A DESCRIPTION OF A MULTILAYER MENTORING PROGRAM FOR REDUCING RECIDIVISM OF INCARCERATED YOUTH

by Nicole Maki Weller, Theresa A. Ochoa, Corinne C. Datchi, Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, Molly A. Riddle, and Becky Mungle[1]

Juvenile delinquency is a dynamic social problem, with numerous risk factors resulting in varying levels and types of dysfunction. Risk factors such as school achievement deficits, impoverished neighborhoods, strained family relationships, negative peer networks, substance use, and parental incarceration are commonly identified as factors associated with juvenile offending (Hoffmann et al., 2013; Henry et al., 2012; Hill & Tyson, 2009). The far-reaching impact of juvenile delinquency can be observed in disproportionately higher rates of unmet developmental, social, and mental health needs among adolescents involved in delinquent activities (Zavala & Spohn, 2013; Kort-Butler, 2010). As such, the study and prevention of juvenile delinquency requires a variety of stakeholders to collaborate to address this multi-faceted problem.

Programs and policies must attend to the immediate problem of juvenile delinquency as well as examine the multiple components associated with it, including the juvenile's behavior, social networks, family dynamics, educational opportunities, the criminal justice system, and how these factors work together for or against the youth. It is necessary to identify the risk factors to enhance the understanding, treatment, and prevention of juvenile delinquency. The focus of this manuscript is to describe the components of a mentoring program for incarcerated youth, which uses an interdisciplinary approach to identify the factors associated with juvenile delinquency, and to help prepare the youth for reentry into his or her community after a period of incarceration.

School Factors

The first risk factor for juvenile delinquency is the increasing police presence in schools, supported by an influx in architectural surveillance, which has led to relatively minor infractions being treated using severe forms of punishment such as suspensions, expulsions, and school-based, mandatory arrests (Kupchik & Catlaw; Mittleman, 2018). The ways in which disciplinary policies in practices within schools can channel (certain) students into the criminal justice system is called the 'school-to-prison' pipeline. Policies and practices that contribute to the pipeline include zero-tolerance policies or the use of school-resource officers (Curtis, 2014; Monahan et al., 2014; Wolf & Kupchik, 2017).

The major concern with overly punitive measures is that they ultimately exclude certain students from being in their classrooms (Wolf & Kupchik, 2017), heighten students' risk for future arrests or dropping out of school, and contribute to students' contact with the juvenile justice system (Losen et al., 2014). Preventing youth from entering this pipeline requires an interdisciplinary effort between scholars in education, psychology, sociology and criminal justice. Interdisciplinary collaborations are well equipped to investigate micro, meso, and macro level influences on whether students possess risk factors predictive of juvenile delinquency.

Individual Factors

Research has identified several individual predictors of antisocial behaviors and criminal convictions in adolescence and adulthood. These include personal characteristics or risk factors that develop during childhood and adolescence and increase the likelihood of offending and recidivism: neuro-cognitive impairments, impulsivity, hyperactivity, poor concentration, high levels of sensation seeking, poor self-concept and low self-esteem, negative attitudes towards the law, high daring, low emotional and cognitive empathy, and low intelligence and educational attainment (Azeredo et al., 2019; Curcio et al., 2013; Farrington, 2019; Farrington & Welsh, 2006 ; Jolliffe et al., 2016; Kennedy et al., 2019; Savoleinen et al., 2018). Intelligence, academic performance, and hyperactivity-impulsiveness are the most often cited within-youth variables that correlate with chronic delinquency (Kennedy et al., 2019; Curcio et al., 2013; Jolliffe et al., 2016). The interaction of these youth characteristics with broader environmental factors impacts youth outcomes. For example, academic achievement and low hyperactivity-impulsiveness are stronger predictors of criminal conduct for youth from deprived and disrupted families, compared to youth from intact and middle-class families (Jolliffe et al., 2016). Substance use and poor mental health have also been linked to delinquent behaviors (Kennedy et al., 2019). Drug and alcohol use increase the odds that adolescents will commit a crime and recidivate (Kennedy et al., 2019) and they are also associated with the number of violent offenses (Hein et al., 2017). Wylie and Rufino

(2018) found that up to 90% of justice-involved youth have been exposed to a traumatic event. Anger and irritability are psychiatric symptoms which contribute to violent reoffending in adolescence (Hein et al., 2017) and prior victimization, abuse and neglect are related to recidivism and unsuccessful discharge from juvenile diversion programs (Wylie & Rufino, 2018).

Social Context

The social context is another important factor in youth delinquency. Increasingly, research points towards the importance of the social context in understanding the risk factors and protective mechanisms associated with juvenile delinquency (Dotterer & Lowe 2011; Irvin et al., 2011). This includes the social, physical, and economic environments that facilitate interactions between the juveniles and their families, peers, educators, and communities (Hawkins & Weiss, 2017; Zembroski, 2011).

The social context of economic deprivation can be observed on the individual characteristics that influence delinquency, but it also affects neighborhood quality, itself, a mediator for juvenile delinquency (Jaggers et al., 2014). The correlation with juvenile delinquency at the neighborhood level is observed through neighborhood disorder, weak or missing social ties within the community, minimal or no informal social control among residents regulating juvenile behaviors, and inadequate levels of collective efficacy (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004).

Collective efficacy describes what neighbors are willing, and capable of doing to improve their neighborhoods. It represents the collective ability of members of a community to regulate the behaviors of individuals and groups within the community. Collective efficacy contributes to the overall safety and social order of a particular community. Neighborhoods lacking in collective efficacy lose the social cohesion that unites neighbors together for the overall wellbeing of the community, and increase the opportunity for criminal activities and overall social disorder. For example, without collective efficacy, neighbors are less likely to intervene if they observed youth spray-painting graffiti on buildings, when compared to neighbors who feel strong social cohesion to their community (Cusson, 2015).

The social context surrounding peer influence on juvenile delinquency is observed under two sequentially linked processes. In the first, aggressive and disruptive youth are rejected by their peers, and this rejection often leads to continued and future deviant behaviors (Miller-Johnson et al., 2002). In the second, and even in light of the social rejection from their non-deviant peers, youth still crave social connectedness. To achieve this personal need, youth will gravitate towards deviant peer groups who condone their anti-social behaviors and collectively engage in delinquent actions together (Warr, 1996; Thornberry & Krohn, 1997; Dishion et al., 1995).

Family Factors

The characteristics of the family environment are well-established factors that influence the development and wellbeing of children and adolescents. Family conflict and violence, low family cohesion, harsh and inconsistent parenting practices, poor parental monitoring, negative parent-child relationships, and family economic deprivation were found to be associated with conduct problems in adolescence (Azeredo et al., 2019; Kennedy et al., 2019; Farrington, 2019; Jolliffe et al., 2016). Youth from low family socio-economic status have greater levels of delinquency (Azeredo et al., 2019), and youth from disrupted homes who live with a single parent are more likely to show externalizing behaviors (Kennedy et al., 2019). Having a convicted father and mother and harsh parental discipline were found to be some of the most important predictors of violence convictions for male juvenile offenders at ages 10-20 (Farrington, 2019). In contrast, according to Joliffe et al, (2016), good parental supervision, parental warmth, and secure attachment bonds between child and parent acted as protective factors against juvenile delinquency (Jolliffe et al., 2016). To be sure, family factors are one of several important factors to consider in the study of youth delinquency.

Risk factors at the individual, school, family, and community, levels interact in complex ways to promote juvenile delinquency. It is difficult to say with certainty which stage of adolescent development or which factors are most salient in promoting juvenile delinquency, but rather, that exposure to any combination of these factors are most important for juvenile delinquency. Widely used punitive measures at school disproportionately effect high-risk youth who often come from communities with high-crime, high-poverty, and low collective efficacy. Individual and social risk factors are concentrated within these same communities including parental stress and disengagement, exposure to community and family violence, and social and peer pressure. Through interdisciplinary collaboration, we have developed an interdisciplinary mentoring program aimed at reducing youth recidivism by addressing the combination of risk factors which promote juvenile delinquency.

Youth Mentoring

Youth mentoring refers to the relationship between a youth and an adult who provides guidance, assistance, and support for the youth. Early youth mentoring was facilitated by charitable organizations who paired adults with vulnerable youth living in poverty or youth that had become involved with the juvenile court system. Contemporary youth mentoring has expanded to include support from foundations, corporations, and the federal government which emphasize the positive one-on-one relationships between youth and adults who provide support and advocacy to enrich the lives of the youth (Kupersmidt et al., 2016; Pryce et al. , 2015). Recently, there has been increased focus on the positive impact of youth mentoring

to address poor school performance and delinquent activity. Addressing these critical societal challenges requires more complex youth mentoring models as well as a better understanding of the effective practices of recruiting and training high-quality mentors, who can provide the technical and emotional support assistance that the youth require (Kupersmidt et al., 2016; Pryce et al., 2015).

HOPE: A Youth Mentoring and Family Intervention Program

Helping Offenders Prosper through Employment (HOPE) is a university-based program with two components: *HOPE for Youth* and *HOPE for Home*. Both components involve collaboration between Indiana University and the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC). *HOPE for Youth* is a mentoring program created by the second author (Ochoa & Swank, 2018). The program started with two mentors in 2013 who provided mentoring at a juvenile correctional facility for girls in Indiana. In 2016, the IDOC adopted the *HOPE for Youth* mentoring program for all three state-level correctional facilities (LaPorte, Logansport, and Pendleton). At the time of this writing, 50 undergraduates have served as mentors in the program. The *HOPE for Youth* mentoring program is guided by three principles of similar importance: timely mentoring; a positive and responsive approach to youth behaviors and concerns; and collaboration (Ochoa et al., 2019).

The mentoring program for incarcerated youth uses the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) framework that emphasizes proactive rather than reactive and humane rather than punitive responses to maladaptive behavior. PBIS is a tiered approach of responding to and modifying behavior on a systemic and individual level. Some juvenile correctional facilities in the United States have adopted this non-punitive approach to rehabilitation and results have proven effective. Unlike many correctional facilities where youth's pro-social behavior is largely ignored and where anti-social, undesired behavior receives a harsh, punitive response, facilities which use PBIS seek to identify a set of pro-social behavioral expectations, provide a set of rewards for positive behavior, and then establish a set of responses for violations of the rules. Nelson and Liaupsin, two leading scholars in the field of juvenile justice and disabilities, point out that PBIS encourages adults in juvenile correctional facilities to focus on catching the adolescent being good and rewarding pro-social behavior instead of waiting to reprimand the youth when violations of school rules occur (www.pbis.org).

HOPE for Youth

In the facility component of the university-based youth mentoring and family intervention program, *HOPE for Youth*, faculty from two campuses recruit, train, and supervise undergraduate students from different academic disciplines who provide weekly one-on-one mentoring support to a youth in the juvenile

correctional facilities. Mentors are paired with a youth primarily on the basis of where the youth is planned to be released. This geographical compatibility increases the likelihood that the mentoring relationship will continue once the youth is released. Nonetheless, mentors are asked to accept any youth who volunteers to participate in the mentoring program. Youth mentoring begins when the youth is first admitted to correctional confinement. Pairing youth with a mentor during the period of incarceration helps establish a strong and positive relationship between mentor and mentee with the goal of increasing the likelihood that the youth will maintain contact upon release. Weekly mentoring sessions last approximately one hour and are conducted in the evenings or weekends. Mentors prepare session activities using materials provided to them by the HOPE leadership team in a resource binder which mentors take to and from each mentoring session. Mentors are also free to create their own activities. Given HOPE's focus on employment, activities generally include exploring options for employment and vocations, writing employment goals and assessing progress towards their fulfillment, filling out job applications, writing a resume, and developing and practicing employment soft skills such as shaking hands and responding to criticism from potential job employers and co-workers.

Mentors are required to fill out a log after each session describing the activities conducted in the session, indicating what went well and also what they intend to do for the following session. The log is submitted electronically within 24 hours of each mentoring session and is reviewed by the mentoring co-director and distributed to key people, including IDOC and HOPE personnel who provide feedback to the mentor. By design, HOPE is not a stand-alone mentoring program. HOPE is designed to complement rehabilitation and treatment goals established by the correctional facility personnel.

Collaboration among several stakeholders supports the *HOPE for Youth* mentoring program. IDOC funds the salary of three HOPE personnel: Two individuals serve as Mentoring Co-Directors and one serves as a Community Liaison. These three individuals are paid by the IDOC but university personnel supervise the 20 hours weekly for each position. In practice, these three individuals represent a significant financial commitment by a state agency in Indiana to collaborate with Indiana University. In addition to funding three personnel lines, a variety of other personnel collaborate in the implementation of the HOPE mentoring program. The Director of Juvenile Education and the Statewide Transition Director receive weekly logs from all mentors in the three facilities for the purpose of sharing information. In turn, they respond with suggestions to questions posed by mentors about specific youth and clarify any procedures required by the IDOC. At the facility level, there is a transition coordinator who shares information with mentors about specific youth. All mentors are aware of information for their assigned youth and, to the extent possible, mentors communicate with the transition coordinator

about goals, release dates, and treatment objectives for the youth assigned to them for mentoring.

Sharing information between different people who interact with the youth provides an opportunity to complement the work different people do with and for the student. For example, in one of the facilities, youth are enrolled in a class focused on employment readiness. In this case, the students may begin a resume as an assignment for the class. Knowing that the student started a resume in his class allows the mentor to help the student pick up where he left off and work towards completion of the resume instead of starting from the beginning. Similarly, if the mentoring log indicates that the youth and mentor started a resume in one mentoring session, the course instructor will know from reading the log that the student either already started or completed a resume.

Communication through the mentoring logs has also proved to be useful in helping to mobilize transition services for the youth by communicating when the student's estimated release date is nearing or when there has been a change that will mean the student is staying longer. When the student is going to stay longer, mentors are able to help the youth process some of the disappointment the youth may experience because they have to stay incarcerated longer than previously anticipated.

Even though communication is a primary focus, challenges do exist. In some instances, changes in the youth's behavior or treatment programming occur that are impossible to communicate before mentors begin the two-hour drive to the facility. In these instances, the mentor arrives at the location only to turn around to make the drive back home. Although challenges exist, mentors are aware that these unforeseen events are out of the control of the mentoring program and/or the facility personnel, and as a testament to their adaptability and flexibility, skills we also wish to model to the mentees, they adjust accordingly. The correctional facility personnel have, on occasions, called the mentoring director on the weekend to inform them of such changes before the mentor started the drive. This level of communication initiated by the correctional facility personnel is interpreted as an indication that facility personnel value the program and its participants. Similarly, mentors have had to cancel or reschedule a mentoring session due to car troubles, illnesses, or personal engagements. In these cases, the facility is notified and they in turn communicate the change to the mentee to ensure that the mentee is not disappointed when his or her mentor does not show up as the youth expected. Bidirectional communication is an indication that both the HOPE program mentors and the facility personnel value the mentoring relationship enough to communicate changes that impact the mentoring relationship. It is this flexibility, and resilience in dealing with obstacles and frustrations which we hope to model to our mentees and which we also hope will benefit our college student mentors in their future endeavors.

HOPE for Home

The family component of the HOPE program is called *HOPE for Home* (Datchi, 2019). It consists of various family assessment and intervention activities that begin soon after incarcerated youth have been paired with a HOPE mentor. For purposes of the *HOPE for Home* component, family is defined broadly to include members of the nuclear and extended family as well as non-biological kin. Participation in *HOPE for Home* activities is a collaborative process whereby the youth, the youth's primary caregiver(s) or legal guardian(s), the HOPE mentor, and the *HOPE for Home* coach (hereafter called "family coach") make decisions about family involvement and reentry planning. The family coach is an individual with experience in the helping professions (e.g., psychology, social work, counseling) who also receives formal training and supervision by key personnel in the HOPE program.

HOPE for Home operates within the framework of social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent, 2005), positive youth development (PYD; McNeely & Blanchard, 2009), and family systems theory (Stanton, 2009). Together, these empirically-based theories highlight the resilience processes that enhance youth educational and vocational outcomes and that have the capacity, if activated, to reduce recidivism. SCCT emphasizes the role of the youth's environment in the development of self-efficacy beliefs, vocational interests, and career choices. In particular, supportive family conditions (e.g., financial and emotional) and exposure to career-relevant opportunities at home have a positive influence on youth vocational development (Bryant et al., 2006). Likewise, PYD offers an ecological model of adolescence that emphasizes the importance of youth relationships with important others (e.g., family members, school personnel) and their effects on youth's perceived abilities, confidence, and self-worth. Family systems theory calls attention to the family as a primary context of adolescent personal and vocational development; it also provides a lens for looking at connections between youth and their environment and for understanding the dynamic and complex interdependence between the risk and protective factors that influence delinquent behaviors. Family involvement is a well-established, empirically-based principle of best practice for mentoring and other programs that target juvenile delinquency (Duriez et al., 2017); it derives from scientific findings about the influence of family characteristics such as age-appropriate supervision, consistent and clear limits, open youth-parent communication, strong relational bonds, and parental support (Dubois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hurd et al. , 2013; Larose, 2018).

HOPE for Home starts with the assessment of the family environment. Family assessment serves two functions: to gather information to make program decisions and to track change to determine the effects of *HOPE for Home* activities on the family dynamics and the youth's behaviors. Assessment involves the use of standardized and non-standardized instruments. Structured questionnaires and parent

interviews are used to collect family data and identify family members who have a close bond with the youth and who have the capacity to serve as positive role models during and after incarceration. The program uses surveys and standardized measures like the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (available at www.sdqinfo.com) to gather information about individual, family, and community risk and protective factors. This information is relevant to the selection of program objectives that match the unique needs of the youth and their families. Family assessment helps determine who in the youth's household or community will participate in the *HOPE for Home* activities. Ideally, this includes the youth's primary caregivers or legal guardian(s) or a close adult family member (such as an uncle, sister, grandmother) who has shown motivation to form a natural mentoring relationship with the youth. (Hereafter we will use the terms "caring adults" to refer to the youth's family members who are participating in *HOPE for Home*.) The HOPE family coach and the youth's primary caregivers make joint decisions about the degree and nature of family involvement in *HOPE for Home*.

HOPE for Home interventions include family psychoeducation, skill practice, reentry planning, and coaching. Family psychoeducation happens in parallel with the youth's participation in *HOPE for Youth* mentoring while the youth is residing in the juvenile detention facility. The family coach and the caring adults meet once a month to review and discuss key facts about adolescent psychosocial and career development and to examine how they can use the information to increase the caring adults' responsiveness to the youth's needs. Specifically, the caring adults read and learn about the adolescent brain, identity formation, career maturity and career planning during the teenage years, how to balance autonomy and connection, and how to build emotional and social competence. Using this knowledge, the caring adults can evaluate their understanding of the youth's behaviors and consider their role(s) in promoting positive youth outcomes. The caring adults also build core psychosocial skills –effective communication, decision making, goal setting, self-regulation, problem-solving and conflict management— to increase their capacity to support the youth's growth. Skills learned in the psychoeducation sessions can be practiced during visits or phone calls with the youth in the detention facility; this is an opportunity not only to model but also to reinforce behaviors the youth is learning during mentoring activities. The primary goals of family psychoeducation and skill practice are to encourage positive family engagement and participation in the youth's education and career planning during incarceration as well as to provide information and strategies for creating warm and supportive youth-adult interactions.

Some specific reentry planning intervention activities take place during the month prior to the youth's release. The youth, the youth's mentor, the family coach and the family members who participated in *HOPE for Home* meet to discuss how they will support the youth's school or employment goals in the community.

The HOPE mentor and family coach clarify their respective roles as well as the frequency and type of contact they will have with the youth and the family during the transition. Guidelines for using communication technology such as emails, texts, or videocalls are agreed upon and clarified. The goal of reentry planning is to define and encourage ongoing family engagement when the youth returns home.

Family coaching intervention refers to monthly interactions that take place between the *HOPE for Home* coach and the youth's caring adults after family reunification. The HOPE family coach maintains contact with the family when the youth returns home through email, phone, and/or video to review progress towards the youth's reentry goals, to encourage the caregivers and/or family mentor to apply their new knowledge and skills, and to support their efforts to use family and community resources to improve the youth's outcomes.

Broadly speaking, the HOPE program, like no other mentoring program, has four significant characteristics. First, it is multidisciplinary, researchers from multiple academic disciplines contributed to its development and application. Mentors are also undergraduate students recruited from various academic disciplines and majors. Second, programming begins during incarceration and the same mentor follows the youth out to the community once released. Third, complementary and coordinated programming is offered to youth and to parents to maximize support for the student once released. Finally, and most important, the program is a collaboration between the IDOC and a research university. A such, the HOPE program complies with guidelines established by the IDOC and also the university's institutional review board to seek participation from vulnerable and incarcerated youth populations in the mentoring program.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration

Interdisciplinary collaboration is essential to develop interventions that address the complex problem of juvenile delinquency and recidivism from multiple angles: individual, educational/vocational, relational, and familial. Considering the various and complex factors that influence delinquency, the HOPE leadership team aims to break down silos in educational, correctional and psychological practice and research, in order to address juvenile crime and incarceration from an interdisciplinary perspective. For example, scholars in education may focus on factors specific to the school or the youth at school while the sociologist might focus on the factors that impact youth behavior in the context of their peers or community. Psychologists might highlight the role of co-occurring problems, such as comorbid mental health disorders and substance abuse. In another example, the criminologist might focus on whether pipeline prevalence is tied to youth's levels of social control, association with deviant peer networks, residence in high-crime

neighborhoods, or membership in families with high levels of criminal justice system involvement. These interdisciplinary perspectives have the effect of expanding our understanding of the complexity of the problem of delinquency and violence.

In addition, the diversity in HOPE leadership allows for the integration of discipline-specific expertise and for the refinement of HOPE's multidimensional intervention program. The HOPE leadership team includes four university professors with expertise in special education, criminal justice, psychology, and sociology. The Director of HOPE specializes in special education and students' emotional and behavioral disorders. The supervisor of *HOPE for Home* is a family psychologist who conducts research on family-based treatment programs for justice-involved populations. The third member of HOPE's leadership team is a sociologist with expertise in juvenile risky behaviors. The fourth member is a professor of criminal justice who has expertise in reentry experiences of individuals based on race, gender, and poverty.

Future Directions for Practice and Research

Mentoring is an effective approach to the reduction and prevention of juvenile delinquency and violence. Systematic research reviews and metanalyses have shown that mentoring has statistically significant and positive effects on youth with moderate risk of offending (DuBois et al., 2011). While these effects are small, they compare with those of community- and school-based interventions, including evidence-based family treatment programs like Functional Family Therapy. Likewise, the National Mentoring Resource Center, a program of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, has evaluated contemporary mentoring programs and found that nine were effective in reducing recidivism (OJJDP, n.d.). Only two of these programs integrate components that focus on the youth and their natural environments (e.g., parents, family relationships, teachers). Future research should evaluate the relative effectiveness of integrative and multidimensional mentoring compared to individual-focused mentoring. It should also estimate the cost-effectiveness of individual-focused and multidimensional mentoring programs relative to other evidence-based interventions, and explore the change mechanisms that are specific to mentoring.

Multidimensional, integrative mentoring programs like HOPE represent an ecological approach to the reduction and prevention of juvenile delinquency; they involve the youth and their families and connect them to prosocial members of their communities (e.g., mentors, family coaches, community organizations). Ecological mentoring programs are most responsive to the needs of communities with collectivistic and family-centered values. They also are less likely to be perceived as a form of external interference in their everyday life, as they respect the

importance of the youth's natural environment and offer opportunities for family involvement. Future research may also investigate the broader effects of integrative mentoring programs on youth's and family's interactions with other systems. For example, it may study correctional officers' perception of youth and families who participate in mentoring activities during detention. Such findings would provide helpful information about the role of mentoring in improving mesosystemic relationships that are often characterized by mistrust and biases.

Conclusion

Programs like *HOPE for Youth* and *HOPE for Home* provide benefits on many levels to the incarcerated youth, their families, and the communities where youth live, and to which they will return after incarceration. The foundational principle of HOPE Mentoring is to prepare the youth for successful community reentry through employment preparation embedded within the mentoring sessions. HOPE Mentoring is a case study of a program which explores and utilizes best practices to better understand the risk and protective factors which lead to juvenile delinquency and those that contribute to a reduction in recidivism.

HOPE Mentoring aims to serve the needs of incarcerated youth in the juvenile correctional facilities of Indiana, while simultaneously supporting the programmatic goals of the IDOC. The multidisciplinary HOPE leadership team has developed rigorous recruitment, training, and mentoring models that can be implemented broadly to replicate HOPE Mentoring across multiple states. Critical to the success of HOPE Mentoring is the collaboration with the IDOC – a partnership that informs the services and activities that HOPE mentors provide their mentees. Recruitment, training, and ongoing communication with the undergraduate mentors occurs in part because of feedback from the IDOC and in part because of the infrastructure of HOPE Mentoring that provides as much guidance and support to our undergraduate mentors, as we provide to the mentees. The expertise of the multidisciplinary leadership team has produced additional support services for the youth mentees, for example, the creation of HOPE for Home, which provides mentoring services for the families of the incarcerated youth. The IDOC has identified HOPE Mentoring as a best-practice volunteer mentoring program, not because the incarcerated youth in Indiana have unique needs, but rather, because the foundation of HOPE Mentoring is the collaboration between its multidisciplinary leadership team, its undergraduate mentors, and its partnership with the IDOC. These principle tenets of HOPE Mentoring contribute to its adaptability to juvenile correctional facilities across the country.

References

Azeredo, A., Moreira, D., Figueiredo, P, & Barbosa, F. (2019). Delinquent behavior: systematic review of genetic and environmental risk factors. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, *22*(4), 502-526. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-019-00298-w

Bryant, B. K., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Reynolds, P. (2006). Parenting in relation to child and adolescent vocational development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1), 149-175.

Curcio, A. L., Mak, A. S., & George, A. M. (2013). Do adolescent delinquency and problem drinking share psychosocial risk factors? A literature review. *Addictive Behaviors, 38*(4), 2003-2013.

Curtis, A.J. (2014). Tracing the school-to-prison pipeline from zero-tolerance policies to juvenile justice dispositions. *The Georgetown Law Journal, 102*(4), 1251-1277.

Cusson, M. (2019). Collective efficacy and social control. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition.

Datchi, C. C. (2019). *HOPE for Home: Family Psychoeducation and Family Coaching Manual.*

Dishion, T.J., Andrews, D.W. and Crosby, L. (1995). Antisocial boys and their friends in early adolescence: Relationship characteristics, quality, and interactional process. *Child development*, *66*(1), 139-151. doi:10.1111/j.14678624.1995.tb00861.x

Dotterer, A. M., & Lowe, K. (2011). Classroom context, school engagement, and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, *40*(12), 1649–1660. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9647-5

DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*(2), 57–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611414806

Dubois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American journal of public health, 95*(3), 518-524.

Duriez, S. A., Sullivan, C., Sullivan, C. J., Manchak, S. M., & Latessa, E. J., University of Cincinnati, & United States of America. (2017). Mentoring best practices research: Effectiveness of juvenile mentoring programs on

recidivism. *Center for Criminal Justice Research.* https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/251378.pdf

Farrington, D. P. (2019). The development of violence from age 8 to 61. *Aggressive Behavior, 45*(4), 365-376. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21831

Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (2008). *Saving children from a life of crime: Early risk factors and effective interventions.* Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, S. R., and Weiss, J.G. (2017). The social developmental model: An integrated approach to delinquency prevention. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 6*(2), 73-97. doi: 10.1007/BF01325432

Hein, S., Barbot, B., Square, A., Chapman, J., Foley Geib, C., & Grigorenko, E. (2017). Violent offending among juveniles: A 7-year longitudinal study of recidivism, desistance, and associations with mental health. *Law and human behavior, 41*(3), 273-283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000241

Henry, K.L., Knight, K.E., & Thornberry, T.P. (2012). School disengagement as a predictor of dropout, delinquency, and problem substance use during adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*(2), 156-168.

Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental psychology, 45*(3), 740–763. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015362

Hoffman, H. J., Daly, K. A., Bainbridge, K. E., Casselbrant, M. L., Homøe, P., Kvestad, E., Kvaerner, K.J., & Vernacchio, L. (2013). Panel 1: Epidemiology, natural history, and risk factors. *Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery, 148*(4_suppl), E1–E25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599812460984

Hurd, N. M., Varney, F. A., & Rowley, S. J. (2013). Involved-vigilant parenting and socio-emotional well-being among Black youth: The moderating influence of natural mentoring relationships. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 42*(10), 1583-1595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9819-y

Irvin, M. J., Meece, J. L., Byun, S. Y., Farmer, T. W., & Hutchins, B.C. (2011). Relationship of school context to rural youth's edu-cational achievement and aspirations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,40*(9), 1225.

Jaggers, J.W., Robison, S.B., Rhodes, J.L.F., Guan, X., & Church, W.T. II (###). Predicting adult criminality among louisiana's urban youth: Poverty, academic risk, and delinquency. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 7*(1), 89-116.

Jolliffe, D., Farrington, D. P., Loeber, R., & Pardini, D. (2016). Protective factors for violence: Results from the Pittsburgh youth study. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 45*, 32-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.007

Kennedy, T. D., Edmonds, W.A., Millen, D. H., & Detullio, D. (2019). Chronic juvenile offenders: Exploring risk factor models of recidivism. *Youth violence and juvenile justice, 17*(2), 174-193. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204018770517

Kupersmidt J. B., Stump K. N., Stelter R. L., & Rhodes J. E. (2017). Mentoring program practices as predictors of match longevity. *Journal of Community Psychology, 45*(5), 630-645. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21883

Larose, S., Boisclair-Châteauvert, G., De Wit, D. J., Dubois, D., Erdem, G., & Lipman, E. L. (2018). How mentor support interacts with mother and teacher support in predicting youth academic adjustment: An investigation among youth exposed to Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada programs. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 39*(3), 205-228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-018-0509-8

Kort-Butler, L. A. (2010). Experienced and vicarious victimization: Do social support and self-esteem prevent delinquent responses? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 496–505.

Kupchik, A., & Catlaw, T. J. (2015). Discipline and participation: The long-term effects of suspension and school security on the political and civic engagement of youth. *Youth & Society, 47*(1), 95–124.

Lent, R. W. (2005). A social cognitive view of career development and counseling. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (pp. 101-127). Wiley.

Losen, D. J., Hodson, C., Keith, M. A., Morrison, K., & Belway, A. (2015). Are we closing the school discipline gap? *Center for Civil Rights Remedies*. Retrieved from http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/are-we-closing-the-school-discipline-gap/AreWeClosingTheSchoolDisciplineGap_FINAL221.pdf

Monahan, K.C., Vanderhel, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(7), 1007.

Miller-Johnson, S., Coie, J. D., Maumary-Gremaud, A., Bierman, K., & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (2002). Peer rejection and aggression and early starter models of conduct disorder. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, *30*(3), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1015198612049

Mittleman, J. (2018). A downward spiral? Childhood suspension and the path to juvenile arrest. *Sociology of Education, 91*(3), 183–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040718784603

McNeely, C., & Blanchard, J. (2009). *The teen years explained: A guide to healthy adolescent development.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. *Center for Adolescent Health.* https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/center-for-adolescent-health/_docs/TTYE-Guide.pdf

Ochoa, T.A. & Swank, (2018). *HOPE for Youth: Mentor Training Manual.*

Ochoa, T. A., Weller, N. M., & Riddle, M. A. (2019). Undergraduate students as job mentors to support youth transitioning from incarceration. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry, 6* (2), 132-143. https://doi.org/10.25771/4kff-bx24

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention National Mentoring Resource Center [OJJDP]. (n. d.). Mentoring program Reviews. https://nationalmentoringresourcecenter.org/index.php/what-works-in-mentoring/reviews-of-mentoring-programs.html

Pryce, J., Giovannetti, S., Spencer, R., Elledge, L. C., Gowdy, G., Whitley, M. L., & Cavell, T. A. (2015). Mentoring in the social context: Mentors' experiences with mentees' peers in a site-based program. *Children and Youth Services Review.* 56: 185-192.

Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of "broken windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*(4), 319–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250406700401

Savoleinen, J., Eisman, A., Mason, W. A., Schwartz, J. A., Miettunen, J., & Jarvelin, M. R. (2018). Socioeconomic disadvantage and psychological deficits: Pathways from early cumulative risk to late-adolescent criminal conviction. *Journal of adolescence, 65*, 16-24.

Stanton, M. (2009). The systemic epistemology of family psychology. *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of family psychology,* 5-20.

Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (1997). Peers, drug use, and delinquency. In D. M. Stoff, J. Breiling, & J. D. Maser (Eds.), *Handbook of antisocial behavior* (pp. 218–233). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Warr, M. (1996). Organization and instigation in delinquent. *Criminology*, *34*(1) 11-37. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1996.tb01193.x

Wolf, K. C., & Kupchik, A. (2017). School suspensions and adverse experiences in adulthood. *Justice Quarterly, 34*(3), 407-430. doi:10.1080/07418825.2016.1168475

Wylie, L. E., & Rufino, K. A. (2018). The impact of victimization and mental health symptoms on recidivism for early system-involved juvenile offenders. *Law and human behavior, 42*(6), 558. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000311

Zavala E., Spohn, R.E. (2013). The role of vicarious and anticipated strain on the overlap of violent perpetration and victimization: A test of general strain theory. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(1), 119–140. doi:10.1007/s12103-012-9163-5

Zembroski, D. (2011). Sociological theories of crime and delinquency. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 21*(3), 240-254. doi:10.1080/10911359.2011.564553

Endnotes

1 **Nicole Maki Weller, PhD**, is an Associate Professor and Chair in the Department of Sociology at Indiana University Kokomo. Her research focuses on the intersection of sociodemographics and adolescent risky behaviors. Most recently she has examined the impact of social environments on adolescent drug use and abuse. She serves as the Site Coordinator for HOPE Mentoring – a mentoring program for incarcerated youth. **Theresa A. Ochoa, PhD**, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, in the School of Education at Indiana University Bloomington. She is the founder and executive director of HOPE, a mentoring program for incarcerated youth. Her research focusses on juvenile delinquency, special education law, and teacher preparation. **Corinne C. Datchi, PhD**, ABPP, is Associate Professor and Chair of the Psychology Department at William Paterson University in Wayne, New Jersey. She is also Past President of the Society for Couple and Family Psychology, a division of the American Psychological Association. Her research and clinical

practice focus on correctional populations, reentry, problem solving justice, and gender. She is the co-author of two edited volumes: Gender, Psychology, and Justice: The Mental Health of Women and Girls in the Legal System (NYU Press, 2017) and Integrative Couple and Family Therapy: Treatment Models for Complex Clinical Issues (APA Books, 2019). **Molly A. Riddle, PhD**, is an Assistant Professor and Elementary Education Coordinator of the Department of Education, School of Social Sciences and Education at Greensboro College. Dr. Riddle's background includes eleven years of K-12 teaching and alternative education. As a scholar she is dedicated to cultivating a robust understanding of diversity, equity, and social justice within communities and classrooms. **Miriam Northcutt Bohmert, PhD**, is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice at Indiana University, is an expert in gender, social justice, sexual assault, restorative justice, prisons, and community supervision. She has worked with the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Justice, and the Arnold Ventures Foundation on corrections and reentry topics.

Copyright of Journal of South Texas is the property of Journal of South Texas and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.