



Online citation: Bickel, Christopher. 2010. "From Child to Captive: Constructing Captivity in a Juvenile Institution." *Western Criminology Review* 11(1):37-49.
(<http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v11n1/Bickel.pdf>).

From Child to Captive: Constructing Captivity in a Juvenile Institution

Christopher Bickel
California Polytechnic State University

Abstract: *Juvenile detention centers are not simply places that regulate and control the behavior of children accused of crimes. Nor are they places that “rehabilitate” or “fix” children in need. Instead, juvenile detention centers provide the social location in which detained children, who are often working class and of color, are created unequal, and treated accordingly. I argue that inside juvenile detention centers, children are constructed as “captives,” as members of a permanent, disreputable category. Focusing on the experiences of juvenile detention guards, I show how guards construct detained youth as pathological and deserving of punitive treatment. As a result, detained youth are ushered into a rising category of exclusion that carries the salience of other categories of difference, like race, class and gender. “Captivity” is a rising marker of inequality, and is the product of an ongoing interactional process that is reproduced, maintained, and legitimated in the everyday interactions between guards and between guards and detained youth.*

Keywords: Juvenile Justice; Detention; Detention Guards; Inequality

*Someone said life is easy when you're a kid.
Now that I think about it . . . when was I a kid?
My life has been hard.
My mother dead, my brother lost, my father crazy
My life trapped in a cage.
Who was to care for me when I was in trouble.
No one to help
No one to care*

--Angel, a 16 year-old captive of the state.

I received this poem in the mail from Angel, a young man I mentored for over six years. Since the age of 12, he has spent most of his teenage years locked up, leaving him angry at the juvenile justice system, which he believes has robbed him of his childhood and “prepared him for the pen.”

I spent nearly two years as an ethnographic researcher inside Rosy Meadows, a large juvenile detention center that houses anywhere between 150-200 youth between the ages of 11-18 in the Northwest, United States. In 2005, for

the United States as a whole, 354,100 youth cycled through such juvenile detention centers (OJJDP 2008). The more time I spent talking with the incarcerated youth and their state-issued guardians, the more I began to question the conventional research on juvenile justice, which is far too often defined by existing paradigms of rehabilitation and punishment. On the left, progressive criminologists and policy makers decry the draconian shift toward punishment and the subsequent evaporation of funding for rehabilitation programs, leaving a “vulnerable” population “at risk” (Inderbitzen 2006; Krisberg 2005). On the right, conservatives argue that the juvenile justice system is far too lenient on “dangerous” and “predatory” youth and should focus more on punishment and incapacitation (DiIulio 1995). As the debate rages between rehabilitation and punishment, there is another overlooked, and far more insidious, function of the current juvenile justice system: the systematic branding of incarcerated youth as “criminal,” leading to the death of childhood and the birth of what I call “captivity.”

Given the massive experiment in incarceration over the last thirty years, it is time to think of “captivity” as a rising form of state legitimated inequality, similar to other categorical identities, like race, gender, and class. In this article, I avoid using conventional words like “delinquent,” “offender,” or “criminal” not only because these terms reduce the humanity of the children to whom they are applied, but also because they are theoretically insufficient; they push researchers to focus solely on the behavior of children and ignore the role institutions play in constructing categories of delinquency (Becker 1963). Instead, I use the concept of “captivity” to highlight the interactional and institutional process through which incarcerated children are created different inside a total institution. The concept of captivity implies interaction because to be a captive, one must be held in that category by some outside force, whether it comes in the form of a guard, a judge, or an entire institution. To understand the social world of juvenile detention centers in particular, and “juvenile delinquency” in general, the researcher must focus not only on the activities of detained children, but also on the activities of juvenile justice officials. I emphasize that a captive identity is not a descriptor of the individual attributes or behaviors of detained youth, but rather it is “an emergent property of social situations” (West and Zimmerman 1987). As such, captivity must be constructed, reproduced, and maintained in the everyday interactions between guards, and between guards and children. A captive identity, then, is the both the outcome of and justification for the creation of a new category of inequality that carries the salience of other categories of difference, like race, class, and gender.

Not since slavery have we seen the rise of an institution that so fundamentally perpetuates and legitimates massive inequality, especially for inner city children of color. While there is little ethnographic research on juvenile institutions, there is a growing body of literature that links adult criminal justice institutions to growing social inequality. Western (2006) argues that incarceration has become a normal part of the life course for the urban poor. Incarceration limits the educational and occupational opportunities available to the formerly incarcerated, especially young Black and Latino males (Western 2006). Similarly, Pager (2007) finds that the “negative credential” of incarceration severely restricts the job opportunities available to the formerly incarcerated, whose chances of being considered for employment are nearly half that of applicants without criminal records. The mark of incarceration, Pager writes, results in the “categorical exclusion of whole classes of individuals on the basis of their stigmatized identity” (Pager 2007:149). With nearly 7 million people in the U.S. in prison, jail, or under the control of probation or parole, the research of Western and Pager suggests that the prison has become a major mechanism that reproduces and legitimates inequality for the urban poor (Austin and Irwin 2001).

Although the United States detains and incarcerates people at a rate that far surpasses that of any other nation, there has been an almost complete lack of recent ethnographic research on what happens to people while they are held captive in an era of mass incarceration. Few researchers have stepped foot inside the cinder-block halls of juvenile and adult facilities, let alone talked with the confined and their guards.¹ Most of the detailed ethnographic accounts of juvenile and adult facilities were written prior to the 1980s, long before the era of massive incarceration, leading Waquant (2002) to decry the “curious eclipse of prison ethnography.” If there has been an eclipse of prison ethnography, then there has also been a total whiteout of ethnographic studies on juvenile detention centers and youth prisons.

It is within this yawning gulf in the literature that I situate my ethnographic research on juvenile detention centers. My research suggests that juvenile detention centers are not simply places that regulate and control the behavior of children accused of crimes, nor are they places that “rehabilitate” or “fix” children in need. Instead, juvenile detention centers provide the social location in which detained children, who are often working class and of color, are created different and unequal.

To make this argument, I draw from Erving Goffman’s (1961) classic work on total institutions and West and Fenstermaker’s more recent work on “doing difference” (West and Fenstermaker 1995; Fenstermaker and West 2002). Goffman asserts that total institutions, such as prisons and mental hospitals, subject people to a massive status degradation and force inmates to undergo a “series of abasements, degradations, humiliation, and profanations of self” (Goffman 1961:14). Total institutions are all-encompassing and sever inmates from the outside world, restrict their movements inside the institution, and more importantly, deprive human beings of their individuality and humanity. Goffman (1961) contends that it is not individual illness or pathology, but rather the institution itself that fundamentally shapes the social world of the inmate and their self-conceptions. Indeed, the very architecture of the detention center, the focus of this study, suggests youth are different and dangerous: the thick steel doors, the countless locks on every door and every drawer, the listening devices built into each cell, and the numerous gazing security cameras. Although the overwhelming majority of youth are detained for non-violent offenses, the architecture of Rosy Meadows resembles that of adult, more secure institutions.

My research suggests that detention centers not only subject children to a process of status degradation (Garfinkel 1956; Goffman 1961), but also play a crucial role in the construction of “captivity,” a rising category of exclusion and inequality. Moving beyond traditional criminological research, I draw from West and Fenstermaker’s (1995) “Doing Difference” framework. The “doing difference” framework was originally intended

to explain the construction of categories of inequality, like race, class, gender, and sexuality (West and Fenstermaker 2002). The social construction of captive identities, however, shares much in common with other categorical identities. West and Fenstermaker argue that categories of difference are not so much individual attributes, but rather they are accomplished through everyday interaction. West and Fenstermaker, for example, assert that we “do gender,” and this involves a social process of “creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological. Once these differences have been constructed, they are used to reinforce the ‘essentialness’ of gender” (Fenstermaker and West 2002:13). Through every-day interaction, people engage in behavior with an eye toward what it means to be a man or a woman. These normative conceptions, to which all are held accountable, reinforce the “essentialness” of gender and, therefore, reproduce and reaffirm gender inequality; so much so that many behaviors can be easily identified as feminine or masculine, as if they were “natural” rather than socially constructed differences.

In this article, I use the “doing difference” framework to provide a unique analysis of the ways in which a new form of inequality, referred to as captivity, is first imposed and then reproduced, maintained, and legitimated in the everyday interactions between guards and detained children.² Guards offer descriptive accounts of the detainees as “pathological,” “untrustworthy,” “dangerous,” and “irresponsible.” In the words of Wally, a detention guard in his 40s, “These kids are skilled manipulators. They don’t want to take responsibility for their action...You know, I can’t be intellectual with them, or anything like that, just because of our backgrounds. They’re different. They’re not really educated. They’re not really mature. They’re not responsible.” Wally is not alone. I heard countless guards describe detained youth in similar ways, as “baby criminals,” “troubled,” “assholes,” “manipulators,” “predators,” and “con-artists.” This particular way of framing youth – as pathological, troubled, and dysfunctional – shapes every aspect of juvenile detention facilities. Guards are trained to always be suspicious of the “pathological” juvenile population. They are instructed never to turn their backs to the youth, never to share personal stories, and to maintain their social distance, almost as if the youth are suffering from an infectious disease that threatens to contaminate all who come too close.

The training guards receive and their experience on the job, leads guards to believe that the youth are “pathological,” “untrustworthy,” “dangerous,” and “irresponsible.” These characteristics, guards argue, are part of the captive’s “essential” character (West and Fenstermaker 2002:207). Guards, then, interact with the youth with an eye toward these normative conceptions. Through these everyday interactions, juvenile facilities usher detained youth into a constructed category of

exclusion that marks the end of childhood and the birth of captivity – leaving Angel to question inside a small cage of cinder-block and steel, “when was I a kid?”

RESEARCH METHODS: WHEN THE RESEARCHER BECOMES ACCOUNTABLE

There is a contentious debate between ethnographers about the value of critical ethnography. On one side, more traditional social researchers, with a positivist bent, argue that the goal of the researcher is to “transcend personal biases, prejudices, and values and remain neutral toward their object of study” (Esterberg 2002). The goal, here, is to be an objective observer, not an active participant in the social worlds of the researched. On the other side, critical ethnographers argue that objectivity in the field is impossible and that the researchers have their own interests and biases. Thus, rather than claim to be “objective,” ethnographic researchers should instead be reflexive about how their social identity, their standpoint, shapes the research they produce (Twine 2000).

As a critical ethnographer, I worried deeply about how my status would affect my access to detention guards. Before I was a researcher, I served as a volunteer at Rosy Meadows. I was young, wore baggy pants, had a goatee, and was just starting graduate school. Later, I would become an ethnographic researcher. I began my fieldwork at Rosy Meadows in October 1998. I spent 20 hours a week for nearly two years inside the detention center. I ate the bland food, played cards, and attended church services. I followed both the youth and the guards in their daily routine. During the ethnographic component of my research, I spoke with 25 guards, asking them questions as they went about their work. This more informal way of speaking with guards proved highly effective, as guards were far more comfortable talking to me during their daily routine. I also formally interviewed guards in the summer of 2002. I interviewed an additional 8 detention guards and a detention supervisor. I obtained most of my interviews through convenience sampling. I simply sat outside the detention center and asked guards if I could interview them. I obtained 3 interviews through snowball sampling with the assistance of guards who helped set up these interviews. All formal interviews were recorded with the consent of the interviewees.

When I returned to Rosy Meadows in 2002, my former status as a volunteer helped me not only gain access to detention guards, but also aided the interview process. I had known many of the guards that I interviewed from when I was a volunteer. One guard, in particular, helped me set up interviews with guards I didn’t know. She knew me as trustworthy and as someone who would not talk to management. Without her help, I doubt I would have been able to interview as many guards as I did.

From my experiences as a volunteer and researcher, I knew what questions might raise caution among the guards and saved those for later in the research process. In addition, I knew many of the dilemmas guards faced in their daily routines and knew how to ask questions to elicit their feelings and personal stories about dealing with detained youth. This would have been difficult had I been an outsider with no familiarity of what goes on inside juvenile detention centers. In general, my experience in detention helped me formulate a series of open-ended questions that struck at the heart of many of the personal dilemmas guards face in their interactions, not only with captive children, but also with their co-workers and supervisors.

However, one of the difficulties I had in connecting with guards was the different ways we saw the children. As indicated above, many detention guards held a narrow view of detained children and embraced normative conceptions of the captive population as pathological and untrustworthy. I didn't see the children that way. Much of this had to do with where I came of age. Growing up in the inner city of Indianapolis, I had a number of friends who had been detained or incarcerated. I didn't know them as "criminals" or "delinquents;" I knew them as Charles from down the block on Forest Manor or Mike from around the corner on Meridian Street. I knew them as friends, and as such, I knew their lives were far more complex than the "criminal" labels could ever capture.

Aside from growing up with friends who were confined within the juvenile justice system, I also served as a mentor for two teenagers who were sent to youth camps. Angel, who was 15 when I first met him, lived around the corner from me, and I knew him and his family quite well. I knew Angel as more than just a blue uniformed captive; I knew him in other roles as well. He was a brother, a grandson, a damn good chess player, and someone who loved video games. I knew him as the young man who raced down the driveway to scoop a three year-old off the street, milliseconds before a car raced by. My experience as a mentor provided a more intimate picture of the lives of detained and incarcerated children, something that is often lacking in the conventional literature. This sometimes made it difficult for me to interact with detention guards whose only experience with the youth was within the confines of a juvenile detention center. Because guards are instructed not to intermingle with formerly detained children on the outside, they rarely see the youth in roles outside of those they play in detention, and this makes guards far more susceptible to stereotypes, as well as contributing toward their construction and maintenance.

Because I had a different view of the children than most guards, I had to be careful about who found out. As a volunteer, guards held me accountable to the way they saw the detainees, as "troubled youth" who don't take responsibility for their actions. Many guards simply

assumed that I saw the children in the same way, and it was difficult for me to manage their expectations of me. At times, they expected me to treat the youth as they did. And when I didn't, when I, for example, brought candy for the youth on Halloween, a couple of guards commented that I had been manipulated, hustled by youth addicted to candy. Guards often warned me that if I didn't watch out, the youth would take advantage of me. Many guards told me always to be suspicious of the youth. Even during my volunteer training, I was instructed to take off my gold jewelry before entering detention for fear that the youth might steal it. "If it's valuable, don't take it into detention," the volunteer coordinator warned.

On other occasions, detention supervisors held me accountable in more formal ways. One evening, Angel's grandfather came to visit him in detention. I was playing cards with Angel, and he asked if I wanted to join him for the visit. A guard escorted us down the hallway and up the stairs to the visiting room.

Angel's grandfather, Manuel, sat quietly, a black cowboy hat covered his head. He smiled when he saw us, slowly rising from his chair to greet us. He hugged Angel and shook my hand.

"Where's Big Mike?" Angel asked, looking for his uncle through the reinforced windows. Enough family members have been denied entrance into detention that Angel no longer expects to see anyone other than his grandfather. Nonetheless, Angel has not accepted the power of his keepers to sever his ties from his family.

"That's messed up, why won't they let me see him? Why won't they let him in?"

Manuel shook his head, angry, but trying not to show it. Angel walked to the window and tried to look out through the security doors at his uncle. "That's fucked up. Why won't they let me see him? He's my uncle. He's family."

A voice from the control booth blared over the speakers, "Angel, sit down. If you get up again, I'm going to cancel your visit."

The visiting room grew quiet; only the buzz from the fluorescent lights could be heard. Manuel rose slowly from his chair and limped over to the intercom. "Stop treating the kids like this. Keep treating them like this, and I'm going to get my lawyer."

A couple of the parents in the room cracked a smile, happy to hear somebody talking back. Manuel returned to the table, and we talked for about five minutes, until the family sitting next to the window left. Angel suggested that we sit by the window, so he could see his uncle on the other side. Manuel moved first, then I followed, and then Angel. That way they could not cancel our visit. It worked, but the guards in the control booth stared at us for the remaining 25 minutes. I knew I was in trouble.

After the visit, I made it down the stairs to control post #1 when the phone rang. The post staff called my name and instructed me to return to central control. There, I met

Kirsten Baker, a middle-aged supervisor. She held my volunteer card and driver's license in her hand, a subtle hint that I was supposed to leave.

"Angel knows better than to do that," Kirsten says abruptly with the tone of a parent. "He knows the rules. He was acting like a child."

As politely as possible, I explained to her that Angel was upset because he couldn't see his uncle, and that I didn't know about the rule to stay seated at all times in the visiting room. I apologized. Kirsten then told me that she has known Angel's grandfather for years, and that he wasn't a good role model. However, throughout our conversation, Kirsten kept confusing Angel's grandfather with his uncle, calling them both by the wrong name, a mistake that told me she didn't know Angel's family as much as she thought.

"Well, in the future, and I know it's not your responsibility, but if you can tell them not to move in the future, maybe tell them that's not a good idea. They should know, but when you moved with them, it made you look like you were colluding with them."

Throughout my time as a volunteer, my actions sometimes came under the gaze of detention guards and supervisors for breaking the rules and crossing the invisible line between guards and captive. In cases like the above, when I was suspected of colluding with the youth, I played the role of a naïve graduate student, as someone who was unaware of the detention rules. As much as possible, I avoided voicing my thoughts. My silence bothered me, a weight that felt like I was acquiescing to an unjust system. Deep down, I wanted to tell Kirsten that she was stereotyping Angel and his grandfather and that she didn't know them at all. I wanted to challenge their visiting policies as unnecessarily restrictive and punitive. But I didn't; instead, I played the role of an apologetic idiot, so that I could come back to the detention center another day. In this way, I was held in check and brought back in line with normative conceptions of detained children. My silence was secured.

My experiences taught me a lesson about the ways that guards themselves are held accountable and how they are pressured to behave in accordance with the normative conceptions of the captive population. In my interviews, I noticed that a handful of guards, especially those who had a rapport with the youth, often hid their feelings from their co-workers as well. One guard in particular disagreed with many of the rules he was expected to enforce. He routinely broke them. He let the youth stay up later at night, allowed them to have pencils in their cells so they could write letters, and he let them stay out in the courtyard for longer than the designated time. But, he did so in secret, always with an eye to what his co-workers might think if he was detected. He dimmed the lights when the children were out of their cells past their bedtimes, so that they couldn't be seen from the hallway. He made sure he had a friend at the post before he took the kids out to the courtyard for

extended periods of time. My involvement as a volunteer helped me see this aspect of a guard's social world and helped me remain sensitive to the pressures guards experience on the job, a sensitivity that would have been impossible had I taken a more "objective" and more detached approach to conducting research at Rosy Meadows.

CONSTRUCTING CAPTIVITY IN A JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER

The pressures that I felt as a volunteer to conform to a more punitive, detached way of interacting with the youth were similar to those experienced by detention guards. In this section, I discuss the experiences of juvenile detention guards: how they view the youth under their charge, the training they receive, the rules they enforce, and the punitive culture that develops among them. In doing so, I attempt to show how the functionaries of juvenile justice construct detained youth as "captives," as members of a disreputable category.

The Hood Complex: Framing Pathology

It's a quiet evening in Unit B. Devin, a tall detention guard in his early 30s, stands before a group of blue uniformed children. He's trying to teach them about responsibility, hard work, and making the right choices. Some of the teenagers look down, eyes focused on their orange sandals, while others watch Devin with keen interest. This formal activity is called structured learning, and all guards on the night shift are supposed to take an hour out of their day to teach the children life lessons, but few ever do.

"How many of you have heard about Mike Tyson?" Devin asks.

The children nod their heads, aware of Tyson's recent troubles with the law.

"I think he was set up!" Sean says, sitting at one of the circular tables with three other children.

"What?" Devin asks with raised eyebrows, "You don't think that he is responsible for what he did?"

"I'm not saying that," Sean answers, "I'm saying they made him out to be a demon. That is all you ever saw of him. He was a demon."

"Why are you making excuses for him?" Devin asks, his voice slightly agitated. "He is an abusive person. He abused his wife. He's hit people. He can't control himself. That's on him."

Slightly frustrated, Sean answers, "I'm not saying he didn't do those things. He probably did, and he was wrong. I'm saying that people made him out to be a demon, and he played right into that. He acted like they wanted him to act."

Devin pauses for a moment, and then with an air of condescension, says, “Man, you’ve got ‘hood complex’ don’t you?”

“I’m not in a gang. I’m not part of any hood,” Sean says, taking offense to Devin’s accusations.

“I’m not saying that,” Devin says, “Do you know what I mean when I say ‘hood complex’?”

“No, but I’m not in a gang.”

“Listen,” Devin says authoritatively, “I’m not saying you are. I’m just saying that you expect people to do for you without you giving anything back. You see, some of you are going to have to change your attitude. The outside world isn’t going to mess around with you. My people are in Texas. They worked hard. They pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps. It’s a struggle, yeah, but you have to make the right choices. You have to think of more than just yourself.”

Devin continues, his voice calmer and more sincere. “You’re gonna have to learn to play the game. You may have to change the way you dress. To get a job, you may have to wear a suit. I’ve had to wear a suit at times, you know. You’re gonna have to learn how to act in different places; how to have a positive attitude. Employers don’t like someone with a bad attitude. You’re gonna have to learn how to say ‘yes sir’ and ‘no sir,’ and stuff like that.”

“Let me ask you something. How many of you ever feel relaxed?” Devin asks.

“Man,” another blue-uniformed teenager says, “How can we be relaxed, we’re locked up?”

Devin’s use of the phrase “hood complex” to explain Sean’s behavior speaks volumes to how guards view detained children. In Devin’s mind, the blue uniformed children that sit before him lack the proper values to succeed in mainstream society. They have bad attitudes. They lack the values of hard work, responsibility, and, perhaps most important, respect for authority. When Sean offers a different account of Mike Tyson’s troubles with the law, when he suggests that the demonization of Mike Tyson in the media also played a part in his downfall, Devin quickly dismisses the teenager’s ideas. For Devin, the fact that Sean even mentions the demonization of Tyson is evidence of a tragic ailment infecting the children inside detention: the “hood complex” — a deeply entrenched, pathological value system to be found among children living in low-income inner-city neighborhoods.

This narrative reveals how guards construct children as members of a disreputable categorical identity, which legitimates the massive status change from child to captive. The social construction of the captive population relies on the production and maintenance of descriptive accounts of their behavior inside and outside detention walls (Heritage 1984). Devin deploys the “hood complex” as an account, an explanation for why the children are locked up. Devin doesn’t even know Sean’s name. But Sean wears a blue uniform, and as a result, Devin treats him like a captive, a criminal worthy of suspicion.

Devin is not alone in offering this account of the captive’s behavior. In my interviews, guards often voiced similar characterizations when describing detained children. The more sympathetic guards use words such as “troubled” or “at-risk,” while more punitive guards use words such as “baby con-artist,” “criminal,” and “assholes” to describe the detainees. Although there are gradations in how guards describe the children under their supervision, each word positions the problems squarely on the shoulders of the captive population. In his book, *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*, Heritage argues that the “social world, indeed what counts as social reality itself, is managed and acted upon through the medium of ordinary description” (Heritage 1984:137). Descriptive accounts not only help people make sense of their world, but also these accounts construct social reality. For detention guards, descriptive accounts like the “hood complex” help guards justify some of the more unsavory parts of their job, like forcing teenagers into cells the size of a small walk-in closet sometimes for days, even months at a time. Goffman argues that inside total institutions, descriptive accounts like the “Hood Complex” serve an important function:

Given the inmates whom they have charge, and the processing that must be done to them, the staff tends to evolve what may be thought of as a theory of human nature. As an implicit part of institutional perspective, this theory rationalizes activity, provides a subtle means of maintaining social distance from inmates and a stereotyped view of them, and justifies the treatment accorded them. (Goffman 1961:84)

The idea that captive children act from a defective value system travels far beyond the minds of individual guards and can be found deeply embedded in the very structure of the detention center. It can be found in the training that guards receive, the rules that guards enforce, and the everyday conversations that guards have with detainees and their co-workers. The assumption of pathology lies at the heart of the Rosy Meadows, and rationalizes how the children are treated, caged and punished.

“It’s Bad Everywhere:” Training to Assume Pathology

All guards are required to attend the two-week juvenile workers academy. The academy instructs guards on how to supervise confined youth, how to enforce the rules, and how to properly use physical force. Beyond the technical aspects of their employment, the training academy exposes guards to an institutional framework that provides a normative conception of the children as pathological, as internally deficient. In this section, I focus on how guards come face to face with an accounting framework that portrays children as pathological.

Alana is in her early 20s and identifies as Asian American. I talk with her after she finishes the training course at the detention academy. She describes her time at the academy as disturbing, because she felt that the recruits were trained to be overly hostile and aggressive toward the youth.

“When I was at the academy, we did this role playing game,” she says. “There were three kids in the shower, and you know, at the other institutions they have group showers. So, they asked, what would you do if the kids were flooding the showers and refused to come out? A couple of the staff from the other institution said, ‘You mace them.’ And everybody there was agreeing with them. I was like what about trying to talk them out. They said, ‘no, no don’t do that. It’s procedure to mace them. You got to follow procedure.’”

Before she attended the academy, Alana’s few months of employment at Rosy Meadows convinced her that the institution was particularly cold and hostile toward the youth. However, she thought Rosy Meadows was the exception. Now, she says, “I realize that it’s bad everywhere.” She looks frustrated, the look of somebody who is fighting against a system she feels powerless to change.

Alana’s experience at the training academy taught her not only how she is supposed to view the captive, but also how she is expected to treat them. When Alana says, “I realize that it’s bad everywhere,” she highlights how a punitive approach to managing the detained youth has become part of the normal operating procedure of juvenile justice institutions, so much so that those guards who question institutional procedures are brought back into line with instructions to “follow procedure,” even when it requires spraying teenagers with mace.

All new recruits attend this mandatory training academy during their six-month probationary period of employment. It is here where guards learn to view children as captives and treat them accordingly. Alana lends me a copy of the *Juvenile Workers Handbook*. I study its pages and find numerous warnings about the pathological behavior of detained and incarcerated youth. The Handbook, for example, describes captive children as sociopathic, and lists a series of steps to deal with them.

“The first step in preparing to deal with offenders,” the Handbook says, “is to understand the sociopathic personality.”³ The Handbook lists characteristics of the “sociopathic” personality: “irresponsible, self-centered, feels little or no guilt, sees others as objects for exploitation, compulsive liar, and strong drive for immediate gratification, adept at manipulation, has lack of insight into own behavior, uses others to meet own needs, lies about behavior.” The Handbook warns, “You must recognize that a majority of the offender population will be sociopathic to some degree.”⁴

There is also a section dedicated to warning guards about manipulative behavior: “FACT: You can be

manipulated by the helpful and friendly as well as the aggressive and demanding offender...Realize that inmates will take advantage of you if you let them...Understand the characteristics of a ‘criminal’”⁵

At the academy, guards are not only taught to view the detained children as pathological, manipulative, and untrustworthy, but also, given this “objective” reality, they are taught to treat captive children differently from how they would treat children outside the detention walls. The training academy teaches guards to be prepared at all times, to watch their back, and use physical force in ways that are only acceptable inside the detention walls. Guards learn how to use chemical sprays, self defense tactics, and take-down techniques, all of which are framed as normal and legitimate operating procedures when dealing with “potentially violent” detainees. “Safety and Security” is the mantra, and all forms of punishment -- five point restraints, chemical sprays, and take-down tactics—are justified under its banner.

At the academy, guards learn what kind of people the captives are, their personality, their behavior, and their disposition. In the process, children are reduced to the crimes they may or may not have committed. Other roles that the children play on the outside are erased; they are no longer brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, athletes or students; instead, they are captives. The idea that the captives are pathological is not just a belief or an attitude. Rather, it is an account of social reality that eclipses all other explanations (Heritage 1984:154). Missing from these descriptive accounts is a discussion about how detention policies may create the problems guards experience on their jobs. Take, for example, the claim that the detainees are “manipulative.” Manipulation is largely a product of the institutional environment. Detained youth are deprived of everything from toothpaste to hairbrushes to lotion. As a result, they must find ways to secure their daily necessities through what Erving Goffman calls “secondary adjustments,” or what detained children call “working the system” (Goffman 1961: 54). This, according to Goffman (1961), is not a product of some internal character flaw, but rather is the product of the institutional context in which this behavior occurs.

Although the institution trains its workforce to view the children as pathological, the training they receive is short-lived. For guards to adopt the normative conceptions of children as pathological, they must experience conflict in their everyday interactions with the children that legitimates and even justifies these normative conceptions. When the youth deploy “secondary adjustments” to cope with the institutional reality of confinement, when they flood their toilets, bang their fist against their doors, cuss at staff, guards point to these behaviors as emblematic of their essential character. Instead of seeing these behaviors as the product of confinement inside total institutions, guards treat these characteristics as though they are essential features of captive children. This process is only

amplified by the rules and punishments guards are expected to enforce.

Mice in a Maze: Detention Rules and Punishments

At Rosy Meadows, there is a body of rules that guards are expected to enforce. These rules govern everything from how the detainees walk down the hallway – hands to the sides, quiet, head forward – to how they wear their institutional garb: shirt tucked in, pants pulled up, and identification band on the right wrist. In all, there are over 50 rules that govern the captive's behavior inside detention. These rules are the backbone of what officials call the behavior management program — an incentive/punishment system viewed by detention officials as a “teaching tool...to change behavior.”⁶ Like the training of guards, the implicit assumption of the behavior management program is that the children are pathological in some form or another, which is manifested in their behavior – behavior that requires proactive institutional guidelines to transform it.

The behavior management program, also known as the “level system,” imposes an artificial hierarchy on the detained population, marking those with, and those without, certain privileges. Ideally, if detained children follow all the rules and obey the instructions of their keeper, they are rewarded with extra time out of their cells, later bedtimes, and allowed more telephone access privileges. If, however, they break institutional rules or defy the guard's orders, they may be punished with cell confinement, which in theory should last anywhere from eight hours to three days, but, in reality, may last for months. If detainees, for example, have a pencil in their cell, or if they possess more than five books, they may be locked in their cells for 16 hours. If they tuck their pants into their socks, if they are found with sagging county blues, they may be locked in their cells for two days. If they flood their cells, they may be locked in their cells for a minimum of three days, with additional punishment depending on how they behave while confined to their cells. I have, on two separate occasions, observed children confined to their cells for a period of three months for 23 hours a day.

The rules and punishments are the material manifestation of normative conceptions of detained children as pathological and are situated in a juvenile justice framework that relies heavily on punishment to impose behavioral conformity. Many guards believe that detained children can't be trusted, and this assumption shapes their interactions with captive youth. For example, when escorting the children down the hallway, guards never turn their backs to the detainees. Or when issuing pencils, guards always count to make sure they have all the pencils before the children return to their cells. Guards rarely leave their personal items out in the open. Instead, they make sure they are safely locked away. Guards not

only believe that the captive can't be trusted, but also they identify a series of behavior problems that are believed to be part of the captive's essential character. The children are viewed as behavior problems, because, first, they don't respect adult authority, second, they don't respect the rules, and third, they don't take responsibility for their behavior. Many guards believe that these attitudes, or as Devin calls it, “the Hood complex,” are the primary obstacles blocking the captive's entrance into a more middle-class style of life and a life free of crime. From the official perspective, the key to managing detained children is to change their behavior by subjecting them to a rigid set of rules and punishments.

The rules, however, place guards in a precarious position. Given that the rules are grounded in an assumption of pathology, the children experience the rules as overly punitive and unjust and are likely to resist them. The rules, because of their punitive nature, pit guards against captives. After all, a guard's job is to control children via small cinderblock cells, which is not likely to be viewed favorably by the children who must figure out how to cope with the boredom, anxiety, and frustration associated with long periods of confinement. If a guard enforces the rules as they are supposed to, their days will be characterized by widespread conflict with the detainees, and it is this conflict and the behavior that emerges from it, that ultimately confirms for the guards that the children are pathological, and deserving of punishment.

“I Have to Be Mean All the Time:” The Development of a Punitive Culture

I have focused on the training guards receive and the rules they enforce to illustrate how normative conceptions of the captive population as pathological are embedded within the social structure of the institution. The institution, however, does not exist outside of the people who carry out its policies and practices. One of the side effects of the “get tough on crime” movement is that it has radically changed the interactions between detention guards and youth. As juvenile institutions eschewed rehabilitation for punishment, a punitive culture developed among guards. A guard's worth is often based on their ability to hold the line against the captive population. In the next section, I examine the pressure guards feel to embody a more punitive approach by focusing on the experience of two rookie guards: Jennifer and Alana.

Jennifer looks exhausted. She leans against the control booth in the hallway, talking to the guard inside. All the children in her unit are locked down. Some stand at their doors, quietly staring out of narrow windows. Others communicate to one another through the cracks of their doors.

“What's goin' on?” I ask Jennifer.

“Argh, they’re bad today,” she says, looking back into the Unit. “I don’t know what’s wrong with them. They’re really acting up. It’s crazy in there.”

At this point, Jennifer has been working at the detention center for nearly a year and feels she has lost control of her unit. The children often argue with her over the way she enforces the rules. When we are an earshot away, the children often tell me that she is always “power-tripping.” Most of the children don’t like her, and a few hate her with a passion that only the confined can understand. So when she orders the children to their cells, some move at a snail’s pace, others bang on their doors, and a few cuss at her – anything to make her day a living hell. Jennifer is at the end of her rope. She tells me that she’s thinking about finding another job.

A few weeks later, I catch up with Jennifer again, and she still looks tired.

“Are you still thinking about leaving?” I ask.

“Oh yeah! I don’t think I can take much more of this. I have to be mean all the time. I’m just not like this. This isn’t me. I’m not a mean person, but with this job, you have to be. I thought I’d be able to do more one-on-one with the kids, but most of my day is spent yelling at them. I just don’t like that. That’s not the way I am.”

“What is it that makes you feel like you have to be mean?” I ask.

“It’s the kids. You see them. You know, if you don’t have control, if you’re nice to them, they’ll walk all over you. When I first came in here, I tried to be nice, and tried to be lax on the rules, but they took advantage of me. So, slowly I had to toughen up.”

And toughen up is exactly what Jennifer did. When she works the units, I see many of the children locked behind steel doors, punished for what the children see as petty infractions. One child, for example, spent a day in his cell for, in Jennifer’s words, “looking funny.” Jennifer rarely talks to the youth when problems arise. Instead, she locks them away. In return, the captives rebel by banging on their doors, cursing at her, and in some cases, flooding their toilets. These acts of resistance turn Jennifer’s day into a living hell. She is always putting out fires. To escape the chaos of her unit, she takes excessively long breaks that last for hours. This, of course, fans the flames of juvenile rebelliousness, because while on break, the children wait in their cells until she returns, adding more time to the 14 hours a day they already spend in their cells.

I talked to Jennifer when she first started working the units. “It’s an easy job,” she said. “I like just talking to the kids, and trying to help them out.” At the time, Jennifer was far more lenient with the youth. She bent the rules and let them stay out past their bedtime, so she could talk with them one-on-one. But, this raised the suspicion of her co-workers, who felt she was “too soft” when dealing with the captive. Her co-workers began to spread rumors that she was afraid of the youth, and that she couldn’t handle her job. “She won’t last very long,” a few guards told me,

when she wasn’t around. Her co-workers began to police her and watch her every move.

“The problem,” Jennifer lamented, “is that there are people in your business a lot of the time. Like, they’ll come into your hall and tell you that your kids should be down and stuff like that. A lot of it, I think, is because I’m new.”

On many occasions, I observed staff invade her unit, sometimes yelling at her to enforce the rules. One evening, I was playing cards with a few teenagers, but our game was drowned out by loud thumping sounds of a young man’s fist banging against his cell door. He was angry because Jennifer punished him with two hours of cell confinement for dancing in the hallway on his way to church. Soon after, one of Jennifer’s co-workers barged into the unit and questioned her.

“Who is that banging on the door,” Tyree, a short, stocky guard asks.

“It’s Huey. He’s mad because I gave him hours,” Jennifer answers.

“You need to give him more hours,” Tyree admonishes with the condescending tone of a parent reprimanding a child. “I wouldn’t tolerate that.”

Jennifer deals with these kinds of invasions on a regular basis. Her co-workers, usually male, scrutinize her ability to enforce the rules, often in front of the children. Jennifer is certainly not alone. I talk to other guards who tell me the same thing. Alana also experiences pressure from her co-workers to enforce the rules by the book. One day, for example, I’m sitting at the table with Alana and two other children, playing cards. Meanwhile, a couple of detainees challenge one another to a friendly push-up contest. Huey, a 16 year old, takes off his shirt to flex his muscles while he tries to out-do his competition. Wally, Jennifer’s co-worker, who is guarding the adjacent unit, stands in the hallway and stares at the children as they compete for who can do the most pushups. Wally shifts his eyes surreptitiously between the shirtless detainee and Alana. Finally, he walks into the unit and says in a deep authoritative voice, “Put your shirt on! Put your shirt on!” Huey looks startled, and then stares at Wally with the eyes of a hawk. Wally and Huey are at a standoff, eyes blazing, until Alana, who has a rapport with Huey, walks up and politely tells him, “Put your shirt on, please.” Huey follows Alana’s orders without the cold stare, and without altercation. Wally leaves without acknowledging Alana’s presence.

On another day, Tyree charges into Alana’s unit. He sees Andre, a 17 year-old, on the phone. “Why are you on the phone?” he yells at the young man, who had been waiting for three days to talk to his daughter. “It’s not the weekend,” he shouts, and then, in mid-sentence, he stops and looks at Mario, a 16 year-old, who’s sitting quietly at the table. “What the hell are you doing out of your cell? I gave you hours. What are you doing out of our cell?”

Tyree's tirade turns to Alana, "What is he doing out of his cell?"

Alana looks stunned, speechless.

"What do you care?" another detainee interrupts, almost protectively.

"Do you have a problem? Do you want hours, too?" Tyree shouts, veins beginning to pop from his forehead. Tyree then leaves the unit and walks down to the supervisor's office to complain that Alana is not enforcing the rules.

A few weeks later, Alana tells me that Tyree thinks she's afraid of the kids. "I mean, what does he want me to do, yell at the kids for every little thing they do? From now on, I'm just going to keep to myself," Alana says, shaking her head. "This all makes me think that maybe I'm in the wrong place." Alana has been talking to other women, and they tell her to watch her back. One woman, for example, says other guards did the same thing to her until she wrestled a kid to the ground. They left her alone after that, convinced she was tough enough for the job. Ironically, a week later, Alana, too, responded to a fight and had to physically take down the youth. Later in the day, Tyree stopped by to pat her on the back, saying "Nice Job."

New guards, especially women, experience this kind of harassment on a daily basis. Men experience harassment as well, but not to the same degree as women. For example, Jonathan, a guard in his 20s, tells me that when he first started working, a lot of the older guards picked on him because he was young and fresh out of college. They thought he wouldn't be able to handle the job. For Jonathan, the harassment didn't end until he challenged one of the guards to a fight in the parking lot. The guard backed down and never said a word to Jonathan again. For guards like Alana and Jennifer, however, challenging Tyree or Wally to a fight in the parking lot is not an option. There is an unstated belief in detention that men are far more equipped to handle the job than are women, because men have greater physical strength to control the captive population. In an institution that relies heavily on punishment and control, women are perceived to be at a disadvantage, because of their "essential" nurturing qualities, qualities that render them "too soft" for the job. Dana Britton, author of *At Work in the Iron Cage* finds a similar hegemonic masculinity in adult prisons.

The ability to use physical means to control violence is asserted as an inherent requirement of the job, one that sets the limits of what women are able to contribute. This kind of categorical assertion relies fundamentally on essentialist notions about masculinity and femininity. These ideas are key components in the prevailing form of occupational masculinity that holds men, strictly by virtue of being male, are better able to deal with inmate violence than women. (Britton 2003:171)

Listening to Jennifer and Alana, I realize how the aggressive treatment of children is not only codified in the rule books and the training that guards receive, but also is an important part of the hyper-masculine culture among guards, a culture that is reproduced and maintained through interactions that place a high value on the ability to use of physical force and violence. Guards gain acceptance from their co-workers by displaying their toughness – a peacock-like ruffling of feathers that proves they can handle their jobs and enforce the rules. Guards, like Alana, prove their strength by using physical force against detained children. Here, the bodies of captive children become the stage where guards act out their toughness and prove their worthiness as detention guards. Britton writes: "In their early days on the job, all officers must prove themselves, not only to inmates, but also to coworkers and supervisors. In a men's prison, the key to accomplishing this is demonstrating the ability to handle violence" (Britton 2003:169).

Although all new guards experience pressure to display their toughness, women experience far more pressure than their male counterparts. Women experience a dual accountability. At once, their male co-workers hold them accountable to hegemonic ideals of masculinity and femininity, while simultaneously holding them accountable to their status as detention guards. In a masculine culture, the former is viewed as a disadvantage to one's ability to perform the responsibilities of the latter. As such, guards like Jennifer and Alana are held accountable to normative conceptions of the detained population and are pressured to display their toughness, to enforce the rules, and take control of their unit. Guards are conscious of how their actions are assessed by their co-workers, and as a result, guards begin to enforce the rules by the book and embrace a punitive demeanor to show they have control over captive children.

The pressure to conform to institutional expectations sets in motion a cyclical process that ultimately confirms the image guards hold of the captive population. In her early days on the job, Jennifer didn't have as many problems with the detained youth. She even claimed, "It's an easy job." It wasn't long, however, before Jennifer caved into the pressure from her co-workers. Afraid that she would be viewed as "too soft," Jennifer started to yell at the captives and enforce countless petty rules. She no longer talked with the youth one-on-one, and she became more distant in her interactions. As a result, the youth lashed back with creative means of resistance, like dragging their feet, pounding their fist against their steel doors, and flooding their toilets. This creative resistive response only reaffirmed Jennifer's belief that the children are pathological or, as Devin says, inflicted with a bad case of the "hood complex." This vicious cycle explains how Jennifer, in a matter of months, transformed from a guard who loved working with children to a guard who sees the

captives as pathological, as crazy, and deserving of punishment.

The accounts by Jennifer and Alana expose how normative conceptions of captive youth are maintained, reproduced, and sometimes challenged in the everyday interactions of guards. Guards work in an institutional context that has been heavily shaped by the “get tough” on crime movement, and consequently, they experience a great deal of pressure to conform to institutional expectations to treat the youth as captives.

Everything about the institution—from physical structure of the buildings to the way guards are trained, to the rules and punishments they are expected to enforce, to the culture of guards—pressures guards to adopt punitive approaches to working with the detained children, an approach that ultimately confirms how guards think about the youth. As I described in this article, the normative conceptions guards hold of detained children are not only the product of the detention structure, they are also, in part, the cause. Yes, the material realities of the detention structure – the training, the rules, and the punishments – constrain detention guards in multiple ways. But guards still have agency. It is through their daily interactions with captives and co-workers, in the context of the historical and ideological framework of U.S. juvenile justice, that guards perform much of the institutional work by policing one another and pressuring their co-workers to adopt aggressive, punitive approaches to interacting with captive children. Responding to these pressures, many guards like Jennifer, begin to enforce the rules by the book, embracing a punitive demeanor to show they have control over their units. In doing so, detained children resist their punitive attempts to establish control and deploy the “weapons of the weak,” like dragging their feet, banging against walls, and flooding their toilets (Scott 1985). A battle ensues between keepers and kept – a battle that reaffirms for the guards that the captives have distinctive, even immutable, characteristics, which must be controlled and contained. This causes the children to become more deeply suspicious of the guards and the justice system that employs them. It is through this everyday process that guards become purveyors of an institutional logic that ultimately constructs the children as members of a categorical identity that is deserving of the punishment they receive.

This, perhaps, explains why only a few guards at Rosy Meadows work directly with captive children. Most sit behind their desks and limit their interactions with captive children. The children often tell me that there are only a handful of guards who talk with and listen to them. A lot of guards agree. Tommy, an Asian American detention guard, speaks about his co-workers: “Many are so institutionalized, if a kid asks to see a nurse, their first assumption is that he’s faking it and that he’s alright. They’re not interested at all in the kids. As far as getting to know the kids, I only know of about 3 or 5 staff that have the motivation to invest their time with the kids.” The

other guards, he says, have burned out and have given up on the children. “You come to work, put in your hours and go home.” My research tragically suggests that at Rosy Meadows, the ideals of rehabilitation are dead. Not a single guard I interviewed believed that Rosy Meadows provided a rehabilitative environment for detained children.

Confronting an institution that is structured around punishment, even those guards who desire to work with the children find that their efforts receive little reward from their superiors and are often discouraged by their co-workers. Speaking to the how juvenile institutions push guards in a punitive direction, Miles explains, “the chances of being able to retain the good part of what you brought in with your creative thoughts, your enthusiasm, and all your love of humanity, whatever it might be, I think you would find that in most cases you’d feel like you got hit by a truck...the whole system is such that it would tax you beyond your resources.”

CONCLUSION: THE TRAGEDY OF CAPTIVITY

During my first few months as a volunteer at Rosy Meadows, I always left the building with a terrible feeling in my stomach. There was little in the academic literature that could prepare me for such a harsh reality. Inside the detention walls were not the “offenders,” “delinquents,” or “criminals” that are mentioned in much of the literature. Instead, I saw young men and women trying to make sense of their world, faced with days, months, and sometimes years locked into a brutal time warp that many felt robbed them of their childhood. It wasn’t easy to see so many children locked up in 7’ X 8’ cells. It was even more difficult to see how most detention guards treated the youth, as if they were an entirely different class of human beings, undeserving of basic human rights. Perhaps this shouldn’t be surprising given that the United States has joined only Somalia in refusing to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child.⁷

One of the most difficult aspects of conducting research at Rosy Meadows was how normal it all seemed. Most within the institution went about their work as though holding hundreds of children in cells was a natural state of affairs, the only logical way to manage and control “delinquents.” How does the caging of adolescents become a “natural” state of affairs? After all, locking children in cells is not acceptable in most social contexts; in fact, it is illegal. Imagine the criminal charges parents would face if they locked a child in a closet for 23 hours a day. Or picture the public outcry school administrators would face if teachers locked their students in school bathrooms.

The only way for the caging of adolescents to become “normal,” is if the children are framed as different from all other children, and therefore deserving of such treatment.

The media, of course, does much of this work, particularly with the rise of the “super-predator” myth, popular in the 1990s, that warned of skyrocketing crime perpetrated by a new type of youthful offender (Hancock 2000). In this article, however, I argued that detention centers have become the primary location in which children are created different and unequal.

One of the limitations of this article is that it focuses exclusively on detention guards and the punitive environment in which they work. In future articles based on the same research, I will turn my attention to how detained youth experience juvenile detention centers and how they respond in the way they are framed by detention officials. My research suggests that incarcerated young men often internalize the stereotypical images detention guards hold of them. Some think heavily about suicide, while others lash out and resist the authority of their keepers, only to be pushed deeper and deeper into the juvenile justice and, later, criminal justice system.

This article is also limited to what happens inside detention walls. Tragically, I suspect that the stigmatizing mark of captivity does not end once the children are released. My continued conversations with formerly detained and incarcerated youth lead me to believe that the experiences of confinement, as well as the stigma of captivity, continue to shape their interactions with more than just the juvenile justice system. Victor Rios, in his article, “The Hyper-Criminalization of Black and Latino Male Youth in the Era of Mass Incarceration,” contends that formerly incarcerated young men experience hyper-criminalization, not only from juvenile justice institutions, but also “from non-criminal justice structures traditionally intended to nurture: the school, the family, and the community center” (Rios 2006: 40). As formerly detained and incarcerated young men navigate their lives outside detention walls, they often find that the ghost of captivity continues to haunt their life opportunities.

Shortly before his 18th birthday and his release from a state youth camp, Angel sent me a deeply reflective letter:

Chris, I want to ask you what you think of me as a person? I’m gonna be honest with you, there are two sides to me, which you probably already know. There is the side I was born with, the good side that has dreams. Then there’s the other side, the side that grew up in a cell, the side that’s ready to explode...Bro, I’m almost 18 now, and I’m afraid that I’ll commit another offence and do some time in the pen. I’m afraid to leave this place because of the many chances I’ll have to commit another felony. I don’t know what side will win. It’s fucked up, my time in juvenile hasn’t prepared me for the outside, it’s only prepared me for the pen.

A couple of years later, Angel passed away in a car accident. Nearly a third of his life had been spent locked away, mostly inside a small 7 X 8 cage. I wept for weeks and still feel the pain and loss as I type, four years after his death. The consequences of Angel’s story and the confinement of thousands of children are heartbreaking, not only for those condemned to captivity, but also for those detention guards, who must ultimately come to terms with the fact that their jobs do little to help the children they deal with on a daily basis. The story of Rosy Meadows is not simply about an ineffective institution that fails to rehabilitate children. It is a far more catastrophic story about how juvenile justice institutions and their functionaries construct children as captives and in the process, rob sections of an entire generation of their childhood.

Endnotes

¹ Most juvenile detention centers use a number of words to describe staff that supervises detained youth. Some institutions use “Juvenile Service Officer,” “Juvenile Supervision Officer,” or “Juvenile Rehabilitation Officer.” Rather than reify the official story of rehabilitation promoted by juvenile institutions, I intentionally use the word “guard,” which is a more accurate description of their work. Not one guard I interviewed believed that the youth received any form of rehabilitation while in detention. Although most guards desired to develop a more positive rapport with the youth, most felt that their role had been reduced to assuring the “safety and security” of the institution, which is similar to that found among guards in adult prisons. Fictional names have been used for all of the guards referred to by name in this article.

² I acknowledge that these differences are also maintained and reaffirmed in the interactions between children as well, but the data I present here are limited to the interactions between guards, and between guards and children.

³ Criminal Justice Training Commission, Juvenile Workers Academy, Part II, Supervision.

⁴ Criminal Justice Training Commission, Juvenile Workers Academy, Part II, Supervision.

⁵ Criminal Justice Training Commission, Juvenile Workers Academy, Part II, Supervision.

⁶ Rosy County Department of Youth Services, Level System Handbook, 6: “The underlying concept of the level system program is that of behavior modification. This is viewed as a teaching tool using reinforcement to change behavior”

⁷ Amnesty International (1998).

References

- Amnesty International. 1998. *Betraying the Young: Children in the US Justice System*. London, UK: Amnesty International.
- Austin, James and John Irwin. 2001. *It's About Time: America's Imprisonment Binge*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Becker, Howard. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Britton, Dana. 2003. *At Work in the Iron Cage: The Prison as a Gendered Organization*. New York: New York University Press.
- DiIulio, J.J. (1995, November 27). The Coming of the Super-Predator. *The Weekly Standard*, p. 23.
- Esterberg, Kristin. 2002. *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Fenstermaker, Sarah and Candace West. 2002. "'Doing Difference' Revisited: Problems, Prospects, and the Dialogue in Feminist Theory." Pp. 205-216 in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*, edited by S. Fenstermaker and C. West. New York: Routledge.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1956. "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies." *American Journal of Sociology* 61:420-424.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Hancock, LynNell. 2000. "Framing Children in the News: The Face and Color of Youth Crime in America." Pp. 78-98 in *The Public Assault on America's Children: Poverty Violence and Juvenile Injustice*, edited by V. Polakow. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Inderbitzin, Michelle. 2006. "Lessons from a Juvenile Training School: Survival and Growth." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 21:7-26.
- Krisberg, Barry. 2005. *Juvenile Justice: Redeeming Our Children*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Statistical Briefing Book. Online. Available: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/court/qa06301.asp?qaDate=2005>. Released on September 12, 2008.
- Pager, Devah. 2007. *Marked: Race, Crime and Finding Work in Era of Mass Incarceration*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rios, Victor. 2006. "The Hyper-Criminalization of Black and Latino Male Youth in the Era of Mass Incarceration." *Souls* 8:40-54.
- Twine, France Winddance. 2000. "Racial Ideologies and Racial Methodologies." Pp. 1-34 in *Racing Research, Researching Race: Methodological Dilemmas in Critical Race Studies*, edited by F.W. Twine and J. Warren. New York: New York University Press.
- Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2002. "From Slavery to Mass Incarceration." *New Left Review* 13:41-60.
- West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society* 9:8-37.
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 2002. "Doing Gender." Pp. 3-24 in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*, edited by S. Fenstermaker and C. West. New York: Routledge.
- Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

About the author:

Christopher Bickel is an Assistant Professor at California Polytechnic State University. He is both an academic and prison rights activist. Aside from his research on juvenile institutions, he has worked with the formerly incarcerated in drug rehabilitation centers, sober living homes, and a halfway house.

Contact information: Christopher Bickel, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Social Science, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407; Phone: (805)756-2097; Fax: (805)756-7019; Email: cbickel@calpoly.edu