casella (2003) also found that these schools felt under pressure to fill the placements in their alternative programs and schools with students. Since the creation of

these alternative schools and outplacement programs is expensive and uses taxpayer money, many school administrators feel pressured to fill the programs. Students who are perceived as being dangerous to the school are then shuttled to these programs, proving that the program or school is worth the cost.

In both high schools, Casells (2003) found that the police officers had the ability to arrest and charge students with a crime. The security guards, who did not have the power to arrest, often recommended sanctions such as expulsion and suspension, and worked closely with the police officers. This meant that incidents that were once handled within the school and allowed administrators to use their discretion are now subject to criminal prosecution. A simple disagreement in the hallway is now viewed as breach of the peace; a fight between students can result in assault charges.

Casella (2003) found that with all these measures, African-American and Latino boys in both high schools were perceived as being more dangerous than their Caucasian peers. This perceived dangerousness led to their placement in alternative schools or programs, more contact with the criminal justice systems, and labels that make it hard to regain placement in regular high schools. Once labeled and involved in the criminal justice system, Casella (2003) concluded that most of these minority youth are eventually incarcerated in the prison system.

Casella's (2003) interviews with prison inmates who went through the violence intervention program revealed that many of the inmates, who were African-American or Latino, were placed in outplacement programs during their high school years and deemed dangerous by their schools. Many told Casella of their years "between" schools, being

shuffled to alternative schools, programs, boot camps, and finally ending up in prison (Casella, 2003, p. 66). Many inmates felt that once they had been deemed dangerous by school personnel, their incentive to behave or become a “normal” student disappeared. They found that nothing they did would remove them from suspicion, so they embraced the dangerous label and began accordingly. The prison track of such students began with their perceived dangerousness, labeled by school personnel who needed to fill placements and provide a feeling of safety within their school.

Restorative justice.

In response to zero tolerance policies and students who may pose a danger to others, many researchers and educators have looked to restorative justice as an alternative solution. Restorative justice as defined by Belinda Hopkins (2003) is “not in terms of those who are to blame ‘getting their just desserts’ but as ‘all those affected by an “offense” or incident being involved in finding a mutually acceptable way forward” (p. 144). As defined by Haft (2000), “[the] restorative justice principle hold[s] offenders strictly accountable for their conduct while seeking to repair and restore the integrity of the school community after an offense has occurred” (p.804). In restorative justice, the wrongdoer is recognized as also having been affected; therefore, finding a way to move forward involves all parties (Hopkins, 2003). Restorative justice focuses on restoring the community of the school for all involved, instead of simply punishing the offender (Haft, 2000). Such policies require a shift in the thinking of all involved, including administrators, teachers, students, and parents. Victims and perpetrators meet with mediators to decide on a suitable solution to the problem at hand; there are no set

punishments in restorative justice. Other types of restorative justice models include conferencing, healing circles, peer mentoring, and other kinds of group discussion activities.

Hopkins (2003) wrote that “restorative justice [is] considered here in three distinct ways: as a set of processes and approaches; as a set of skills; and as a distinctive ethos and philosophy” (p. 144). The processes and approaches are often the most visible part of restorative justice since they are the mediations and rule changes that follow a switch to this approach. The skills that are important for restorative justice are those required to facilitate the communication and healing process for all involved. Lastly, the ethos, or philosophy, of restorative justice must be understood for it to function. For example, if restorative justice is being used in a school, but a victim’s parents are unhappy with an agreed-upon solution and press for the administration to step in and change the solution to more of a punishment, the restorative justice philosophy is not being used correctly. Hopkins’ article included a chart that details the nine changes in the punishment paradigm that must be understood and accepted before restorative justice can work (Hopkins, 2003, p. 145).

Preventative/punitive justice.

As Mead wrote in 1918:

It is the assumption of this procedure that conviction and punishment are the accomplishment of justice and also that it is for the good of society, that is, that it is both just and expedient, though it is not assumed that in any particular case the meting out to a criminal of the legal recompense of his crime will accomplish an

immediate social good which will outweigh the immediate social evil that may result to him, his family, and society itself from his conviction and imprisonment On the other side lies the belief that without this legal justice, with all its miscarriages and disintegrating results, society itself would be impossible. In the back of the public mind lie both these standards of criminal justice, that of retribution and that of prevention. It is just that a criminal should suffer in proportion to the evil that he has done. On the other hand it is just that the criminal should suffer so much and in such a manner that his penalty will serve to deter him and others from committing the like offense in the future. (p. 582)

This duality, in the minds of society, is the cause of the preventative/punitive conflict that has arisen in society. Preventative justice measures such as car ignition locks for repeat driving under the influence (DUI) violators, more police officers, DUI checkpoints, neighborhood watches, and warning signs and posters, are all ways to deter crime. These measures fall under the label of preventative detention but do not provide the satisfaction of punitive measures that many in society demand. Society wants to prosecute criminals and lock them away so that safety is restored. There is a feeling of safety with punitive justice. In contrast, “Under President Bill Clinton, the government began encouraging and funding local programs intended to offer enticing entertainment alternatives, like basketball games for inner-city youths—referred to as ‘Midnight Basketball’—again as a way to *prevent* crime,” targeting groups at risk for criminal activity, offering solutions to help teens avoid the criminal justice system” (Harcourt, 2012. P. 5).

Punitive justice is the opposite of preventative justice. Punitive justice punishes the criminal long after the debt has been repaid. The U.S. Supreme Court approved this type of punishment in their case *Kansas v. Hendricks*, 1996, when they ruled that violent sexual predators, who are still deemed a threat, can be entered into preventative detention even after they have served their sentence. Other punitive measures include zero tolerance policies, where the behavior is punished, regardless of the circumstances or the person. Punitive justice looks for problems, while preventative justice attempts to avoid or prevent problems. Currently in both education and society, punitive justice has become the norm. Police profile certain types of people to try to inhibit the amount of crime; schools suspend or expel students for the maximum amount of time so that parents and other students can feel safe. Punitive justice is about providing the illusion of safety by removing the physical reminders or those who commit the crime.

Special populations.

Many people believe that when a student receives special education services in school it means that they will receive extra help or modifications that will put them on the path to success. For most youth, though, nothing is farther from the truth, especially for African-American and Hispanic males. James M. Patton (1998) examined the beliefs, assumptions, and views in special education and the effects of labeling African-American youth. He also examined the discourse that is missing in the discussion of special education: acknowledgement of the overrepresentation of African-American and other minority males in special education, and the detrimental impact the label has on their future.

The face of this ethical issue is no longer the low-achieving, drug-addicted student who skipped school and got into trouble. According to August J. Maauser (1974), today's new juvenile delinquent is younger (between 13 and 14), smarter (an average IQ of 95), and African-American (arrested at a rate of three to one). Even though the new juvenile delinquent has a higher IQ, many still face learning problems. Gary H. Bachara and Joel N. Zaba (1978) examined the "cause-and-effect relationship between learning problems and juvenile delinquency" (p. 58). They attempted to find hard evidence of the causal links. In their study, they found that for the juvenile delinquent whose primary problem is a learning disability, there are academic therapies that are effective for decreasing their chances of recidivism.

However, there are key risk factors for youth who enter the school-to-prison pipeline. Togut (2011) reiterated that being a minority (African-American, Latino, Native American, Inuit or Pacific Islander) combined with a low socioeconomic status means that a youth is more likely to receive a special education label. Accountability testing has not helped these students. Instead, it has raised the stakes for schools, tying desperately needed funds to test scores. Some struggling schools have attempted to enhance their best possible scores by labeling or pushing out their weakest students. Hence, "the period between 2000 and 2001, U.S Department of Education data indicates that at least 13 states labeled more than 2.75% of Black students intellectually disabled. Nationally, the prevalence of White students labeled mentally retarded was approximately 0.75% in 2001, and in no state did the incidence of labeling White students rise above 2.38%"; the South had much higher rates of labeling compared to the North (Togut, 2011, p. 165). Togut

believes that there is a correlation between the discrimination faced by Black children in school discipline policies and their overrepresentation in special education. As he explained, “there is no absolute proof of racial discrimination, there is strong evidence that there exists some form of systematic bias in the use of school suspension and expulsion” (pp. 178-179). This seems to be the problem with the school-to-prison pipeline, as there is very compelling evidence that there is a problem, but scientific proof is hard to find.

Criminal Justice Theory

Although the concept of criminal justice has been around since Roman times, within the last 50 years, criminal justice scholars have attempted to arrive at one general theory. Currently, however, debate rages among scholars and practitioners about exactly what should be included in this theory. This section gives an overview of multiple and current theories of criminal justice.

According to Fitch, Normore, and Werner (2011) the theory for all crime originally came from the principles of determinism versus free will, which can be traced to the Old Testament in the Bible. The theory of original sin is credited to Adam and Eve’s fall from grace. This fall and subsequent sin and punishment recorded in the Bible emerged as the first theory to explain crime (Fitch et al., 2011). However, during the 1900s, John Locke began to challenge the notion that God or Satan controlled the behavior of humans; instead, Locke believed that humans had the free will to choose their course in life (Locke, as cited in Fitch et al., 2011). This freedom of choice became known as the free will theory, which in time became an important part of criminal justice

because it put responsibility on the person to make the correct moral decision. People who chose to commit crimes were considered morally deficient, and these deficiencies needed swift and painful correction.

In the 1800s, “one of the earliest scientific attempts to identify the biological causes of crime originated with the theory of phrenology championed by Franz Joseph Gall” and emerged as a way to identify criminals (Fitch et al., 2011, p. 167). Gall believed that the brain was divided into parts that functioned independently of each other; without use, certain parts could deteriorate, causing the brain to turn to criminal behavior (Fitch et al., 2011). These postulations by Gall (who was unable to study the brain physiologically) led to other speculations about the brain and its relationship to criminal acts.

One of these explanations was that genetics played a role in criminal activity. It was speculated that the birth of a child to parents who had criminal defects would continue the criminal cycle. For example, if an alcoholic father married a woman who was a thief, their child would be either mentally retarded, a thief, or an alcoholic. These speculations led to others about the role genetics play in criminality. The theorists who fell under the genetic mindset thought that genetics played a role in who would commit a criminal act. They believed that there were less evolved humans and that they possessed distinctive features (Fitch et al., 2011). The most renowned theorist of this notion was Cesare Lombroso, whose ideas were used by “Alphonse Bertillon, a French police officer, who developed a method of cataloguing chronic offenders by recording a series of 11

measurements, including the limbs, head, shape of the ear, mouth and eyes, tattoos, scars and personality characteristics” (Nafte & Dalrymple, 2011, as cited in Fitch et al., 2011).

The next theory to arise was the rational choice theory that emerged from the work of Jeremy Bentham, a nineteenth century philosopher who assumed that “the potential lawbreaker weighs the perceived benefits of a criminal act against the perceived costs of punishment” (Fitch et al., 2011, p. 170). With this in mind, Bentham designed a prison with a panopticon through which a prison guard could keep constant surveillance of inmates, never allowing them a moment of privacy. Adding to Bentham’s theory was James Q. Wilson who believed that criminal tendencies were a product of poor parenting. While the government could not fix bad parenting, incarcerating offenders could limit the damage done by them (Fitch et al., 2011).

The third theory that emerged was that crime is a learned behavior, which asserted that “behavior is believed to be a function of its consequences” (Fitch et al., p. 171). According to this theory, behaviors that receive rewards are more likely to be repeated than behaviors that earn negative feedback. People can learn criminal behaviors simply by watching others perform criminal acts, but the negative consequences deter others. Psychologist B. F. Skinner’s research and research by Bandura point to criminal behavior as a learned societal behavior (Fitch et al., 2011).

A fourth theory that developed is the criminal personality theory. This theory was developed in 1979 by Yochelson and Samenow after their 16-year study of criminals confined to a hospital. They found “that the patients were manipulating the therapy sessions to their own advantage, so as to provide excuses for their criminal conduct in an

effort to control their therapeutic outcomes” (Samenow, 1984, as cited in Fitch et al., 2011). Yochelson and Samenow determined six key traits of a criminal: “1) the criminal lacks empathy; 2) the criminal feels no obligation to anyone except his own interests; 3) the criminal is enamored with living a life of excitement, at whatever expense; 4) the criminal is a predator who pursues power and control; 5) the criminal feels put down and becomes angry when he does not get his way; and 6) with the exception of planning for a crime, the criminal does not think long-term” (Fitch et al., 2011, p. 173). While Yochelson and Samenow’s longitudinal research provided interesting insight, critics have attacked their theory because many of the participants left before the study was completed although the few participants who completed it did show some change (Fitch et al., 2011).

These theories and implications have shaped the way juvenile delinquents have been viewed in relation to their crimes. Currently, society firmly believes that the individual is responsible for their actions and has the ability to choose right from wrong. Due to the work of researchers like Yochelson and Samenow (1979), many believe that criminals and juvenile delinquents all possess the six key traits that they found. Therefore, society has taken the view that criminals are unfeeling, uncaring, sociopathic, juvenile, and make the choice to break the law. This view of adult criminals has also filtered down to juvenile delinquents, making it harder for juveniles to be viewed as victims or to receive the mental, physical, social, or education help that they may need.

Juvenile Justice

The area of juvenile justice is not new in the adult penal system; it has existed since the 1600s in the United States. However, research on the effectiveness of juvenile justice is still in the beginning stages compared to other fields. One of the issues with studying the effectiveness of juvenile justice has been a lack of standardization across the country. Since juvenile justice tends to lend more weight to external factors surrounding the juvenile, the prerogative of judges and prosecutors has taken precedence over a standardized punishment system. While this approach can be viewed as beneficial, it also provides difficulty for researchers who seek to study the effectiveness of treatments or sentencing. Therefore, the literature in the field of juvenile justice is vast, ever changing, and regional/state-specific. Presented below is an overview of the literature on juvenile justice that pertains to this study.

The beginnings of juvenile justice.

The first law to address juveniles was the Stubborn Child Law passed by the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1646, which stated,

If any child, or children, above sixteen years of age, and, of sufficient understanding shall CURSE or SMITE their natural FATHER or MOTHER, he or they shall be put to death, unless it can be sufficiently testified that the Parents have been very unchristianly negligent in the education of such children: so provoked them by extreme and cruel correction, that they have been forced thereunto, to reserve themselves from death or maiming. (Martin, 2005, p. 38)

This statute remained in effect in Massachusetts for almost three centuries before being changed. During the 18th Century Enlightenment and Reform movements in the United States, juvenile laws began to change.

The first change was to create “houses of refuge” in which “middle- and upper-class reformers turned private homes into communities of needy children, where education, food, and shelter were provided” (Martin, 2005, p. 39). Many of the children sent to these houses were from the immigrant and lower classes, as their home life was deemed unfit by the upper and middle classes. It was not until 1823, when the New York Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents was established, that the group began to work on creating a philanthropically supported house of refuge for juvenile delinquents, which opened in 1825 (Martin, 2005). This house of refuge was home to “street youths, thieves, and vandals” (Martin, 2005, p. 39), although youth who had committed more serious crimes were placed in jail or prison. These houses provided strict discipline, a highly regulated day, and taught youth a trade (Martin, 2005). In the Pennsylvania case *Ex parte Crouse*, the court upheld the involuntary commitment of youth and explained the fundamental principle of juvenile justice as:

The object of charity is reformation, by training its inmates to industry; by imbuing their minds with principles of morality and religion; by furnishing them with means to earn a living; and above all, by separating them from the corrupting influence of improper associates. To this end, may not the natural parents, when unequal to the task of education, or unworthy of it,

be superseded by *parens patriae*, or common guardianship of the community. (*Ex parte Crouse*, 4 Whart. 9 Pa.1838)

A second movement arose in the middle of the nineteenth century called the child savers; their fundamental belief ‘was “that environmental conditions can have a deleterious effect on children – bad environments produce bad children” (Martin, 2005, p. 41). This group’s three key beliefs were: “Children should not be treated the same as adult offenders, each individual child should be treated as a unique individual with unique needs, and the juvenile justice process should be less onerous than the adult criminal process” (Martin, 2005, p. 41), and set the tone for the modern day juvenile justice system. The child savers created reformatories or reform schools that “softened the severity of the Houses and sought to create a homelike environment for residents with an emphasis on education” (Martin, 2005, p. 41). This change in attitude toward youth helped usher in the juvenile court era that began in the late nineteenth century and lasted through the first two decades of the twentieth century (Martin, 2005).

The juvenile court era began in 1874 when Massachusetts passed legislation that formed children’s tribunals, followed by New York, Rhode Island, and Colorado (Martin, 2005). This legislation separated adult offenders from youthful offenders. However, it was not until 1899 in Illinois that the legislation actually created a comprehensive and modern juvenile justice system (Bilchick, 1999). Four radically new concepts emerged, including, “youths under the age of 16 who engaged in certain deviant behaviors should be classified as ‘juvenile delinquents’; special rules of procedure should govern the adjudication of cases heard before juvenile courts; child and adult offenders should be

separated; children are victims of their environments and should be rehabilitated” (Martin, 2005, pp. 43-44). To make these tenets enforceable, a juvenile court was created “to provide dispositions targeting the rehabilitative needs of the offender rather than issuing punitive sentences based on the seriousness of the offense” (Hinton, Sims, Adams, & West, 2007, p. 466). This movement towards juvenile rehabilitation prompted researchers to examine other factors that contributed to juvenile delinquency. Moreover, the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute was established in 1909 in Chicago to aid the Chicago Juvenile Court by providing “recognition that juvenile delinquents were frequently in need of mental health services” (Hinton et al, 2007, p. 469).

Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act.

The next major legislation regarding juveniles was enacted by Congress in 1974. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) replaced an older 1968 version (Martin, 2005). The new JJDP “tied federal funding to state restrictions on the detention and institutionalization of juvenile delinquents” (Martin, 2005, p. 49). The JJDP created the four Ds: “deinstitutionalization, diversion, due process, [and] decriminalization” (Martin, 2005, p. 50). However, a rise in juvenile crime in the 1980s and 1990s caused many juvenile courts to issue harsher sentences (Henggeler & Sheidow, 2003). With this rise in crime, “1.6 million youth younger than the age of 18 were arrested by law enforcement personnel in 2000” (Hinton et al., 2007, p. 470). The most recent data from 2010 show that officers arrested 1,642,500 juvenile offenders (Sickmund & Puzanchera, 2014). Of those arrested, 29% were female, 73% were ages 16 to 17, 66% were White, 31% were Black, 1% were American Indian, and 1% were Asian (Sickmund

& Puzzanchera, 2014). The majority of these arrests were for crimes that fell under the property crime index, including larceny, which was the number one offense (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014).

In public and private schools nationwide, 32.8% of students were involved in a physical fight (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014), 26.1% of students faced vandalism issues (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014) and 7.1% of students felt too unsafe to attend school (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). The number of students who brought weapons to school dropped to 5.4% (from 6%) and students who were injured or threatened with a weapon to 7.4% (from 9%) (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014).

Although the percentage of students using weapons at school decreased, their drug use has been on the rise. Almost half (48%) of high school seniors said they had tried illicit drugs in 2010, as had 37% of 10th graders, and 21% of 8th graders (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). On school campuses, 25.6% of students had been offered, sold, or given an illegal drug in the past 12 months, and Hispanic males were most likely to be offered drugs (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014).

Gang activity in schools also remained relatively stable between 2006 and 2010, with an estimated 29,400 gangs comprised of 756,000 members in 3,500 jurisdictions (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). Juvenile gang members were most likely to be Hispanic, followed by Blacks, then Whites, and Others, and most gang members were male (92.3%) with only 7.7% being female (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). However, female gang membership has been increasing as opportunities for them have expanded

beyond the stereotypes (Clemson, 2015). Furthermore, juvenile murder rates fell (Sickmund & Puzanchera, 2014).

At-risk behaviors.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) conducts a bi-yearly survey of students in at least one grade, grades 9 through 12, in public and private schools in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. This survey asks students to anonymously answer questions about their at-risk and health-risk behaviors. Due to the large number of schools and students that participate, researchers can aggregate these data based on urban, suburban, or rural districts, as well as by race and gender. The CDC found that certain genders and races were more likely to be at-risk for certain behaviors. White students were more likely to report that they had texted or emailed while driving, carried a weapon, were the recipient of electronic bullying, or had been bullied on school property, used cigarettes, frequently smoked cigarettes, smoked ten or more cigarettes a day, smoked on school property, used smokeless tobacco, currently used tobacco, used birth control methods, ate vegetables, drank milk, exercised at least 60 minutes a day for five days a week, used sunscreen, and used indoor tanning devices (CDC, 2014).

Black students were more likely to be in a physical fight at school, trying to quit smoking, had sexual intercourse before age 13, had sexual intercourse with four or more people, using a condom, getting tested for HIV, not eating fruit or drinking fruit juice, not drinking milk, drinking soda/pop, not participating in 60 minutes of physical activity on any given day, and having asthma. Hispanic students were more likely to engage in activities such as riding in a car with someone who had been drinking, feeling sad or

hopeless, considering attempting suicide, making a suicide plan, carrying out a suicide attempt that ended in injury or treatment with a doctor, drinking alcohol, using cocaine, inhalants, ecstasy, heroin, methamphetamines, steroids, being offered illegal drugs on school property, attending physical education classes, trying to lose weight, fasting, using diet pills or powders, and taking laxatives (CDC, 2014). All three races reported carrying a gun, experiencing physical dating violence and sexual dating violence, cigarette and cigar usage, alcohol and injecting illegal drugs, using birth control, drinking or using drugs before sex, eating vegetables and not drinking soda/pop, being active for at least 60 minutes in seven days, playing one sport, and being obese (CDC, 2014).

These at-risk behaviors can lead to juvenile incarceration, and “according to the Justice Policy Institute (JPI), the average state spends almost \$250 per day per youth on post adjudication residential facilities (McLeigh & Sianko, 2010, p. 334). When families are involved or multiple methods of therapy are used, the cost can rise substantially. However, when juveniles “drop out of high school and engage in a lifetime of offending and drug use ... costs to society are estimated between \$1.7 and \$2.3 million” (McLeigh & Sianko 2010, p. 335). In order to understand how a student or youth can become a juvenile offender, the juvenile justice system must be explored. When a juvenile is apprehended by police officers for a suspected crime or turned over to the law because of an incident at school, the juvenile is put through an intake process “where the prosecution and defense gather information about the incident in question, the seriousness of the offense, and previous criminal or court history” (Clemson, 2015, pp. 124-125). If there were previous criminal charges and rehabilitation had been assigned, the team will

consider the success or failure of the rehabilitation measures. There are then three options for how the court or prosecutors can proceed, as follow.

Juvenile justice procedures.

The first option is a dismissal of the charges. Many times, dismissal will be recommended for minor or less serious crimes, improper handling of the case, or when a juvenile seeks treatment on his own (Clemson, 2015). This method involves no further prosecution or documentation against the juvenile; however, it is noted on his or her case file should there be a future incident. If the case is not dismissed, then the second option is to handle the case informally (Clemson, 2015). Informally handling the case means that the youth agrees to certain conditions for a specific period of time. When the juvenile, their family, the prosecutor, defense attorney, and court meet, each must agree on the conditions set forth in the agreement. Once the terms have been agreed upon, the youth is given a parole officer who will monitor the youth to make sure that he or she is meeting the terms of the agreement. Some examples of informal handling include restitution, curfews, counseling, further education, and community service.

More severe crimes are dealt with through a process that is similar to adult court, which is called formally handling a case. The severity of the crime is most often the deciding factor in whether a case will be handled formally. Once the decision has been made to proceed with a formal hearing, the juvenile is often placed in a juvenile holding facility. Juveniles who are not placed in detention are given bond to ensure their appearance in court. When a juvenile is placed in a detention facility, a hearing must be held within 24 hours to determine if they need to continue to be helped in the detention

center or if they can be released on bond (Puzzanchera & Robson, 2014). The next step, regardless of whether the juvenile is in detention or on bond, is a formal hearing. This hearing requires a discussion of the juvenile, prior offenses and rehabilitation, family life, and education by all parties involved. From this discussion, two options are available.

The first option is a waiver hearing, which means that the discussion has come to the conclusion that the juvenile's past record with criminal issues and failed rehabilitation, as well as the seriousness of the current crime, warrants a more serious handling of the case (Puzzanchera & Robson, 2014). A waiver hearing often means that the juvenile will face charges in an adult court, where other options are available. Certain procedures must be followed for a juvenile to be tried in adult court, and the crime must fit certain standards, that is, that the juvenile be over the age of 14 at the time the crime was committed, and the crime must be a felony in the adult criminal system. Precedence has shown that once a juvenile is tried in adult court, they will be tried in adult court for any subsequent crimes.

The second option that may be used to handle a juvenile criminal case is to recommend the juvenile for an adjudicatory hearing. In the juvenile system an adjudicatory hearing is similar to a trial in the adult system (Puzzanchera & Robson, 2014). However, all evidence is presented to a judge and there is no jury present in an adjudicatory hearing. Juveniles have the right to an attorney, witnesses, avoiding self-incrimination, and cross-examining witnesses. If the juvenile is found guilty, he or she will then be remanded to a detention center for a disposition hearing the next day. In this hearing, the judge is given all prior known information on the juvenile, including prior

offenses, education level, social interactions, psychological, social, and emotional levels, home life, as well as previously completed treatments. With this information, the judge will then determine, based on the current crime, the appropriate method of treatment for the juvenile. The corrective actions can include counseling, incarceration in a juvenile facility, detention, community service, restitution, or rehabilitation (Clemson, 2015).

When the juvenile has completed their sentence, a probation officer will be assigned to periodically check on the juvenile to make sure that they are meeting the goals set out in the sentence. If the juvenile meets the terms of release and stays out of further trouble for five years, their record will be expunged; all juvenile records will be expunged when the juvenile turns 19. If the juvenile has been designated a *child in need of services* (CHINS), meaning beyond the control of their parents, absent without consent from home, has a drug addiction or is a danger to the community, has been convicted of a felony, or a traffic violation, these convictions will not be expunged from their record.

Currently in the juvenile justice system, overcrowding is a serious problem. According to McLeigh and Sianko (2010), a national survey “showed that one third of secure juvenile facilities in the United States were at or over capacity or were relying on makeshift beds” (p. 337). Along with issues of overcrowding, inhuman treatment has been alleged as well as violations of juveniles’ civil rights, including “dangerous or overly harsh disciplinary techniques, such as four-point restraints, strip searches, pepper spray, and lengthy isolation” (McLeigh & Sianko, 2010, p. 337). Youth who are waived to the adult criminal system face some severe consequences, including being “8 times more likely to commit suicide than their counterparts in juvenile facilities, 5 times more

likely to be sexually assaulted, 3 times more likely to be assaulted by prison staff, and 50% more likely to be assaulted with a weapon than youth in a juvenile facility” (McLeigh & Sianko, 2010, p. 337). One of the harshest punishments that a juvenile could receive prior to 2005 was life without parole.

In 2005, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled “that capital punishment for crimes committed when the offender was under the age of 18 violated the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment” (McLeigh & Sianko, 2010, p. 337). The percentage of juvenile cases in which the juvenile was over the age of 16, that were waived to criminal court in 2013 was 1.2% (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2015). For juveniles who were younger than age 15, only 0.1% of criminal cases were waived to adult court (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2015). The cases that were most likely to be waived to criminal court were those involving personal offenses (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2015). In 2013 there were 323,300 adjudicated and the majority were property cases, followed by public order offenses, and person offenses (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2015).

Organizational Theory

To understand how the formal and informal protocols of the public school and juvenile facility function, a brief examination of organizational theory literature is necessary. For the sake of expediency and the narrowing of an extensive branch of research, this section of the literature review offers a broad glimpse of organizational theory. This overview includes organizational structure, organizational characteristics, the human factor of the organization, and organizational control influences.

Formal versus informal organizations.

One of the first factors that must be considered is how the formal organization comes into existence. Organizations fall into two types, informal and formal; schools and juvenile facilities are considered formal organizations. Arnold S. Tannenbaum (1966), in *The Social Psychology of the Work Organization*, defined a formal organization as one that “produce[s] goods or provides services *efficiently*” (p. 2). Tannenbaum (1966) defined the informal organization as “the unplanned, informal set of groups, friendships, and attachments that inevitably develop when people are placed in regular proximity to one another” (p. 1). Both public schools and juvenile facilities are formal organizations since they provide a service to society. In examining organizational structure, four key factors are discussed in the following.

Organizational goal achievement.

After defining the type of organization being examined, it is important to consider three perspectives that influence how organizations achieve their goals. Hage and Aiken (1970), in *Social Change in Complex Organizations*, indicated that “any definition of organization has three major social scientific perspectives” (p. 11). Two of these are the sociological perspective and the psychological perspective. According to Hage and Aiken (1970), from the sociological perspective, the organization is “viewed as a collective of jobs or ‘social positions,’ each with its own skills, powers, rules, and rewards” (p. 11). This contrasts with the psychological perspective, which the authors defined “as an aggregate of individuals, each with his own abilities, interests, behaviors, and motives” (p. 11). According to Hage and Aiken (1970), the third perspective, the

socio-psychological, combines the two theories and asks, “Is the right man in the right job? Or “How do characteristics of the organization affect individual patterns of perception and thinking?” (p. 12). Understanding that all three perspectives play a role in how the organization achieves its goals is crucial to understanding how formal and informal rules are implemented in the organization.

Organizations form for many reasons, but a key one is to accomplish organizational goals, which provide clarity to the organization and a unifying factor for the individuals who are working in it (Weiner, 2009). As Weiner summarized, the purpose of the organization and what it is trying to accomplish represent the initial exchange medium for all personnel and keep organizational personnel focused on achieving the set goals of the organization. As organizations evolve and become more complex, mechanisms are put in place to help facilitate personnel with meeting the organizational goals. Weiner (2009) believes that mechanisms that provide for the clear understanding of the relations between the goals of the organization and the values of the individual are advantageous, and that these mechanisms are a crucial part of the organization. Since organizations do not exist in a bubble, and personnel bring their own values to them, mechanisms that work to combine their values with the organization’s goals help make the organization work better.

Structural Components of Organizations

Formal organizations also have structural components that differ from informal organizations. In this literature review, three main structural components are discussed as

relevant to this dissertation: organizational characteristics, the human factor, and organizational control.

Organizations have a multitude of characteristics that help to define them and their goals, missions, and functions. However, the characteristics of the organization that pertain to this study include the formalization, stratification/reward system, purpose, specialization, order, authority, uniformity, bureaucracy, and efficiency. In the following, the literature that details each of these characteristics as related to the two organizations, public school and juvenile facility, is presented as a context appropriate for this study.

Formalization.

Formalization in an organization has been defined by Hage and Aiken (1970) as “the degree of codification of jobs in an organization. The greater the number of rules specifying what is to be done, whether formally written or informally understood, and the more strictly they are enforced, the greater the formalization of the organization” (p. 43). In layman’s terms, this means the systematic arrangement of the jobs required to keep the organization functioning. Formalization allows little in the way of leniency and latitude for the person assigned to the job. Highly formalized jobs do not encourage creativity or initiative but encourage rule following and automation (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). In fact, in highly formalized institutions, jobs can become stagnant due to the lack of new ideas and innovation (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

The assumption regarding highly formalized institutions is that those who created the positions know the best way for the job to be completed (Hage & Aiken, 1970). In schools, the formal organization is characterized by “teaching roles defined by division of

adult labor into specialized tasks; teaching roles defined by subject matter and types of students; an emphasis on social interactions that are rule governed, are effectively neutral, and have limited individual discretion; and a form of authority that is attached to the role within the organization rather than to the person occupying the role” (Lee, Bryk, & Smith, 1993, p. 173). The danger of formalization in schools is that teachers, administrators, and staff can become locked into the power of the position without exploring other options for how to complete their jobs.

Stratification.

In addition to formalization, understanding how stratification and rewards are used to keep the layers of the school organization functioning as a cohesive unit is important to this research study. Stratification in education is outlined by Collins (1971) as “(a) occupational positions that require particular kinds of skilled performance; and (b) positions that must be filled with persons who either have the native ability, or who have acquired the training necessary for the performance of the given occupational role” (p. 1004). This means that schools, when viewed in light of organizations, have a hierarchy of jobs and positions that must be filled by those who have received specialized training. As with most organizations, as one ascends to the top, more training is required. In schools, even those on the bottom rung of the organization, including custodians, bus drivers, teacher aids and secretaries, are required to have some type of training. Teachers, who are the next level in the organization are required to have more formal training, including a bachelor’s degree with specialization, and are required to be working towards a master’s degree in their chosen area. A step above the teachers in the hierarchy are the

principals, who have completed even more area specific training and are often required to hold certifications in administration. At the top of the school hierarchy is the superintendent who, in most scenarios, has received the most training and certifications of anyone in the school hierarchy.

Rewards.

In order to enforce stratification, a system of rewards is put in place for those within the organization, even at the student level. School discipline, discussed in a later section of this literature review, is part of the system of rewards and punishment on the student level. Roch, Pitts, and Navarro (2010) examined policy tools in their study and found that “a school’s discipline policy is aimed to incentivizing students against disrupting the learning environment, and those policy tools (whether carrots or sticks) all focus on such motivation to comply” (p. 41). This is also applicable to teachers and administrators within the school organization; if the staff does not buy into the mission of the school and work to undermine the organizational mission, the policies and hierarchy will either force the person into cooperating with the organizational mission or they will leave the organization. Roch et al. (2010) also found that “varying sets of policy tools will ‘coproduce’ citizen outcomes that have implications beyond more narrow organizational goals” (p. 42). This means that the goals within the institution can move beyond the institution and affect society through implementation. These carrots and sticks, as labels, are offered at all levels of the organization to keep the people within it working towards the organization’s goals.

How organizations meet their goals.

Those within the organization design its goal, also known as the mission or purpose of the organization, so that the organization can meet its agenda. The school functions as both a “state institution conducting activities in a society and single schools as organizations fulfilling their daily work” (Berg, 2007, p. 577). According to Berg, “the steering of the school may be sub-divided into steering through the mandates set out in formal, official documents, and such implicit steering that the school as an institution exercises, for historical and other reasons, over schools as organizations” (p. 579). These informal and formal policies set the framework and course for the institution. Formal policies or “explicit steering is an articulation of the formal mission/s that the school as an institution is given by its governing body” (Berg, 2007, p. 579). These formal policies, often written, can come from the federal, state, or local government, the community, or the school administration and dictate the goals the school needs to meet to be considered successful. As Bidwell (2001) wrote, “Teaching is a never-ending effort to reconcile what cannot be truly reconciled – an effort to preserve standards while engaging students’ interest and good will” (p. 103).

Informal policies.

Informal policies or implicit steering (Berg, 2007) are “missions [that] can be understood in a historical context, but also in terms of various kinds of demands and expectations that emerge from the surrounding society and community” (p. 579). However, other research has shown that informal policies can be found at all levels of an organization (Fuller & Clarke, 1994; Kagan, 2010; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). These

informal policies can be weak or strong depending upon who is implementing them and their usage within the institution. Berg (2007) stated that the

school as an institution can be seen on the one hand as a ‘form’, i.e., as a formal administrative system for conducting activities around the idea of education. On the other hand, the school as an institution can also be seen as the agency responsible for the reproduction of society, that is, for instilling, e.g., social norms, cultural traditions, and the transmission of the knowledge and skills necessary to the individual and society. (p. 581)

Authority.

In this study, authority is an important aspect of the school institution. At all levels of its stratification, power is invested in the position and given to the person who occupies that position. This power is associated with the position, but is also impacted by the person who currently holds the position. In organizations, this power is referred to as authority and is dependent upon which position that person is in within the stratification of the school organization. Regarding the level of teachers, Hansen (2006) wrote “professional authority [is] garnered through preparation, experience, and dedication (p. 180)” and in providing an element of care for their students.

However, to balance that care, teachers must also provide the daily discipline to manage their students and meet the institution’s goals. As Campbell (2006) wrote, “Curricular authority requires teachers to account for their practice to others, such as local educational administrators, governmental bodies, or the internal school community

itself; professional authority compels teachers to be accountable to themselves, both individually and collectively, as members of a community of professionals” (p. 112).

While Campbell (2006) specifically targeted teachers in this statement, principals, superintendents, school boards, communities, the state and federal governments all have authority that is imparted by the schools and are also used to control the schools.

Authority is invested in the organization and by the organization to its members who then proceed to use this authority to implement the informal and formal policies of the school with the students. Thus, authority moves through the institution in a cyclical manner.

Bureaucracy.

The last characteristic of the organization that applies to this study is bureaucracy. In recent years, the bureaucracy in organizations has come to be associated with tedious paperwork, frustration, and the inability of the organization to accomplish its goal. In reality, bureaucracy was meant “as a label for a type of formal organization in which impersonality and rationality are developed to the highest degree” (Tannenbaum, 1966, p. 7). This term was invented by German sociologist Max Weber, who wrote that “the capitalist market economy which demands that the official business of the administration be discharged precisely, unambiguously, continuously, and with as much speed as possible” (Rubenstein & Haberstroh, 1960, p. 73).

In Weber’s view, bureaucracy helps organizations function with speed and precision by removing the subjectivity and imprecision of the organization. Weber believed that once created and running with precision, “bureaucracy is among those social structures which is the hardest to destroy” because it is a “means of carrying

‘community action’ over into rationally ordered ‘societal action’” (Rubenstein & Haberstroh, 1960, p. 74). According to Hall (1972), examining the bureaucracy of an organization at each level can help determine its functions and type. By understanding these key components of the organization, researchers and those within the organization can decide whether it is meeting its stated goals with efficiency and success.

The human factor.

Another major element of organizations is what Tannenbaum (1966) called the human factor, noting that organizations “recognize *esprit de corps* and *morale*, as general motivational forces, but do not explore these forces in detail” (p. 12). When F. W. Taylor, the American mechanical engineer, helped to launch the research movement of scientific management, the examination of the individual’s function within the organization was born. Since one of the underlying goals of the organization is to run it as smoothly and efficiently as possible, research was done on how to motivate persons within the organization to do their job as efficiently, smoothly, and with the most production. This involved creating a process that treated individuals as replaceable cogs in the machinery of the organization.

However, it is important to note here, that while some studies like The Hawthorne Studies (Tannenbaum, 1966), which set out to find the best way to mechanize individuals, actually found very different information. It is important to keep in mind that even today, research has not found a way to mechanize individuals. Individuals in organizations today are still people who have their own thoughts, feelings, and ways of completing tasks; even in the most mechanized jobs, total mechanical efficiency has not been and

will not be achieved as long as individuals are employed. There are, however, factors which can increase the productivity and work of those employed within organizations.

Based on data collected from research on human motivation, Maslow (1943) found that 13 propositions created a hierarchy of needs. McGregor reduced these 13 needs to five basic ones that all workers within an organization have in order to feel fulfilled. Based on Maslow's hierarchy, McGregor, in Rubenstein and Haberstroh's *Some Theories of Organization* (1960), asserted that workers in organizations have five basic hierarchical needs which include "physiological and safety needs, social needs, ego needs, and self-fulfillment needs" (pp. 180-182). When the physiological needs of an individual are met (i.e., food in their stomach, a bed to sleep in, and a safe location to live in), they are motivated to meet their safety needs. Safety needs, according to McGregor (1960) are for the "fairest break possible" (p. 181). When a worker feels threatened, they are less likely to take risks and be productive and more likely to cling to the status quo. When these first two needs have been met, the individual begins to look for the third, that is, social needs or "for belonging, for association, for acceptance by his fellows, for giving and receiving friendship and love" (p. 181). This need can be beneficial to the organization if the individual can find or create a tight knit, cohesive group within his work group. The fourth need is the ego needs of the individual and there are two types according to McGregor (1960).

The first type of ego need according to McGregor (1960) is the "need for self-confidence, for independence, for achievement, for competence, for knowledge" while the second type refers to a person's "need for status, for recognition, for appreciation, for

the deserved respect of one's fellows" (pp. 181-182). In an organization, these ego needs can affect the motivation and work of the individual as well as the outcome and productivity of the organization. The last need is for self-fulfillment. As defined by McGregor (1960), self-fulfillment means "realizing one's own potentialities, for continued self-development, for being creative in the broadest sense of the term" (p. 182). As individuals cycle through these stages, they continually develop as part of the organization and as individuals, constantly needing new and different things from the organization in order to flourish. If these needs are not met, the organization can stagnate and workers may leave to find a different job that will meet their needs.

Organizational control.

The last major part of an organization that is important for this study is control—around, within, and from the organization itself. In this area of research, three distinctive pillars have emerged: the regulative, normative, and cultural pillars, which are considered vital elements in an organization. As Scott (2001) wrote, "regulatory processes involve the capacity to establish rules, inspect others' conformity to them, and, as necessary, manipulate sanctions—rewards and punishments—in an attempt to influence future behavior" (p. 52). All organizations have regulatory processes that control how the institution is run, how its workers are rewarded, how they are punished, and what the goals of the institution are. These regulatory processes align with the goals of the institution. The second, or the normative pillar, refer to the values and norms that "introduce a prescriptive, evaluative, and obligatory dimension into social life" (p. 54). Organizations have their own sets of ideals and ethics that govern its mission, but also set

the tone for those within the organization, those affected by the organization, and the community around the organization. The third is the cognitive pillar which “stresses the centrality that constitutes the nature of social reality and the frames through which meaning is made” (p. 57). So not only do organizations shape those within them and around them, but they also actually shape the society in which they are found. An example would be the organization, or company, Apple, whose logo and branding are symbols that “have their effect by shaping the meanings we attribute to objects and activities” (Scott, 2001, p. 57). These impacts at all levels create change within the individual and the society.

The last piece regarding organizations that needs a brief mention is the role that outside and societal pressures have on an organization. Studies such as the Stanford Prison Study (1971) and one by Solomon E. Asch (Rubenstein & Haberstroh, 1960), highlight the power that organizational pressures can have on those within the organization. However, recent high-profile events have also shown that external pressures can shape organizations as well. For example, how external pressures can change organizations can be seen in the Veteran’s Health Care issue, The Pennsylvania State University athletic scandal involving alleged sexual abuse of athletes by a former coach, and No Child Left Behind.

Goffman: Framework for This Study

In this study, Erving Goffman’s view of the total institution and worlds within the institution provides the framework for this study. Therefore, it is important to understand how Goffman (1961) defined these worlds and how they interact within the institution.

Communities/worlds within the institution.

Prisons, including juvenile facilities, and schools attempt to create communities within their walls. One key difference between the institutions is that attending school is a rite of passage that everyone has participated in. Since school is a mandatory institution in today's society, everyone can relate to its structure. Juvenile facilities, unlike schools, are closed institutions, so not everyone has access. In order to understand the true workings of the juvenile facility or prison, the insights and voices of inmates and those who have examined prisons can play a key role in the public's understanding and perception of this institution. To understand how communities within both institutions grow and evolve, the main means of institutional community creation will be examined. The first piece of community building is to create a sense of community among those required to be in the institution, which would be the inmates and the schoolchildren.

Dependent world/dependent making process.

Goffman (1961) postulated that there are three worlds within the whole institution. In his research, which has focused on the prison institution, he indicated that the first is the inmate world, which is created through other inmates, guards, formal and informal protocols. To have an inmate world, the institution must first make an inmate. Inmates are not born; people are born and create an identity in the outside world. Once a crime is committed and the perpetrator is sentenced to do time in a correctional facility, the inmate-making process goes into effect. That is, an inmate goes through a series of humiliations, belittlements, deprivations and examinations of the self that sever the connection between their home world and their new institutional world (Goffman,

1961). Goffman broke this process down into 13 parts, not necessarily in sequential order, nor does every inmate transition through every part.

Elements of the inmate-making process include barriers, admissions procedures, initiations, loss of identity equipment, verbal humiliation, indignities of treatment, mortification, violation of information about self, lack of privacy, physical mortification, forced medication or food, forced interpersonal contact, and forced social relationships (Goffman, 1961, pp. 15-35). The staff in the whole institution is part of the creation of the inmate, as are more seasoned inmates. Through the process of inmate making, the new inmate severs connections with the outside world and becomes part of the institution. Their assimilation into the institution is crucial because the learning of institutional rules, hierarchy, and institutional rationale make it easier for the staff to perform their jobs.

People work.

Staff or supervisors enforce formal and informal protocols within the institution. Staff within the total institution have a unique position; they perform what Goffman (1961) refers to as people work (p. 74). Unlike inmates, the staff goes home at the end of their shift, they have outside statuses, and outside roles; the walls of the institution do not define their community. Staff within the total institution must be incredibly careful, as “people can take on somewhat the same characteristics as inanimate objects”, so a humane standard must be maintained and staff are constantly watched by power supervisors and outside groups to make sure that all standards are maintained (Goffman, 1961, p. 74). Inmates are not a passive group, so staff must be wary of being baited, inmate escapes, framing, and becoming too close to inmates. Inmates are people, too, so

there is always the risk of emotions and involvement between staff and inmates, even with formal and informal instructions in place.

Since inmates are people and require humane standards, the staff performs their duties in a special moral climate that is set by the decisions of the frontline supervisors. In addition to maintaining humane standards, the total institution has institutional goals that inform the language and the moral climate. According to Goffman (1961), there are approximately 11 different goals for the total institution. These goals encompass economy, education, training, medical, psychiatric treatment, religious purification, protection of the wider community, incapacitation, retribution, deterrence, and reformation (Goffman, 1961, pp. 83-84). Each goal has its own language in the institution and each institution must make progress toward its goals. Staff make decisions on the types of inmates they are dealing with based on the type of institution they are employed by. For example, staff members employed in a mental hospital assume that all of their inmates have mental disorders. The role of staff within the institution is to control and defend the institution, translate administrative ideals into the privilege and punishment system, and to develop the institutional perspective (Goffman, 1961, pp. 86-87). The staff develop an institutional theory/view of the inmate, which “rationalizes activity, provides a subtle means of maintaining social distance from inmates and a stereotyped view of them, and justifies the treatment accorded to them” (Goffman, 1961, p. 87).

Voices from the institution.

Understanding the daily workings of the prison or the juvenile facility, from the perspective of an inmate is difficult. Without being incarcerated, fully understanding the process, perspectives, and scope of the institution is not possible. However, insight provided by inmates gives a glimpse into the daily systems, social networks, informal systems, and nuances that become the world of the inmate or the juvenile. In this section is it important to note that the adult system does have significant variations from the juvenile system, but understanding the process of becoming an institutional dependent is the main theme of this section.

Several themes emerged from the writings of inmates who authored *Behind a Convict's Eyes: Doing Time in a Modern Prison* by K. C. Carceral et al. (2004) and *About Prison* by Michael G. Santos (2004). The first theme was the creation of the inmate (Carceral et al., 2004; Santos, 2004). The inmates spoke about their lives before their incarceration as being the essence of being a human. They were able to make decisions, provide for their families, have the freedom to choose their dress and food, and other daily choices they took for granted. Once inside the prison, they wrote about how their individuality was taken away by the institution, the process, and the correctional officers. Numbers instead of names, mandatory times to eat, work, and play, no privacy, and other controlled situations, which create inmates for the institution, removing the previous individuality of the person.

The second theme the incarcerated individuals wrote about was the politics of the prison, treatment by the guards, the workings of the criminal justice system, power within

the institution, battles with depression, anxiety, and thoughts of suicide, gangs, safety, prison cultures, and prison subcultures. Santos (2004), sentenced to federal prison for being a drug kingpin, wrote about feeling like a child within the prison system. His book provides an in-depth look at life in several federal prisons of varying security levels, discussing the tenuous relationships that develop between guards and inmates, prison culture and subculture, and the differences within the prisons due to security levels. Inmate written books provide a perspective on how the policies and procedures and their implementations affect those who are incarcerated in the prison institution.

The third theme that emerged from the inmates' writings was about developing the ability to survive in prison. Stephan Stanko in *Living in Prison* detailed how inmates had to learn how to interact with prison guards. These interactions were unavoidable since inmates and guards occupied the same space, but older inmates could offer advice and teach new inmates how to avoid angering correctional officers and receiving disciplinary tickets. New inmates also needed to learn how to avoid prison violence, a difficult task in a place known to be violent. As Stanko (2004) wrote, "Each fight exists as a catalyst for greater disruption" which can lead to further punishment, injuries, and even death for inmates if they are involved or caught in the violence (p. 173). Besides violence, Stanko wrote about how inmates use associates, join gangs, or remove themselves from the prison society in order to cope with the isolation of prison (Brady, 1976). Other inmate authors discuss how inmates cope with prison and their coping mechanisms that are similar to those of Stanko's.

Front Line Supervisors: Correction vs. Education

The power presence that comes to mind for most people are the supervisors. In the world of the institution, supervisors are viewed as the leaders and power holders. However, these power-holding supervisors are generally relegated to offices that are away from the main action of the institution. Frontline supervisors, or those on the ground level of the institution, play an important role in enforcing the protocols passed down from the power supervisors. In the case of juvenile facilities, the frontline supervisors are the correctional officers; in schools, the frontline supervisors are the teachers.

Enforcement literature.

Between the inmate world and the staff world lie the formal and informal protocols that introduce the inmate to the institution. There are three types of formal structures that Goffman (1961) listed as part of these instructions: first, are the house rules; second, are the rewards and privileges; and third, are the punishments. Goffman (1961) defined house rules as “a relatively explicit and formal set of prescriptions and proscriptions that lays out the main requirements of inmate conduct” (p. 48). Rewards and privileges are “held out in exchange for obedience to staff in action and spirit” and can be simple things that an inmate would take for granted in the outside world (Goffman, 1961, p. 49). Finally, punishments “are designated as the consequence of breaking the rules” (Goffman, 1961, p. 50). These formal structures are written down and the

institution's administration makes sure that staff enforce the instructions among the inmates.

Supervisors within the institution are in charge of enforcing the house rules fairly and consistently throughout the institution. By enforcing these house rules, the supervisors set the tone for the safety and mentality of the institution. For example, if house rules are enforced sporadically and selectively, the dependents of the institution will view the supervisors as uncaring, unfair, and biased. This mentality can be dangerous for supervisors because it breeds hostility and anger. Rewards and punishments that are issued by supervisors are another means of control within the institution. Rewarding and giving privileges for good behavior make a dependent's life easier and encourages them to continue the desired behavior. By issuing punishments for problematic behaviors, supervisors protect other dependents and themselves, and help to maintain order in the institution. Power supervisors often create the house rules, as well as the rewards and punishment system, but enforcement is left to the frontline supervisors.

Classroom control literature.

The classroom control literature is similar to the enforcement literature. There are house rules (the rules issued by the school district/teacher), rewards and privileges, and punishments that students must live by, both within the institution and within the classroom. While correctional officers receive education that is specific to maintaining control, teacher education focuses on theories of learning, leaving classroom control to be learned on the job. Jere Brophy's article, "Educating Teachers about Managing Classrooms and Students," (1988) examined the roles that teachers play in classroom

management, student socialization, and disciplinary interventions. Brophy's research shows that teachers are in charge of a delicate balancing act. He stated that because of the diversity of a classroom in regard to learning and student personalities, teachers have to create lessons that meet the needs of all students. In order to do this, teachers must have a management system in place that works to minimize distractions and stop meltdowns before they wreck the lesson and the classroom.

Brophy (1988) found that since teachers are not trained in this balancing act, it is either something that they intrinsically know how to do, or they learn through experience. Teachers must learn the routines, which Brophy (1988) defined as being the standardized rules that teachers must follow (p. 4). It is not just the formal rules that must be understood; the "*heuristics* (implicit rules of thumb)" are another dimension of classroom control that teachers must learn to implement, negotiate, and apply with little formal instruction (Brophy, 1988, p. 4). Brophy concluded that teachers who have the best classrooms require students to conform to the rules, without appearing to be authoritarians. Teacher education, according to Brophy (1988), needs to include a focus on classroom management, the handling of disciplinary issues, involvement in the socialization of students, and better forms of classroom management.

The issue that Brophy (1988) skirted was the focus of a study by Elizabeth Cohen (1972) about the interconnectedness of students and teachers in the classroom. While the school itself is an institution, it is important to remember that the classroom, while being part of the larger institution, is also its own miniature institution. Although there are rules that apply from the larger institution, there are also rules that apply only to the classroom.

As Cohen (1972) stated, students affect teachers; teachers affect students; and formal and informal protocols affect teachers and students; social factors and environmental factors all contribute to the complex system of the classroom. Cohen's research (1972) shows that prison units and classrooms function as mini-institutions with their own complex social systems, but also as part of the larger social institutional system.

Gary D. Gottfredson and Denise C. Gottfredson (2001) compiled samples from U.S. public, private and Catholic schools, covering the activities and policies used to prevent behavioral problems. Principals of 848 schools completed the original survey, 635 principals completed a second survey, and what was found was highly informative. Their study found that schools are engaged in a wide range of security initiatives, but the one main link between all schools was the strict policies that they had on dangerous behaviors. Suspension was used most frequently for problems despite many schools having other options for controlling student misbehavior.

As Gottfredson and Gottfredson (2001) pointed out, the issue of discipline is a problem that plagues schools across the country. They found that many schools were using methods that did not have a foundation in research. One prominent piece in the research was regarding the actions that had formal rules written about them. The findings from the Gottfredsons' (2001) data collection showed that almost all schools had 10 actions that had rules written specifically for them. Beyond those 10 actions, the policies and responses varied by school and region.

This lack of consistency can lead to students using their social networks and power to display behavior that is detrimental to classroom management (McFarland,

2001). McFarland found that students and their social networks have more control in the classroom than the teacher. Using various vignettes, McFarland (2001) detailed cases where students openly mocked the formal and informal protocols within the classroom. For example, McFarland (2001) wrote of an observation he made during his fieldwork where he “witnessed students openly joking about how low their grades were” (pp. 623-624). Depending on the opinions and strengths of the students, formal and informal protocols can be used as a bonding tool, or they can be used to make a mockery of their intent. These vignettes provided valuable insight into the important role that teachers have in maintaining control of the classroom.

Discretionary Decision Making

The majority of the literature on discretionary decision making has focused on law enforcement personnel and the personal judgments that go into the decision to stop, arrest, charge, and punish those who break rules (Geoffrey, MacDonald, & Dunham, 2005; Jones & Kerbs, 2007; Marwah, 2012; Tillyer, 2012). However, discretionary decision making also takes place in educational organizations on a daily basis. Discretionary decision making in education is defined by Lyman, Ashby, and Tripses (2005) as educational leaders “making decisions based on one’s own judgment rather than on arbitrary bureaucratic rules and procedures” (p. 38). Most research in educational discretionary decision making focuses on administrators’ use of school discipline policies. Research by Nora Findlay (2015) on Canadian principals “sought to understand the application of values within legally fixed parameters of their administrative discretion” (p. 472). Findlay (2015) found that these elementary school

principals partially based their discretion “on their own values systems; their perceptions, preferences, and assumptions; and also external influences such as context and circumstances, expectations of parents or other stakeholders, and resources, such as time” (p. 499). Findlay (2015) noted that principals needed flexibility, common sense, and good judgment when using discretionary decision making.

Certain states have been moving away from zero tolerance policies: North Carolina (2011), Colorado (2012), and Massachusetts (2012), all have gone to a more permissive approach that “encouraged greater flexibility in student exclusion decisions” (Morton, 2013; 2014, p. 765). In 2003, Texas outright rejected the zero tolerance policies that other states embraced. Through three statutory amendments, “School districts [need] to consider a student’s self-defense, intent, disciplinary history, and disability prior to exclusion from school” (Morton, 2013; 2014, p. 763). With the focus on the school-to-prison pipeline and research emerging on the role that zero tolerance policies play in putting minority students at-risk for incarceration, more states are following Texas’ lead and encouraging schools to return to discretionary decision making. With President Obama signing The Every Student Succeeds Act in December 2015, which encourages states to set their own standards for school districts, decisions for discipline and other discretionary practices have been turned back to the schools.

However, one last aspect of discretionary decision making is lacking in the research. An article by Burns and DiPaola (2013) examined the “teachers’ perceptions of fairness with respect to interactions with school administrators, decision-making processes, and decision outcomes [that] can contribute greatly to understanding effective

schools” (p. 4). They found that organizational citizenship behavior, defined by Organ in 1988 as “worker performance that is discretionary, not directly or explicatory recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (p. 4), was highly influenced by the principals’ use of fairness and justice in discretionary decision making throughout the school (Burns & DiPaola, 2014). Teachers who felt that their principals were just and fair in their discretionary decision making were more likely to display positive organizational citizenship behaviors, thus creating a better organization. Teachers who did not feel that their principals were fair or just in their discretionary decision making were less likely to show positive organizational citizenship characteristics, and the organization was less likely to function smoothly or meet the (1943) hierarchy of needs as applied to employees. More research is needed in this area, which may show that discretionary decision making could play a larger role in the effective functioning of institutions, especially schools.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study originated with Irving Goffman’s study of total institutions. Goffman (1961) found that there are three major worlds within the institution that can be used to analyze it. In a prison, these worlds include the inmate world, staff world, and the people-work world. The inmate world view contains the inmate making process, as well as an explanation of how each protocol’s role serves to mold the creation of a new identity for the participant. From the staff ‘s world view, they must balance the institutionalized formal protocols with the human needs of the inmates. The staff world cites the dangers that are involved for those who work within the

institution, from threats that originate inside the institution to maintaining a life outside the institution. The staff worldview provides insight into the delicate balance of working within an institution.

The third portion of Goffman's work concerns the idea of people work. People work is what the staff perform, a balance between the formal protocols of the machine-like institution and the human needs of the people in the institution. People work includes the translation of formal protocol into the inmates' world language, along with helping form the identity of the inmate; creation of the morality of the institution; enforcing the privileges and punishments of the institution, and the institutional perspective. The institutional perspective rationalizes the activities of both the institution and the staff, creating a subtle way of maintaining the social distance between the inmates and the staff, the stereotyped views of the inmates, and the justification of the treatment of inmates. The data collected for this study were analyzed using these three world views.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Using a rigorous and detailed methodology, this study examined the following research questions: a) Which juvenile facility and school informal protocols are similar? b) Which juvenile facility and school formal protocols are similar? c) Which juvenile facility and school informal protocols are different? and d) Which juvenile facility and school informal protocols are similar? Due to the complex nature of the institutions involved, the methodology for this study employed Irving Goffman's view of the inmate world, staff world, and people work. His theoretical framework was used in the current study to examine the formal and informal protocols of the public school and juvenile justice facility, as well as how these protocols are enforced by front line supervisors.

Justification for a Qualitative Case Study

In this research, the stories, explanations, and observations of the participants were crucial to understand what happens in terms of protocols in a juvenile facility and public school. As Merriam (2009) stated, "The product of a qualitative inquiry is *richly descriptive*" (p. 16). In this research, the school context is not the issue; most people have attended school and have a general understanding of what happens in a school and a classroom. However, most people have not been in a juvenile facility; the rules and daily style of living in this institution present a world that is far removed from most people's understanding and experience of life. The rich description provided by this qualitative study will allow a comparative view that takes the reader inside the worlds of both a juvenile facility and a school.

Qualitative methods used in this study have allowed the researcher to ask in-depth questions about the practices of those in charge and compare these answers with the actual practices of those leaders. As Maxwell (2013) wrote, “Interview questions are what you ask people [in order] to gain that understanding” (p. 101), especially in the juvenile facility and school in this study where there was an emphasis on meeting external guidelines and avoiding external critics. In addition, through interviews conducted with juvenile facility and school leaders, follow-up questions were asked, giving insight into which policies or practices the leaders believed would be best suited for their needs.

This comparative case study between a juvenile facility and a public school filled a gap in the educational leadership literature. Only one previous empirical study made a direct comparison between prisons and schools. Ronnie Casella (2003) examined the connections between two schools’ preventative discipline policies and a prison’s policies, which provided valuable insight into discipline policies. Therefore, the researcher believed that the current study would open a new way to examine school practices, especially in daily practice.

Research Design

The research design of this study aimed to examine connections between a juvenile justice facility and an inner city public school as they used their formal and informal protocols. To accurately observe and compare them, the researcher conducted interviews with public school teachers, principals, juvenile facility teachers, and the juvenile facility supervisor. Observations were also completed by the researcher in both

institutions to corroborate or further explore the protocols and implementation by staff. By conducting a case study, important characteristics as defined by Creswell (2009), allowed a more natural research design. Rather than research multiple institutions, the researcher limited this case study to one juvenile facility and one school, therefore using a small population to collect data that were more detailed and in-depth. As Merriam (2009) wrote, “Sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight, and there must [be a] select sample from which the most can be learned” (p. 77). Detailed understanding in this case study could be achieved through a small sample as suggested by Merriam (2009). Another reason for using a small sample was the ability for the researcher to gain admittance to the facilities and the institutions in the community. Since these two organizations were in the same city, and only a few blocks from each other, many of the same students cycled in and out of each institution. This allowed the population to be similar and created a continuity between the two organizations.

Site Selection

Site selection for this research study was crucial: if an inappropriate site was selected it could alter or skew the results of this research. In the selection of the juvenile facility and the public school site for this study, a set of criteria were developed by the researcher, which helped form a “bounded system” as defined by Merriam (2009) as “a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” in order to examine the policies and procedures of the juvenile facility and the school (p. 40). By creating a boundary, the

researcher was able to explore how policies and procedures were implemented in both institutions.

These criteria consisted of five parts, which were met by each institution. The first criterion was that the institution must be solely responsible for its dependents for a minimum of five hours of day. The second criterion was that the facilitators of the institution must receive some type of specialized training that allows them to perform their jobs. This could be a two-year degree in criminal justice, a four-year degree in education, or advanced classes in either field. There must be a training difference between the facilitators and their wards. Third, each institution must have formal protocols for the facilitators to follow on an average day. Fourth, facilitators must have direct supervision of the institutional participants. Fifth, there must be a manager of the facilitators. The sites selected below met or exceeded these criteria and are discussed in more detail.

Juvenile justice facility.

In choosing a juvenile justice facility, the researcher selected one in Ohio near the public high school chosen for the study. This selection was based on the proximity of the detention center to the public school, the accessibility of the facility (close by) as well as the way the facility handled the researcher. Approval for access to the juvenile facility was gained from speaking with a judge.

Juvenile corrections in Ohio are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Youth Services (DYS). The DHS confines juvenile offenders who are between the “ages of 10 and 21, who have been adjudicated and committed by one of Ohio’s 88 county

juvenile courts” (DYS). These facilities that confine the youth help to address criminal actions, behavioral problems, drug addiction, sexual issues, and mental health problems, with a focus on rehabilitation and return to the community (DYS). The DHS operates a yearlong school that offers regular and vocational curriculum opportunities for confined juveniles (DYS). The DHS is also involved in prevention programs, treatment centers, counseling services, and other positive impact ventures (DYS). The mission of the DHS “is to improve Ohio’s future by rehabilitating youth and empowering families and communities. The vision of the agency is a safer Ohio: one youth, one family, and one community at a time” (DYS).

The community that this juvenile facility is located in is a dilapidated steel town in Ohio and was located three blocks from the public school. Drugs have become a serious problem in the community. Drug-related deaths in the county have risen almost 50% to 81 from 2015, and between May 2015 and February 2016, 21 out of 23 heroin overdoses were reversed by police using naloxone (Riccutti, 2015). The population of the city has been declining, with almost 1,000 people leaving the city between 2010 and 2014 (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau). The majority of the population were women (51.9%) and 23.7% of the population were under 18 (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau). Almost 70% of the population were White, approximately 30% of the population were Black, less than .02% of the population were Native American or Alaska Native, and .04% of the population were Asian (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau). Home owners in the city comprised 53.3% of the population and there were close to 17,000 households in the city (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau). High school graduates made up 83% of the

city population, while those with bachelor's degrees or higher comprised 12% (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau). Approximately 50% of the city population was employed in the civilian workforce, the median income was \$29,249 in 2014 dollars and approximately 34% of the population were considered in poverty (QuickFacts, U.S. Census Bureau).

From records received from the juvenile justice facility, the research found that for the period encompassed by the records, the juvenile justice facility had a yearly attendance of approximately 510 juveniles: 400 males, 126 females; 247 White juveniles, and 197 Black juveniles. Of those juveniles, 87 had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that were documented, 308 juveniles were currently enrolled in a school district, and 190 were not enrolled in a high school or online education program.

School selection.

During 2013, in the state of Ohio, there were eight school typologies. Typologies one and two were rural schools described as "Rural – High Student Poverty and Small Student Population" and "Rural – Average Student Poverty and Very Small Student Population." Within these two typologies were 231 districts that were home to 280,000 students (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, May 8). Three and four typologies are considered "Small Town – Low Student Poverty and Small Student Population" and "Small Town – High Student Poverty and Average Student Population Size" consisting of 200 districts and 385,000 students (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, May 8). Suburban districts comprised typologies five and six, described as "Suburban – Low Student Poverty and Average Student Population Size" and "Suburban – Very Low

Student Poverty and Large Student Population” and home of 123 districts and 560,000 students (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, May 8). The last two typographies are urban, defined as “Urban – High Student Poverty and Average Student Population” and “Urban – Very High Student Poverty and Very Large Student Population” including 55 districts and home to 410,000 students (Ohio Department of Education, 2013, May 8).

The school being used in this study was a seven on the typology scale and located in the same town as the juvenile facility, so the city demographics are the same as listed above. The average daily enrollment for the school district was approximately 1,300 (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). White students comprised 44% of the students; Black students, 43.2% , Hispanic students, 2% and Multiracial students, 10.5% (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). The percentage of students with disabilities was 20.1%, and 96.5% of the students were economically disadvantaged (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). The chronic absenteeism rate was 35.7% (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). All the teachers have a bachelor’s degree and 56.5% have a master’s degree; all the teachers were teaching in areas where they were properly certified (Ohio Department of Education, 2013). In four years, 76.2 % of the students graduated from the high school and in five years, 80.5% had graduated (Ohio Department of Education, 2013).

This school district contains four kindergarten through eighth grade schools that are situated in various communities in the city. In the communities where three of the schools are located the majority of the residents are Black and of a lower socioeconomic status. The fourth school is located in a predominately White section of town, and many

of these residents have a higher socioeconomic status than the other three communities. The school district was part of the Ohio School Facilities Commission new school building project and was eligible to receive all new buildings for every school in the district. Prior to the new schools being built, the district had an alternative school for students who had been in significant trouble, had serious mental health issues, or needed additional help that was not available in the regular school. However, when the new school buildings were opened, and a new superintendent was selected to run the district, he believed that the alternative school was decreasing the success of the district in meeting Adequate Yearly Progress as demanded by NCLB. The students that had been in the alternative school were placed back in the regular school with no transitioning services or continued services that they were receiving in the alternative school.

In examining the national enrollment data for 2011-2012, the total enrollment was 49,605,534; parsed out: White students were 51.7% (25,627,170), Black students were 15.9% (7,883,124), and Hispanic students were 23.6% (11,697,439) (Civil Rights Data Collection, 2011-2012). Of the students enrolled, 12.3% or 6,086,341 had some form of disability as defined by IDEA. On a state level, enrollment in Ohio during fall 2014, the school demographics differed slightly from the national trends. In Ohio, there were 1,368,850 White students, 288,416 Black students numbered, and there were 82,141 Hispanic students (Ohio Department of Education, Enrollment Data, 2014). In Ohio, students with disabilities as classified by IDEA numbered 276,698. According to the Ohio enrollment data, this school is typical of the enrollment of the state, with White students being a slight majority over the Black students, followed by Hispanic students.

In this school, the Hispanic student population is much smaller than in other areas of the state.

Sample Selection

Since this study was concerned with the informal and formal protocols that are implemented by juvenile facility teachers, schoolteachers, the juvenile superintendent and school principals, a purposeful sample of the institutions was chosen. Maxwell (2013) defined purposeful sampling as “particular settings, persons, or activities are selected deliberately to provide information that is particularly relevant to your questions and goals, and that can’t be gotten as well from other choices” (p. 97). Merriam (2009) wrote, “criteria you establish for purposeful sampling directly reflect the purpose of the study” (pp. 77-78).

In this study, the participants were public school teachers, juvenile justice teachers, high school principals, school resource officers, and the juvenile justice facility supervisor. These participants were selected specifically because they were in the position to choose how and when to implement the policies and procedures handed down from their institutions’ administration. Serving as enforcers of the policies and practices allows the juvenile justice teachers, the juvenile justice facility supervisor, public school teachers, and the principals leeway for whom they choose to enforce the rules, when they choose to enforce the rules, how they enforce the rules, and when they choose other forms of enforcement. This is not information that can be obtained from any other sources, since other sources are not directly in charge of the administration of the policies and procedures.

Additionally, when the two institutions were selected as sites for the research study, each had specific demands that they placed on the researcher. The public school specifically requested that the researcher examine the freshman floor of the school. The main high school principal revealed that the majority of discipline issues involved freshman students; by his estimates, almost 75% of all discipline issues involved freshmen. One of the main goals of the principal was to find ways to lower the rates of discipline infractions at the freshman grade level. At the juvenile justice facility, the supervisor asked the researcher to examine the educational situation and make recommendations for change. The supervisor hoped to see classes being taught, learning taking place, and the educational needs of the incarcerated juveniles being met.

Confidentiality

To ensure the confidentiality of each institution and staff member within the institution was maintained, interviews were conducted with juvenile facility teachers, public school teachers, the juvenile superintendent, and school principals. Due to unrest between the administration and teachers union, the teachers' representative asked that interviews not be recorded for fear of repercussions against the participants. This request was granted by the researcher, and detailed notes were taken versus audio recordings.

Once the participants consented to be interviewed and observed, they were asked where they wanted the interviews to take place. Every participant asked that their interview take place in their classroom or office during prep periods. No names or personally identifiable information was used to identify the participants and the interviews.

In keeping the confidentiality of each institution, generic descriptors were used to describe the institution, but specific identifying information was kept out of the description. The data that were collected will be stored for three years, and only the advisor, committee, and the researcher will have access to the data, which will be stored on a computer with password protection.

Data Collection

The data for this study included interviews conducted with freshman teachers at the public high school, as well as the school resource officers, grade-level principals, the head high school principal, teachers in the juvenile justice facility, and the juvenile justice supervisor. Observations took place in freshman classrooms, the behavioral pullout room, hallways, and other areas in this high school. In the juvenile facility the observations were limited to the classrooms in the facility. Documents collected from each organization included the formal rules given out to each organization such as the Student Handbook and the General Rules at the high school.

Interviews.

The verbal and physical reactions inherent in the daily interactions of each group were of interest to the researcher, as well as the formal protocols that govern each day. Through the interviews, the researcher gained an understanding of the thought processes and rationalizations that went into the implementation of the informal protocols of control used by the juvenile justice facility teachers and the public school teachers. Interviews conducted with the juvenile facility superintendent and the multiple high school principals focused on their understanding, implementation, and rationalization of the

formal rules that are required to keep their respective institutions meeting the institutional goals. Interview data as described by Merriam (2009) should be “the primary mode of data collection [and] should be based on the kind of information needed” (p. 88).

Merriam (2009) described the interview data as like having an in-depth conversation with a person in order to find out what is on their mind. Since the researcher is interested in why, when, and how juvenile justice facility teachers, public school teachers, and public school principals chose to enforce formal policies and procedures and when they chose to enforce informal policies and procedures, interviews were one of the only ways to understand the thought processes and actions of those within the organization.

The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews; this type of interview protocol allowed the researcher the flexibility to follow significant moments, yet provided enough structure to keep the interview on a relevant track. Semi-structured interview questions allowed the interview to be “guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time” (Merriam, 2009, p. 90). Using the semi-structured interview protocol, the researcher asked four main questions of each participant.

- How do you apply the rules of the institution in the areas you control?
- How did you learn to control your classroom?
- What is your role in the institution?
- How long have you done this for?

These four questions were asked of every participant in the study. Depending on the participant’s answers to the questions, follow up questions were asked of each

participant. Several examples of these included: How do you make sure that you implement your rules fairly? How do you use the behavioral pullout room? What behaviors result in removal from your classroom? How would you describe your working relationship with the administration? Depending on the participant, time constraints, and information needed, these interviews ranged from 15 to 45 minutes.

In the public school, 17 interviews were conducted with four administrators, one School Resource Officer, and 12 different public school teachers. Forty-four teachers were responsible for teaching freshmen and the floor had one principal. In the juvenile justice facility, there was one facility supervisor and two juvenile justice teachers that the researcher was allowed to interview. This meant that a total of 20 interviews were conducted for this study.

Document review.

Documents from the juvenile facility and school were also collected and analyzed for this study. The juvenile facility protocols included the General Rules, which demarcated the acceptable behaviors allowed in the juvenile facility living quarters, and the Classroom Rules, which specified the behaviors allowed in the classroom setting. These two documents were collected by the researcher as they were the only formal policies available in the facility. The school documents included The Student/Parent Handbook, the explanation of rules and policies in the school, and A Student's Guide to Positive Behaviors, which detailed behaviors and actions that are acceptable as well as those that were unacceptable in the school. According to Merriam (2009), documents can be similar to interviews in that they can provide "new insights, and being sensitive to

the data are the same whether the researcher is interviewing, observing or analyzing documents” (p. 150). For this study, the formal documents provided insight into the formal protocols of the institution without human interpretation. Within the institution, documents are the formal rules and policies that lay out the rules of the organization; their interpretation is shown by those who enforce the rules. Examining the formal rules without interpretation revealed the vision of those in charge of the institution. When the interviews and observations were conducted, the interpretations of those who enforce the rules were added, providing a new view of the institution.

Observations.

A total of 40 observations were conducted by the researcher, 30 in the school and 10 in the juvenile facility. These observations focused on the implementation of formal protocols, as well as on the informal protocols that were used by each staff member to accomplish the goals of the institution. The researcher began the observations by using Merriam’s six elements (physical setting, participants, activities/interactions, conversations, subtle factors, and researcher behavior) to gather information about the institutions as a whole and the spaces that the researcher observed (pp. 120-121). Unlike interviews, observations have two unique features according to Merriam. “Observations take place in the setting where the phenomenon of interest naturally occurs instead of a location designated for the purpose of interviewing; second, observational data represent a firsthand encounter with the phenomenon of interest” (Merriam, 2009, p. 117), making observations a perfect rationale for interviews. Observations allowed the researcher to

corroborate the claims that the participants made during their interviews as well as to observe informal protocol behaviors that did not support the interview data.

Observations in the juvenile facility took place in the juvenile classroom since the living spaces of the juveniles were considered off limits to the researcher due to privacy issues. In the school, observations took place in the classrooms of multiple teachers, the behavioral pullout room, the therapy room, the in-school suspension room, lunch room, School Resource Officer's office, the hallways and the principal's offices. Due to the public nature of the school, the researcher had few restrictions on making observations, therefore constantly observed these areas during the time spent in the public school.

The observations in both facilities lasted approximately five months and the duration of each was a school day. In the public school this meant that observations took place from approximately 8 am to 3 pm; in the juvenile facility, school was held from 9 am to 3 pm. During observations in the public school, the researcher attempted to act as a participant observer, defined by Merriam (2009): "the researcher's observer activities are known to the group; participation in the group is definitely secondary to the role of information gatherer" (p. 124). In this study, the researcher did not participate in classroom activities in either institution, and attempted to maintain a low profile in the school.

Continuous field notes were used by the researcher to record the activities being observed. While the field notes attempted to take a "wide angle" view of the situation, "narrow angle" lenses were used when specific protocol enforcements were used (Merriam, 2009, p. 129). This shift from the broad view of the situation to the focus on

what protocols were used occurred because of the emphasis of the research questions in this study. During this shift, the exact actions of the observed were detailed in the moment and later, during interviews, the researcher would ask the interviewee to explain their decisions about that moment. Later, during free moments, the researcher would write down what the formal rules dictated should have happened and write a short comparison between the differences. This allowed the researcher to keep the incident, actions, dictated actions, and explanation from the observed, for use later in the study.

Specifically, in these observations the researcher was looking for the use of formal and informal protocols by the observed. In these scenarios, the formal protocols were the rules issued in the handbooks, classroom rules, and guides that are given to those in the institution and their usage by those being observed. The informal protocols are the unwritten rules, or unofficial and unique guidelines, that are made by every participant to control their part of the institution as they strive to meet the institutional goal.

Data Analysis

As Creswell (2009) noted, an analysis of data for the findings “involves preparing the data for analysis, conducting analyses, moving deeper and deeper into understanding the data, ... representing the data, and making an interpretation of the larger meaning of the data” (p. 183). Since the interviews in this study were not recorded, transcriptions were not needed. After the first interviews and observations were completed, themes were selected from data that appeared repetitive. As more interviews and observations took place, these themes either gathered strength by receiving more supporting evidence

or were replaced with new themes that had more supporting evidence. Once the data began to repeat itself and the researcher was not gathering new data or isolating themes, the observations, interviews, and documents collected were deemed completed. From there, these themes were first divided into informal and formal protocols by the researcher, based on whether or not the rule or underlying theme of the rule appeared in any of the handbooks, rules or guide. If the rule or underlying rules did appear in the handbook or any other formal document, the protocols were considered formal protocols. If the underlying rules or rule did not appear in any formal handbook or rule set, they were considered informal protocols. Once the themes were parsed out by formal and informal protocols, the comparison of the protocols within the two institutions began.

Divisions within the formal and informal protocols were broken down into these subheadings: informal similar protocols, formal similar protocols, informal different protocols, and formal different protocols. Similar protocols meant that the same rule or a similarly worded rule appeared in both of the institutions' formal rules or was conducted informally in both institutions. An example is the formal protocol for the dress code. Both institutions enforce a dress code, and even though each differs in what is enforced in the dress code, each institution has a dress code that is enforced and worded in a similar fashion. The appearance of rules or enforcement that were alike is the definition of it in this study. Different is defined in this study as protocols that are not alike or not comparable between the institutions. An example of a different protocol in this study is handcuffing. In the juvenile facility, handcuffing appears as a formal protocol in the

rulebook. However, in the public school there is no rule on handcuffing and it falls within the jurisdiction of the School Resource Officer.

When the data were collected at the two research sites, they were aggregated into two bundles. The first bundle of data collected related to the formal protocols in the public high school and the juvenile justice center. Data bundle two collected in this study focused on interviews and the researcher's observations of teachers in both locations. Data bundle two that was analyzed was the formal protocol data. In this study, formal protocol documents included The Student/Parent Handbook, A Student's Guide to Positive Behaviors, General Rules, and Classroom Rules. A combination of these four documents was given to every student/juvenile in both institutions, and they were required to sign an agreement stating that the rules had been read and understood.

The data analysis began with the formal protocols, which was a logical step that mirrored the path of the students and juveniles. On the first day of school or incarceration, the students and juveniles were required to read, sign, and return the agreement that was contained in the formal protocols. In these four formal protocols were many similarities and differences that will be discussed in this section. In order to present the information in a logical and concise manner, related ideas were grouped into themes. These sub themes are then presented under their respective headings, formal protocol similarities and formal protocol differences. Each theme will be presented, explained, and proof provided from one of the four formal protocols. This data analysis begins with formal protocol similarities followed by formal protocol differences.

Once these similarities and differences have been listed and explained in Chapter 4, Chapter 5 will add the data obtained from the observations and interviews to provide a complete picture of the fidelity to certain protocols and the infidelity to other protocols. By the addition of interview and observation data, the effect of human implementation on the enforcement of institutional protocols is seen. Additionally, the research also plays a role in this study and will be addressed in the following ways.

Since the researcher is the key instrument of this study, researcher reflexivity was an important component to address (Merriam, 2009). Reflexivity as defined by Merriam (2009) is when researchers “need to explain their biases, dispositions, and assumptions regarding the research to be undertaken (p. 219). The researcher reflexivity in this case was drawn from the literature review, conversations, and personal beliefs that had formed prior to this research project. The researcher believed that there was a similarity between the juvenile facility and the school in their protocols, policies, and procedures. In order to combat this bias, the researcher needed to clearly state her assumptions, experiences, and views in order to allow the reader to see how the connections were drawn. Additionally, the researcher’s advisor gave her input on sections that might be biased and pushed the researcher to reread and remove this bias.

Credibility and Dependability

To ensure the credibility and dependability of the data, the researcher triangulated them. Triangulation is defined by Maxwell (2013) as “using different methods as a check on one another, seeing if methods with different strengths and limitation all support a single conclusion” (p. 102). Interviews, observations, and formal document protocols

were compared to ensure that an accurate portrayal was given of the daily activities in each institution. Additionally, periodic member checks were conducted with the interviewees to confirm that the researcher's interpretation of the data was accurate. In conducting the member checks, it was important for the researcher to realize that there was some discrepancy between what the researcher interpreted and what the interviewee said or did, especially when the actions or words of the interviewee were deemed inappropriate by the administration. Therefore, these member checks were used as a way to check the collected data and as an interview to judge the reactions of the interviewee when they read a description of their actions/words. The last check that the researcher had was a peer review by dissertation committee members.

In order to give this study dependability, memos were kept, which formed an audit trail. Maxwell (2013) wrote that "memos not only capture your analytic thinking about your data, but also *facilitate* such thinking, simulating analytic insights" (p. 105). While the behavior of humans cannot be guaranteed, even if the situations are exact, the memos detailed the process of conducting the research and critical thoughts that arose. This included memos on interviews and observations, as well as notes on the formal protocols that governed each institution. Those memos and the audit trail will give other researchers who wish to duplicate this study an insight into what situations presented themselves, the responses of all involved, and the outcomes of the situations. With this information, other researchers should be able to understand the inferences drawn from the data.

Limitations

Limitations are defined as the constraints placed on the research study through either the methods or design. Limitations that affect this work include the interviewees' willingness to be honest and open about their rationalizations in employing their informal protocols, meaning that hidden biases may be present in their rationalizations, but they may not be willing to verbalize them for fear of reprisal. Secondly, observations that were conducted were a snapshot of the daily routine therefore, the observations could be anomalies or not show an accurate representation of the daily routines. Third, the generalizability of this study is not a guarantee, some institutions will be better and some institutions will be worse. Fourth, time was a limitation, the research will comprise a small chunk of time both within in the year and within the life of the institution; both institutions have long histories and far-reaching futures. The research time is a small section of their respective timelines. These differences are important to understand, but do not affect the outcome of the study.

Finally, both institutions are under constant scrutiny from the media, their communities, and watchdogs, many of whom would not miss a chance to jump on the institution for any hint of wrongdoing. This means that interviewees may receive warnings from their superiors to be on their best behavior and to present only the best and brightest picture for the researcher.

Delimitations

Delimitations are the bounds that the researcher placed on the study and these are as follows: First, the researcher will not be conducting interviews with juveniles and students because it is beyond the purview of this study that focused on protocols and

there usage. Secondly, the researcher chose to limit her focus to the experience of the inner city school and their use of the informal and formal protocols within the classroom. Third, the researcher limited herself to a juvenile facility because juvenile facilities incarcerate juveniles with an emphasis on rehabilitation and education. The same goes for schools; the focus of the school is to educate students.

Chapter 4: DATA RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings from the data collection and analysis, and explores the similarities and differences in the informal and formal protocols that were used in both institutions. The purpose of this chapter is to illustrate what the similarities and differences look like in formal and informal interactions between the institution and the people who work in the organization. By presenting the protocols grouped together by theme, this presentation will help answer the research questions by showing the links in the protocols between the institutions.

Formal Protocol Similarities

In this section, the similar themes that emerged between the four formal documents of the research locations will be examined. These themes emerged by grouping together similar rules, language, and intentions into larger ideas. These ideas were then consolidated into larger themes based on the intent and language of the rules.

Ranking.

Each institution has a formal method of ranking their students and juveniles in order to organize and place them in their respective systems. In the public school, this ranking is done with a numerical grading system. The Student/ Parent Handbook and A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior, issued by the public school district, lay out the specific number of points required to achieve each rank. According to the Student/Parent Handbook, "all grades shall be converted to letter grades of their numerical equivalents: A=4; B=3; C=2; D=1; F=0" (p. 14) with a weighted scale for the college-level classes offered at this particular location. When converting grades into percentages for the

academic nine weeks, “The standard grading scale is as follows: A = 90-100%, B = 80-89%, C = 70-79%, D = 60-69%, F = 0-68%” (Handbook, p. 15) and more specific calculations follow. These grade calculations allow the school to rank students within the grade level. The Student/Parent Handbook outlines levels that students can achieve with grades they have accrued during the academic period. The public school has an honor roll, which is open to students who have a grade point average of 3.2 or higher (p. 14).

This use of points and a ranking system in the public school corresponded to the ranking system used in the juvenile justice facility. According to the general rules at the juvenile facility, juveniles can complete tasks to earn points throughout the day. When their tasks are completed, they are awarded points, and the juveniles are placed in a tier group. Since points in the juvenile system can be removed if the staff deem it necessary, points are constantly in flux. Every juvenile to enter the facility enters in the middle tier, which means that the juvenile has accrued between 40 and 79 points. To achieve the top tier requires that juveniles earn over 80 points, for which they are given extra privileges at the discretion of the staff. Tier 3 is the isolation tier, which is 0-39 points, when the juvenile loses all the privileges that they have accrued.

Discipline.

Large portions of each of the formal protocols cover the discipline policies of the institution. The public high school used five different methods of discipline, each laid out in detail in The Student’s Guide to Positive Behavior as well as the Student/Parent Handbook. Intervention tickets are the first step used in the discipline process in the public school. Tickets are issued for “students who become disruptive,” and depending

upon the infraction, may be subject to in-school or out-of-school suspension (Student/Parent Handbook, p. 9) The Handbook lists the expectations of the behavior that students are expected to display during in-school suspension, after school detention, and out-of-school suspension. Behaviors that earn a student one or more of these discipline measures are outlined in the Student's Guide to Positive Behavior. For example, one section in the Guide is titled "What Types of Behavior Can Result in Expulsion?" and lists six activities that will result in an expulsion that is not more than 80 days (p. 23). In every part of the guide that discusses the public school discipline, there are two caveats that state that the "lists [are] not all-inclusive" (Guide, p. 23) and discipline decisions are subject to the "discretion of the teacher or administrator" (Handbook, p. 9).

In the juvenile facility, the discipline protocol is divided into minor and major infractions as well as isolation. Each minor infraction in the juvenile facility earns the juvenile a three-point deduction in accrued points. There are 23 violations that are considered a minor infraction, and if a juvenile "acquires an abundance of minor infractions in one day, the punishment for the resident will be determined by the shift supervisor" (General Rules, p. 2). Major infractions, of which there are 10, are punishable by the loss of all accrued points as well as the possibility of criminal charges. Several of these major infractions in the juvenile facility are similar to those in the public school, including threatening staff, teachers, or others, contraband (i.e., weapons, drugs, and medication), assault, and fighting (General Rules, p. 3; Guide, p. 23). The juvenile facility assigns isolation, which is the removal of all points and privileges. Within

isolation, there is medical isolation, which means removing a juvenile from the general population due to a medical condition that may be dangerous to himself, staff or other juveniles. In addition to the listed behaviors that will earn a juvenile a point deduction, other behaviors or activities that guards deem dangerous, disrespectful, or detrimental may be punished at the discretion of the guard or staff member.

Handcuffing is a regular occurrence at the juvenile facility as well as leg shackling (Observation 19). When a juvenile resident breaks the rules, in any manner, guards immediately restrain them and place them in their cell (Interview 18). Depending on the violation, the resident may also be placed in isolation for a set time. If the violations are serious in nature, residents can also receive new criminal charges (Interview 19). Some residents, due to the serious nature of their crime, are in constant isolation and confined to their cell for long periods (Interview 19). In the juvenile facility, there is no administrative discretion allowed, and all residents are treated similarly (Observation 18). Guards receive training and periodic education classes to reinforce their training and update their juvenile skill set.

Personal property.

Each institution encourages their wards to limit the amount of personal material that is brought into the facility. In the case of the juvenile facility, personal material brought in from the outside is limited to what is approved by guards/staff and the facility materials given to each juvenile while they are incarcerated. Public schools are slightly more lenient with the types and amount of personal material that are allowed to be on

school property; however, the school encourages students to bring the least amount of personal material necessary.

According to the Student's Guide to Positive Behavior, the students are responsible for the care of their own personal property (p. 4), and any item that is distracting or being misused may be confiscated by teachers, staff, or administration. Each student is given a locker in the school building, and it is the student's responsibility to keep the locker clean, locked, and all personal possessions inside the locker. All personal property that the student brings to school must be stored in the students' locked locker to prevent theft and distractions. These lockers are subject to searches at the discretion of the staff, and "the student assigned to the locker is responsible for the contents" (Handbook, p. 8). Lockers are to be kept clean and well-maintained. If a locker is damaged, the student is responsible for the charges.

In the juvenile facility, personal property is limited to the juvenile's uniform, books, Bible, toilet paper, shoes, and shower locker. A specific list of tasks including sweeping, toilet cleaning, mopping, and trash disposal are required of the juvenile in each of their cells. Blankets are to be folded and placed in position; shoes are placed outside the juvenile's cell along with their Bible and book. Other personal items under the supervision of the juvenile include shower kits that are not to leave their shower locker. Since the juvenile's possessions within the facility are limited, personal property allowed in this facility is quite different from the type of personal property brought to the public school.

Food.

Since each institution is in possession of its youth for meals, there are specific rules that govern their behavior during meal times. Because the juvenile facility is a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week, 365-days-a-year institution, it provides its residents with breakfast, lunch, and dinner, while the public school only provides breakfast and lunch. In each institution, food is made available at no charge, and each youth is required to take a complete lunch as provided by the cafeteria.

The public high school has seven rules that students are to follow when they enter the cafeteria. They are required to speak in a normal voice, without yelling or creating loud noises; wait in line without cutting and remain in the designated seating locations, throw away all trash, abstain from throwing items, use the appropriate restrooms, remain in the cafeteria until properly dismissed, and leave all food and drinks in the cafeteria (Handbook, p. 7). There are also specific times where food is served and students can eat. These times correspond with the bell system that is in the school.

Similar rules apply in the juvenile facility with 11 specific rules pertaining to residents in the dining room. These rules include, but are not limited to, receiving one tray in the food line, no talking, no exchanging of food, no seat swapping, showing utensils to staff before leaving, and throwing away trash. Should any utensils be missing or not shown to staff, “All residents will be held responsible and lockdown will occur until missing items are found” (p. 7). Once again, as in the public school, the consumption of food is the focus, and additional rules can be enforced as needed by staff to ensure that food consumption is happening.

Technology use.

Technology plays a major role in both institutions, especially in learning. While the public school and the juvenile center have computer centers with Internet access, certain restrictions are given to students and residents when they access the computers. In the public school, students who bring their own personal technology into the school, in the form of cellular phones and tablets, are also under a set of rules that attempt to limit the interference those devices have on the student's attention and instructional time.

In regard to the student's personal technology that is brought to school, the school's rules state that "no student shall display or use electronic communication devices in the school during classroom instruction or during an assembly or other gathering part of the instructional day" (Handbook, p. 7). Cellular phone and tablet usage is permitted between classes, during lunch, and during breakfast; however, no video or photos are permitted at any time (Handbook, p. 7). Also, students are not allowed to use their phones to call home during the day; instead, they must use the telephone in the office to make calls (Handbook, p. 7). Headphones are also not permitted at any time during the day, and school staff may provide further limits at any time if deemed necessary for the safety or function of the school. Violations of these policies will result in the electronic device being confiscated and possible disciplinary action. In order to retrieve the device, parents must come to the school to obtain it. Staff are not responsible, nor will they investigate the loss or theft of a personal electronic device, according to the Student/ Parent Handbook (p. 7).

In regard to using school-owned technology, the Student's Guide to Positive Behavior states that "students are prohibited from using equipment or devices in a

manner that may be physically harmful to another person” (Guide, p. 12). This is followed by the rule that prohibits technology from being used “in a way that might reasonably create in the mind of another person an impression of being threatened, humiliated, harassed, embarrassed, or intimidated” (Guide, p. 12). In areas where a reasonable expectation of privacy exists, such as rest rooms or locker rooms, photos and video are banned according to the Guide (p. 12). School electronic devices, such as computers in the computer labs, are equipped with technology that blocks access to certain websites. However, not all material can be blocked, and on page four of the Student’s Guide to Positive Behavior, a list of “Acceptable Uses” and “Non-Acceptable Uses” can be found. At any point, students who are caught accessing blocked sites, sending harmful messages, or misusing technology in any manner, may have their technology privileges revoked and may face further disciplinary action.

The use of technology in the juvenile justice center is limited to the computers and Internet access available in the classroom. Juveniles are not permitted to bring in their own personal technology such as cellular telephones, laptops, or tablets. Each juvenile who is permitted to attend class and is not facing a technology-based crime charge, is allowed restricted access to the Internet in order to do schoolwork or quietly listen to music through their center-issued computers. When class is dismissed for the day, the laptop is left in the classroom and students no longer have Internet access. If the Internet is misused in any manner, students will be banned from accessing the computer for the duration of their confinement. Students who do not attend class, or are facing an Internet-based crime charge, do not have access to technology. Juveniles are allowed to

send and receive mail from the United States Postal Service, provided that their behavior meets the required standards. All mail is screened for inappropriate content, and mail that is received that is deemed inappropriate will be held until the juvenile is released.

In addition, juveniles are allowed one phone call a week provided their behavior meets the appropriate criteria. This phone call is a maximum of 15 minutes and must be to a parent or guardian. If a three-way call is made, or “if you make a call to anyone other than a parent or guardian, you will lose your phone privilege until you are released” (General Rules, p. 8). During these phone calls, juvenile residents can ask their parent or guardian for clean undergarments and any hygiene products that are needed.

Behaviors.

As discussed earlier, each institution has a set of policies regarding discipline for behaviors deemed inappropriate by the institution. In the public school, a list of unacceptable behaviors is emphasized, while in the juvenile facility a list of positive behaviors is emphasized. In the school, in *A Student’s Guide to Positive Behavior*, six pages are dedicated to behavior that is considered detrimental to the education of a student. Eight behaviors are listed as never being acceptable in school. These include possession or use of a weapon; selling or transmitting controlled substances; counterfeit drugs, steroids, or alcohol; setting or attempting to set a fire; physical assault; sexual assault; fighting; bomb threats; or criminal behavior (Guide, p. 20).

In addition to these never-acceptable behaviors, other behaviors will earn students disciplinary action. These include, but are not limited to, truancy, disruption of school, damage to school/person’s property, inciting fighting, knowledge of weapons, use or

possession of tobacco, trespassing, hazing, insubordination, gambling, forgery, impersonation, theft, extortion, personal technology, bullying, sexual behavior, profanity, and chronic misconduct (Guide, p. 25). These behaviors, depending upon the severity of the incident, may receive varying forms of punishment, ranging from an Intervention Ticket to an out-of-school suspension or criminal charges. A list of acceptable behaviors can be found in the Student/Parent Handbook in the form of a grid, which entails which behaviors are appropriate in each location. (See Appendix) These grids are also displayed in print at various locations in the school hallways and classrooms to remind students of the positive behaviors expected from them.

Unlike the public school's policies, the juvenile facility does not have a specific section that chronicles expected behaviors. Instead, under each facility heading, expected appropriate behavior is listed. Juveniles in this facility are expected to clean their cell, display proper hygiene, use a positive attitude, and respect staff directives (General Rules, p. 1). In addition, there are specific behaviors that are expected in the showers, dayroom, hallway, classroom, and cells. For example, in the hallway, appropriate behavior includes "when your cell door is opened, you are to come out of your cell and go immediately to the closest orange line. You are to stand with both toes on the line, back to the wall and have your hands behind your back" (General Rules, p. 6). The line must be single file, no touching, no gazing around, and the juvenile's hands are to be behind his back at all times (General Rules, p. 6). Other behavior guidelines include rules for playing cards, eating, showering, phone calls, mail, uniforms, and medication.

Dress code.

One of the numerous responsibilities of each institution is to enforce a dress or uniform code for their respective wards. In the public school, the policy is broad when it discusses which clothes are acceptable for school. For example, there are three sections, tops, bottoms, and shoes, and two to four items that are acceptable for wear to school in each category. Under the category of tops, these are deemed acceptable clothes:

“tailored or fitted, long sleeve, short sleeve, knit shirts, turtlenecks, long and short sleeve T-shirts (no tank tops or sleeveless undershirts), sweaters, sweatshirts, vests, or cardigans (proper fit) (Guide, p. 8). However, for items that are not permitted to be worn to school, the list is much more detailed and extensive.

Prohibited items include but are not limited to dangerous clothing, gang affiliated clothing, clothing that exposes body parts, oversized or saggy clothing, advertisement clothing, headgear, shoes with wheels, beach attire, yoga pants, sleepwear, outdoor clothing, and many other items (Guide, p. 8). School administrators and staff may ban an outfit, trend, or fad if needed. In school, during gym class, there is a list of acceptable clothing for students to wear, which includes pants, t-shirts, and shoes (Guide, p. 8). Any student who does not comply with the dress code for either location may be asked to “call their parents or guardian to bring a change of clothes, be provided with alternative clothing, receive an in-school suspension, or be suspended from school” (Handbook, p. 22).

In the juvenile facility, the uniform code is more streamlined and condensed. Since the residents' choices are limited to the uniform they are supplied by the state, their choices are much less varied. The juvenile facility only has three rules under their uniform code. They include "no resident will come out of their cell without having their uniform on and properly secured. All undergarments must not be visible. All t-shirts or sweatshirts must be tucked into your uniform. Any resident who intentionally damages a uniform will have ten extra days added to their sentence" (General Rules, p. 9). Due to the limited options of the residents in the juvenile facility, these uniform rules are simple and minimal.

Visitors.

Since both the public school and the juvenile facility are institutions in the community and provide services for youth, visitors, such as parents or guardians, are sometimes required to come to the institution. In order to handle these situations, each institution has in place a set of guidelines and rules, which are based on state law. By law, all visitors must report to the principal's office and state their reason for being on school property. Then, "the principal is required by law to determine whether a visitor's presence poses a disruption to the learning environment and must be removed" (Handbook, p. 6). If a visitor is deemed acceptable and allowed to enter the school, a giant yellow name tag with the visitors name, time of entrance, reason for entry, and time they must leave is placed on their shirt, approximately chest high. If this nametag is not visible or has been removed, the visitor may be asked to leave. In order to conference with a teacher or administrator, the visitor must make prior arrangements. Visitors are

not allowed to bring in concealed weapons of any kind, even with a concealed weapon permit. In addition, any behavior that is deemed threatening toward staff, students, or administration will result in an immediate removal of the visitor and possible criminal charges (Guide, p. 17).

Visitors in the juvenile facility are subject to the same types of rules as those in the public school. However, in the juvenile facility, visitation is limited to two days a week and permitted only if the resident's behavior is acceptable. In this particular juvenile facility, visitation is on Wednesdays from six to seven in the evening and on Sundays from one to two in the afternoon. Residents are not allowed to receive anything directly from their visitors, and all residents will be searched before returning to their cells. Visitors are allowed to bring necessary and requested items to the juvenile; however, these must be given to staff to be screened before they can be given to the resident. Anyone found trying to smuggle or give residents unauthorized items may face the possibility "that charges will be filed under certain circumstances" (General Rules, p. 4). Once again, no weapons or drugs of any type are allowed inside the facility, even with proper documentation.

Criminal prosecution.

If residents, students, or visitors commit an egregious behavior in either institution, the institution reserves the right to file criminal charges against those involved. Depending on either the severity of the incident or magnitude of the infraction, the institution reserves the right to handle the incident with their own discipline policies, or they may elect to bring in outside help in the form of police. These caveats are found

in the sections on discipline, behavior, technology, and visitors specifically, but the institutions reserve the right to call in additional help at any time.

Agreements.

Each institution requires that its students or residents read and sign an agreement that states that they have received, read, understand, and agree to abide by the rules and regulations listed in the documents. In the public school, these forms must be signed by both the student and their parent or guardian and be returned to the school within the first week. At the juvenile facility, the resident signs these agreements within the first 24 hours of incarceration. The signed forms are kept in a secure storage area and used if an issue arises where a student or resident claims they did not know or understand the rule. Then the form is brought out, the rule found, and the appropriate punishment is implemented. These signed agreement forms are for the protection of the student, staff, and institution since it serves as a form of proof that the student or resident received a copy of the rules.

Formal Protocol Differences

While the public school and juvenile facility share some striking similarities in their sets of formal protocols, distinct differences occur in the formal protocols of each institution. These differences are due in part to the mission of each institution and are centered on the concept of attendance versus mandatory placement. State and federal law makes it mandatory for students to attend public school; however, attendance is voluntary with the risk of repercussions. Residents are placed in the juvenile facility through the jurisdiction of the juvenile or adult court system and are not allowed to leave unless

granted permission by these same courts. The next section will highlight the most striking differences between the public schools' formal protocols and the juvenile facilities' formal protocols.

Schools

This section on differences between the formal protocols for the public school and juvenile facility will begin with the differences found in the school's two formal protocol guidebooks, A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior (also referred to as the Guide) and the Student/Parent Handbook (also referred to as the Handbook). These two documents are given to every student in grades 9 through 12 on the first day of school. Students and parents are to read, sign, and return the agreement sheet inside each booklet. By signing and returning the agreement, the student and parent/guardian are agreeing to abide by the rules and regulations laid out in each booklet.

Extracurricular activities.

In the public school system, extracurricular activities are offered for students as a way to boost school involvement, increase morale, allow students to excel, and bring in additional revenue for the school. At this particular school, since it is quite large for the area, a variety of activities are offered, some unique. In regard to student leadership, students may become involved in the Student Council, Interact Club, Key Club, the communication network, or the robotics team. Other student organizations include "academic team, drama club, band, literary magazine, National Honor Society, science club, ski club, speech and debate, Upward Bound, choir or yearbook" (Handbook, p. 10). For students interested in athletics, the school offers baseball, basketball, bowling,

cheerleading, diving, football, golf, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, track, and volleyball (Handbook, p. 10). Joining any of these activities is free, and students are encouraged to get involved.

Attendance.

This was discussed briefly before, but attendance at school is strongly encouraged. While there are laws that mandate that all children and teens within the appropriate age limits to attend school, the truancy laws are hard to enforce. Therefore, this school encourages all parents and guardians to send their children and teens to school. A section in the front of each booklet encourages teens and parents/guardians to make sure their student is coming to school and is prepared to learn. The section on attendance in the Guide to Student's Positive Behavior stresses that when "a student misses school, valuable instruction is missed" (Guide, p. 5). This section also emphasizes that students are only allowed to miss a set number of unexcused days before the student is at risk of failing the grade level. "If a student is truant for ten percent or more of the required school days and has failed at least two subjects, the student will face retention" (Guide, p. 5), meaning that the student will be held back to repeat the missed grade.

Appeals.

In the public school, if a student is suspended or expelled for a behavior, the student or parent/guardian has the right to appeal an expulsion or suspension. The process for appealing a suspension requires that "a written notice of appeal be filed with the Treasurer ... within five days of the suspension decision" (Guide, p. 27).

Expulsion appeal hearings begin with a notification in writing to the superintendent's office within "fourteen calendar days of the date of the expulsion decision" (Guide, p. 27). The student or parent/guardian "may be represented in all appeal proceedings and will be granted a hearing" (Guide, p. 27). All appeals will follow the "Ohio Revised Code Section 3313.66/3313.66" (Guide, p.27).

Anti-bullying.

This public school, like many others in the country, has created a strong protocol for dealing with incidents of bullying, intimidating behavior, aggressive behavior, and harassment. According to the school guidelines, harassment, intimidation and bullying are defined as

Intentional written, verbal, graphic, or physical act[s] that a student or group of students exhibits toward another particular student[s] more than once and the behavior causes mental or physical harm to the other student[s] and is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive that it creates an intimidating, threatening or abusive educational environment for the other student[s]. (Guide, p. 18)

Aggressive behavior is also defined by similar standards. Electronically transmitted acts that fall under each category face the same punishment. These policies apply to all activities within the school district and any off-campus, school-sponsored activities or functions.

Transportation.

Located in the middle of a medium-sized city, this particular school has a mixture of students who come to school by bus, driving, or walking. For those who ride the bus there are three categories of rules: Safety, Order, and the Rights of Others. The types of rules under safety include “staying out of the street, crossing in front of the bus, follow directions of the driver, keep[ing] all body parts inside of the bus, no tobacco products, body parts should be kept to oneself, no unnecessary conversations, never bend down near the bus, use the handrail when entering and exiting the bus, and do not throw items on the bus” (Guide, p. 15). Rules under the category of order include “arriving before the bus, lining up to enter the bus, riding the assigned bus, no eating or drinking, and maintaining the cleanliness of the bus” (Guide, p. 16). The last category, the rights of others, includes a “safe and orderly bus ride, treating others with respect, respecting the property of others, and no obscene language” (Guide, p. 16). The school uses security videos to monitor the behavior of students while on the bus. Penalties for violating these policies may result in suspension of bus privileges or other disciplinary actions.

For students who drive to school there is a specific set of rules. They must park in the assigned student parking lot, park at their own risk, may not leave school without permission, may not drive recklessly or speed, no loitering in or near their vehicle, no impeding buses, or move their car during the school day (Handbook, p. 8). If a student is caught breaking any of these rules, the school reserves the right to revoke their driving privileges. The school also reserves the right to call in the local police for matters that are more serious, such as theft, vandalism, or accidents.

Cancellations.

Due to inclement weather in the area the school is located in, sometimes it is dangerous or impossible for students and staff to safely reach the school building. On these days, an executive decision is made by the superintendent to cancel school for the safety of students and staff. In Ohio, each school district receives five snow/emergency days before they must make up the days. When school is cancelled, students and staff do not come to school, there is no instruction time, and extracurricular events are cancelled.

Secondary education.

Students at this particular public school have a wide range of options to earn college, technical, or advanced education credits. The postsecondary enrollment option for students in grades 9 through 12 allows them the opportunity to take classes at “eligible institutions including community colleges, postsecondary vocational technical institutions, state universities, and private colleges and universities” (Handbook, p. 16). To find out more and register for these programs, students and their parents must make an appointment to speak to the school guidance counselor. Students may also take Advanced Placement courses that are offered at the school. Advanced Placement courses are rigorous high school courses that are certified by the College Board and allow students to take the AP examinations for college credit at the end of the course (Handbook, p. 16).

Students at this particular school have access to the MVCAP program, which assists parents and students in researching appropriate colleges, universities, and post-secondary programs, provides help in completing financial aid forms, and helps students seek scholarships to pay for post-secondary education (Handbook, p. 16). Two programs

similar to MVCAP are the Upward Bound Program and University Academic Achievers Program, the latter “designed to help students continue their education beyond high school” (Handbook, p. 16). These programs include “college preparation, career planning, counseling and tutoring, cultural enrichment, financial aid assistance, and scholarship search help” (Handbook, p. 16). Students in this public high school also have the option to attend the career and technical center to receive training in a career field while completing high school.

Graduation.

The culminating point of high school is graduation, where students who have met the state requirements receive their diploma certifying that they are official high school graduates. In order to graduate, according to the state of Ohio, students must pass required testing and meet certain curriculum requirements. In Ohio, the students are responsible for obtaining the Ohio CORE standards. These standards include “four units of English/Language Arts, a half unit of health, four units of mathematics, a half unit of physical education, three units of science, three units of social studies, and five units of electives for a total of 20 units” (Handbook, p. 12).

In these units, specific classes are required. For example, in the mathematics unit, one unit must be Algebra II (Handbook, p. 12). The physical education unit requires two physical education classes; science units must include one unit of physical science, one unit of life science, and one unit of advanced study (Handbook, p. 12). Social studies requires that one unit be on American History and one on American Government (Handbook, p. 12). When a student has met all the academic and testing requirements, a

they will be allowed to graduate. Passing grades on a series of tests are also required by the state of Ohio for graduation. These tests are performance-based assessment tests and end-of-the-year course exams, which align with Ohio's Learning Standards. The testing process begins when the students are freshmen and are tested in physical science, Algebra I, and English I.

Removal.

Out-of-school suspension is one form of removal that has been discussed in the section on discipline. However, sometimes it becomes necessary for a student to be removed during an emergency. This is called an emergency removal, and the purpose is to "remove a student from any curricular or extra-curricular activities, from the school premises, if [the administration] perceive[s] that a student's presence poses a continuing danger to person or property" (Guide, p. 26). Teachers and the administration have the ability to remove a student at any time if they feel that these requirements have been met.

Since an emergency removal is reserved for severe issues, three steps must be taken to ensure that the process is carried out correctly. Often a student who is removed using an emergency removal will also face a suspension or expulsion, so a written notice must first be sent to the parent or guardian of the student (Guide, p. 26). Then, a hearing is conducted within 72 hours. If expulsion is not an option, the hearing will be held with a school administrator (Guide, p. 26). Finally, if an expulsion is possible, the hearing will be scheduled and conducted by the school board or its liaison (Guide, p. 26).

Security surveillance.

Due to the size and number of students in this public school, the school building, premises, and buses are equipped with video surveillance systems. These systems monitor exit doors, hallways, and other locations to provide a constant monitoring of students. If an incident occurs, the administration can access the videos to make an accurate determination of what happened. Since the videos are protected by the U.S. Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the videos are subject to privacy and protection laws. “Videos can only be viewed by the City School District staff and require a legal subpoena/summons to be released” (Guide, p. 16); however, with the proper paperwork, videos can be released to students, parents/guardians, or community members. When criminal offenses are committed, the videos may be released to the city police department.

Juvenile Justice Facility

Some protocols in the juvenile justice facility are quite different from those in the public school system, the reason being that residents in the juvenile facility have been charged or convicted of a serious crime and are either serving their punishment or awaiting trial. This particular justice center contains residents who are accused of rape, felonious assault, murder, and other serious crimes. In order to ensure the safety of fellow residents and staff, certain protocols are followed and little leeway is allowed.

Isolation.

Unlike the public school, which uses removal as a way to ensure the safety of other students, the juvenile facility uses a form of isolation to ensure the safety of residents and staff. Residents who commit a major violation such as fighting, assault,

threats, escaping or talk of escape, rioting, obtaining contraband, not taking medication, or anything defined as criminal behavior (General, p. 3) are immediately put into isolation. For this juvenile facility, isolation is the loss of all accumulated points and privileges. Residents are confined to their cell for longer periods of time until they can earn enough points for admittance to the middle tier.

Movement.

The residents' movement through the juvenile facility is highly structured. When residents are allowed out of their cells, they are to "go immediately to the closest orange line ... stand with both toes on the line, back to the wall and have [their] hands behind [their] back" (General, p. 6). When residents are directed by a staff member, they are allowed to move, and there must be no more "than one arm's length between residents" (General, p.6). There is also no touching of people or items while residents are moving through the facility. These movement rules were put into place since the facility is often over capacity and can be quite crowded when groups need to move for classes, meals, or other activities.

Daily living routine.

Since residents live in the juvenile facility on a semi-permanent basis (between two weeks and a year), they are required to do daily housekeeping chores. Each morning, the residents are required to sweep out their cell, mop, clean their toilet, and dispose of trash (General, p. 5). They are given two rolls of toilet paper each morning, which must last until the next morning. Any time the residents leave their cell, their bed must be made with the blanket folded on the end of it (General, p. 5). In the evening, when the

residents are returned to their cells, their shoes must be left outside their cell with the toes facing the wall (General, p. 5). In regard to personal items, the residents are allowed to have one book, a Bible, three pictures, and three letters, and when the resident is not in their cell or it is evening, those items must be placed on the ledge outside of the resident's cell (General, p. 5). If residents are caught with contraband, depending upon the type, points can be deducted or criminal charges can be pressed.

Specific rules also apply to the locker room, where residents shower. Since the facility is co-ed, females shower every morning and males shower every evening (General, p. 5). Residents are given 10 minutes to shower and must be back in their cells before the time expires or points will be deducted from their scores (General, p. 5). There is no touching, pushing, or horseplay allowed in the locker room, and any resident caught causing a problem will be dealt with as deemed appropriate by staff. Residents are also required to keep the shower area clean and their lockers organized.

In the evening, the facility turns the lights out at 10 p.m. and the residents are required to stay in their bed unless they are using the rest room (General, p. 5). During quiet evening hours, there will be no talking or noise from residents. Residents are not allowed to roll their floor mat up and put it on their bed (General, p. 5). Any resident caught violating these rules will face a point reduction, and depending upon the severity, residents may be handcuffed and moved to a disciplinary cell.

Handcuffing.

Residents of this facility may be handcuffed at any time depending on the observations of the staff. If a resident has shown that he cannot keep from touching items

as he moves through the facility, he may be handcuffed. A resident will also be handcuffed as they are taken from the facility to attend court or counseling. If residents fight, misbehave, or otherwise cause a commotion, they may be handcuffed for the safety of other residents and staff. Handcuffing is at the discretion of the staff and guards within the facility.

Dayroom.

Well-behaved residents who are not in isolation or school may spend time in the dayroom. The dayroom is considered a privilege for residents who have earned time out of their cell. Residents must be in at least the middle tier before they are allowed to spend time in the dayroom. In the dayroom, only four residents are allowed to play cards at one time (General, p. 6). Card players are not allowed to damage cards, slap them on the table, or gamble; residents caught violating these rules will no longer be allowed to play cards and may lose points. Chairs are not to be leaned on or tipped back, all four chair legs must be on the ground, residents' feet must be flat on the floor, and residents must face forward in the chair (General, p. 6). Movement in the dayroom is not permitted without staff approval and loud noises will not be tolerated (General, p. 6). Spending time in the dayroom is a privilege, and this privilege can be taken away, based on behavior in the dayroom and during the week.

Communications.

Phone calls and mail are the only way that residents are allowed to communicate with family and guardians in the community. In order for residents to make a phone call, the parents/guardian must first set up an account with the telephone service. Then,

residents must show positive behavior in order to earn their phone call. “Phone calls last up to fifteen minutes” and may only be made to a parent or guardian (General, p. 8). If a resident is caught calling anyone besides a parent or guardian, or making a three-way call, phone privileges will be revoked for the duration of the resident’s time in the facility. Residents are to use phone calls as a time to ask their parent or guardian to bring any items that they may need that are approved by the facility. Asking to use the phone will result in a loss of phone privileges for one week (General, p. 8).

Mail is another form of communication that residents may use. Sending and receiving mail is a privilege that is based on good behavior. Mail will not be sent or “distributed if it contains explicit sexual content or gang content” and residents “may not write to or receive mail from other institutions unless it is from a parent” (General, pp. 8-9). Residents are allowed time to write letters on Sunday if their behavior is positive; however, residents are not allowed to share writing material (General, p. 9). Three letters are permitted to be in each resident’s cell, and letters are the personal property of the resident and may not be read by other residents (General, p. 9). Mail content is taken seriously and criminal charges may be pressed if the material warrants.

Informal Protocols Similarities

Informal protocols for this case study are defined as classroom or juvenile facility protocols, which are expected by the teacher or guard, but not written in formal documents. During observations and interviews with teachers, administrators, and guards at each facility, several themes emerged from the researcher’s observations. These themes will be supported by evidence collected by the researcher in the form of quotes

and scenarios. Beginning with observed and documented similarities, the following sections will explore informal protocol similarities in the public school and juvenile facility, followed by informal protocol differences.

Teachers' feelings regarding their job.

In both facilities, the behavior of the teachers and students during instructional time was similar. In the public school and juvenile facility, the teachers frequently repeated these phrases: "Pay attention, stop talking, sit down, are you on topic, and that's not appropriate" several hundred times a day (Observations 1-20). The majority of the teachers observed by the researcher in both facilities expressed stress, tiredness, and frustration. In Observation 4, the teacher being interviewed made the comment that "coming to work every day took every ounce of her energy and mental strength to get through the day." (Interview 4) Other teachers in the public school agreed with this sentiment and discussed how draining the environment was on their energy and mental health. One teacher even told the researcher that she sold her home that was close to the school and moved almost an hour away because she needed the drive time to decompress before she encountered her own family (Interview 4). She said that prior to that, she and her husband were on the verge of divorce because she came home so angry and tired every day and took it out on her loved ones (Interview 4). Of the three veteran teachers in the public school who were interviewed, all three indicated that they were simply waiting until they could retire or receive a buyout package, and that they would be leaving (Interviews 5, 6, and 19).

In the juvenile facility, two classroom teachers teach residents who are enrolled in its school. One classroom is for males and one for females, and the two teachers were employees of the public school system, which was the first research site. One teacher, in his interview, stated that he would be retiring in three weeks and “could not leave fast enough” (Interview 19). He expressed disgust with being assigned to work in the juvenile facility, and even though he was not old enough to retire, he was offered a buyout package that he took (Interview 19). The other teacher was a year from retirement and “biding his time until he retired” (Interview 20). He categorized his placement in the juvenile facility as “the administration trying to place veteran teachers in places where they would retire sooner, since they [veteran teachers] require higher salaries” (Interview 20). Teacher 20 felt that his placement in the juvenile facility was a way for the administration to encourage his retirement (Interview 20). Therefore, he defined his job as being more of a classroom monitor than a teacher (Interview 20).

Based on the researcher’s interviews and observations in both the public school and the juvenile facility, teachers in these two institutions felt that the school environment was draining their physical, mental, and emotional resources. Many expressed a form of subdued frustration with the climate of the school, stating that the students’ quarrelsome nature and disrespect made every day a battle for control in the classroom (Interviews 2-4, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-20). While the public school teachers felt that discipline policies were ineffective for their needs, the teachers in the juvenile facility felt that the discipline policies were adequate since residents who acted out in the classroom were escorted out by guards and could face serious consequences that were not options in the public school.

Student classroom technology behavior.

While student access to technology is quite different in each institution studied, the usage is similar. Students in the public school have access to their cell phones (despite rules) and can be found using technology when they are not supposed to. These same circumstances were found in the classroom at the juvenile facility. In the public school system, students watch YouTube videos in the back rows of classrooms, peruse Facebook during instructional time, text, tweet, take pictures and video during the school day (Observations 1-16). Even when the students had permission to use authorized technology in the classroom, they found ways to avoid doing the assigned work. During Observation 2, the class in the public school was held in a computer lab where the students were supposed to use the Internet to research their assigned writing topic. Of the 19 students in the classroom, only 6 were observed using the computer in the manner assigned (Observation 2). The other 13 students were using the Internet to look at Nike shoes, had circumvented the Internet blockers to access Facebook, were checking MLB baseball scores, watching YouTube music videos and other off-topic behaviors (Observation 2).

Residents who were able to attend school in the juvenile facility had access to laptops at their individual workstations. The purpose of these laptops is for students to complete their assigned work or attend classes at online schools. Many students used their laptops for this purpose but also circumvented the rules by accessing sites and pages that had nothing to do with assigned school work (Observations 19, 20). While the juvenile facility's administration had placed Internet blockers on certain sites, residents

were able to circumvent these blocks or avoid them completely. For example, pornography was blocked by the administration, but the juvenile facility students were able to access racy music videos on YouTube instead of completing their assigned work (Observations 17-20). While the teachers attempted to monitor these actions and shut them down, it was a never-ending battle that the students seemed to win.

Sporadic enforcement of formal protocols.

In interviews in the public school, one of the frequent comments that the researcher heard was that formal rules were only enforced at certain times, for certain students. A prime example of this was shared during Interview 11 with the teacher who had been involved in the incident. A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior and the Student/Parent Handbook have specific sections that address the issue of threatening behaviors and threats directed at students, administrators, and staff. In this incident, as related to the researcher by the teacher involved, the teacher was in the middle of teaching a lesson. He asked the students for quiet, but one young lady continued to speak loudly and distract other students. After addressing the student personally, the student fired back at the teacher that she did not have to be quiet and could continue doing whatever she liked. The teacher responded that, no, the student could not, and if she had a problem, she could leave the classroom. In return, the student yelled back that, no, she could not because she was expected to be in the "stupid" classroom because her probation officer made it a condition of her release. At that point, the teacher decided to stop fighting with her and wrote her a discipline ticket and told her to go to the discipline room. She began swearing at the teacher, refusing to leave, flipped her chair over and

threw her books on the floor. When the teacher called the principal and school resource officer (SRO) to the room, the young woman threatened to kill the teacher and harm his family. The principal and SRO heard these threats and decided to check the young lady's locker, book bag, and car. In her car, they found two medium sized knives and told the teacher to be careful.

After this incident, the teacher expected that the young woman would be expelled and removed from his class since that was the protocol for threats and weapons. Instead, she received a three-day suspension and returned to the teacher's class to finish out the school year. The teacher was incredibly disturbed, felt unsafe in his own classroom, and disliked that the rules were not enforced. As the story circulated around the other teachers, many worried that they were at increased risk for being victims of violence in their classrooms. This was mentioned to the researcher in at least half of the interviews (Interviews 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15) .

Another example of this inconsistency was in the enforcement of the technology policy. Although the public school had a formal stance on student use of electronics in the classroom, many teachers did not enforce the rule, circumvented the rule, or enforced the rule completely. During Observation 5, the teacher embraced the use of technology and told the students to use their own personal technology to answer questions. In Observation 6, the teacher strictly forbade the use of all technology, and anyone caught with a phone would receive a referral to the discipline room. These inconsistencies were evident in the observations as teachers sporadically enforce their own rules.

In the juvenile facility, the formal protocol is that students are allowed to use their designated laptop to complete assigned homework or attend online school. Internet blockers are put in place by administrators to keep residents from accessing Internet sites that are prohibited; however, sites like YouTube and Google are still available to the residents. Residents who are in school and not interested in completing their work use the Internet to watch music videos, research their favorite artists, design shoes, and other off-topic tasks. While the juvenile school teachers actively monitor the Internet, according to one teacher, “It is easier to let the students harmlessly look up that stuff on the Internet than to battle them all the time” (Interview 20). This allowed students a modicum of freedom.

Varying educational levels.

One of the striking similarities between both facilities was that the classrooms had students of varying educational levels working side by side. In the public school the discrepancy between those who were on grade level and those who were behind was obvious during instructional time. During the researcher’s observations, as the teachers were teaching, students who understood the lessons were following along, taking notes, and answering questions. Students who were behind were often talking among themselves, not paying attention, or goofing off. When it came time for students to work on their assignments in class, many asked questions that showed their lack of on-grade level skills. During Observation 6, which was a mathematics class, one young man sitting next to the researcher, turned and asked if she knew the answer to six multiplied by three. Not wanting to simply give the student the answer, the researcher asked the

student if he could guess the answer. His response was 20. Without the ability to do simple multiplication, this student could not do the more complex factoring that the teacher had just taught during class (Observation 6).

In the juvenile facility, all residents who are willing to attend class and are still enrolled in school can go to the classroom in the juvenile facility. Since this juvenile facility is temporarily home to residents from age 11 to 17, the classrooms contain students of all educational levels. Most students in the facility have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and a variety of work; the teachers in the juvenile facility view themselves as tutors to answer questions and guide students in their work, not as teachers. However, all learning in the juvenile classrooms is self-guided and directed by the work that is sent from the student's home school district. As Interviewee 19 stated, "Sometimes home schools send schoolwork that is appropriate to the student's learning level and sometimes they send work that is completely inappropriate to the student's learning level. When this happens, the student normally can't do the work and instead browses the Internet or causes problems and has to be removed" (Interview 19). Just as in the public school, these varying educational levels in the juvenile classrooms also lead to issues of misbehavior.

Lack of formal training in classroom discipline.

One consistent answer in each interview was the teacher's response to the question of whether or not they received training in classroom discipline during their college experience. The universal answer to this question was no, the teachers had not received any training in how to manage their classes in terms of behavior and discipline.

This sentiment was true for all the teachers, no matter their teacher-training institution. Teachers in the public school often left trouble-making students in the classroom because they did not want the administration to think that they were incapable of controlling their classrooms. Every time a teacher wrote a disciplinary ticket and sent the student to the discipline room, the discipline teacher noted on a spreadsheet the name of the student, their misbehavior, referring teacher, and other information. Each month, these referrals were tabulated and the teacher who referred the most students received a talk from the administration about the number of referrals and how the teacher could better control their classroom. Many teachers mentioned in their interviews that they felt that instead of receiving a lecture, receiving guidance, tips, and strategies for classroom management would be more effective in helping their classroom discipline.

The teachers in the juvenile facility said that the only reason that their classrooms functioned as smoothly as they did was “because the guards would remove any resident who made even the slightest problem in the classroom, sometimes even when the resident really should stay in the classroom to get their education” (Interview 20). Since a guard was constantly present in each classroom, if there was any misbehavior the guard normally dealt with the issue. However, during the interview when the juvenile facility teachers were asked if they had received any additional support or refresher courses in classroom discipline, both responded negatively. In the 20 interviews conducted, only one teacher thought that at some point they might have received a one-day lecture on how to control their classroom, but they could not remember anything that they had learned or implemented (Interview 8).

Lack of consistency.

In addition to the previously mentioned issue with the enforcement of the school technology policy, some teachers felt that their discipline referrals were not taken seriously by the administration. To demonstrate this theme, an incident happened on the way to the researcher's observation in the school. A young man was sent out of class for repeatedly disrupting the teacher. In the hallway, on his way to the discipline room, he encountered the freshman principal. Since the researcher and the principal were walking to a classroom together, the principal stopped to talk to the young man. The young man stated his case and complained that the teacher had been "disrespectful to him since he just wanted to get his homework" (Observation 4). The principal proceeded to talk to the young man about what comprised respectful behavior and how he could display behavior that was more respectful. The young man complained that if his football coach found out that he had been in the discipline room he would be in trouble and how that was not fair "especially since he didn't do anything, that teacher had it out for him" (Observation 4). After the talk, the principal agreed to escort the young man back to his classroom and talk to the teacher.

The researcher observed what occurred in this classroom. On entering the room, the principal told the teacher that the young man had apologized and would not be acting out again. As the researcher continued to observe that period, the young man repeatedly was disrespectful to the teacher by acting out, being on his cell phone, talking loudly, and wandering around the classroom (Observation 4). When the researcher interviewed the teacher later that afternoon, she expressed the feeling that "the principal usurped her

ability to discipline her students when she ‘talks’ to the student and then sends them back into the classroom. That action causes the student to feel like the principal is siding with the student and that the student got away with being bad with no repercussions, so they come back into the classroom feeling superior” (Interview 4). The teachers in this school felt that the administrators commandeered their authority and created consistency problems.

Even in the juvenile facility, where the residents and staff have to abide by strict protocols, there is lack of consistency. Since the classrooms are divided by gender and there are fewer girls in the facility than boys, the girls’ classroom had a more lenient atmosphere. In the boys’ classroom, there were 20 young men. On the girls’ side, the two girls in the class received one-on-one attention from their classroom teacher and had more freedom than the boys. Some of these freedoms included the ability to talk to each other, listen to music without repercussions, and move around the classroom (Observation 18). On the boys’ side, they were not allowed to move without permission, could not listen to music or speak to each other, and were under supervision by a guard at all times (Observation 17).

Large class sizes.

In every classroom that the researcher observed, except the girls’ juvenile classroom, class sizes were large, between 20 and 30 students. In several classrooms, the sheer number of absences made the classroom manageable (Observation 3, 4, 12, 14). One classroom in particular stood out: this teacher was a first-year teacher and his classroom had 31 students assigned to it during three different periods. However, this

classroom only had 29 desks. When the researcher asked him how he managed this issue, he said that he had never actually had all of the students assigned to the classes show up. On the day the researcher observed this teacher's classroom, he was also being observed by the principal. This observation occurred during the third period when the teacher had a large number of students, as 27 of the assigned 31 were present. Behavior was definitely an issue during the class period, and when it was over, the principal and teacher sat down for the post-observation discussion. In this discussion, the principal brought up the issue of classroom management, and the teacher admitted that he had a difficult time with the large class size. He asked the principal for ideas and strategies that he could implement in his larger classes, and the answer was "I'm not sure, but you need to do something" and then it was on to the next topic (Observation/Interview 14). After the principal left, the teacher expressed his frustration with the answer he received, to the researcher, and his concern for the future of his job (Interview 14).

Another new teacher expressed similar frustration after she received a note from the administration criticizing the number of students she sent to the discipline room. When the researcher observed this teacher's room, her mathematics classes averaged 25 students, with the highest number being 29. The only way to describe the classroom was pandemonium. There was a verbal fight between two students during instructional time, with objects being thrown, shouting, and general chaos. During the interview, the teacher stated she has repeatedly been criticized for her classroom management and has asked for help every time, but has received no help, instructions, or strategies (Interview 3).

In the juvenile facility, males outnumber females and the male classroom has more students than the female classroom. Since the desks that are installed in the juvenile classrooms are bolted down as permanent structures, the number of students allowed in the classroom at one time is limited to the number of desks available. At the time that the researcher observed, there were 20 desks available for students and 19 were in the classroom (Observations 17-20). One resident had permission to attend school, but he had completed all of his work, had previously caused issues in the classroom, and was not allowed to attend class until he had more schoolwork to complete. In the boys' classroom, a guard was constantly present to help the teacher keep order, which was needed every time the teacher was helping another student. For example, during Observation 18, a male student asked the teacher a question about his science homework. During the time that the teacher was helping the student answer the question, a different young man got up, walked over to another student, smacked him on the arm, and made it to one more student before the guard warned the student that he would be removed if he did not sit down immediately.

Discipline statistics.

The school's discipline statistics were available to the researcher for September through May 2015. When establishing the parameters for the study, the public school asked the researcher to examine the discipline statistics of the freshmen students. The administration believed that freshmen comprised the largest number of discipline issues and wanted suggestions on what could be done to improve the behavior of incoming freshmen. The following numbers represent the number of referrals, not the individual

students who received referrals (i.e., a student could have received four referrals in one month; therefore he was counted four times).

The researcher found that over the course of the year 31 teachers referred 725 male students and 23 teachers referred 396 female students (Skill and Support Center). Of those, 793 were Black, 293 were White, and 19 were Hispanic (Skill and Support Center). The majority of those students were disciplined for disruption of instruction, followed by conflict with staff, out of area, and conflict with another student (Skill and Support Center). To put this in perspective, the total enrollment in this public high school building was 1,386 (Ohio School Report Card, 2013-2014). Of the 1,386, demographics show that 610 were identified as White (44%), 599 as Black (43.2%), 146 as Multiracial (10.5%), and 28 as Hispanic (2%) (Ohio School Report Card, 2013-2014). Ninety-six and a half percent (1,338) of the students in this public high school were considered to be at an economic disadvantage according to the Ohio School Report Card, 2013-2014.

Teacher dress code.

While the students and residents in both facilities have a dress code, the teachers in both are not governed by a specific dress code. The teacher turnover rate at this school is moderately high; of 44 freshmen teachers, 19 were new to the district this year (Interview 1). Almost half of these new teachers were young women, a year or two out of college (Interview 1). On the first day, the researcher went to ask a student for directions to a classroom and did not realize that the student was actually a teacher. There was no way to differentiate the teachers from the students in some instances. On Fridays, teachers wore blue jeans and school shirts, which provided a uniting theme and

differentiated them from the students. However, in 17 out of 20 observations and interviews, the teachers wore wind pants, sweatpants, and even yoga-style pants. Shirts ranged from tee shirts to sweatshirts, and tennis shoes finished off the attire. Three teachers wore dress clothes every day; these outfits consisted of dress shoes, khakis, dress pants, skirts, and shirts with collars. In contrast to the majority of teachers, the administration wore khakis, shirts with collars and ties, dress pants, suits, and skirts every day (Interview 1).

In the juvenile facility, the dress code for the teachers was the same as the public school. The two teachers came to work in clothes that ranged from blue jeans to wind pants, tee shirts to sweatshirts, and tennis shoes. The guards assigned to the facility were constantly in uniform and appeared to differentiate only in the shirt that was chosen (i.e. uniform tee shirt or sweatshirt or button-down shirt). During Observation 18, when a resident was upset with the answer the teacher gave, the student proceeded to say to the teacher “I shouldn’t have to listen to you, you don’t even look like a teacher” (Observation 18). Several students silently nodded their head until the guard spoke up and silenced everyone.

Learning.

This theme is based strictly on observations by the researcher. However, numerous teachers subtly hinted at this issue in their interviews. Since both institutions have students in classrooms that have such varied educational levels and skills, the standard method of modeling, assisting, and then allowing students to try the work on their own, does not seem to work in either. Of the 18 teachers observed in the public

school, only one occasionally used this style with success (Interview 5). He credited his success to his prior coaching experience and the fact that he interwove interactive lessons into lectures (Interview 5). Other teachers who attempted to implement the lecture-and-practice style had chaos in the classroom. In multiple classrooms, the moment the teacher began explaining how to do the work or the project, the students would talk among themselves, wander around the classroom, throw things, touch each other (punching, hitting, etc.), and engage in other disturbing activities. When the teacher had finally quieted the students back down and given them the assigned work, it ended up on the floor, left on the desk, or thrown away (Observation 3, 7, 8, 10, 14). During other observations, when the students were asked to turn in homework, they claimed that they never received it, did not know they had to do it, or did not understand how to do it (Observations, 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14).

Learning in the juvenile facility was just as chaotic. Since the residents came from schools all over the county and were in multiple grades, they had different curriculums and work to do. During the interview with the two teachers who taught in the juvenile facility, they said that they ran their classrooms as private tutoring classes since they felt that they could not actually teach lessons to the residents due to the varying levels of education (Interviews 19, 20). Running the classroom in that style left residents with many opportunities to explore the Internet, listen to music, or simply sit quietly until the school day ended. When students would direct a question to the teacher and the teacher would reply by telling them to read the book or look at their materials, the

resident would complain that they were not actually learning anything (Observations 17-20).

Many times the students' home schools sent residents photocopied worksheets or had them read the book chapter and answer the chapter questions (Observations 17-20). Sometimes this coincided with what the school was actually teaching and other times it was just work to fill the time. During the interview with the juvenile facility supervisor, he discussed how disappointed he was in the teachers who were in the juvenile facility (Interview 18). He explained that before these teachers were assigned to the facility, the previous teachers had taught group lessons, created work for the students, and made learning relevant for the residents in the facility (Interview 18). The facility supervisor expressed hope that with the changes coming to the juvenile justice sector, education would become a priority and standards would be set for incarcerated juvenile education (Interview 18).

Informal Protocol Differences

There were some striking differences in the observed informal protocols and in the interviews conducted in both facilities. These differences were to be expected considering the different missions of each institution. The public school system's mission statement is, "Creating a culture of education to guarantee the success of every student" (Handbook) while the juvenile facility's mission is "a secure facility designed for the care and custody of incarcerated youths under age 18, pending disposition of their cases" (General, p. 1). These distinct mission statements mean that diverse methods are used to achieve the goal of each institution.

Tickets

When students get into trouble in the classroom in the public school, the teacher writes out a yellow ticket. This ticket contains a brief explanation of what happened, what the teacher would like done, and the teacher's name. After receiving the ticket, the student is required to go to the discipline room. Once the student enters the discipline room, they are to take a seat and wait for an assistant principal to work on their case. The classroom supervisor pulls the student's discipline record along with the ticket, and then waits for the assistant principal to decide what the punishment will be. Each nine weeks, the discipline record starts anew, and the students are allowed to be tardy eight times and have eight discipline referrals. When a student has reached their eighth, in-school suspensions are given, and if a student receives more than four in-school suspensions, they are then given an out-of-school suspension for every referral after that.

Good behavior is also rewarded with tickets, which are called golden tickets. Golden tickets were new this school year, and the teachers were supposed to give out the golden tickets to students who displayed positive behaviors listed in the behavioral grid (Handbook pp. 1-2). When a student receives a golden ticket, they may immediately fill it out and take it to the office to enter it into a raffle box. As the student enters the office with the golden ticket, the office staff makes sure to praise the student's behavior. Tickets are drawn every Friday and prizes include free tickets to football games, free tickets to homecoming, gift cards, and catered lunch with a favorite teacher. This system was put in place by the principal to reward students who acted in a positive manner and to encourage other students to display proper behavior (Interview 1).

Chaos.

Compared to the more-disciplined atmosphere in the juvenile facility, the public school climate seemed disorganized, chaotic, and confusing. During the researcher's time in the school, there were nine fights, constant yelling by teachers and students, four instances that required the school resource officer, and one fight that actually put the school on lockdown and blocked the researcher from attending for two days. The fights were an almost everyday occurrence, and students who were not involved did not react. In fact, during the verbal altercation in the classroom during Observation 4, the students not involved in the altercation continued their daily business (Observation 3). The fight that kept the researcher out of the school happened at the end of the day as students were on the buses to go home. A fight broke out between two groups of students. Students were knocked unconscious while other students videotaped the incident. This incident made it to social media where parents and the community reacted strongly. Students who were involved were expelled from class and many faced criminal charges. The day after the fight, the school was on lockdown and no visitors were allowed in the school. All students who entered the school were also subject to a search and had to pass through a metal detector. This delayed the start of school for almost two hours on that select day.

The hallways were unruly between classes during the first three weeks of the researcher's observations. Although there was a bell that signaled when the students were late to class, the first few weeks they completely ignored these bells and wandered into class whenever they felt like it. In fact, during the first week of observations, the average instructional starting time was eight minutes after the tardy bell with the quickest

starting time being four minutes and the longest being 16. Students would saunter in at various times or walk by classrooms poking their head in and creating a disturbance. When the administration began to notice these issues, they began to enforce the tardy policy by placing teachers in the hallway and any student who was tardy to class had to serve after-school detention. This began to eliminate the issue associated with the unruly hallways.

Another difference between the public school and the juvenile facility was the amount of yelling that took place in the classrooms. Students yelled to each other in the classroom to talk about their days, teachers yelled at the students, and students and teachers yelled at each other. In Observation 10, students were yelling across the room to each other when the teacher began the lesson. In order to quiet the class, she yelled at the students to be quiet (Observation 10). Several students yelled back at the teacher and a screaming war ensued (Observation 10). In fact, the teacher turned bright red and the researcher worried for her health before she finally sent the three students out on discipline tickets (Observation 10). This yelling between students and teachers happened in a multitude of classrooms and was noted by the researcher in multiple observations (Observations 3, 4, 7-10, 14, 15). When asked by the researcher if the teachers believed that yelling was an effective strategy for classroom control, many replied that they did not think that it was, but did not know any other way to handle the situation in their classrooms (Interviews 3, 4, 7-10, 14, 15). These teachers expressed a frustration and feeling of helplessness with the situations in their classrooms.

Miscommunication.

At the beginning of each school year, the teachers and administrators have an in-service day to discuss the policies and how they are to be implemented in the upcoming year. One of the points of confusion that seemed to arise from many of the teachers was the use of disciplinary tickets and the discipline room. In interviews with the administration, they expressed their belief that disciplinary tickets and the disciplinary room were to be used for “the worst of the worst, not as a classroom management tool” (Interview 1).

However, the assistant principals felt that teachers were using the disciplinary room and tickets as a classroom management tool since the assistant principals received tickets that complained of students sleeping in class. One assistant principal even said during an interview “I don’t understand why a teacher would write a student up for sleeping in class; at least the student is quiet and not causing trouble. If she wants to sleep, let her sleep” (Interview 16). When teachers were asked about their expectations for the disciplinary tickets and room, they believed that they were for any student who was not behaving in class (Interviews 2-15). Some teachers used tickets more frequently and when observed, their classes were quieter and more traditionally structured than teachers who used the ticket system less frequently (Interviews/Observations 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14). New teachers who were interviewed expressed reluctance at using the ticket system since data were collected on the number of students each teacher sent to the disciplinary room (Interviews 2, 4, 7, 8, 12-15). Four of these new teachers also had classrooms that were disorganized, chaotic, and loud, and had received suggestions that

classroom management was a skill they needed to improve during formal observations by their principal (Observations 2, 4, 7, 8, 12-15).

One of the unintended issues that arose with this ticket system was that the teachers began to judge each other's teaching ability. Each month, it would be leaked as to who had referred the most students to the disciplinary room and whispers would begin to circulate about that teacher (Interview 16). Since new teachers were only hired on a one-year trial basis, most of them did the best they could to stay off the referral list, believing that if they made the list, their contracts would not be renewed (Interview 14). One teacher who consistently made the list felt that "the administration deliberately leaked the information in order to pressure her to change her practices and make their job easier" (Interview 6). This teacher was finishing her doctorate and left the school two weeks after her interview and observation for a teaching position at a local college.

Teacher gender also seemed to play a role in how many students were referred to the disciplinary room. Twenty White, female teachers sent 547 male students to the disciplinary room, and 256 females were sent by 13 White, female teachers (Skill and Support Center). Of those 803 students referred by White, female teachers, 580 were Black, 204 were White, and 10 were Hispanic (Skill and Support Center). Seven White, male teachers sent 150 male students and six White, male teachers sent 122 female students to the disciplinary room (Skill and Support Center). In examining the race statistics for White, male teachers, of those 272 referred students, 184 were Black, 72 were White, and 6 were Hispanic (Skill and Support Center). On the freshman floor of the public school, there was only one Black female and she was an administrator. There

were three Black males on the floor with one being an administrator. These Black, male teachers referred 23 male students, 18 female students, 23 Black students, 15 White students, and 3 Hispanic students.

Type of schooling.

A key difference between both institutions was the type of education that was happening in them. In the public school, teachers were attempting to impart new knowledge to the students and build educational skills by teaching students mastery. Teachers would teach the concept, provide guided practice for the students (if possible, there was some hands-on learning), and followed the lesson with individual practice. Active learning was happening in the school through teachers and assignments. This was demonstrated through the observations of teachers in the school. Every teacher that was observed had an active lesson plan for the day and assigned students homework based on that day's lesson.

As described before, the juvenile facility teachers handled their job as if they were private tutors to their residents. Learning in those classrooms looked much different than the learning in the public schools. Some students were actively engaged working on assigned school work or attending online school. However, the majority had school work but either did not understand how to complete the work, were bored with the work, or did not have enough prior knowledge to complete the work (Observations 17-20). Male students, especially, sat with piles of work on their desks, and their heads down listening

to music (Observation 20). Since the resident's home school had the final say in whether or not the work actually counted for a grade, many residents gave it minimal effort, knowing that they were going to fail the class (Interview 20). The teachers in the juvenile facility also had no leverage to force their residents to complete the work.

Opt-out option/No schooling.

In the public school system, students have to wait until they are 18 years old in order to opt out of the public school. This process normally involves multiple sources trying to discuss other options with the student, placing them in a general equivalency diploma (GED) program, or a technical school. The public school system tries a variety of options to keep students from leaving high school without receiving their diploma. Students are also required to attend school and if they do not, they can face truancy charges.

However, in the juvenile facility, if a resident is enrolled in a school, he can choose to opt out daily from attending class with no penalty (Interview 18). If a resident has completed all of their assigned work, they can choose to stay in their cell instead of attending classes for the day (Interview 18). If a resident does not feel like attending class that day, they can also opt to stay in their cell for the day (Interview 18). Disruptions or bad behavior can also keep a resident from attending school. These are choices that the resident can make in regard to his schooling. However, if a resident is not enrolled or has been expelled from his school, they do not receive any type of education unless their parent or guardian enrolls them in a different school or an online

program (Interview 18). There are youthful, male juveniles who are not receiving any educational services because they are not currently enrolled in a school (Interview 20).

Dress code.

Dress codes have been established for the residents and students in each institution, although their enforcement varies greatly. During the observations in the public school, students were observed wearing clothing that came close to violating the dress code and clothing that did violate the dress code. However, enforcement appeared to be sporadic, depending upon which teacher or administrator was patrolling the hallways. Some teachers allowed students to keep on whatever they were wearing but issued a verbal warning that the clothing was not appropriate (Observation 5). Other teachers ignored dress code violations and continued with their teaching (Observation 4). Administrators also fell into these same two categories, with one being known as “The Enforcer” (Interview 6). This administrator is known as being a stickler for enforcing the dress code and sends student to the discipline room for new clothes on a regular basis. In the discipline room, there are gray sweat pants and bright green sweatshirts that students may rent for the day in order to stay in school. Should a student refuse to use the clothes in the disciplinary room, they may call their parents or guardian to bring new clothes to school (Interview 16). If a parent or guardian refuses to or cannot bring in other clothing, the student may face in-school suspension or out-of-school suspension.

In the juvenile facility, the residents are provided a uniform that they must wear or must stay in their cell until they are dressed appropriately. The residents must provide their own undergarments, which are also searched and regulated by the staff before they

are distributed by the guards. Unlike the public school, there are no options for the residents of the juvenile facility. Residents are not offered second opportunities to change clothes or to call their parents or guardians for appropriate clothing. Refusing to wear the provided uniform will result in the loss of points, possible isolation, or even further criminal charges. All guards and teachers enforce the uniform code in a similar manner and residents abide by the rules.

Discipline.

Students in the public school are subject to a set of disciplinary rules that are unique to the institution of the school. These rules are defined in the Student/Parent Handbook as well as in A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior. However, the administration makes sure to emphasize the fact that discipline can be administered at the discretion of the teachers, staff, or administration. This discretion can be exercised using school-based sanctions or outside law enforcement agencies. To illustrate this discretion and partnership, the school resource officer provided the researcher with the list of students who have had criminal charges filed on them within the school this year. Ten students faced assault charges, nine were charged with inciting violence, seven with criminal trespass, six with disorderly conduct, six with detainers/warrants, five with theft, three with curfew violation, two with concealed weapons, two with felonious assault, two with unruly conduct, one with prohibition, one with illegal conveyance, and one emergency removal (Charges Filed). According to the school resource officer, when charges are filed against a student and they are removed from the school by the officer, it

is because all other options have failed. The school resource officer said that they are “truly the last possible option” (Interview 17).

In the juvenile facility, the use of handcuffs, point deductions, and new criminal charges are all discipline strategies that are used to enforce the rules. Handcuffs are used when a juvenile is a danger to him/herself, other juveniles, or staff within the facility. As explained earlier, juveniles accrue points based on behavior that conforms to the rules of the facility. When juveniles disobey the rules, points are deducted from their total and privileges are revoked based on the number of points that have been removed. This means that the juvenile can have classroom access, mail and phone privileges, and even the freedom to move about the facility. Finally, if the action or behaviors are severe enough, new charges can be filed against the juvenile, resulting in further legal trouble and a longer or more severe sentence.

Summary

The formal and informal protocols in each institution have similarities and differences that help each institution meet their goals. As the similarities show, there are issues in the public schools that should warrant further examination of the effects of these policies on students. This examination is needed in the areas of criminal prosecution, discipline, and ranking since they can be detrimental to the success of students in the public school. In the juvenile facility, adding more options for well-behaved residents, like athletics or secondary education options, may encourage residents to return to their home schools and become involved in the educational process.

When examining the informal protocol similarities, it appeared that large classes, varying educational levels, lack of formal training, and the discipline statistics were issues that urgently need to be examined further. These issues can be directly linked to the future success of these students and residents, and are an important predictor of their future success. The public school, especially, needs to examine their teacher discipline records and provide additional training to teachers who have high rates of discipline referrals. In the area of informal protocol differences, the way that the juvenile facility educates residents is of serious concern, and a new method for providing education to a variety of students needs to be examined. Crucial issues in the public school are the distrust and miscommunication between teachers and administration. This rift sends mixed messages to students, disempowers teachers, and creates climate friction.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter explores the themes and findings that emerged from the results described in Chapter 4. In this chapter, these themes will be illustrated through observations, interviews, and information found in the literature review. This chapter is divided into two sections, one on the high school and one on the juvenile facility in the study. By separating these chapter components, an in-depth analysis will emerge. Observations were an important part of this study, so it is in this chapter that their impact on the study will emerge. These observations will be triangulated with data from the literature and interviews where possible in order to create the best understanding and most complete picture of the study results. The themes that emerged from the school institution will be examined first.

School

The five themes that emerged from the school institution were communication, behavior, enforcement, management, and institutional instability. These themes developed when similar occurrences were witnessed by the researcher during observations, interviews, and data were collected from the school.

Communication.

The theme of communication as occurred in this study were the interactions of the administration and the teachers, and the teachers and the students. Communication is not limited to verbal interactions; it includes written documents as well as physical

interactions. The researcher's observations will be used to illustrate the issues with communication in the institutions.

The behavioral pullout room was a center point of communication issues within the school institution. When interviewed, 8 out of 15 teachers said that they felt uncomfortable sending students to the behavioral intervention room because they thought that the administration was judging their teaching ability based on how many students they sent out on behavior referrals. Therefore, many teachers either ignored or handled issues that arose in their classrooms on their own, which resulted in much different rules for each classroom. When interviewed, the administration denied pressuring or judging the teachers based on the number of students they referred for disciplinary action. However, each time a student was sent out with a behavior issue, the teacher, time, date, and type of infraction had to be written on a card and sent with the student to the behavioral pullout room. This information, plus other details about the student, including whether they had an Individualized Education Program (IEP), was entered on a spreadsheet. At the end of each semester, the totals were tallied, indicating which teachers had sent the most students to the behavioral pullout room. In the researchers' interviews, the administration denied that pressure was placed on the teachers to lower their behavior referral numbers, but the majority of teachers interviewed felt pressure to not be in the top five teachers who had sent students to the pullout room.

The administrators who were interviewed defined the purpose of the behavioral pullout room in a different way than the teachers did. When asked what the exact purpose of the behavioral room was, many administrators said that it was for students

who were disrupting, interfering, or posing a hindrance to the teacher or other students. However, this explanation was quickly followed by this direct quote from both administrator interviewed: “The behavioral pullout room is not for classroom management” (Interviews 1 and 16). When questioned further about the purpose of the behavioral pullout classroom, none of the administrators could provide a complete list of behaviors that should be dealt with in the classroom versus those that warranted a trip to the pullout room. Many administrators used the caveat: “Well, it depends on the teacher” (Interviews 1 and 16). These miscommunications and confused expectations between the administration and the teachers apparently helped cause discrepancies in expected classroom behaviors.

When one teacher requested assistance from an administrator, during a private meeting, on how to control behavior in his classroom, the principal told the teacher that the meeting was for the purpose of evaluating his teaching methods and content. The principal emphasized that the meeting needed to stay on track due to limited time constraints (Observation 14). This teacher had two classes of 31 and 32 students, respectively, but he only had 29 chairs in his classroom (Observation 14). During the interview with this teacher, he expressed dismay that his contract would not be renewed because he sent students to the behavioral pullout room as he could not control them in his overcrowded classroom (Interview 14).

Further communication problems developed between the teachers and the administration over the issue of block scheduling, or having two combined periods for the same class. Block scheduling meant that teachers had the same students for the same

class back to back. The administration cited the purpose of these block classes as a way to help remedial students get extra time in classes where they struggled (Interview 1). Mathematics classes, especially, seemed to be a struggle for many students, so the basic algebra classes were block classes. This meant that teachers had almost two hours a day with students in just one subject. They used the first period as a new lesson period, but found themselves unsure of how to proceed with the second period. Since the aptitudes of these students ranged from almost on target to the fourth grade level, the learning gap was so wide between the students that a subject review class lesson was not feasible. Therefore, many of these teachers gave the students a study hall for the second hour, which resulted in chaos, lack of learning, and behavior issues. When the teachers asked for help with planning these blocked classes, the administration avoided providing a direct answer for them (Interview 4 and 6).

Communication issues also arose when the administrators tried to implement a positive reward policy for students. Teachers were told that in order to increase morale and motivate students, golden tickets were to be given out for positive behaviors displayed by the students in their classrooms (Interview 1). A memo was sent to all the teachers outlining the requirements for issuing the tickets, the goals of the ticket program, and how often tickets should be given. During the researcher's observations, not a single ticket was given out, even though the rules stated that the teachers should be handing out at least one a day (Observations 1-16). When asked to define their understanding of the ticket system, a few teachers replied that they believed that it was for outstanding behavior in the classroom, not just good behavior (Interviews 5, 8, and 13).

This communication theme fit with the human factor in the organization literature, that is, Tannenbaum's research (1966) showed the important role that the human plays in the organization. The human factor or "*esprit de corps*" (Tannenbaum, 1966, p. 2) had yet to be explored by researchers, but motivated by Tannenbaum, F. W. Taylor launched research that explored how humans were motivated to do various jobs in the organization. The ultimate goal was the mechanization of humans. However, the mechanization of humans, or the ability to create humans who would strictly abide by rules, perform their jobs in a mechanical function, and work at peak efficiency (The Hawthorne Studies, 1924) has yet to be created and does not exist in the organization, due to the human nature factor. This lack of mechanization means that effectively communicating the policies of an organization is crucial, so that they are enforced precisely by those within the organization, so that the organization can meet its goals.

Additionally, literature on the formalization, stratification, bureaucracy, and authority of organizations gives insight into the communication issues that were seen within the the two organizations in this study. Since these structural components give those within the organization the power to enact rules on those in the institution, communication is crucial. Communication ties an organization together, linking the behaviors and rules to the missions and goals of the institution. By adequately communicating the expectations, goals, expected behaviors, and punishments, the organization can function cleanly and efficiently. With communication issues, other problems arise that may hinder the efficiency of goal achievement as seen in the examples previously provided, since authority is not properly understood or

communicated to those implementing the rules. Also, in many cases, the needs of the employees as derived by Maslow and defined McGregor (1960) are not being met by the institution, leaving workers unfulfilled and unwilling to exert themselves to enforce the institutional norms.

Student behavior.

Formal protocols are proscribed behaviors that are acceptable or unacceptable for students in the school, around the school, and at school events. In the school's, A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior, six pages are dedicated to behaviors that are disadvantageous to the education of all students. Nine behaviors are listed as being prohibited in the school: possession or use of a weapon; selling or transmitting controlled substances; counterfeit drugs, steroids, or alcohol; setting or attempting to set a fire; physical assault; sexual assault; fighting; bomb threats; or criminal behavior (Guide, p. 20).

Other behaviors that will earn students disciplinary action include, but are not limited to, truancy, disruption of school, damage to school/person's property, inciting fighting, knowledge of weapons, use or possession of tobacco, trespassing, hazing, insubordination, gambling, forgery, impersonation, theft, extortion, personal technology, bullying, sexual behavior, profanity, and chronic misconduct (Guide, p. 25). Depending upon the severity of the behavior, students may receive varying forms of punishment that range from an intervention ticket to an out-of-school suspension or criminal charges.

Large class sizes caused classroom control to emerge as one behavioral issue. One teacher interviewed said that he had received no instruction on how to perform

classroom discipline; another teacher stated that he was a former coach, so he treated his classroom like a practice field (Interviews 2 and 5). In one classroom observed, a verbal fight broke out between two girls in the middle of the lesson. The teacher ignored their loud swearing and shoving and continued teaching. Every student in the class watched the fight, but the teacher turned her back to the students and continued teaching. During the interview, the researcher asked the teacher why she had not dealt with the fight by removing the students from class; she responded by saying that she felt the incident was not severe enough to warrant their removal (Interview 3). She noted that the prior semester she had sent every student who fought to the behavioral pullout room and when the referral numbers were totaled, she was the teacher with the second highest number of referrals. Someone from the administration mentioned this to her, so she felt that she was no longer able to send referrals unless the issue was severe (Interview 3).

When students were referred to the behavioral pullout room, they received a detention, suspension, or expulsion depending on their discipline record. The majority of students (over 80%) who entered the pullout room were repeat violators, and the classroom monitor knew every student by name and could almost anticipate when a student would be sent to his room (Interview 16). The man who monitored the behavioral pullout room was a former prison correctional officer who had turned to teaching as a second career. Two assistant principals rotated in and out of the pullout classroom on a daily basis and were in charge of checking each student's discipline card, deciding on an appropriate punishment, and then handling the distribution of that punishment (Interview 16). Calls home informing parents of the impending suspension

or expulsion of their child were made at least once a period from the classroom as students were sent down for violations of rules (Observation 16). Hallway fights happened at least once a day, and students were expelled for these incidents, as well as fights on buses or at extracurricular activities. When the fights or violations became assaults or misdemeanors, the school resource officers were called in, and the violators were dealt with at the police station.

In one incident, explained to the researcher during an interview with an administrator, during a dismissal in the fall, a fight broke out between two students who were waiting to get on the bus (Interview 16). Friends of the two students joined the fight outside and inside the bus, fighting with their fists and any weapons they could find. The bus driver, acting to try to stop the fight, immediately told the students to stay on the bus and attempted to shut the doors to minimize the fight. Students leapt out windows and opened the back door of the bus. The school resource officers responded, as well as the administrators and city police officers. Students were handcuffed and placed in police cars to end the fight. Some students recorded the fight on various social media sites. In one video, a student is seen punching another student in the face and as that student fell to the ground, the attacking student grabbed the unconscious student and hit his head on the ground. When the fight was over and the administration realized that almost 100 current and expelled students were involved in the fight, the school was closed to all visitors and guests for two days, including the researcher. Every student who entered the building the following day was searched by police officers and required to go through a metal detector

before entering the building (Interview 16). The administration claimed that it was the only way to guarantee the safety of students after the fight (Interview 16)

Additionally, hallways were also places of behavioral issues. Students pushed other students into the lockers, ran from class to class, slapped backs and books out of other students' hands, made phone calls, listened to music through headphones, and exhibited a variety of other prohibited behaviors. During one observation, the researcher saw a 6'3" male slam a 5'11" friend into the lockers and then laugh when his friend dropped all his books and had to pick them up off the floor (Observation 5). Other students began to copy these actions. When the administrators tried to put a stop to this behavior by walking the hallways and sending students who performed these actions to the behavioral room, the students continued this behavior in the hallways that were not being patrolled (Observation 5-16).

According to the literature, behaviors fit in the reward system of organization systems. Behaviors that follow the formal protocols of the system are rewarded; behaviors that break the formal protocol system are disciplined. This system of rewards and punishments keeps students and teachers focused on performing behaviors that help the institution meet its goals and mission. Roch, Pitts, and Navarro's (2010) examination of policy tools found that "a school's discipline policy is aimed at incentivizing students against disrupting the learning environment, and those policy tools (whether carrots or sticks) all focus on such motivation to comply" (p. 41). In addition, these behavioral rules help with organizational control; using formal protocols as an "attempt to influence

future behavior” that is acceptable and desired by the institution and approved by the greater society (Scott, 2001).

These policies further enhance the building of communities in the institutions, as mentioned by Goffman (1961). In the institution, the building of community is important since it creates a hierarchy within the institution through which power and authority flow. According to Goffman’s theory, the students are in the dependent world, or those upon whom the rules are enforced. Administrators and teachers then comprise the staff world; they interpret the rules of the institution and enforce them in a manner that promotes the mission of the institution. In this scenario, teachers, more than principals, use people work as a way to bridge the gap between the formal policies of the school and the needs of the students. It is through the behaviors of those within the institution that the system of punishments, rewards, institutional control, and community building can be observed.

In the organizational theory literature, Roch, Pitts, and Navarro (2010) found that “a school’s discipline policy is aimed at incentivizing students against disrupting the learning environment, and those policy tools (whether carrots or sticks) all focus on such motivation to comply” (p. 41). In both facilities in this study, the discipline policies were the sticks with which to enforce the institution mission, while golden tickets and points were used as rewards or “carrots” to encourage the desired behaviors. As detailed in the literature review, rewards are an important part of the institutional organization. Rewards keep both employees and dependents motivated to enforce the policies and protocols of the institution. Without rewards, the potential to enforce the policies is minimized and organizational goal achievement can be minimized.

Rule enforcement.

Within the institution, teachers and administrators are in charge of implementing formal protocols. They are tasked with the job of imposing these rules on the students in the institution so that the establishment will continue to run in the desired manner. The Student Handbook and A Student's Guide to Positive Behavior in the school in the study exist so that the institution has a formal set of rules to rely on, and so that the students are aware of the rules. These formal regulations are in writing so that they are less arbitrary, subjective, and universally enforceable.

One example of a written formal protocol is the technology policy. According to the formal rules of the school, technology, especially cell phones, are not to be used: "No student shall display or use electronic communication devices in the school during classroom instruction or during an assembly or other gathering part of the instructional day" (Handbook p. 7). Cell phones are supposed to be stowed in the students' lockers until the end of the day; however, this is not always the case. As observed, students had their cell phones on their person during classes, and the majority used them in class, despite repeated warnings and threats (Observations 1-16). Part of the difficulty in enforcing this rule was the wide variety of responses from the teachers in regard to the cell phone policy. Only two teachers strictly enforced the no-cell phone policy, which forced students to try to sneak in their cell phone usage, hiding it under their desks or under books (Interviews 6 and 15). One teacher openly embraced cell phone usage,

saying that his class used their cell phones for research purposes in class (Interview 5). The majority of the teachers fell between these two extremes, leaning toward not allowing students to use their cell phones in class, but ignoring or not punishing those who did. These conflicting messages by the freshmen teachers made it hard for all the teachers in the grade to enforce the cell phone policy and was an additional cause of behavioral problems for some teachers.

The school also had a tardy policy, a student being tardy when the bell rings that signals the start of the next class and they are not yet in the classroom or in their seat. At this school, classes are 55 minutes long, and the students are given five minutes to navigate the hallways between classes. A bell signals the end of class as well as the beginning of class each period. This second bell is called the tardy bell. Students are allowed to be tardy to each class only five times per semester (Interview 1). These tardies are recorded by the teacher during class attendance each day (Interview 1). After a student acquires five tardies, on his or her sixth tardy, the student is given a detention (for a first offense) or a suspension (once they have received a detention) (Interview 1). Since the students did not see an immediate impact from being late, many disregarded the tardy bells, leading to detentions, suspensions, and noisy hallways.

In the enforcement literature, Goffman (1961) identified house rules as “a relatively explicit and formal set of prescriptions and proscriptions that lay out the main requirements of inmate conduct” (p. 48). Within the institution, the supervisors are responsible for impartially and reliably implementing the formal protocols or house rules. Through this enforcement, the supervisors set the tone of the institution. When house

rules are enforced intermittently and discerningly, the dependents of the institution will view the supervisors as hardhearted, unjust, and biased. This can be dangerous for supervisors because it produces aggression and rage in those being controlled. To mitigate this, rewards issued by supervisors are another means of control within the institution.

The principal in this school attempted to implement a rewards-based system called Golden Tickets (Interview 1). These were in contrast to Yellow Tickets; Golden Tickets were given to students for displaying positive behaviors in the classroom or hallway (Interview 1). Teachers were tasked with giving out one Golden Ticket a day, each week, so that the students could see positive behaviors in the classroom being rewarded (Interview 1). Each time a student received a Golden Ticket, they were to take it to the office and put it in a container labeled Golden Tickets (Interview 1). At the end of each week, a drawing was held for a chance to win a prize. These prizes ranged from free tickets for extracurricular activities to ordered-in lunch with a teacher of the student's choice (Interview 1). During the resesarch observations, however, not one single Golden Ticket was given to any student in the classroom (Observations 1-16).

According to Goffman (1961), rewards and privileges for good behavior make a dependent's life easier and encourage them to continue the desired behavior. However, a lack of rewards and privileges can cause the dependent to become frustrated and annoyed, and thus act out or display behaviors that violate institutional protocol.

Power is a key element in rule enforcement in the schools. With the implementation of No Child Left Behind in 2002, the allocation of federal money became

tied to the test scores of the students in schools. Highly publicized school violence events in the late 1980s through the early 2000s brought zero tolerance policies, dangerousness, and preventative punishment to the attention of schools. Students who were perceived as dangerous or as causing problems within the school could be excluded from the school and testing through these new policies. Additionally, students who were put in special education classes were not required to pass the tests and thus did not hurt the schools scores. Therefore, some schools used the zero tolerance policies and special education classes as ways to bypass the rules of the federal government related to NCLB results. When this happened, the goals of the institution changed subtly, which changed where the power was held in school organizations. Teachers, whose students' test scores determined the outcome of the funding for the next year, then held the power that was once held by administrators. With the replacement of NCLB by the Every Child Succeeds Act, in 2015, the power of the teacher and administrator is currently in a constant flux. Teachers still hold the power to influence test scores, but administrators hold the power over the teacher's careers. This shifting power struggle causes the rule enforcement issues seen in the organizations.

Control/management.

Much of the school control literature has focused on classroom control, which has played an important role in creating an atmosphere where students can learn new material and thrive (Brophy, 1988). However, in this study, the classroom is not the only place where this literature was relevant. Control and management combine to help the institution function so that it will meet its daily goals and overall mission. Not only are

teachers tasked to provide control in their classrooms so that students can learn, but administrators are also required to provide supervision throughout the entire school to both students and teachers, to manage student control. In this section, both types of control and management will be shown in relationship to the literature, observations, and interviews.

In one observed classroom, the lesson for the day was to bring history alive with a guided movie (Observation 15). A guided movie is a movie that is accompanied by a fill-in-the-blank worksheet that prompts the students to look for answers in the movie. This movie was the culmination of a chapter that the teacher had just finished teaching (Interview 15). With the movie, she intended to provide the students with visual images of what they had just learned (Interview 15). During this movie, the students would not stop talking and the teacher kept yelling at them to quiet down (Observation 15). This teacher yelled at the students 22 times in a 15-minute period, threatening to stop the movie, throw everyone out of class, and flunk all the students (Observation 15). Finally, after 15 minutes of yelling, the teacher shut the movie off and berated her class for their inability to follow directions (Observation 15). The teacher was so upset that her face turned red while she continued to yell at the students for the remaining 20 minutes of class (Observation 15). After class had finished, the teacher remarked that this had been her worst class and that she dreaded having that class when all the students were present (Interview 15). Students' inability to follow directions that resulted in a teacher yelling was commonplace in 7 of the 15 classrooms observed in the school (Observations 1-15).

When asked during interviews if the teachers had experience with classroom management or had learned classroom management skills during their teaching degree programs, 14 of the 15 teachers interviewed responded that they had not (Interviews 2-16, 19-20). The majority responded that they had learned classroom management that they used during their present teaching by recalling incidents in their previous classroom experiences as students (Interviews 2-16, 19-20). One teacher responded that although she had not received any instruction on classroom management, her parents had both been teachers and she often went to them with problems to use their knowledge and experience in her classroom (Interview 13). The one teacher who had received instruction in classroom management during his undergraduate experience found that most of what he was taught did not seem to be effective in his current teaching situation (Interview 2). He explained that at his previous teaching position, the strategies he had learned were effective and he had utilized them on a daily basis for a controlled and calm classroom (Interview 2). In his current situation, he explained that he felt out of control, lost in his own classroom, and did not know how to regain control of his students or their learning (Interview 2).

Administration management issues in this school focused on formal and informal protocol implementation and involved an element of communication. Many of these observations appear in the communication section of this dissertation. It is important to remember that within the institution, actions, behaviors and rules are not stand-alone incidents. Each action impacts the institution in a variety of ways since it is interconnected at all levels.

The technology policy, or more specifically the use of cell phones in the classroom, was one example of a school-wide management issue. One teacher interviewed claimed that he liked using technology in this classroom so that the students could use their phones for research purposes since he did not have enough computers for every student (Interview 5). Other teachers claimed that they strictly adhered to the no cell phones in the classroom policy (Interviews 2-4, 6-17). However the researcher observed students using their cell phones hidden under their desks, behind books or even in the open on top of the desks (Observations 1-16). Technology usage also took place in the hallways with students listening to music through their earphones or making phone calls. Depending on which administrator was walking through the hallway at the time, students would be asked to remove the device, have the device confiscated, be sent to the behavioral pullout room, or continue on their way (Observations 1-16).

Another management issue was the behavioral pullout room. When interviewed, 8 out of 15 teachers said that they felt uncomfortable sending students to the behavioral intervention room because they believed that the administration judged their teaching ability on how many students they sent out on behavior referrals (Interviews 3-4, 7-10, 12-13). Therefore, many teachers either ignored or handled issues that arose in their classrooms on their own, which set different rules for each classroom. When interviewed, the administration denied pressuring or judging teachers based on the number of students they referred for disciplinary issues (Interviews 1 and 16). However, each time a student was sent out on a behavior issue, the teacher, time, date, and type of infraction had to be filled out and sent on a card with the student to the behavioral pullout

room (See Appendix). This information, plus other information about the student, including if they had an IEP, was entered into a spreadsheet and at the end of each semester, the totals were tallied for the teachers who had sent the most students to the behavioral pullout room. In interviews, the administration denied that they pressured teachers to lower their behavior referral numbers this way, but the majority of teachers felt pressure to not be in the top five (Interviews 1 and 16).

The administrators who were interviewed defined the purpose of the behavioral pullout room differently than the teachers. When asked what the exact purpose of it was, many administrators said that it was for students who were disrupting, interfering, or posing a hindrance to the teacher or other students (Interviews 1 and 16). However, this sentence was quickly followed by this direct quote from every administrator interviewed: “The behavioral pullout room is not for classroom management” (Interviews 1 and 16). When questioned further about the purpose of the behavioral pullout classroom, none of the administrators could offer a complete list of behaviors that should be dealt with in the classroom versus behaviors that warranted a trip to the behavioral pullout room (Interviews 1 and 16). Many administrators used the caveat, “Well, it depends on the teacher” (Interviews 1 and 16).

In relation to the literature, Brophy (1988) indicated that teachers are responsible for a fragile equilibrium. Brophy (1988) stated that the teachers have to produce instruction that meets the needs of all students, regardless of the learning diversity and student personalities in the classroom. To achieve this, teachers must minimize distractions and stop meltdowns through an effective management system in the

classroom. While this is pertinent for classroom teachers, administrators also have a responsibility to minimize the distractions and keep both teachers and students focused on the larger goals of the institution. Cohen's research (1972) demonstrated the interconnectedness of the institution and the importance of uniformity in implementing rules and protocols since classrooms are a small section of the entire institution.

The themes that emerged from this Ohio school, through observations, interviews, and literature analysis, provide an overview of what the results from Chapter 4 mean in relationship to the school. While it is important to see what the informal and formal protocols look like written in institution language, it is through the actual implementation of those protocols that the progression of the institution toward its goals can be viewed. Formal protocols that are chosen by the administration as focal points to address with staff give insight into what is viewed as important by the organization. By highlighting these protocols, the institution either believes that enforcing them will move the institution closer to its goals or that there is a need for the protocols to be enforced to meet the daily goal of the institution. This translation and enforcement of protocols is then given to the teachers who interpret their requirements and the needs of their students and turn these formal protocols into daily informal protocols that they believe will fulfill their daily needs and the institutional needs. This interplay between the informal and formal protocols intends to move the institution forward toward meeting its institutional mission.

Juvenile Facility

Three themes similar to those of the school emerged from research at the juvenile facility. These themes included education, populations, and communication, and while there were some similarities between the school and the juvenile facility, the latter had its own unique challenges. Triangulation of the researcher's observations, interviews and the literature provided additional evidence to support the findings of the data analysis.

Education.

Education was one of the main points frequently mentioned in the handbook for the juvenile justice center. The juveniles were encouraged by the staff and corrections officers to spend as much time as possible in the juvenile classroom (Interview 20). However, outside factors limited the juvenile's ability to spend time in the classroom. According to the teachers in this facility, the students could attend the class in one of two ways (Interviews 19 and 20). First, a student had to be enrolled in a school district, which would send work for them to complete (Interview19). If the school did not send work, then the student was unable to attend class that day (Interview19). Enrollment in an online program was the other way that a student could attend class in the juvenile facility (Interview 20). Unless the student was expelled or not enrolled in a school district, the responsibility for assigning and gathering work for them fell to the school district, mainly the secretaries and the teachers. Since there are almost no penalties for not giving a student work to complete while in the juvenile justice facility, many teachers either forget or do not complete the request (Interview 20). When teachers did assign work to students, it focused on reading a chapter and answering the chapter review questions at the end of the textbook. If a student did complete the work, it may or may not be have

been graded by the teacher (Interview 20). If a student was not enrolled in any school, either online or physically, a parent had to sign and complete paperwork to enroll their child in either type of school (Interview 20). If a parent refused to complete this paperwork or take responsibility for the student, they could go indefinitely without enrollment in an educational program (Interview 20).

During the research observations at the juvenile facility, there were 3 female students and 14 male students who were able to attend classes (Observations 19 and 20). This meant that 1 female and 10 male could not go to the classroom during the day, either for the reasons stated above or because of behavior issues that voided their classroom time. However, students could also opt out of attending class that day by telling the correctional officer that they did not want to attend school, which meant that the student would be confined to their cell for the duration of the day (Interview 19). During Observation 17, a student came into the classroom and completed a few minutes of work. After a few moments, he stood up and announced to the correctional officer that he “wanted to go back to his cell because this work is bull****” (Observation 17). The teacher responded first telling the student to “sit back down, do the work, and be quiet” (Observation 17). The juvenile followed this comment by walking around the room, hitting another student on the shoulder, and talking. When asked again to sit down, the juvenile responded that he “didn’t have to, he’d already asked to leave and no one paid attention” (Observation 17). At that point, the correctional officer stepped in, handcuffed him and led him back to his cell. The teacher said during the interview that this was a

regular occurrence for the student and that the teacher was thinking about limiting his time in the classroom (Interview 19).

In 2015, the Ohio Department of Education conducted a study at the neighboring juvenile center and found that it was in violation of federal laws in regard to students with IEPs (American Civil Liberties Union, 2015). IDEA still applies to juveniles who are incarcerated in all facilities, meaning that IEPs must be followed for all students who have them in any facility (Musgrove & Yudin, 2014). All students who are incarcerated have the right to a high quality education and highly qualified teachers, according to the *Guiding Principles for Providing High-Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings*, a report issued by the federal Departments of Education and Justice.

In addition, a study by Noguera (2003a) showed that students who get into trouble are not passive victims; they understand that there are consequences to their actions and are living up to an assigned label (Noguera, 2003a). Additionally, these juveniles may fall into the special populations category and may have a diagnosed or undiagnosed learning disorder. Therefore, they struggle to complete work assigned them from the school district. Since the juvenile facility classroom is used only as a study hall for students, these students' modification needs may not be met. Unlike the schools, the federal legislation of No Child Left Behind does not apply to the juvenile facility, so accountability is limited to the enrolled school district of the juvenile. Additionally, responsibility for the juvenile's learning is placed on the school district, not on the juvenile facility. This allows for gaps in the education of the student based on the issues that have been addressed here.

Populations.

As noted in the results, two distinct populations were residing in the juvenile facility. One was the short-term population, that is, juveniles who may live in the facility for two weeks to several months (less than six) and will transition back to their home school districts within the same school year (Interview 19). The second is the long-term population, that is, juveniles who will be incarcerated for longer than six months and may be facing transfer to the Department of Youth Services' prison, depending on the outcome of their trial (Interview 19). These two groups presented unique challenges for the juvenile facility in providing their education.

In the male classroom, there were four students who were considered long-term residents. One had been incarcerated for 9 months, one for 11 months, one for 1 year, and one for 1 year and 3 months. In observing these students, they had steady work that was sent by their home school districts, completed their work, and sat quietly in the classroom (Interview 19). In contrast to this, the short-term population received school work intermittently, were likely to cause classroom disruptions, and more probably to opt out of the classroom environment (Interview 19). According to one teacher, the short-term population was “trying to prove that they were really bad***** by being disruptive in the classroom, that way they can go back and brag to their friends about their time in the facility” (Interview 20). Short-term juveniles were less likely to receive school work from their school district and were prone to browse the Internet (Observations 17-20). This browsing led to disruptions as students attempted to access prohibited sites and teachers removed them from the classroom (General Rules).

In the female classroom of the facility, none were considered long-term residents. Of the three females allowed in the classroom, two were serving 5 months and one was serving 2 months (Interview 19). Two of the three were still enrolled in school and received their school work on a constant basis (Interview 19). The third was enrolled in an online education program; the fourth was not allowed in the classroom due to a major computer violation and received work to complete by paper and pencil (Interview 20). Because fewer females were incarcerated in this juvenile facility, their classroom was much quieter and they received more one-on-one time with the teacher (Observation 18, 20). This discrepancy in population capacity relates back to the literature on preventative detention, where African-American and Latino boys are labeled dangerous by character judgments rather than by actual dangerous incidents (Casella, 2003). In this case, however, the juveniles in this facility were incarcerated for severe behaviors such as rape, armed assault, and murder. However, it is possible that their entry into crime began with a preventative label. Several authors (Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Maauser, 1974; Togut, 2011) found that being young, Black, Hispanic, or Native American, and receiving a label of special education made a student's risk of being incarcerated rise. This phenomenon is known as the school-to-prison pipeline. In regard to the literature on short-term and long-term juvenile facility residents, the literature is scarce and does not add any new information to this study.

Communication.

How education was conducted created key communication issues in the juvenile facility. When the students were able to attend class, many had modifications that were

mandated by their IEPs that were not being met (Observations 17-20). Records that were obtained by the court from the student's enrolled school district showed which students had an IEP, what the IEP was for, and how the modifications should be performed (Juvenile Data Records). However, the juvenile teachers cited the non-teaching nature of the classroom, material sent from the school district, space, and time, as the reasons they did not implement the IEP modifications in the juvenile facility (Interviews 19-20). When the teachers were interviewed by the researcher and asked about IEP modification plans and the lack of implementation, they explained that since they were not teaching and not responsible for the work being sent, they did not need to implement the students' IEPs (Interviews 19-20). The teachers at the juvenile facility stated that they felt that the enrolled district needed to send work that met the student's IEP; the juvenile facility teachers' job was to make sure that the student had time and access to do the sent work, not to teach (Interviews 19-20).

This view directly contradicted the desires of the juvenile facility director, who wished to see these teachers teaching set lessons and providing instruction to students (Interview 18). The director claimed that previous teachers had taught lessons, assigned homework, and used activities that engaged the students and created an interactive learning environment (Interview 18). The director was disgusted with the classes being run as study halls and felt that the facility was doing an injustice to the students by not providing meaningful education during their incarceration (Interview 18). One teacher was set to retire at the conclusion of this study, and the other the following year. The director expressed hope that he could find two teachers who were motivated to set up

classrooms and provide education to students through actually teaching lessons (Interview 18). New requirements coming from the juvenile justice system were changing the educational face of justice centers in Ohio. However, the new standards had not yet been released.

One of the key issues of communication in the juvenile facility arose from the tension between the veteran teachers and the supervisor, the teachers felt that they deserved better teaching positions and admitted that they were simply putting in their time until they could retire (Interviews 19 and 20). Each teacher spoke early about the number of days until they could retire, and even had a countdown posted on their calendar (Interviews 19 and 20, Observation 18). This desire to be done with teaching and the juvenile facility led to friction when the juvenile director requested better educational opportunities for the students. Since the director was not the actual supervisor of these teachers (they worked for the school district), he felt powerless to correct their behavior or fire them (Interview 18).

Within organizations, communication is important for how they meet their institutional missions, through formal and informal policies (Berg, 2007). This focus on meeting institutional goals must be tempered with the needs of the people in the institution, and a balance must be created (Campbell, 2006; Goffman, 1961). Workers in the institution must also have their needs taken care of in order to translate the formal rules for those in the institution. Institutional workers, according to McGregor in Rubenstein and Haberstroh's book (1960), have five needs that must be met. Social and ego needs must be met in order for the institutional worker to be motivated and work to

enhance the productivity of the institution. When these needs are not met, work and motivation may be lacking and the workers' output may hurt the institution.

Public accounting.

The lack of public accounting to anyone in the juvenile system is symbolic of the themes and patterns in the juvenile system itself. It seems that lack of accountability in the classrooms in the juvenile facility mirrors the lack of external accountability for the center. Schools are not held accountable when they do not send work for their students to the facility. Students are not held accountable for completing the work sent. Teachers can't be held accountable for the teaching material or following state and federal law. Finally, the director was not held accountable for the success, failure, education, or recidivism rates of the juveniles in the facility. This lack of accountability, on all levels, mirrors the lack of accountability to external sources that are supposed to ensure complicity with federal and state laws, policies, and procedures.

Relationship to Institutional Functioning

Relating the themes, patterns, and manifestation of these results to the functioning of the institution, the results of the data as related to the research questions indicated a connection between the struggles observed in the public school classrooms and the functioning of the organization, or vice versa. The research questions addressed the similarities and differences between the informal and formal protocols of each institution, and the data showed that there are connections between the two. As these formal and

informal protocols are imposed on students both consciously and unconsciously by administrators and teachers in schools, the labeling of students who violate the formal discipline policies of the school targets them for perceived and performed behaviors. This was especially prevalent in the ninth grade at this particular public school since that is when four separate middle schools combined to form one high school, and the teachers were tasked with creating a homogenous student body. In addition to teaching content knowledge, the freshmen teachers had to familiarize the students with the new environment of high school by enforcing the formal rules of the institution in order to create high school students. This process of acclimatizing these students created a focus on the discipline of the formal rule process in the school; violations of formal and informal classroom policies would result in more formal punishments such as detentions, suspensions, and expulsions. The latter two punishments remove students from school and put them in contact with those outside the control of the school, often with the juvenile delinquent population.

Relationships that are created outside of the school with already delinquent populations put these newly suspended/expelled students at risk for joining others and becoming more delinquent (Archer, 2009; 2010; Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Clemson, 2015; Hirschfield, 2008; Noguera, 2003a; McLeigh & Sianko, 2010; Wald & Losen, 2003). As delinquency increases, the risk for incarceration in a juvenile facility increases. Once a youth has entered the juvenile justice system, they face a new set of formal and informal protocols that have formal punishments, which are more drastic, life altering and severe than those in schools. Moreover, just as in schools, once a youth is labeled a delinquent,

they are more intensely scrutinized by probation officers, police, teachers, parents, and community members. Increased attention to a youth's actions may lead to further encounters with law enforcement and eventually lead to much more severe consequences.

This recurring cycle of protocol violation and punishment makes it difficult for those caught in the system to get out of this cycle. Increased scrutiny, which follows a protocol violation, makes it highly likely that the violator will be caught breaking the rules again and receive more punishment. Each encounter with the discipline related to the formal protocols tends to result in more severe punishment. For example, in the public school, the first violation results in a detention, followed by suspension, and eventually expulsion.

Protocol violations are not limited to schools; in the juvenile justice facility they also lead to punishments. Violations of rules inside the facility can result in segregated lockdown (isolation) or further charges against the youth. Once released, the youth must continue to meet certain benchmarks set by the courts and probation officer, and if the youth does not meet these requirements or violates the conditions of probation, they can be rearrested and face more serious consequences. Each time a youth violates the formal protocols of either institution, the punishment stakes rise, creating larger problems for the youth and higher risk to their chances of a successful future.

By examining the formal and informal protocols of each institution, not only is an awareness of the similarities and differences in each raised, but there is also an understanding of how protocol violations and punishments build, resulting in more severe punishments for youth trapped in the cycle. For the majority of youth, their first

encounter with formal rule violations and punishments come in schools, hence the reason for a public school being one site location for this study. Youth who have frequent school punishments may find themselves in the juvenile justice system, which explains why a juvenile justice facility was chosen as a comparative location.

However, formal protocols are not the only rules that youth need to navigate. As observed by the researcher, there are distinctive sets of informal rules in each classroom, rules set by each individual teacher that are arbitrary, unique, and enforced sporadically at the whim of the teacher. Youth have to learn to navigate these informal policies as well as the formal rules, creating a challenging labyrinth for them. In addition, the arbitrary nature of humans, when placed in a position of power, such as teachers, administrators, probation officers, and directors, can lead to irregular enforcement of formal and informal rules based on numerous factors. This creates further problems for youth, who may not be adept at reading and interpreting these persons' moods, body language or other subtle social clues. Missing these clues may result in youth entering the cycle of protocol violation and punishment.

Unexpected Issues

However, despite what seem to be the building blocks and/or trajectory of youth delinquency, it is not a definite or clear path. The researcher was interested to find six unexpected issues in the research. First, the researcher documented the chaos in the classroom. Yelling, shouting, screaming, fighting, swearing, inappropriate language, belligerence, and general mayhem were present in the majority of the classrooms that were observed. The hallways were filled with students shouting, swearing, hitting,

bumping, and pushing, as they traversed from class to class. These actions in the classrooms and the hallways were limited to the freshman wing only; the sophomore, junior, and senior hallways and classrooms in the high school were orderly and quiet. It was a contradiction for the researcher to see the general disorder in the freshman wing compared to the orderliness of the upper grade levels. Observing the actions of the youth in the freshman wing made it easy for the researcher to understand why the majority of discipline referrals were given to freshman students. They were like children, testing boundaries and looking for limits, but having trouble grasping the nuances of each individual teacher's classroom style that they now faced.

Secondly, the researcher noted the role of the School Resource Officers (SROs) in the school. Research on SROs shows that many school districts often use them to enforce discipline policies and be a visible presence in the school; however, this school district used the SROs for a different purpose (Clemson, 2015). While the SROs were a visible, armed presence in the school, only once during observations were they called upon to investigate an issue. This revolved around a cell phone stolen from a girl's locker during gym class. The SROs were involved in breaking up a bus fight and in ensuring the security of the school in the days that followed it. Despite these incidents, the SROs believed that their job was to provide a strong, but silent presence in the school. The SROs did teach two classes during the day, both of which focused on helping students make good decisions and discussed real-life scenarios and implications of decisions. When interviewed, the SROs described their position in school as being a mentor,

followed by being a teacher, and lastly, as a law enforcement officer, which fit the literature on SROs (Clemson, 2015).

However, the SROs did allow the researcher to have access to data on the number of arrests that they had performed at the school. Arrests did take place during the bus fight, but were for things such as warrants, probation violations, and drug use that may or may not have taken place on school property. One SRO claimed that the school was the best place to pick up students who had violated their probation because they were required to attend school, so the officers would wait for the student to come in to the school and then arrest them (Interview 17). Yet, generally, the SROs claimed that they had very positive relationships with the students in the school. To the researcher, this seemed like a direct contradiction between building trust and enforcing the law. Prior to the large bus fight, the SROs were definitely more hidden during the school day, preferring to stay in their office in the main office area. However, after the bus fight, the SROs wandered the hallway more frequently, were called to intervene in several fights, and began publishing promotional material that was given to students and parents, creating a more visible presence in the school.

Issue three emerged from the use of resources in the public school. Although the school fell into the category of low-income and received federal and state assistance to provide free breakfast and lunch to all of the students, the school did receive a few extra services that were not provided in other schools. One such service was an outside counseling service that provided two trained psychologists to be on the school property at all times. These counselors had their own private room, which was set up as a therapy

room with couches and low lighting as well as places for group and individual counseling. However, instead of using the counselors for students displaying behavioral, emotional, or psychological problems, they were used as fight mediators.

A chance encounter with one of the psychologists during a fight in a hallway ended in an unexpected interview. The psychologist claimed that their services were originally supposed to be for at-risk students who displayed problematic behaviors, with the hope that they could correct the behaviors or other problems before they derailed the academic and social achievements of the student. However, the administration of the school had decided that the psychologists' main job would be to help students negotiate fights through mediation. The psychologists claimed that they had great success rates for students who used their mediation services, but she felt that their services would be better used in the behavioral pullout room to help students with problematic behaviors. So while the school had some resources that could have been beneficial to students, the administration had not allowed them to serve their purpose, further hindering the students' success.

The fourth interest for the researcher was in the juvenile justice facility, with regard to the deficiency of education provided the juveniles in the facility. The researcher knew from prior experience that school districts were supposed to provide schoolwork for students who were in the juvenile justice system. However, the lack of schoolwork provided by the majority of students' home school districts, combined with the absence of teaching and ignorance of federal law, created problems in the juvenile classroom. The *Guiding Principles for Providing High Quality Education in Juvenile*

Justice Secure Care Settings cites as its first principle to create “a safe, healthy facility-wide climate that prioritizes education, provides the conditions for learning, and encourages the necessary behavioral and social support that address the individual needs of all youth, including those with disabilities and English Learners” (U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). According to The National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice, students with IEPs are entitled to related services and their special education plans while incarcerated.

School-age youth could go through their entire incarceration without seeing schoolwork from their home district, return to school, and be expected to be up to date in their education. These educational conditions provided a juxtaposition for the researcher since the literature reviewed showed that juvenile facilities in Ohio had policies that dealt specifically with providing high-quality instruction to students. Since the state of Ohio runs the juvenile facilities, the researcher assumed that government oversight would be checking the conditions of education provided in their facilities. However, this did not appear to be the case, and the educational deficits in the juvenile facility directly violated state and federal laws and policies (*Guiding Principles for Providing High Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings*, U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, 2014; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2006, §300.2).

Issues five and six for the researcher involved both institutions. The fifth problem observed by the researcher was the miscommunication, tension, and lack of trust between the teachers and staff in both institutions. The teachers in the public school stated that

they would not allow the researcher to audio record their interviews for fear of retaliation from the administrators:

The school climate around here, well, there is a lot of problems and our union representative told us we can talk to you, but that it can't be on tape. We don't want anyone to get ahold of it and use it against us. However, you'll find we're a really friendly bunch of teachers, and we want to find a way to make this [the school] better for ourselves and our students. But, they [the administrators] make it harder for us to do our jobs because they haven't taught here. They don't understand how bad these kids really are. (Interview 2)

During their interviews, the teachers at the public school were candid and honest, explaining that they did not feel the administration understood their difficulties in the classroom and did not provide adequate support. The teachers interviewed stated that they felt undermined by the administration, believing that it did not have their best interests at heart, and that the administrators were focused on federal mandates and not on the realities of the school.

In their interviews, the administrators stated that they felt the teachers were lazy, unprepared for the realities of the students, and expecting the administrators to do the teachers' jobs for them in the realm of classroom discipline. This created visible tension between the teachers and administrators. In one key incident observed by the researcher, a student was sent out of class to the behavioral pullout room for swearing and yelling at a teacher (Observation 4). On the student's walk to the behavioral pullout room, he encountered a principal and the researcher walking toward the class the student had just

been removed from (Observation 4). The student immediately began pleading his case with the principal, promising her that he had learned his lesson and would not be doing his actions again (Observation4). The principal had stated to the researcher, only moments earlier, that the philosophy used on the freshman floor was that everyone makes mistakes, and deserves a second chance (Observation 4).

True to that philosophy, the principal walked the student back to the classroom, demanded that the teacher reinstate the student, and discarded the behavioral ticket (Observation 4). Since this was the classroom that the researcher was observing, a mental note was made to compare the student's behavior to what he had promised the principal. During the course of the class, the student repeated his behavior, swearing at the teacher, shouting out during the lesson, and yelling at the teacher when she tried to correct his behavior (Observation 4). When interviewed after the class, the teacher explained that once the student was put back into class, she did not feel that he could be put out again for behavioral issues (Interview 4). In the teacher's opinion, the student had gained the principal's permission to continue the bad behavior and had made it harder for her as a teacher to enforce the discipline policies in her own classroom (Interview 4).

This kind of miscommunication, tension, and distrust was present in the juvenile facility as well. The director of the juvenile facility wanted the juvenile teachers to teach, providing an education for the youth incarcerated in the facility. However, the juvenile teachers found that the challenges posed by the transient population, multiple school districts, and the population of students provided challenges that they were not willing to

accept. This animosity was visible in interactions between the director and the teachers, and came out verbally during the interviews. The teachers expressed disgust with the director since he did not understand the challenges posed by providing education to the population under the teachers' control. In contrast, the director expressed frustration and displeasure with the teachers, believing that laziness was at the root of the problem since the neighboring county had teachers in their juvenile facility who managed to provide classes and teaching experiences to their incarcerated youth. These conflicting expectations were visible in interactions between the teachers and the supervisor, and were noticed by youth and correctional officers. This tension created problems when the teachers needed support in disciplining the youth, and affected the functioning of the institution.

The sixth and last issue for the researcher was the lack of awareness of the challenges faced by the youth outside the context of the institution that created the behavioral issues inside the institution. Listening to the students' conversations in the public school classrooms, the researcher observed that many students faced issues of hunger, drug and alcohol usage, addiction in families, homelessness/residential insecurity, violence, grief/loss and many other challenges. During an interview with an SRO, the comment was made that "These students are the most resilient kids I know. They see so much tragedy and bad stuff happening in their community, yet they still come to school every day" (Interview 17). While the SROs acknowledged that the majority of students came from tough life situations, many of the teachers seemed unaware of the students' realities as affecting their behavior.

All of the teachers interviewed lived outside the community and received much of their information about the community they taught in through the news, which highlighted the negative events in the community. When asked about their students, most teachers knew that the majority of them received free lunches, but little else about them. Through conversations overheard in hallways and classrooms, the researcher estimated that almost half or more of the freshman students encountered had faced hunger, used drugs and alcohol, had premarital sex, encountered violence, and lived in broken homes. All of these issues affect youth differently and influence how students respond to power and those in positions of power. However, the teachers interviewed seemed unaware of these issues and their impact on the students, especially how they contributed to their students' undesirable behavior in their classrooms.

This lack of awareness continued into the juvenile justice facility, even though extensive information is gathered about juvenile delinquents before they are brought before the court. The juvenile director, as well as the teachers, correctional officers, and counselors, have access to the juvenile's record in the juvenile facility. Despite this access, the teachers seemed to know nothing about their students, including their IEPs, learning histories, test scores, academic achievements, and home lives. When the researcher asked how many students in the classroom had IEPs, one teacher logged onto the system, tallied the number, and then expressed disbelief about the amount of information he could find on the system about each student. When questioned further, the teacher admitted that he rarely accessed the system, believing that it was not

important to know more about his students; rather his job was to babysit those allowed in the classroom (Interview 20).

Although many of the juveniles in the facility received counseling in addition to their punishment, this counseling focused on drugs and alcohol or anger management, not on helping the youth cope with past or present traumas. Since there was little acknowledgement of the students' past traumas and no acknowledgement of their present traumas, the students finished their time in the juvenile facility still suffering and returned to schools where they were under increased scrutiny for protocol violations. When these students returned to classrooms with teachers who knew little about the ordeals suffered by these students, had no training in classroom management practices, and were using outdated discipline techniques, the situation was ripe for institutional chaos and protocol infractions. The fear of losing control of the institution or students within the institution leads teachers, administrators, and directors to tighten formal protocols, trapping more students in the cycle of infractions and punishments.

Summary

In summary, the data show that there were definite similarities and differences between the two institutions in this study. They both rely on formal protocols that are comparable to provide order in their institutions and eliminate subjectivity, providing what the institution deems an equitable experience for all youth based on their adherence to the mission, goals, and formal protocols of their particular institution. However, this equitable experience as provided through the use of formal protocols is mitigated by the informal protocols implemented by staff that are chosen to translate the institutional

rules. These informal protocols are used intermittently and at the whim of staff who are tired, under stress, possibly biased, and uninformed of the histories of the students whom they are expected to teach and control. These factors, combined with youth who are navigating new social, emotional, and physical spaces in high school, are the reasons that direct protocol violations happen. In order for the institution to keep functioning effectively, these direct protocol violations must be punished to curb the behavior of others who may be tempted to follow suit. These punishments and the escalation of severity in punishments for repeated negative behaviors within the institution, place a number of students in a cycle that is difficult to break out of, without intense intervention in all aspects of the students' lives.

These two institutions embody the ideas of education and discipline/punishment in similar institutions in the United States. However, while these two institutions make their own rules for their institution, they are also governed externally by rules that are imposed from higher authorities. These include the state of Ohio as well as the U.S. Federal Government. Policies that are made at the federal level are then passed down for the state to implement, in addition to the policies that are established at the state level. Studies have shown that there may be some inherent biases in these federal and state policies that are perpetuated in the individual institutions in the communities (Ard & Knaus, 2013; Au, 2013; Harper, 2012; McCarthy, Crichlow, Dimitriadis, & Dolby, 2005; Troyna & Williams, 1986; Wiley, Garcia, Danzig & Stigler, 2014). The structural inequalities that begin at the federal and state levels are then perpetuated at the local level, with serious consequences for the youth who are impacted.

In addition to the structural inequalities that may be present in the actual policies that the organizations must abide by from their authorizing organizations, i.e., the state and federal governments, the implementation of the institutions' own policies creates more problems for the organizations. This discrepancy between the actual policies and their implementation creates further problems for the organizations as seen in this study. Building on the ideas of structural bias and implementation failure, new possibilities for different studies emerge. However, due to the scope and research questions directing this study, further explorations are beyond the range of this study. Nonetheless, in the following chapter, ideas for further research will be discussed in relation to finding out more about the cycle of youth and potential delinquency, if not incarceration, and what can be done to change the problematic protocols in both the schools and juvenile justice facilities.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In this last chapter, a review of the study will be discussed as well as the implications it on policies, practices, and possibilities for future research. In the areas of policy and practice, these suggestions come from gaps in the literature, as well as the interviews, observations, and results presented in prior chapters. While these suggestions are not complete or all encompassing, they represent key issues that warrant further study to complement and conclude this study.

Review of the Study

This review of the study will briefly cover the research questions, methodology, and literature that were used, highlighting the data that emerged as important parts of the study. The research questions that drove this study focus on the informal and formal protocols of the institutions. Protocols are defined as the rules, daily and long-term, that guide the mission of the institution. These protocols may be formal, defined as written and explicit, that govern the daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly activities of the institution, or they may be informal, which is defined as unofficial and implicit, the use of which subtly impacts the daily functioning of the institution. The questions guiding this study were as follows: a) Which informal protocols in a juvenile facility and a school are similar? b) Which formal protocols are similar between juvenile facilities and schools? c) Which juvenile facility and school informal protocols are different? and d) Which formal protocols are different between a juvenile facility and a school? These questions guided the review of literature and the data collection throughout the study.

Using these research questions, the methodology focused on how institutions organize the people within them and how the institution functions. Erving Goffman's theory of the total institution and parts of his organizational theory were the framework for this study of the functioning of the institutions' rules in the institution, the people who work for the institution, and the people confined or educated in the institution. Using this framework to partly analyze the data collected, the study found that there were definite similarities and differences between the institutions examined.

Using the literature on organizational theory, the researcher found that institutions deal with these formal protocols in a similar manner: ranks, disciplines, dealings with personal property, food, technology, behavior, dress code, visitors, criminal prosecution, and formal agreements. However, other formal protocols, such as secondary education, attendance, appeals, bullying, transportation, school cancellations, graduation, removals, and security video were only employed in the public school in the study. The juvenile facility had its own set of formal protocols that were unique to its institution as well, such as the isolation of the juveniles, monitoring of their movements, their daily living routines, handcuffing, dayroom use, and communications with the outside world.

In regard to informal policies, the two institutions shared similar policies. These included teacher feelings, student classroom technology behavior, sporadic enforcement of formal protocols, students with varying educational levels, teachers' lack of formal training in classroom discipline, lack of consistency, large class sizes, discipline statistics, teacher dress code, and learning. These informal policies helped those who implemented the formal policies of the institution cope with or balance the needs of the institution with

the needs of those who were served by the institution. The informal policies that differed between the institutions included tickets as rewards for good behavior, chaos, miscommunication, type of schooling, opting out/no schooling, dress code, and discipline as occurred in the public school. These differences could be explained by the type of mission that each institution had in the larger society it served.

Implications

The next section will cover the implications for the study as well as future research. Implications for the study emerged from the interviews, observations, document collection, and literature that was found with this study. Each section will detail the top three ideas that emerged under that particular theme and will be corroborated with data from the previous chapters.

Implications for Policy

Policy in this section means an overarching guideline that controls the establishment as a whole, not just sections of the organization or people within the institution. In this section, the majority of these suggestions came from the researcher's interviews and is reinforced by missing pieces in the formal protocols.

Juvenile recidivism tracking.

Unlike the adult prison system which tracks former inmates once they are released from prison, the juvenile facility does not. In the adult system, this tracking system to check the recidivism rates monitors whether or not former inmates violate parole, commit new crimes, or avoid future encounters with the law. In recent years, the recidivism rate has pertained to how the adult prison system judges the success of their incarceration

programs. Should former inmates avoid committing new crimes and violating their parole, the incarceration is considered successful, but if the former inmate is re-arrested or violates parole and is re-incarcerated, then the program is considered unsuccessful. This tracking system provides the adult system with feedback about the success and failures of the incarceration facilities.

However, in juvenile facilities nationwide there is no tracking system to gauge the youths successes or failures on release. In this juvenile facility, although records are kept on each individual juvenile who enters it, these records only apply to the time that the student is in the facility. Once the juvenile leaves the facility and completes probation, there is no follow-up by the facility to find out if the student has re-enrolled in high school, stayed out of trouble, or gotten into trouble again. The teachers and correctional officers in the juvenile facility simply rely on their memories and stored records to see if the juvenile has been in trouble previously.

If a juvenile tracking system were put in place similar to the adult system, the successes or failures of these facilities could be compared and procedures that are more effective could be utilized. According to Bachara and Zaba (1978), juveniles who commit crimes due to learning disabilities can be rehabilitated using academic therapies, which decrease the risk of the juveniles recommitting crimes. If these therapies include helping students with appropriate behaviors, anger management, abuse, stress disorders, and other disabilities that students come to the juvenile facility with, they might leave the facility with better ability to cope in schools and be less likely to encounter the discipline system in the school. As Patton (1998), Togut (2011), and Maauser (1974) found in their

research, Black, Hispanic, and Native American boys have a tendency to be placed in special education classes at a higher rate than White or Asian students, which puts them in greater contact with the school discipline systems. With the inclusion of SROs in schools, some research has shown that this creates a greater link to the juvenile justice system for these students (Clemson, 2015; Hirschfield, 2008).

Once incarcerated in this particular juvenile facility, these juveniles were not receiving academic instruction or therapies that would help with their problems. However, in different juvenile facilities, different approaches could be used that give these youth the skills that will allow them to be successful in their transition back to school and home life. By identifying these successful programs through the success of the juveniles in avoiding a return to the juvenile facility, other facilities could implement similar programs and increase the possibilities of success for the juveniles. Also, by creating a tracking system for juveniles who are released from the juvenile justice facility, further research could be done on the types of learning, activities, counseling, therapies, and transition services that help juveniles transition smoothly into their school and home life without the risk of being incarcerated again.

Reciprocal policy.

The way the current system works, the juvenile facility notifies the secretary at the student's home school that the student is currently a resident of the facility for a certain amount of time. The teachers at the juvenile facility rely on the secretary at the school to inform the student's teachers that the student will need work to complete, collect the work from the teachers, and then notify the juvenile facility teachers that the

work is ready to be picked up for the student. Once the work is collected by the juvenile teacher, the student is finally able to go to the classroom during his incarceration.

Unfortunately, some students never receive work during their time incarcerated, which puts them further behind in school when they return, and causes them to fail the school year and repeat the grade. This leads to further frustration on the part of the student and can lead to the phenomenon that Casella (2003) found in his research of students being labeled based on their perceived dangerousness because of their looks, friends, and reputation.

According to the *Guiding Principles for Providing High-Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings*, a report issued by the federal Departments of Education and Justice, juvenile facilities are to provide high quality teachers and education to juveniles in these facilities. However, in interviews with the teachers at the juvenile facility in the study, it was found that the teachers do not provide educational services to students or follow IEPs, instead use the classroom as a study hall and rely on the schools to send educationally appropriate schoolwork (Interviews 19 and 20). In the General Rules for the detention center, it states that “you are only permitted to attend school if your sentence is more than five days and are currently enrolled at your home school” (p. 4). This policy contradicts the *Guiding Principles for Providing High-Quality Education in Juvenile Justice Secure Care Settings* and creates problems for the juveniles in the system.

A new system for obtaining schoolwork for students in the juvenile facility needs to be implemented. This policy must make it easy for schools to send and receive work,

and be more efficient for the students in the juvenile facility to receive and complete the work. Many schools in the district have websites that give students and parents access to the lessons and homework for the week. Students complete the homework at home and then turn it into the teacher in class. Creating a portal that allows teachers to upload work for the juvenile during their time incarcerated and to even possibly log into interactive lessons and activities would help provide better education to students who are incarcerated, thus smoothing their transition back to their home school districts and better chances of academic success.

Universal school policy enforcement.

While the first two policy implications apply to the juvenile facility, the third is unique to the school system. During interviews with the teachers for this study, many stated that they felt that the freshman students did not understand the rules of the high school because they had not had such rules enforced on them in the younger grades (Interviews 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15). These students came to the high school not understanding the concept of credits (Interview 11), not understanding proper classroom behavior (Interview 6), and having a disregard for consequences (Interviews 11, 8, 16). These interview insights were observed during the issue with tardies, as students disregarded the bell and continued about their business in the hallway, despite repeated warnings from administrators (Observations 1, 3-6, 9-11, 14). The students who disregarded these rules knew there might be consequences, but chose to flout the rules either having no fear of the rules or there being a prior lack of enforcement. These students fit Noguera's (2003a) finding that students who break rules are not passive

victims; they know there is a consequence, but they either embrace the rule-breaking label or lose motivation to follow school policies. This loss of motivation to follow school rules may be a symptom of the zero tolerance policies and increased police presence in schools that do not allow room for variation in punishments (Clemson, 2015). It is possible that incentive to follow school rules and change behavior can be found in alternatives to zero tolerance, such as restorative justice (Haft, 2000; Hopkins, 2003) or in creating preventative alternatives (Harcourt, 2012).

However, creating an organizational system that enforces rules systematically and effectively from the beginning can create fewer problems as the system progresses. The “regulatory processes involve the capacity to establish rules, inspect others’ conformity to them, and, as necessary, manipulate sanctions—rewards and punishments—in an attempt to influence future behavior” (Scott , 2001, p. 52). By sporadically enforcing the rules throughout the younger grades, before the students enter high school, the stakes are higher due to stricter government policies like Adequate Yearly Progress and other federal regulations. This means that high school teachers are forced to execute the rules for the achievement of the organization’s goals. Balancing the formal rules of the organization with the needs of the students and the teachers creates the people work aspect that Goffman discusses in *Asylums* (1961). The notion of people work can also explain why the teachers in the younger grades do not enforce the rules as harshly as high school teachers; they believe that this is the balance they need to strike to help their students survive. However, it muddles the school organization’s mission and creates issues later on for students.

This problem that needs to be further examined, and either the current rules be enforced better or a new enforcement policy created so that students are less at risk for discipline issues when they enter high school. Currently, this struggle is taking a toll on teachers as they struggle to meet McGregor's suggested five needs: "physiological and safety needs, social needs, ego needs, and self-fulfillment needs" (Rubenstein & Haberstroh, 1960, pp. 180-182). This struggle leads to challenges for teachers to implement formal and informal protocols, feel motivated to meet institutional goals, and issue punishments and rewards for those under their control, which can lead to sporadic enforcement and confusion for students.

Implications for Practice

From this study, implications for practice are suggestions that teachers, administrators, and facility supervisors can use to improve the functioning of their organizations. These proposals emerged from the interviews, observations, formal and informal protocols, and the literature reviewed in this study. Further research on these specific issues may provide more detailed or extensive suggestions that could emerge from that research, especially since this has been a little researched area.

Juvenile education curriculum.

During interviews with the teachers and the supervisor in the juvenile justice facility it was found that they had different views of the education in their system, but all agreed on one point: the juvenile facility needed its own curriculum that was accepted by all school districts in the county (Interviews 18, 19 and 20). By implementing a curriculum similar to that taught to students in the county and accepted by all the schools,

students who were sent to the juvenile facility could attend classes and keep up with their studies from day one of their incarceration. Also, if there was a better educational curriculum in place, teachers would also be able to meet the goals of the student's IEPs and work on bringing students to grade level during their time in the juvenile facility.

Since disproportionate numbers of African American and Hispanic young men are designated IEPs, meeting their needs while they are incarcerated is an important aspect of their rehabilitation. Since almost 35% of incarcerated inmates cited behavioral or academic reasons for dropping out of high school, it is important that the time that these youth spend incarcerated helps to improve their academic standing and behavior so that they can successfully transition back to their school district.

Often, before these juveniles are sentenced to the juvenile justice facilities they have spent significant time in in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, or been expelled and have missed school (Winters, 1997). By providing these juveniles educational opportunities during their incarceration, it is possible that the chances of these youth entering the school-to-prison pipeline could be reduced since lack of education is one of the three major reasons for being in the pipeline. Keeping these young men from entering the pipeline is a crucial step toward lowering the prison population. As discussed in policy implementations, there is no juvenile tracking system to monitor the futures of juvenile offenders, many of whom become adult offenders (Harlow, 2003). These adult offenders face a difficult time staying out of the prison cycle as Langan and Levin (2002) found in their recidivism study: 63% of adult inmates were rearrested within three years. Bell et al. (2013) found that inmates under the age of

21 at their release were more than twice as likely to recidivate than inmates who were released at age 50, mainly because younger inmates often lack skills that are conducive to finding a legal job.

An educational curriculum is also needed in the juvenile facility since some of the juveniles incarcerated there have already dropped out of school. McKeon (2006) found that in 2003 a Black man who dropped out of school stood a 33% chance of going to prison. This was further evident in Ohio where 41% of Black students and 34% of Hispanic students had dropped out, 35% of economically disadvantaged students had dropped out, and 33% of students with disabilities had dropped out (U.S. Department of Education, 2010-2011). New incarceration statistics will emerge in 2016 for the state of Ohio as they transition to a new value-added system, which may improve some of these percentages. However, the impact of school dropout is significant in terms of being unable to acquire gainful employment. The U.S. Department of Labor found that high school dropouts were almost 80% more likely to be unemployed and made \$10,000 less than high school graduates (McKeon, 2006). Moreover, 20% of youth in the lowest income brackets were more likely to drop out than youth in the top 20% (McKeon, 2006). In view of these statistics, an educational curriculum is much needed in the juvenile facility. Providing high quality education to juveniles while they are incarcerated may be one of the most important steps to be taken to prevent the school-to-prison pipeline.

Effective data usage.

Both institutions in this study collected large amounts of data about their dependents, from discipline records to their difficulties, their home addresses, and their

court sentences. In the juvenile facility, the court is responsible for gathering as much information as possible on the juveniles. These data can range from home or custodial address to IEPs, school district previously attended, days of class attended in the juvenile facility, prior offenses, suspected abuse, and drug or alcohol problems. Teachers, the supervisor, counselors, and correctional officers all have access to the computer system that stores these data. According to the supervisor, they are available so that teachers, counselors, and correctional officers can make educated decisions about the education, treatment, and behavior modification that will best help the juvenile (Interview 18).

Additionally, these computerized data collection sheets detail the amount of time that the juvenile has spent in the classroom so that when they return to their home school district, they can receive credit for the days they attended class. However, the juvenile can only attend class when work has been sent by the home school district. As discussed previously, the methods for doing so are not reliable and cause some juveniles to miss out on school work. If they do receive their school work, it is optional as to whether or not they choose to complete it. Even if they do choose to complete the work, it may not meet their IEP goals and the student may not be able to complete it. Should everything align, the school does not have to accept the work that is completed in the juvenile facility.

However, there is almost no use of the juvenile data by anyone after it is collected. During an observation, when the researcher asked one of the teachers for the number of students who had IEPs in the classroom, she did not know where to find these data (Observation 19). After asking the supervisor, the teacher realized it was in the data sheets on the computer and accessed the data (Observation 20). By not using the data,

the teachers and staff are missing crucial information that could improve the experience of the juvenile, especially in their formal education. IEPs are designated in order to help a student learn, so by not helping them meet the IEP standards, the juvenile facility may further hinder them from entering the school-to-prison pipeline.

In the school, data are collected on the student's academic achievement, discipline referrals, educational needs, and other pertinent information. Currently, these data are stored by the administrators in the school, but are rarely used to diagnose problem behaviors, academic deficiencies, or problems in the organization. For example, when a student receives a yellow ticket for a problem in the classroom, the teacher must fill out their name, the period, time, type of infraction, and write a line or two describing what happened during the incident (Observations 1, 3, 4, 14,15, 16). During the first month of research, these data were thrown away once the incident was dealt with by the principals in the behavioral pullout room (Observation 16). Then, in the second month the behavioral pullout teacher began to record these data on spreadsheets at the request of the principal (Interview 16). These spreadsheets contained the student's name, referring teacher, time, period, grade level, offense, race, gender, and whether or not the student had a documented IEP.

When asked what the school hoped to do with these data, the behavioral pullout teacher said that he ideally hoped that the data would be used to diagnose students who were having issues in class before they became serious problems, show which teachers could use some help in their classroom management, and provide an early intervention by counselors and others for at-risk students (Interview 16). However, in reality, he said that

the data would probably continue to be used as a way to see which teachers send the most students to pullout, and in IEP meetings to determine if the student's classroom behavior can be related to their disability.

According to the discipline data presented in Chapter 4 and aggregated from these data sheets, of the freshman students from the top referring teachers, Black students made up 70.52%, White students were 26.08% and Hispanic students were 1.70%. Similarly, Archer's research (2009; 2010) found that while "African-American students represented only 17% of public school enrollment nationwide, they accounted for 34% of school suspensions in 2000" (p. 869). Additionally, between 1972 and 2000, White students suspended for more than one day rose 1.99%, but the percentage for Black students rose 7.2% (Wald & Losen, 2003, p. 10). This rise in suspensions for Black students may be attributed to several factors, including but not limited to, new criminalized discipline policies (Hirschfield, 2008), embracing the delinquent attitude (Noguera, 2003a), or being deemed dangerous (Casella, 2003). By using data that have already been collected at the school and examining students' problem areas, the school may be able to place students in early interventions that curb their problematic behaviors, give teachers additional classroom help, and use alternative discipline strategies to correct deviant student behavior.

Management training.

The literature on this subject has predominately focused on the teacher as a classroom manager. However, according to this study, some of those management techniques and the literature need to be applied to administrators in the school. Building-

wide, it appeared that rule enforcement in the school in the study was sporadic, open to various interpretations, and occasionally ignored. Management training for teachers and administrators would allow both to perform their jobs more accurately and efficiently, thus serving their students better.

Classroom teachers are the focus of most classroom management literature, which discusses the nuances of creating a more smoothly and efficiently run classroom. In this school, as this study shows, there are informal and formal rules that keep the organization moving toward its goals. Classroom teachers are subjected to and implement both types of rules in this school. One prime example is the technology policy in the school (Guide and Handbook). Formally, the organization believes that not allowing technology, especially cell phones, in the classroom will provide the teachers a better environment to teach in and students space to learn with fewer distractions. Some teachers find it too tedious to enforce this policy, while others embrace the additional learning advantage of allowing the students to use technology (Interviews 5 and 6). This inconsistent enforcement upsets the delicate balance and order intended by the school's "house rules" as suggested by Goffman (1961). House rules are defined as "a relatively explicit and formal set of prescriptions and proscriptions that lays out the main requirements of ... conduct" (Goffman, 1961, p. 48). When students and teachers, even the administrators in the school, abide by the "house rules", they receive rewards that encourage them to continue following the rules. If the house rules are broken, punishments are meted out to the perpetrators to discourage these negative behaviors. At both the public school and juvenile facility, classroom teachers are expected to enforce the organization's house

rules since they are in constant contact with the students whose education is the primary mission of the organization.

While students may be the primary focus of the rules of the institution, those who work in the institution are also subject to its rules. In order to enforce the rules on those who work in the institution, supervisors are put in place to make sure that frontline supervisors (teachers) enact the rules appropriately and in accordance with the institution's mission. These supervisors, that is, the principals in the schools, are supposed to help the teachers balance the institution and classroom rules because, as Brophy (1988) found, teachers are not trained to balance the “*heuristics* (implicit rules of thumb)”, individualized learning, classroom discipline issues, and other institutional rules (p. 4). Principals, therefore, are in a place to help the teachers reach this delicate balance through the use of management training, guidance, and other additional assistance.

However, just as the teachers in this school had not received specific training in classroom management (Interviews 3-15), the principals had not received training in teacher management (Interviews 1, 16). In a formal organization such as a school, which thrives on the “[production of] goods or to provide services *efficiently*” (Tannenbaum, 1966, p. 2), the school is viewed as a sociological institution. According to Hage and Aiken (1970), the sociological institution is “a collective of jobs or ‘social positions,’ each with its own skills, powers, rules, and rewards” (p. 11). By vesting teachers and principals with unique sets of skills and powers, the organization hopes to set clear standards, mechanisms, and tools for its faculty that will help the institution meet its educational goals (Weiner, 2009). In the school, this stratification separates teachers

from administrators and creates the power hierarchy within the institution (Collins, 1971).

By developing more comprehensive management programs that enhance the skills of both the classroom teachers and the administrators, issues of communication, power, and goal achievement could improve, serving them and the students better. By streamlining and making management more efficient, this school may find that it has an easier time fulfilling its daily and overall mission. As viewed by Berg (2007), schools function as a “state institution conducting activities in a society and single schools as organizations fulfilling their daily work” (p. 577). This dual mission, combined with the schools’ role in the community to educate future generations, makes organizational goal achievement of paramount importance.

Future Research

While the implications for policy and practices are suggestions for improvement in the organizations as derived from the study interviews, observations, and the literature, ideas for future research have also emerged from areas of particular interest to the researcher in this study.

Teacher’s view of race and gender related to classroom discipline

One area of interest that emerged from this research was that of the teacher’s perceptions of the students’ gender and/or race when disciplining them in the classroom. According to Casella’s study (2003), a teacher’s perception of a student’s dangerousness, as related to race/gender, often leads to their being labeled as dangerous versus the student’s actual actions. In schools, Casella (2003) found that the descriptions of

students as dangerous varied. Some of these descriptions were medical and psychological diagnoses, but many were judgments about the students' character (their self-restraint, sexuality, reputation), their friends, their way of dressing and walking, their 'baggage,' their attitudes, and their backgrounds. According to my observations in this school, the vast majority of the students who were determined to be dangerous were African American and Latino, and most were boys. Similar to Casella's research (2003), the majority of discipline referrals in this school were Black and Hispanic boys, far surpassing their population percentage in the school.

Noguera (2003b) in "The Trouble with Black Boys: The Role and Influence of Environmental and Cultural Factors on the Academic Performance of African American Males," wrote:

Adults, especially women, may be less willing to assist a young male who appears angry or aggressive. A colleague of mine has argued that what some refer to as the "fourth grade syndrome," the tendency for the academic performance of Black males to take a decisive downward turn at the age of 9 or 10, may be explained by the fact that this is the age when Black boys start to look like young men (Hilliard, 1991, p. 113; Kunjufu, 1985, p. 18). Ferguson (2000) found in his research in Shaker Heights, Ohio, that Black students were more likely than White students to cite "toughness" as a trait they admired in others (p. 23). If these researchers are correct, and if the toughness admired by Black males evokes feelings of fear among some of their teachers, it is not surprising that trouble in

school would be common. Gaining a clearer understanding of this phenomenon may be one important part of the process needed for altering academic trends among Black males. (p. 455)

Delving deeper into the role that unacknowledged biases and fear related to race may be playing in the educational system could be an important step in changing disciplinary actions by which teachers penalize young Black and Hispanic men in the classroom. By examining what causes teachers to discipline students, especially minority students at higher rates, it may be possible to create teacher preparation programs at the collegiate level that acknowledge and address these issues with preservice teachers, thereby possibly eliminating the problem before it affects students.

Juvenile education in other facilities.

The teachers and supervisors interviewed at the juvenile facility in Ohio discussed educational opportunities at other juvenile facilities. They described how education is provided in a neighboring facility, citing individual classes and a school-like atmosphere for juveniles incarcerated there. With the emphasis on education in the juvenile justice system, examining how other facilities provide their education, and their successes or failures seems important.

Since recent literature has stressed the impact of special education, academic failure, and disciplinary actions on students in schools (Archer, 2009; 2010; Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Casella, 2003; Hirschfield, 2008; Maauser, 1974; Noguera, 2003a; 2003b; Togut, 2011; Wald & Losen, 2003), the juvenile justice literature has heralded education as a way to prevent the path to juvenile delinquency and incarceration (Clemson, 2015;

Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; McLeigh & Sianko, 2010; Puzzanchera & Robson, 2014). This emphasis on the importance of education is derived from the statistics that show the personal and societal cost of crime for youth. For example, in 2010, police officers arrested 1.6 million juvenile offenders in the U.S. (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014), and if these juveniles were incarcerated, the average cost to the state would have been “\$250 per day per youth on adjudication residential facilities” (McLeigh & Sianko, 2010, p. 334). If families or multiple types of therapy are needed, these costs can rise significantly.

Additionally, when a juvenile “drop[s] out of high school and engages in a lifetime of offending and drug use, it generates costs to society that are estimated between \$1.7 and \$2.3 million” (McLeigh & Sianko 2010, p. 335). According to the U.S. Department of Labor in 2003, high school dropouts were almost 80% more likely to be unemployed than high school graduates (McKeon, 2006). If dropouts do find a job, their counterparts, high school graduates, make almost \$10,000 more per year (McKeon, 2006). As these juveniles become adults, the cycle continues with their children. Young adults in the lowest 20% of the socioeconomic income bracket were six times more likely to drop out of high school than young adults from the top 20% of the income bracket (McKeon, 2006). This can become a pattern for families as their youth cycle in and out of the educational and juvenile institution. Finding a way to provide education to youth who are incarcerated may limit or break this cycle, and provide delinquent youth the ability to re-enter school on grade level and with more coping skills in order to give them a better chance at success in school.

Longitudinal study of both institutions.

The majority of studies that have been conducted on schools and the incarceration system have been case studies, not longitudinal studies. The problem with this dearth of long-term research is that these brief studies only offer a snapshot of the institutions at that moment in time. Since these organizations have histories that cover centuries, capturing a moment in that history only allows researchers to study the current conditions of the organization. Therefore, a limited research does not allow for a complete and encompassing view of the potential future and purpose of the institution. It is therefore important that, at some point, a longitudinal study be conducted to determine the direction these institutions are moving, changes within them, and the impact of personal, legal, and societal changes on these institutions, toward the betterment of the students or juveniles served by them.

REFERENCES

- Alper, G., MacDonald, J. M., & Dunham, R. (2005). Police suspicion and discretionary decision making during citizen stops. *Criminology*, 43, 407-434.
- America, O. H. (1994, January 25). H.R. 1804. *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from: <http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/index.html>
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2008, June 6). *What is the school-to-prison pipeline?* Retrieved from: Because Freedom Can't Protect Itself: <http://www.aclu.org/racial-justice/what-school-prison-pipeline>
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2015, August 19). *ACLU complaint leads to Ohio children with disabilities to receive education: Ohio Department of Education orders corrective action in 14 school districts*. Retrieved from Student Rights Press Release: <http://www.acluohio.org/archives/press-releases/aclu-leads-to-ohio-children-with-disabilities-to-receive-required-education>
- Archer, D. N. (2009-2010). Introduction: Challenging the school-to-prison pipeline. *New York Law School Law Review*, 54, 867-872.
- Ard, R. L., & Knaus, C. B. (2013). From colonization to R.E.S.P.E.C.T.: How Federal education policy fails children and educators of color. *ECI Interdisciplinary Journal for Legal & Social Policy*, 3 (1), Article 2.
- Association of American Universities. (2006). *National defense education and innovation initiative: Meeting America's economic and security challenges in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.

- Au, W. (2013). Hiding behind high-stakes testing: Meritocracy, objectivity, and inequality in U.S. education. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 12* (2), 7-19.
- Bachara, G. H., & Zaba, J. N. (1978). Learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11* (58), 58-62.
- Bell, N., Bucklen, K. B., Nakamura, K., Tomkiel, J., Santore, A., Russell, L., & Orth, R. (2013). *Pennsylvania Department of Corrections: Recidivism Report 2013*. Harrisburg, PA: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, The Bureau of Planning Research and Statistics.
- Berg, G. (2007). From structural dilemmas to institutional imperatives: A descriptive theory of the school as an institution and of school organizations. *Curriculum Studies, 39* (5), 577-596.
- Bidwell, C. (2001). Schools as organizations: Long-term permanence and short-term change. *Sociology of Education, 74*, 100-114.
- Bilchik, S. (1999). Juvenile justice: A century of change. *1999 National Report Series: Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/178995.pdf>
- Brady, M. (1976). *False starts: A memoir of San Quentin and other prisons*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Brenchley, C. (2013, January 23). *High school graduation rate at highest level in three decades*. Retrieved from Homeroom: <http://www.ed.gov/blog/2013/01/high-school-graduation-rate-at-highest-level-in-three-decades/>

- Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4 (1), 1-18.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (United States Supreme Court, May 17, 1954).
- Burns, W. R., Travis, B., & DiPaola, M. F. (2013). A study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools. *American Secondary Education*, 42 (1), 4-23
- Campbell, E. (2006). Curricular and professional authority in schools. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36 (2), 111-118.
- Carceral, K. C., Bernard, T. J., Alarid, L. F., Bikle, B., & Bikle, A. (2004). *Behind a convict's eyes: Doing time in a modern prison*. Australia: Wadsworth
- Casella, R. (2003). Punishing dangerousness through preventive detention: Illustrating the institution link between school and prison. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 99, 55-70.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2015). *Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/index.htm>
- Clemson, C. (2015). *The prison path: School practices that hurt our youth*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Civil Rights Data Collection. (2012). *2011-12 state and national estimation*. Retrieved from: http://ocrdata.ed.gov/StateNationalEstimations/Estimations_2011_12

- Cohen, E. (1972). Sociology and the classroom: Setting the conditions for teacher-student interaction. *Review of Educational Research*, 42 (4), 441-452.
- Collins, R. (1971). Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification. *American Sociological Review*, 36 (6), 1002-1019.
- Congress, I. U. (2002, January 8th). *Public Law 107-110 115 STAT. 1425*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education:
<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Department of Education. (2006, August 14). Assistance to states for the education of children with disabilities and preschool grants for children with disabilities: Final rule. *Federal Register*, 71 & 156.
- Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. (2004, July 8). *DRC current FY 2005 direct institution iudget / inmate costs*. Retrieved from Departmental Reports:
<http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/Reports/costperinmate/July%202004.pdf>
- Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. (2005, April). *FY 2005 year-to-date agency costs*. Retrieved from Department of Rehabilitation and Correction:
<http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/Reports/costperinmate/June%202005.pdf>
- Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. (2013, July 1). *Departmental reports*. Retrieved from Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Master Population Count: <http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/reports/reports10.asp>

Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (2014, March 24). *Departmental reports*.

Retrieved from Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Population Count
Sheets: <http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/Reports/count/March%2024%202014.pdf>

Department of Youth Services. *About Youth Services*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.dys.ohio.gov/dnn/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ex Parte Crouse, 4 Whart.9 (Pa. 1838).

Findlay, N. M. (2015). Discretion in student discipline: Insight into elementary principals' decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5 (3), 472-507.

Fitch, B. D., Normore, A. H., & Werner, D. R. (2011). Theories of criminal justice: The influence of value attributions on correctional education. In A. H. Normore & B. D. Fitch (Eds.), *Leadership in education, corrections, and law enforcement: A commitment to ethics, equity and excellence* (pp. 161-184). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punishment: The birth of the prison*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture? Local conditions and the influence of classroom tools, rules and pedagogy. *Review of Educational Research*, 64 (1), 119-157.

- Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. An open letter to the American people*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Glaze, L. E., & Parks, E. (2012). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2011*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). What schools do to prevent problem behavior and promote safe environments. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 12 (4), 313-344.
- Haft, W. (2000). More than zero: The cost of zero tolerance and the case for restorative justice in schools. *Denver University of Law Review*, 77, 795-812.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1970). *Social change in complex organization*. New York: Random House.
- Hall, K., & Clark, D. S. (2002). *The Oxford companion to American law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, R. (Eds). (1972). *The formal organization*. New York: Basic Books.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of High Education*, 36 &1, 9-29.
- Harcourt, B. E. (2012). Punitive, preventative justice: A critique. In A. Ashworth & L. Zedner (Eds.), *Preventative justice*. UK: Oxford University Press.

- Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional populations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Henggeler, S.W., & Sheidow, A. J. (2003). Conduct disorder and delinquency. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 29 (4), 505-522.
- Hinton, W. J., Sims, P. L., Adams, M. A. & West, C. (2007). Juvenile justice: A system divided. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 18 (4), 466-483.
- Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison? The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12 (79), 79-101.
- Hockenberry, S., & Puzzanchera, C. (2015). *Juvenile court statistics 2013*. National Center for Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/njcda/pdf/jcs2013.pdf>
- Hopkins, B. (2003). Restorative justice in schools. *Support for Learning*, 17 (3), 144-149.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37 (3), 296-321.
- Inter-governmental relations. (2002, January 8). Public law 107-110. *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress.
- Jones, M., & Kerbs, J. (2007). Probation and parole officers and discretionary decision-making: Responses to technical and criminal violations 1. *Federal Probation*, 71 (1), 9-15, 60.

- Kagan, R.A. (2010). The organization of administrative justice system: The role of political mistrust. In M. Adler (Ed.), *Administrative Justice in Context* (161-182). Oxford: Hart.
- Kansas v. Hendricks, 95-1649 (United States Supreme Court, December 10, 1996).
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, Crown.
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002, November 23). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 2004*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Layton, L. (December 10, 2015). Obama signs new K-12 education law that ends No Child Left Behind. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from:
https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/obama-signs-new-k-12-education-law-that-ends-no-child-left-behind/2015/12/10/c9e58d7c-9f51-11e5-a3c5-c77f2cc5a43c_story.html
- Lee, V. E., Bryk, A. S., & Smith, J. B. (1993). The organization of effective secondary schools. *Review of Research in Education*, 19, 171-267.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavior treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist*, 48(2), 1181-1209.
- Losen, D., & Gillespie, J. (2012). Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school. *The Civil Rights Project*. Retrieved from:
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3g36n0c3>

- Losen, D. J., & Skiba, R. J. (2010). *Suspended education: Urban middle schools in crisis. The Civil Rights Project*. Retrieved from:
<http://eprints.cdlib.org/uc/item/8fh0s5dv>
- Lyman, L., Ashby, D. E., & Tripses, J. S. (2005). *Leaders who dare: Pushing the boundaries*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- McCarthy, C., Crichlow, W., Dimitriadis, G., & Dolby, N. (Eds.). (2005). *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge/ Taylor & Francis Group.
- McCarthy, K. (2013, July 25). *U.S. prison population declined for third consecutive year during 2012*. Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics:
<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/p12acpr.cfm>
- McLeigh, J. D., & Sianko, N. (2010). Where have all the children gone? The effects of the juvenile justice system on America's children and youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80, 334-341.
- McFarland, D. A. (2001). Student resistance: How the formal and informal organization of classrooms facilitates everyday forms of student defiance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107 (3), 612-678.
- McKeon, D. (2006, February). *Research talking points on dropout statistics: High school attendance, graduation, completion and dropout statistics*. Retrieved from National Education Association: <http://www.nea.org/home/13579.htm>
- Maauser, A. J. (1974). Learning disabilities and delinquent youth. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 9, 389-402.
- Martin, G. (2005). *Juvenile justice: Process and systems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Marwah, S. (Ed. W. R. Miller). (2012). *“Discretionary decision making.” The social history of crime and punishment in America: An encyclopedia.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Matzat, A. L. (2004, June 15). *Massachusetts education laws of 1642 and 1647.* Retrieved from History of American Education Web Project:
<https://www3.nd.edu/~rbarger/www7/masslaws.html>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interative approach.* Los Angeles: Sage.
- Mead, G. H. (1918). The psychology of punitive justice. *American Journal of Sociology*, 23 (5), 577-602.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2), 340- 363.
- Morris, N., & David, R. J. (1998). *The Oxford history of the prison: The practice of punishment in Western society.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Morton, R. (2013-2014). Returning “decision” to school discipline decisions: An analysis of recent, anti-zero tolerance legislation. *Washington University Law Review*, Wash. U. L. Review 757,
- Musgrove, M., & Yudin, M. (2014, December 5). Dear Colleague. *State Department of Education: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation.* Retrieved from:
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/correctional-education/idea-letter.pdf>

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (n.d.). *School to prison pipeline*.

Retrieved from LDF: <http://www.naacpldf.org/case/school-prison-pipeline>

Nhan, D. (2013). Interactive: State high school graduation rates by race, ethnicity.

National Journal, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/education/interactive-state-high-school-graduation-rates-by-race-ethnicity-20121130>

Noguera, P. A. (2001). Finding safety where we least expect it: The role of social capital.

In W. Ayers, B. Dohrn, & R. Ayers (Eds.), *Preventing school violence, in zero tolerance: Resisting the drive for punishment in our schools*. New York: The New Press, 204-205.

Noguera, P. A. (2003a). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment:

Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory into Practice*, 42 (4), 341-350.

Noguera, P. A. (2003b). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of

environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education*, 38 (4), 431-459.

Ohio Department of Education. (January 25, 2016). *Enrollment data*. Retrieved from:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/Frequently-Requested-Data/Enrollment-Data>

Ohio Department of Education. (2012-2013). *Ohio school report cards*. Retrieved from

Ohio Department of Education:

<http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/School-Search.aspx>

Ohio Department of Education. (2013, May 8). *Typology of Ohio school districts*.

Retrieved from Ohio Department of Education:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/Frequently-Requested-Data/Typology-of-Ohio-School-Districts>

Ohio Department of Education. (2014, February 4). *Value-added student growth measure*.

Retrieved from Ohio Department of Education:

<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Value-Added-Student-Growth-Measure>

Patton, J. M. (1998). The disproportionate representation of African Americans in special education: Looking behind the curtain for understanding and solutions. *The Journal of Special Education, 32*, 25-31.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (Supreme Court of the United States, May 18, 1896).

Public Broadcasting System. (n.d.). *John Dewey*. Retrieved from Only a Teacher:

Schoolhouse Pioneers: <https://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/john.html>

Reese, W. J. (2005). *America's public schools: From the common school to No Child Left Behind*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Puzzanchera, C., & Robson, C. (2014). *Delinquency cases in Juvenile Court, 2010*. U.S.

Department of Justice: National Report Series. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/243041.pdf>

- Roch, C. H., Pitts, D. W., & Navarro, I. (2010). Representative bureaucracy and policy tools: Ethnicity, student discipline, and representation in public schools. *Administration and Society*, 42 (1), 38-65.
- Rubenstein, A. H., & Haberstroh, C. J. (Eds.). (1960). *Some theories of organization*. IL: The Dorsey Press & Richard D. Irwin.
- Santos, M. G. (2004). *About prison*. Australia: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Stanko, S., Gillespie, W., & Crews, G.A. (2004). *Living in prison: A history of the correctional system with an insider's view*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Scott, W. H. (2001). *Institutions and organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2014 National Report*. Pittsburgh: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Source of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review*, 34 (4), 317-342
- Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. L. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children*, 66 (3), 335-347.
- Tannenbaum, A. S. (1966). *Social psychology of the work organization*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Tillyer, R. (2012). Opening the black box of officer decision-making: An examination of race, criminal history, and discretionary searches. *Justice Quarterly*, 31 (6), 961-985.

The National Center for Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice. *Special education in correctional facilities*. Retrieved from:

http://www.edjj.org/Publications/pub05_01_00.html

Togut, T. T. (2012). The gestalt of the school-to-prison pipeline: The duality of the overrepresentation of minorities in special education and racial disparity in school discipline policies. *Journal of General, Social Policy & the Law*, 20 (1), 163-181.

Troyna, B., & Williams, J. (1986). *Racism, education and the state*. London: Croom Helm.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010-2011). *Provisional data file: SY2010-11 four-year regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rates*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education: <http://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/state-2010-11-graduation-rate-data.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *The condition of education 2013 (NCES 2013-037)*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=16>

U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice. (2014). *Guiding principles for providing high-quality education in juvenile justice secure care setting*. Retrieved from: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/correctional-education/guiding-principles.pdf>

U.S. Department of Justice. (2012, December 29). *Quick facts about the Bureau of Prisons*. Retrieved from Bureau of Prisons: <http://www.bop.gov/news/quick.jsp>

- U.S. Department of Justice. (2011). *Federal Bureau of Prisons*. Retrieved from Protecting Society and Reducing Crime: <http://www.bop.gov/>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2013). *Federal Bureau of Prison*. Retrieved from http://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/population_statistics.jsp
- U.S. Department of Education: New York State Archives. (n.d.). *Federal education policy and the states, 1945-2009: The George H.W. Bush years: America 2000 proposed*. Retrieved from States' Impact on Federal Education Policy: http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_essay_bush_ghw_amer2000.shtml
- Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (2003). Defining and redirecting a school-to-prison pipeline. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 9-15.
- Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, 4, 67.
- West, E. (2000, August). *US charter schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.uscharterschools.org>
- Wiley, T. G., Garcia, D. R., Danzig, A. B., & Stigler, M. L. (2014). Language, policy, politics and diversity in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 38. vii-xxiii
- Winters, C. A. (1997). Learning disabilities, crime, delinquency, and special education placement. *Adolescence*, 9 (55), 451-462.

Appendix A

Expected Behavior 1

We are

– We Expect...

	<u>Cafeteria</u>	<u>Hallways</u>	<u>Classrooms</u>	<u>Restrooms</u>
Work ethic	DO YOUR BEST AND GIVE 100% IN EVERY SITUATION IN ALL AREAS			
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay in area • Pick up trash • Put trays back • Know your ID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep hands to self • Keep hallways clean • Move quickly • Walk on the right side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enter ready to learn • Be on time • Follow directions • Complete/turn in work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report vandalism or incorrect use • Maintain cleanliness
Respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise hand for support • Keep hands to self • Use good manners • Maintain personal space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect artwork/displays • Inside voices • Use appropriate language • Follow requests • Let instruction happen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise hands • Respect peers & adults • Take care of materials • Constructive conversation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect privacy • Use manners • Keep neat and clean
Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow directions • Clean up after yourself • Own your actions • Arrive and leave on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a good example • Observe personal space • Own your actions • Have pass when asked • Remain in permitted areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have necessary materials • Practice self-control • Stay on task • Positive attitude • Come prepared to learn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flush the toilet • Wash & dry hands • Place trash in can • Clean off sink
Effective behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be polite to others • Use inside voice • Use appropriate language • Walk • Use time wisely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge others • Walk to the right • Appropriate language • Use personal space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation (smile/engage) • Take pride/do your best • Stay in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect belongings • Use your time effectively
No excuses	TAKE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR ACTIONS			

Appendix B

Expected Behavior 2

	<u>Gymnasium and Assemblies</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Outside of Building</u>	<u>Playground Extra-Curriculars</u>
Work ethic	DO YOUR BEST AND GIVE 100% IN EVERY SITUATION IN ALL AREAS			
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen at the assemblies • Follow all directions • Stay in area • Show school spirit • Put equipment away 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pick up/throw away trash • Enter/exit properly • Sit properly in seat • Be on time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow safety drill directions • Appreciate landscaping • Take pride in schools appearance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hands & feet to self • Follow playground rules • Play carefully • Follow all directives
Respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with others • Use kind words • Listen to others • Give presenters your full attention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hands to yourself • Respect adults on bus • Respect other students • Talk quietly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate language • Hands & feet to self • Observe personal space • Treat others how you want treated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share and take turns/show sportsmanship • Have pride in school property • Follow all instructions
Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow all rules • Report injuries or broken equipment • Find your space/remain in assigned area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use self-control • Follow bus rules • Safely use property • Take personal items with you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report safety issues • Keep school grounds clean • Listen to directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return equipment • Use equipment safely • Use appropriate language • Keep hands to self • Remain in assigned areas • Represent Warren positively
Effective behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage others • Participate • Show sportsmanship • Be fair • Be attentive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge bus driver/aide • Watch for your stop • Share a seat • Use kind words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walk on sidewalks, pavement • Place trash in cans • Remain in area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat others how you want treated • Include others • Follow instructions • Maintain personal space
No excuses	TAKE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR ACTIONS			

Appendix C

Student Behavior Form

3rd 9 weeks									4th 9 weeks									SSC Plan:
Tardy: Late:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Tardy: Late:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
																		Tardy ___ 4 Tardies ___ 8 Tardies ___ 12 Tardies Removals ___ 4 Removals ___ 8 Removals ___ 12 Removals
2124	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	2124	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Discipline Actions ___ (1) DET ___ (1) DET ___ (1) DET ___ (1) ISI ___ (1) ISI ___ (1) ISI ___ OSS - ___ OSS - ___ OSS - ___ OSS - ___ (5) OSS W/
Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Pre-Expulsion conf ___ (6 - 10) OSS Dress Code: ___ Warning/Change ___ Detention ___ Detention Headphones ___ Parent P/U or Day ___ Parent P/U or Day ___ Detention ___ ISI
Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									SSC Plan: Parent Mtgs.
Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									
Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Date: _____ Teacher: _____ Pd. _____ Outcome: _____ Description: _____									Notes:

Appendix D

Table 1. Formal Protocol Chart

Formal Similarities	Public High School	Juvenile Justice Center
Ranking	x	x
Discipline	x	x
Personal property	x	x
Food	x	x
Technology	x	x
Behavior	x	x
Dress code	x	x
Visitors	x	x
Criminal prosecution	x	x
Agreements	x	x
Formal Protocol Differences		
Extracurricular activities	x	
Attendance	x	
Appeals	x	
Anti-bullying	x	
Transportation	x	
Cancellations	x	
Secondary education	x	
Graduation	x	
Removal	x	
Security video	x	
Isolation		x
Movement		x
Daily living routine		x
Handcuffing		x
Dayroom		x
Communications		x

Appendix E

Table 2. Informal Protocol Chart

Informal Similarities	Public High School	Juvenile Justice Facility
Teacher feelings	x	x
Student classroom technology behavior	x	x
Sporadic enforcement of formal protocols	x	x
Varying educational levels	x	x
Lack of formal training in classroom discipline	x	x
Lack of consistency	x	x
Large class size	x	x
Discipline statistics	x	x
Learning	x	x
Informal Differences		
Tickets	x	
Chaos	x	
Miscommunication	x	
Type of schooling	x	x
Opt out option/no schooling	x	x
Uniform code		x
Discipline		x

Vita
CHRISTEN CLEMSON

EDUCATION:

PhD, Educational Leadership
The Pennsylvania State University, 2016
Dissertation: *A Comparison of the Policies and Procedures
of a Juvenile Justice Facility and a Public School*

MEd, Educational Leadership
The Pennsylvania State University, 2011
Thesis: *School Discipline and Prison History from 1600 to the Present Day*

B.S., Secondary Education
The Pennsylvania State University, 2007
Major: English Teaching Options & Communications

PUBLICATIONS:

Clemson, C. *The Prison Path: School Practices That Hurt Our Youth*. Lanham, MD:
Rowman & Littlefield, February 27, 2015.

RELATED EXPERIENCE

Rowman and Littlefield Author, 2015
Farm Bureau AgriPOWER Institute Class VI, 2014-2015
Editorial assistant, *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 2012-2013

PRESENTATIONS

Clemson, C. (2014). "Prison or School: What Transformational Leaders Can Do to Change
Prison-like Policies." Paper presented at the 19th Annual Values and Leadership Conference –
Nippissing Univ. Ontario, CA.

Clemson, C. (Oct.2015). "Educating 'Bad' Kids: A Case Study of a Juvenile Justice
Center." Presented at the 20th Annual Values and Leadership Conference, University
Park, PA.

Clemson, C. (Nov. 2015). Panelist: "Making Invisible Children and Youth Visible
in Research, Theory, and Practice." University Council of Educational
Administration, San Diego, CA.

Clemson, C., & Brelsford, J. (2015). "The School to Prison Pipeline: What Does Play Have
to Do With It?" Presentation at the International Play Conference, Clemson, SC.