

# ChrisFOR REVIEW

📅 Thu, 8/5 8:54AM ⌚ 1:16:46

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

youth, reviewers, paper, juvenile justice system, juvenile justice, facilities, residential facilities, terms, point, happening, bit, journal, adult, process, juvenile, system, reviews, important, research, disproportionate minority contact

## SPEAKERS

Jenn Tostlebe, Chris Sullivan, Jose Sanchez



Jenn Tostlebe 00:14

Hi, everyone, welcome back. My name is Jenn Tostlebe.



Jose Sanchez 00:18

And I'm Jose Sanchez.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:20

And we are the co-hosts of the Criminology Academy where we are criminally academic. In this episode we're speaking with Professor Christopher Sullivan about Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, DMC or the disproportionate minority contact, as well as being a journal editor.



Jose Sanchez 00:37

Chris Sullivan is the incoming director and professor of the School of Criminal Justice and Criminology at Texas State University. Prior to that, he was professor in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati, serving as Director of Graduate Studies for several years. He received his doctorate degree from Rutgers University in 2005. His main

research interests include developmental and life course criminology, juvenile delinquency and prevention policy, and research and analytic methods. Dr. Sullivan will publish juvenile risk and needs assessment, theory, research, policy and practice with Rutledge press, and fall 2021. He is also the author of taking juvenile justice seriously developmental insights and system challenges, which was recognized as outstanding contribution by the American Society of Criminology's Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology in 2020. Professor Sullivan has been named a 250th anniversary Fellow at Rutgers University, and a fellow of the graduate school at the University of Cincinnati, based on his research, and has received award recognition for his mentoring and teaching of graduate students and academic service. Professor Sullivan has been co editor of the Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency since 2017. That is quite a list of impressive accomplishments. Chris, congratulations on your award for your book, which you very kindly sent me a copy. I have it sitting on my desk right now. And thank you so much for joining us.



Chris Sullivan 02:12

Yeah, thank you both for having me. It's really a pleasure to be with you, Jenn and Jose. I've followed some of the different episodes that have come out since you started this podcast. And so I'm really happy to be here, and be among the list of guests you've had.



Jenn Tostlebe 02:26

Yeah, we are very excited to have you on as well. So to give kind of a brief overview, as usual of this episode, we'll start with a section talking about Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, as well as the disproportionate minority contact. And then we're going to dive into a paper that Chris is a co author on on disproportionate experiences in custody. And then last but not least, we're going to ask Chris some questions about being a journal editor, as well as kind of tips and tricks for writing reviews, as well as responding to editors as an author. So Jose, I will let you get started.



Jose Sanchez 03:07

Okay, so Chris, is his customer in this podcast? We're about to hit you with probably a question that is maybe a little too big, but we're going to ask it anyways. So we want to start off with, aside from the obvious of juvenile, the juvenile justice system dealing with adolescents, and sometimes young adults, people in their very early 20s. What are some of the key characteristics that differentiate the juvenile justice system from the adult system?



Chris Sullivan 03:38

Yeah, I think that that is a big, big question. But it is an important question in terms of setting a context for any discussion, really, of the juvenile justice system, because we tend to be a little bit more familiar with the criminal justice system for adults, even those of us who have studied crime and criminal justice for years, you know? I think the first thing I would say is that these things exist on a spectrum. So it's not necessarily the case that there's no, you know, there's no degree of either punishment or rehabilitation orientation in the adult versus the juvenile system. So, in other words, you know, while the juvenile justice system is going to tend to a bit more of a rehabilitative focus, a bit more emphasis on the individual youth and their development, kind of, in addition to, you know, community safety, applying sanctions for offenses that have been committed, while the adult system, because only could be viewed as more punitive, even though it has some rehabilitative features in terms of treatment, whether someone's in the community being supervised or whether they're in prison or jail, where treatment services, excuse me, are made available. So, you know, in terms of that spectrum, in terms of that mix of rehabilitation and punitiveness, it's going to skew little bit more towards rehabilitative approach in the juvenile system. Now with that, you know, you're going to have sort of different language that's often used. So for example, rather than being found guilty, youth would be adjudicated delinquent. So, you know, the idea is going to be to not be quite as rigid in the way in which we talk about cases, the way that we talk about youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system. So those are going to be some features, obviously, in the juvenile justice system, there's going to be potentially other players that come into the process. So, for example, family engagement may be an important aspect of juvenile justice processing treatment, whereas, you know, with the adult system, that's going to be less a point of, point of emphasis. So, I think that both in terms of sort of their operate, sorry, their goals, and then also their operations. There are some differences, maybe not, not to the extent that each excludes elements of the other when we start talking about kind of being punitive or being rehabilitative, but the sort of the emphasis, and the degree to which those are a focus in dealing with cases is going to be different across the the two systems.



Jose Sanchez 06:13

Right. And, and even our cases, are they always, what's the word not public? There's probably a much better better way to say that. But...



Chris Sullivan 06:24

Yeah, I mean, I think generally, there are some protections in the juvenile justice system in terms of not making cases public. You know, however, I think there are instances where

cases and hearings are opened up. The other place where it can become where there's been a bit of movement and discussion in recent decades is really with respect to records, and whether or not juvenile records kind of carry forward or are sealed. So, I think that's another instance of, is there a collateral consequence of committing and delinquent act that carries forward into adult, into adulthood? And there's sort of some varying, I think, varying perspectives on that, and then also legislation on that. But generally speaking, the hearings and the proceedings of a juvenile court are going to be more closed than the adult, the adult process would be.



Jenn Tostlebe 07:16

So over time, I know there's been shifts in what the juvenile justice system looks like, I mean, going way back, they were basically treated the same as adults. And then it changed and then the get tough era came in, and now we're kind of shifting back to rehabilitation. So, we have these, you know, big developments or impacts in juvenile justice. Another one would be like the super predator theory, or the myth that, you know, was largely propagated by the media that theorize there are like these groups of juveniles who are willing to commit violent acts with no remorse. And so can you give us a few examples of these big shifts within the juvenile justice system? And whether we're still feeling their impact?



Chris Sullivan 08:02

Yeah, absolutely. And I think that's a good question. And a nice, it's a nice sort of place to kind of get into how the process of juvenile justice policy and practice has worked over time. And so, so, yeah, I mean, I think Bernard and Kurlychek in their 2010 book, talk about the cycle of juvenile justice. And I think we see these cycles and a lot of different public policy sort of discussions and debates, but they really sort of pointed it out in the context of juvenile justice. And so, you know, they were really remarking on the fact that you would go through these periods of time where treatment would be an emphasis, and then there would be, you know, maybe some watershed case, or some trend that emerges or seemingly emerges. And then there becomes this kind of, if not a panic, at least this kind of push to modify how things are working. And, and Jenn, you just pointed out one, that that's obviously kind of a major factor in juvenile justice policy and practice over the last few decades. So that idea that in the 19, 1980s, 1990s, that crime rates and violence rates, especially for youth and young adults, were really growing exponentially, and that there were these kids that, you know, there's really nothing you could do, except lock them up in order to, you know, ensure that society was not victimized over and over and over again. Which, again, is largely been, you know, seen to

be incorrect over time. You know, so that's an example just in a sense that it triggered a number of different acts in juvenile justice policy, whether that was expanding laws and creating new mechanisms to transfer cases from the juvenile justice system to the adult system, kind of greater levels of incarceration within the juvenile justice system. So, more use of state residential facilities, you know, attempting to or gradually kind of shrinking the distance between what we just talked about as far as those distinctions between the juvenile justice system and the adult system. And so those kinds of trends of happen, and in sort of the 80s, and 90s. And that sort of largely left us with a system kind of at the turn of the century, where a lot of youth a lot of youth were in, in residential facilities legislatively, and even judicially, there was a lot more emphasis, certainly than there had been in the past on sort of punitive kind of sanctions, even some of the, even some of the more treatment oriented and community based sanctions for youth, you know, kind of took on some of the language, the adult court. So for example, you know, juvenile accountability grants were given and in terms of ensuring that youth were being monitored very closely, there were certain sets of steps which, you know, in and of themselves may have been reasonable steps, coupled with a lot of other different initiatives really kind of came as this package, to try to toughen up the court in some ways. And so, when we reached, you know, what was about the, you know, 100 years of the juvenile court, at least, you know, the Chicago initiative, there was a lot of discussion about whether we should abolish the court because it had become so much like the adult system in people's minds and in some of the analysis, and so well, like Barry Feld, prominent juvenile justice scholar argued for, you know, a certain form of abolition at that point. And, so I think what what's happened is that that's sort of one watershed kind of over the last four years. And then, you know, since the late 90s, and early 2000s, we have seen a lot more of a shift back to, alright, are there ways to sort of have this kind of accountability mechanism as one part of the the juvenile justice process, but then also have more effective treatment have a set of alternatives that would allow for local agencies, predominately kind of county juvenile courts, to send fewer youth to, to state residential facilities and house more of them in either community based facilities or have some alternative diversion programs, other treatment programs, coupled with community monitoring, that would be effective. So I think that's kind of where we're at now. So, we're sort of back in this place, as you mentioned, right, where we kind of swing back and forth. What's going to be interesting probably is, you know, whether or not we see and I think there's, you know, I believe you've had some folks on the podcast that have talked a bit about the current kind of trends that we're seeing in US cities, and you wonder about the degree to which some of that carries into, depending on the composition of who's involved in those rises in violence, whether that changes some of the disposition towards juvenile justice, policy and practice. So, we're seeing we're seeing some of that. One other thing I mentioned, too, that's happened more recently, is legislative and judicial shifts in terms of recognizing, you know, Jose mentioned it upfront the obvious difference between

adolescents and children and adults. But, you know, I think what happened in the 1990s is some of that started to become a little more blurred. And, you know, some of those barriers were knocked down. So, I think what we've seen both because of some of the research that's come out around youth development, and some judicial cases, that pushed a bit more to treat kids like kids, and then also some initiatives legislatively, and from kind of activism and lobbying to raise the age of adult jurisdiction over, over youth cases. And so we've seen some of that over the last are a lot of that over the last 20 years or so too, and, that sort of has shifted, shifted the the juvenile system, a bit more towards the evidence base, a bit more towards youth development. But, one of the things I think that's that's notable is actually the most recent Supreme Court case, and there's not that many over the years that deal with juvenile justice, but one that recently came down in April actually sort of rolled back some of the protections that came out of the the period from about 2005 to about 2015 or so. And, so it'll be interesting to see whether or not the courts and legislatures start kind of moving back toward a bit more of what we saw in the 19, 1990s. Now, obviously, hopefully not hopefully, there's more sort of discussion to be had there. But it's worth watching at this point.



Jenn Tostlebe 14:46

Is that the court case? You're talking about the life without parole Miss...Mississippi.



Chris Sullivan 14:51

Jones versus Mississippi? Yeah. So it is and it was it was sort of related to Miller v. Alabama and a couple of others that occurred, you know, maybe 10 years ago or so, yeah, that that one kind of rolled back a bit of what, you know what had been happening previously. So, as we've seen changes in the Supreme Court, this is an example at least, I guess it's applicable to juvenile justice of a place where some of the shifts in the court may have had an impact on that decision. And what we saw sort of in terms of the tendency, or the trend that was happening from 2005, on seems at least in that particular case to have been stopped at that point.



Jenn Tostlebe 15:32

Yeah. When you mentioned that the age of a juvenile has been increasing kind of over time. And then you mentioned Barry Feld and made me think of his idea of, I think he called it the youth discount where it's kind of like the age gradient. So if you're 14, you get a lesser sentence than a 15 year old, etc. What's your take on a concept like that?



15:58

Yeah, so and he talked about it again, and some of that work, I mentioned, where the idea would be in To be fair, you know, some of his concerns and the concerns of others who wanted to sort of abolish the juvenile court. Some of those concerns were about perceptions that there weren't enough due process, due process protections for youth in the juvenile justice system. And so, you know, that could be perceived as another difference between the juvenile in the adult system. So, despite some against some Supreme Court cases over time that tried to make sure that there were procedural protections for youth, they still probably aren't as robust as in the adult system. You know, under the supposition that the court, the juvenile court supposed to be a bit more of kind of this benevolent, benevolent kind of parent, if you will. And so, yeah, his point about, well, we can just have a single system, and then do youth discounting and age discounting, I think, you know, I think there's, there's some, you know, premise by which that could possibly work. However, I think one of the things that we've seen is that it can be quite a slippery slope, just in the sense that if you have youth in the in the adult system, there may be signaling, there may be symbolism, I think Aaron Kupchik talks about this in some of his work, and looking at youth processed in juvenile and adult courts, you know, this idea that bringing youth into those systems, you know, it's not just about the sanction that they're getting, at the end, there's also processing, processes that might be different, and going into a hearing room in a juvenile court may be quite different than going into, you know, a substantial courtroom, in the adult system. And so, I think that there is, you know, there still would be some some issues, I believe in trying to put them together. I also think that some of that, on the one hand, you could argue that the youth discount could come into play, but they're still probably still going to be some discretion that's at play there. And then you're also going to have judges that are used to processing adult cases, potentially, and trying to make those calibrations that I think there could be some challenges there. And the last point I would make on that, too, is I think, you know, at least when I've talked about it in my juvenile justice seminar in the past, one of the things that always comes up is that, you know, to some extent, that's also predicated on, okay, we can take the social service part out of the juvenile justice system, and leave that to, you know, child welfare agencies. And, you know, whether or not the funds that currently go to juvenile justice would then migrate to those settings, I think is a little bit difficult to number one to kind of assess, and know. But I think also, there's evidence where we've seen, you know, we've seen just the institutionalization of mental health facilities over time over the decades, and, you know, with a belief that community treatment would be there to sort of take care of that demand, and we can really ever see that happen. And so I would, I would worry if the same thing could materialize in this type of case.



Jenn Tostlebe 19:06

Yeah.



Jose Sanchez 19:07

So, in your book that we sort of mentioned in your introduction, taking juvenile justice seriously, you mentioned that policymakers and administrators, they often tend to focus on like this big picture type stuff. So, like, how do we take a developmental approach to juvenile justice, and embracing policies and practice that affects adolescents, but you do mention also that, like, that's all good and fine and dandy, but we should also be focusing on the day to day processes and that those often go ignored. Can you give us some examples of what these day to day things are that we should be paying more attention to?



Chris Sullivan 19:55

Sure. And I think you know, the point when I think was trying to make in the book, is really that we do have these particular issues. So, I've mentioned a few of them already, you know, they initiative to raise the age of adult court jurisdiction, you know, the idea of deinstitutionalization of youth so that fewer are actually in state residential facilities and more of them are either in the community or in community based facilities where, you know, maybe parents will have more access, and there's, you know, potentially more rehabilitative options. But, I think one of the point that I would make there is that all of these are really important. Those are things that need to be focused on from a big picture standpoint, but especially if we're talking about developmental juvenile justice, and we think about how we, you know, how we learn and how if we also think about a developmental trajectory, how that happens is through sort of a series of events of interactions, of relationships, that sort of aggregate to something that you see over time. And so, you know, situationally, I think one of the things that we need to keep keep in mind, as we're thinking about developmental, developmental juvenile justice is, and I think this is really also stems from talking with juvenile justice personnel over time, as they've shared their experiences with youth. And what things matter in terms of whether or not the process sort of is, is working as it should or not. And so, a couple of examples, one would be if we think developmentally, the way that the court and the judge communicates with the youth in terms of why particular sanction is occurring, or why they're expected to attend school or engage in a particular type of treatment, that's where maybe the connections going to be made on, you know, the degree to which this is meant to be sort of this developmental intervention, if you will, so that you can kind of be redirected more towards a positive developmental trajectory. The other one that I talked about in the



book, and there's, you know, there's some evidence for it, it hasn't been studied that much. But there is this sort of idea of kind of a therapeutic alliance that comes from comes from treatment, broader treatments in mental health and substance use, where the relationship between the individual and their therapist or the counselor is really important in terms of what comes out of that process. And I think there's a parallel when we start thinking about your probation officer, you know, probation officer interactions with with youth, and so we could have, presumably developmentally appropriate treatment, you know, that basically fits with where the youth is in adolescence, and maybe you know, fits their needs as well. But if that relationship between the probation officer and the youth is roughly the same as it is, it would be if they were just dealing with an adult. And it's mainly, you know, it's mainly kind of just a check in, it's surface level. And it's not sort of this developmental relationship within that can be sort of offsetting, and maybe watered down some of the other things that are happening in the system. So, it's those kind of day to day interactions that I was really trying to get out there and talk about because, you know, if you think about it, from the standpoint of even our own developments, every interaction potentially with with a parent or with a, you know, an adult mentor can have some impact, and especially as they accumulate over time, so that was kind of what was what was met there.



Jenn Tostlebe 23:27

Yeah, it's really interesting. I'm doing some work which, Chris, you know, from if you remember from a few years ago, on interactions between correctional officers and incarcerated individuals, it just makes me think of exactly what you're talking about that you need a good relationship there. And that relationship needs to look different if you're dealing with a youth or an adult.



Chris Sullivan 23:51

Yeah, and you think about the system, there's so many different people interacting with individuals, especially in a prison setting, or on the youth side, and as a residential setting. So, we know that there's treatment personnel, we might know that there's more custodial personnel. And, you know, getting everyone to kind of buy into this juvenile juvenile justice as kind of a developmental developmental factor can be tricky. And so that that's kind of the intent there is that that has to be aligned, as well as you know, having available treatment programs, trying to keep you out of the system as much as possible. That kind of thing.



Jenn Tostlebe 24:27

Yeah. All right. So let's start to move a little bit more into the paper topic. So, talking about disproportionate minority contact, or DMC. It's a term and program that was introduced, I believe, by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or the OJJDP that came out of like this Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in 2002. Can you tell us a little bit more about the history of disproportionate minority contact and then also kind give us a definition of what this means.

C

Chris Sullivan 25:02

Yeah, sure. Absolutely. And I think I think you've hit it pretty well, Jenn, just in the sense of this has become a legislative priority over time. And, so as they develop the the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and then as they've reauthorized it over time, different elements of it started as just disproportion of minority confinement. So, it's really focused a bit more on custodial disproportionality, and then it's evolved into disproportionate minority contact. And now actually, in the most recent reauthorization, in 2018, it's now a racial and ethnic disparities that the JJDP Act has kind of focused on. And so, you know, I think, as we all know, right, these are these disparities actually precede a lot of the legislative initiative, you know, they can stretch back if we think about some of the discussion of the Child Savers by, you know, Anthony Platt, and Jeff Ward has a more recent book from 2012, that looks at race and the juvenile court, I think, in a really thorough way, and particular, you know, elaborates a lot on that history and the evolution of the court with respect to race. But basically, what we know is that in the sort of from this legislative piece, going back a few few decades now that these disparities have been observed, there's been initiatives to try to collect information on those disparities sort of collect data. So, that's been part of this process, and then also try to develop programming and approaches to try to diminish these disproportionate involvement that we see across race and ethnicity groups. In terms of a definition, it sort of is going to be one that follows a bit, depending on the stage of the system and the process. So you can see over time, people have looked at this in a variety of different points, starting at arrest, intake into the system and referral, you know, you can look at and take, for example, the paper will discuss, you know, there, we're looking at actual sort of remanding to juvenile confinement in state residential facilities. But there's also, you know, host of others, whether or not youth are in detention, which is an early stage of the process, which we see, based on Nancy Rodriguez and some other some others work that can carry through into later decision stages as well. So, it's really situations where relative to population, and kind of relative to expectations, do we see disproportionately, that youth of color, youth who have been minoritized, that they are disproportionately in that a, you know, disproportionately experiencing more severe outcomes at a particular point in time. So,

that could be being sent to residential facilities more frequently, just as it could be, you know, being arrested more frequently as well. So it's really about that disproportionality. There's some different ways to measure it. But roughly speaking, that's what we're looking for to see whether or not relative to sort of population numbers and then involvement at particular points in the system, whether that ratio differs across groups. And, what we found is that, you know, that is the case and has been the case for a while. And, even as we've seen some changes over the last 20 years, for example, in youth incarceration rates, which have come down, you know, 50, 60%, we still see those disparities persist.



Jose Sanchez 28:34

All right. Well, I think that gives us a good launching off point to get into your paper. So it was coauthored by our guest, Chris Sullivan, and also Derek Mueller and Hannah McManus. The paper is titled Disproportionate Experiences in Custody: An Examination of Minority Youth Outcomes in Secure Facilities. The paper was published in 2020, in Justice Quarterly, and this article is an exploratory study that examines how race may factor into youth experiences in residential placement facilities. And more specifically, Chris and his colleagues use a stratified random sample of just over 1,500 youth confined in secure residential facilities between 2010 and 2014, to examine whether there was a relationship between race and the number of disciplinary infractions, seclusion time, length of stay, and time absent from educational services. Additionally, they look at whether disciplinary infractions are able to mediate the relationship between race and seclusion time as well as length of stay. Is that an okay summary of your, your paper Chris?



Chris Sullivan 29:52

Yeah, Jose, I think he I think that's a good summary. It kind of, you know, reflects sort of what we what we did and what we found and kind of the study, you know, the study methods. Yeah, I think it's good summary.



Jose Sanchez 30:06

Great. Okay, So question number one, and one. And, you know, this is standard fare for everybody. And unfortunately, Chris, you're, you're no exception. What was the motivation behind writing this paper? And sort of what was the gap that you were trying to fill?



Chris Sullivan 30:23

Yeah, that's a good question. I think, you know, for us, I'll say two things. The first one I'll say is substantively, what we saw in this literature was that a lot of the research, including

a study we had done to look at disproportionate minority contact in the state of Ohio, really focused on outcomes up until a youth would be sent to a juvenile residential facility. So, we sort of in the, in the paper, were sort of saying like, okay, yeah, we see that there's definitely these disparities, we also happen to have access to these data, you know, even imperfect, as they are about kind of what's happening while the youth is in the facility. And so, the question then becomes, you know, can we look at and analyze some questions related to that. And so, I would say that the predominant reasoning was to try to extend, especially in the juvenile justice literature, we cited a little bit in the paper, some stuff that focuses a bit on the adult system, in terms of disproportionate kind of handling and treatment in correctional facilities. But we really wanted to focus on that here, in a juvenile setting, in part, because we know, you know, what happens in a facility is going to matter. And it's going to especially matter for youth who are 15, 16, 17, and so on, right, these are kids that are coming in number one, they're going to generally be fairly far away from their communities, they are going to, you know, get different degrees and quality of treatment, although, you know, that has maybe improved in the facilities, it's still going to be inconsistent. And, you know, they're going to have to sort of meet some different developmental milestones, for example, education, while in those facilities. So, we think it's really important, if we're considering sort of these disproportionality ease in terms of what, who's going into facilities, you know, are we seeing even more on top of that, so are we seeing that those differences are exacerbated in the system, you know, especially when we know that, particularly that stage, you know, being incarcerated could have an impact on their later, both their later offending and that also, they're sort of cumulative life chances, as well, as they're, as they're sort of heading into adulthood. So, it was more it was kind of about understanding what was going on in the facility. But, also using that as a conduit to understand, you know, whether groups of youth predominantly in this state, black and brown youth, were going to be disproportionately affected, both in terms of their presence in the facilities, and then also what happened there as well. So, that was the intent. The other thing I'll say, just really quickly is this is a situation sort of from the standpoint of inside, inside the research process. Usually, when we're doing research, we kind of wind up with, we have this ideal plan in mind going in. And, you know, we gradually have to sort of deal with the obstacles that get sort of raised as we go into the process in conducting our research. And, so this was a situation where we had, we'd gone out and we were trying to get data from police agencies to complete our study. And we kind of we couldn't quite get as much traction there as we wanted to, we really had a list of about 40 agencies that we wanted to get data from, we probably ended up with about half that maybe a little bit less. But the funder basically said to us well, in exchange, will you, you know, take a look at our residential facility data, and do some analysis there. And, so we got these data on the residential facilities much later. And then we were able to think like, oh, wow, we have this information. And we can answer this question well, and that's really, that's really kind of this interesting thing that we want to do. So, is a situation

where we reach some obstacles, but then this sort of other piece of data that we didn't originally collect, or didn't originally intend to collect kind of came our way. And we were able then to carry out this study as a result. So, that was sort of a positive silver lining coming out of that cloud, in our research process.



Jenn Tostlebe 34:31

Yeah, I feel like research never goes exactly how you plan it on paper. So, that's nice. That Yes, came out of that. Yeah. Alright, so it kind of to follow that. And you in a way already answered this. But just to be more direct, you know, why is it important to understand whether there's evidence of the disproportionate minority contact in residential facility experiences among youth? Why is it important to look at this question?



Chris Sullivan 35:00

Yeah, I think, you know, I think it goes back to the intent of the juvenile justice system, right. I mean, the idea, the idea behind juvenile justice in particular is twofold. One is that there is going to be some, you know, some aspect of it that, you know, focuses on community protection that focuses on accountability, but also a major part of it is to try to redirect youth to think especially when we think about that developmental angle, that, that's really, you know, always been in the in the system, but but is even more prevalent and prominent in recent years. And so, what we want to do is to make sure that, you know, we're minimizing as much as possible use of the most severe sanction in the juvenile justice system, which is going to be confined in a residential facility. So, we want to limit that as much as possible. But we also want to make sure that those sanctions are delivered equitably in terms of who's in that, who's in those facilities, but then also what happens in those facilities. So, that's really why we felt it was important to do this study. And again, secondarily, there really hasn't been too much to look at that. And, you know, it's an important gap, especially we think about the fact that youth who are, youth are basically confined as juveniles, they will all be released from these facilities, you know, maybe with a few exceptions, so, and that would really be reserved for cases maybe where they're moving into the adult system at some point. But, so, the idea is really to try to understand whether or not some of those burdens if you will, of juvenile incarceration are kind of disproportionately experienced to begin with. And then also does what happened in the system, or I'm sorry, in the facilities is that maybe adding even more challenges upon release?



Jose Sanchez 36:50

You know, you've pointed it out and you also make this point in the paper that there hasn't been a lot of research done on the impact of race on youth outcomes and experiences within these institutional settings. However, you do, point to other studies that look at how race has factored into other situations like court decision process, processes, placement in secure facilities, things of that nature. And so this body of prior research, sort of provides, like a foundation for your study or a base that you build off of, can you sort of hit us with the main findings from prior research on these topics?



Chris Sullivan 37:33

It varies a little bit, I think, in the juvenile justice system, it varies a little bit by decision point, you know, as far as maybe intake decisions to detain a youth prior to their court hearings, and then going through the whole process to residential placement, the majority of those basically youth, whether it's whether it's Hispanic youth or black youth in the US, you know, there's going to be some disproportion experience of detention of residential placement, the degrees to which that's the case are going to vary a little bit across decision points. So, just as one example, there's some research that's found, as we get into, for example, dispositions as we get into adjudication, there can sometimes be corrections on sort of earlier disparities, in part because those can be kind of fact finding stages. And so, we might see either a little bit of a reversal or diminishing level of disparity there. But certainly, as we start to look at kind of the beginning parts of the system, and then certainly the kind of the deepest end of the juvenile justice system, we're going to tend to see disparities where youth of color are disproportionately, you know, experiencing outcomes that would be seen as more severe in the court. Now, again, that's going to vary a little bit from place to place, it might vary some from decision point to decision point, but generally, the takeaway is that that's, that disproportionate minority contact is there and is, is fairly persistent.



Jose Sanchez 39:07

Right? And so how am I going off of that, how my institutional misconduct come into play here and impact, you know, the relationship between race and the duration of time served, and also time spent in seclusion or sort of solitary confinement.



Chris Sullivan 39:30

So, I think, you know, if we consider, you know, a lot of different other aspects of the criminal and juvenile justice systems, I think there's some clues there. Now, we can't sort of measure or we didn't measure. We have a record based kind of study here. So, we're not necessarily getting at what is original, you know, corrections officers decision making

process. For example, why are these misconducts happening, who exactly is involved? But one of the things we can see is that you know, disproportionately, you know, for example, if it's low level offenses at the front of the system where police are, you know, tending to arrest youth, youth of color at higher proportions than white youth, that's going to be kind of a clue. So, what we would think in the facilities is that if these institutional misconducts, are more, more frequently detected or engaged in or experienced by a youth of color well that's going to have other impacts potentially, on aspects of their institutional experience of the length of stay, they might have, you know, that really affects like what that, you know, we tend to think about sometimes, and we tend to think about a lot of things in terms of variable based kind of measurement. And we're sort of necessarily limited in that way. But if we think about, like, the qualitative experience of one youths time in a residential facility versus another one another youth's time in a residential facility, the question then becomes, you know, are those different in some ways, and what we're trying to get into here is, we have similarly situated youth, one youth of color, and then one way youth, are they having different experiences I while on the system, in that part of the system, and, you know, in turn, what does that maybe mean for the prospects as they leave the system later on?



Jenn Tostlebe 41:24

Well, so I think that's a great place to start to dive into the results of your study. So the first thing that you really focused on is the relationship between race and the number of disciplinary infractions youth were receiving, which can be things and I don't know exactly in your data, but from my knowledge can be things from disobeying an order from someone in the correctional staff, to stealing property, or fighting, or even more extreme forms of violence. And so, what you found was that non white youths had significantly more infractions than white youth in your full model. So, accounting for all of your other variables that included gender and age, among other things. So, based off of this, what does that tell us about disproportionate minority contact beyond just the fact that minority youth were getting more infractions?



Chris Sullivan 42:19

Right, I think what it does is gives us an initial starting point to think about unpacking that relationship and making some determination about what that, what that differential means, you know, what can happen as a result of that differential. And so, we sort of used that and saw that institution misconduct as sort of this almost central variable, in terms of the fact that it can have reverberating effects. And so, it opens the gateway to more time in seclusion, it opens the gateway to a youth perhaps being absent from, you know, school time, while, while in the facility. It obviously we No, we didn't measure it, right, that that

can also have some effects on the perceptions, that administrative staff in the facility that the correctional staff who were working closer to the youth might have. And so, it sort of opens up a potential, you know, set of other outcomes that can happen from there. So, really wanted to look to see, you know, does that initial, does that initial difference pulled up. And I think it's also again, as I mentioned already, it's also a variable that had, also variable to sort of parallels some of our kind of general delinquency variables if we were just looking at youth who were in the community.



Jose Sanchez 43:44

So, one of the things that you looked at was the relationship between race and seclusion time, or the number of days each youth spent in disciplinary isolation, probably better known as solitary confinement, length of stay at the juvenile facility and proportion of time absent from educational services. What were some of your findings when it came to seclusion time?



Chris Sullivan 44:11

Yeah, I think with seclusion time, the predominant way that youth were in seclusion time was basically through some kind of disciplinary step. So, that infraction, you know, has a very, very strong positive relationship with seclusion time. And so, that was at least the time we did the study. And it's changed since, as we note in the paper, but basically, at that time, that was the predominant response to, you know, youth gets in trouble, they're secluded for a period of time. And so, those are very, very strongly correlated. And then what we see is that, you know, with this flurry of infractions, you know, it makes sense that that could potentially, you know, either restrict youths time and treatment, or restrict their time and educational services, and that in turn might lengthen their stay in the facility as well. And again, that gets back to also how they're being perceived in terms of their behavior, in terms of, you know, quote, unquote, getting into trouble. And so, that might have that that can have some implications for other aspects of what's happening in terms of their experience in the facility. So we, we tended to see that the disciplinary infractions was sort of a mediating variable that got into got into length of stay got into, as I mentioned, seclusion time. And each of those in turn, you know, can exacerbate some of the issues that come up due to a youth being in a particular facility. And those are again, just fortunately, experienced by black and Hispanic youth, for example, in our, in our sample, that obviously, is then going to, you know, create a different, different set of circumstances, as those youth leave the facility whenever they do.





Jenn Tostlebe 46:03

Alright, so you kind of touched on your other finding, so I'm just gonna wrap the last two aspects looked at into one. So did you find an association between race and like this, say, in a juvenile facility, and then also a relationship between race and time absent from educational services?



Chris Sullivan 46:23

Yeah, so what we really found was that these were in these operated kind of indirectly. So, once we sort of pulled in the entire system of variables, if you will, then we saw that those are relationships that we would see on the surface, if we just simply looked at, you know, difference in means across groups, for example, you know, those were there at a bivariate level, once we started adding some of the other control variables, they would diminish. But then, when we think about sort of these complex kind of chains of events and relationships, that we really, you know, know and suppose are going to be there when we start thinking about broader, you know, broader trends that we see in data. Those are situations where we then would find that that seclusion time, and I'm sorry, that the infractions in particular kind of served as a sort of mediation in that chain, that linked race to these other outcomes that we saw. So, the answer to the question is yes, and no, we saw them, then we kind of see them diminished. But, then as we start to think about what might be happening in the facility that then triggers other aspects later on, or other experiences or other outcomes later on. That's when we do see this kind of chain happen.



Jose Sanchez 47:37

So sorry, did you have something to say, Jenn?



Jenn Tostlebe 47:39

No, go ahead.



Jose Sanchez 47:41

So overall, you and your colleagues concluded that, you know, as you sort of alluded to race has an inconsistent relationship with outcomes experienced by youth in custody. And while race had a consistent relationship with disciplinary infractions, race was not a significant predictor of seclusion, time, length of stay, nor proportion of time absent from educational services, especially after accounting for other important variables. However, the number, the number of disciplinary infractions, it impacts seclusion time, and length of

stay. So, what are some of the implications of your findings from this paper, one for academics and researchers going forward, but also for the general public and policymakers?

C

Chris Sullivan 48:41

Yeah. So starting starting with kind of academic and research, I think that relationship between race and that outcome that you mentioned, I think it's important to unpack those. And so, to look at these kind of models that are specified and considered as this sort of chain of, of relationships, as opposed to saying like, okay, we found this, or we didn't find this, when we added this set of variables. I think, here, this was an opportunity for us to kind of look at the process a little bit more holistically, and think about kind of what might be an intermediate step that would sort of give us more insight into that the overall relationship. So, if we had just stopped that kind of putting this in a regression model, we might have considered, we might have concluded that, Oh, wow, alright, we do see these bivariate relationships. But, when we add these other control variables to the model that goes away. But, we knew kind of going in that there could possibly be some route through which those differences that we initially observed in race and experiencing disciplinary infractions could have other trigger, trigger other things, you know, down the line. And so, I think it's important to elaborate on our models wherever possible. And I think in terms of the implications, what I would just say is you know, from a policy and practice standpoint, and since this paper's come out, I've given a few presentations building on it. And I'm working on a paper right now that kind of builds on some of that, as well, right, we've seen, as I mentioned, really precipitous declines in youth in facilities. But we have a lot of work to do in terms of looking at what's actually happening in those facilities. So, you know, presumably, if we have fewer youth in the same resources, we should be able to treat youth better, we should be able to manage interactions in a way that reduces the likelihood of fight fights, or reduces or can maybe take a little bit more of a developmental approach to responding to disobedience from youth who are in the facility, facility. So, I would really think that we have to kind of consider the degree to which this is really a significant problem if we have disproportionality going into the system or into the facilities, and then also seeing it within different aspects and experiences. And we really need to make sure that we're focusing a lot of attention on that. Because otherwise, we really are going to see, you know, cumulative disadvantage kind of piled on top of comul, cumulative disadvantage, as you've kind of transitioned to adulthood. And that's really not going to be good for them, that's also not going to be good for their communities and society more generally. So, I think that that those would be the implications that I would say,



Jenn Tostlebe 51:31

Yeah, they're really interesting paper. And I'm, I'm excited, and I'm happy to hear that you're working on more on it. Cuz I'm excited to see what else comes out of it.



Jose Sanchez 51:40

Yeah, me too.



Jenn Tostlebe 51:44

Alright, so is there any last things you'd like to say about the paper before we move into talking about editing?



Chris Sullivan 51:53

No, not really, I think we covered and covered a lot of ground with respect to the paper, it was, as I said, it was a product of a much larger study that involved a lot of student researchers and a couple of colleagues. And so, put in a lot of work. And then also a lot of data collection from people in the field. And so, just kind of acknowledging their, their involvement along the way, I think is about all that I, I'd add at this point.



Jenn Tostlebe 52:21

Cool, yeah. The two co authors, are they candidates, doctoral candidates right now or?



Chris Sullivan 52:26

Yeah, they're. They both are, both are graduate students at the University of Cincinnati.



Jenn Tostlebe 52:31

Yeah. Cool. All right. So let's move into talking about being a journal editor. So, as we mentioned, in your introduction, you've been the co-editor of the Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency with Professor Jean McGloin, since 2017. And so we'd like to talk to you a bit about what made you decide to become a journal editor, and then, you know, editorial decisions. So, our first question for you is just that, why did you decide to take on the role of being a journal editor?



Chris Sullivan 53:04

I think, you know, it's a couple couple of things for me. You know, I'm always someone that as I, as I sort of came along, that was really interested in sort of the process of how scientific work gets from start to finish. And so how, how will we see in journals, you know, essentially, it gets there. And so, for me, it was something that was gradual, I don't know that I sort of came into the start of my career, saying, alright, I want to be want to be a journal editor. But, the more and more that I reviewed papers, was invited to sit on editorial boards and sort of saw the process more, it became more interesting to me, it became something that that I, you know, felt like I was in a good position to do, you know, in terms of where I was in my career in terms of the amount of exposure i'd added to the process at that point. I think it also was, you know, something that from a broader standpoint, there's a bit of being involved in the editorial process, that sort of is serving as someone who's helping either mo, again, move, move the process along and identifying kind of what's in, what's getting into the literature, and then there's also sort of helping people along, you know, as they're developing their work and being able to hopefully contribute constructively to that. And so, you know, I think just being part of the process would be how I sum up. I mean, in a few words, I think it's, we're in a unique position as sort of scholars to kind of have this way of putting our work out there getting critique on it, revising and resubmitting it and then ultimately seeing it in print. And I kind of just like, I've always felt an affinity for that process. And so, being a journal editor, especially in a journal that when I was a graduate student was probably published at Rutgers. That is really kind of the motivation for me.



Jose Sanchez 55:05

So, we've talked to people like Kyle and David about being journal editors, and are always saying how, you know, being a journal editor is a ton of work. And, you know, maybe, yeah, there's a few more details on what the job looks like, what is it exactly that you do as an editor?



Chris Sullivan 55:24

Yeah, absolutely. So, and I would just say, as a caveat, like, this is going to this is going to vary a little bit, depending on the journal and depending on, you know, things like resources, things like processes. So we, you know, we work with Sage Publications on Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. And so that might be different than some other journals that are either more independently published or have different publishers from us. But so our processes and I would also say to that some, some journal editors are going to have different degrees to which they're hands on as well. So, our process really starts with, after an initial screen by our managing editor, we get the paper, I usually will

read it once through and identify who might be good, good reviewers for that paper. Sometimes, that's by looking at the citations. Sometimes that's by me, thinking of someone who I think might be good for it, as I'm reading through it, you know, depending on whether or not it's a particular theory that's being looked at, if it's particular data set, you know, and I'm aware of people who have done work in that area, usually, usually they're going to be cited. But But even failing that, then I you know, I may be kind of jotting down some margin notes, of possible reviewers, I'm also forming my impression of the paper in my notes, that eventually I'll go back to, after I see kind of what the reviewers say. Also, the other the other part of it is, is to kind of read it to see whether or not going to send it out at all for review. So we do in an effort both to move the process along for authors and not necessarily hold them up. And then also to maybe not, maybe be mindful of what we're sending out to reviewers, we may editorially kind of reject a paper. But if assuming most most gets sent out, you know, I'm developing an impression that then I can keep in mind when I see the reviews eventually, right right up the decision letter. So looking at that, thinking about good reviewers, if it's, for example, a paper that's really intense methodologically, or analytically, I might be thinking about, alright, who, who can review this, this particular paper, because that can sometimes narrow the pool. And then once once I've read through it and have my notes, and my idea is about reviewers, you know, it's time to send that out or send the invitations. And then from there, we'll wait to see what the decisions and recommendations are from the reviewers, you know, at that stage, what you're doing is really kind of processing some recommendations and insights, and then coming to a conclusion on what, what should happen with the paper. And so, you know, it's it's partly looking at, like, what are the recommendations, you know, in terms of reject, in terms of revise and resubmit, and so forth. But a lot of it's also trying to read into the comments and make some assessment about strengths and limitations. And then at that point, we send it out, or we send out the response letter to give the author a sense of what the decision is, if it's a revise and resubmit, we want to try as much as possible, identify the most important issues to look at in the revision, or synthesize and clarify the things that really are going to be important and ultimately making a decision, and then sort of proceeds through the rest of the process where the author will make their changes. I'll take another look at it. Usually, a reviewer will take another look at it. At that stage, usually you can make a decision, but there may be, there's occasionally some that go to a second level of review, which I usually do myself.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:02

Okay. You must read a lot of papers.



Chris Sullivan 59:07

Yeah. So, you know, our submissions are generally somewhere between about 220 and 250. a year. So I'm reading I'm reading at least half of those papers fairly closely. And so, regardless of the decision, yeah, and you get to see, kind of going back to your first question, and I don't know that I fully appreciated this when I decided to do this. But it's nice, because you do get to see, you know, what's going on in the field more broadly, you get to see kind of what the trends are and both, you know, sometimes both from a good and bad standpoint, you know, you get to know who's doing what work in particular areas. So that's, that's kind of an interesting aspect of it, as well. Yeah, I do read a lot of papers.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:51

Yeah. Alright, so when you are making kind of an initial publishing decision, what factors are most important to you.



Chris Sullivan 1:00:02

Yeah, yeah. And again, this is going to be driven by the journal. But for me, it's going to be we want that I want to see, you know, papers that are empirically sound, that are thorough and kind of considering the issues at hand that are very clear in terms of what their objective is. And so, you know, one of the things, maybe use, use this to kind of get some, some information out there. I think one of the things you see a lot in people justifying their papers is, you know, say, alright, we're the first to do this, or, you know, this hasn't been done before. And so, what we try even even, and that comes up, even in the best papers, we see, what we really try to do is to push people towards like, well, why is this a gap? Why is it important that we don't know the answer to this question? And so, you know, that's something that I really like to like to see, if I'm looking at looking at a paper, you know, we just charged there. Yeah, we all are. Yeah, we all are, I mean.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:01:01

That's something you and Jean gave me a hard time on during the JRCD workshop, like, that's not good enough.



Chris Sullivan 1:01:08

Well, yeah, you know, that's something where, you know, I think everyone's done that at one time or another. And really, it's a natural shorthand, right? It's something where you can kind of signal in a sentence or two. And we're always trying to be somewhat concise.

And that's a good way to say like, yeah, this is there's a hole here. But you know, I think when I try to push authors to, is to really like, you know, say, alright, well, why does this matter? And I think ultimately, that helps both to situate the work in a way that really makes it as strong possible, as strong as possible. And then also, later on in discussion, like, alright, what has really been learned here? That's super impactful. So yeah, that's a big one, you know, obviously, I think we're looking to make sure that things are empirically sound, although, you know, there gonna be times where, you know, you maybe haven't considered everything in the first submission. And so, then the question becomes, you know, is there enough here to work with, you know, do we feel like at the subsequent stages of the process, that some of these kinks can be ironed out? And so that's a, that's kind of a determinant, you know, determining factor as well. But yeah, I think we're looking for things that are impactful and interesting, you know, looking for things that are empirically sound, but we, you know, we really, we really want to have like kind of some theoretical grounding, we feel like at least at JRCD, that's what we're trying to do with the journal. And so that's a big part of it, too, is like, what's the substantive question and value of of looking at this particular question? And I think the other thing that we definitely look forward to is like, Alright, is this something that, and I don't think it's a matter of novelty? I think it's more a matter of like, is this something that really helps helps us understand a particular problem better? And, you know, I think that's the place to start for us to make decisions.

J

Jose Sanchez 1:03:02

Okay, Chris, I want to pick your brain a little bit more than we already have. So, not a little bit. A lot. What advice would you give to people for effectively dealing with editorial decisions? Whether it's a rejection? Or an r&r a revise and resubmit?

C

Chris Sullivan 1:03:22

Yeah, I think, you know, a couple things, you know, you want to, you know, start off from the standpoint of thinking about it collaboratively, I realized that can be difficult. Sometimes when the tone of reviews, you know, maybe a little bit over the top or maybe feel a little bit pointed, you know, I think you know, so, you know, first thing I would say is on the reviewer side, it's important for people to be constructive, to be thorough and thoughtful. You know, I think if you if you're not sure about a particular aspect of the paper, I think it's enough to just say, you know, I'm not sure about this, and usually one of the other reviewers can pick up on it, or I can, I can pick up on it. So, I think that it starts with hopefully getting good reviews and thorough reviews. And most of the reviews that that I see at the journal are good and constructive and not mean spirited. There are, you know, exceptions and try and minimize those is a good place to kind of start for everyone.

But once the reviews kind of the the decisions made. I think that the important thing is to really, you know, start off from a stan, standpoint of collaboration, not being overly defensive. Usually, at that stage, everyone's paper can use some work. And so using the effective, or using the feedback, effectively, identifying the things that you feel like you can do right out of the gate and kind of building some momentum and responding to those concerns. Because I know you can see at times, you know, you might get three reviewers that have several points each or more and it can be kind of daunting when you're looking at it initially. And so I think you want to sort of say, Alright, what can I, you know, what can I do to improve this paper based on the advice that I've been given by the editor and by these reviewers? And so start from that standpoint, be is thorough as possible, you know, try to be responsive. If you can't do something, you know, I would acknowledge that and then also try, you know, as much as possible maybe to consider the sensitivity of your findings to the point that's being raised. You know, I've been told that I'm someone that that asks for a lot of sensitivity analysis that tries to wherever possible, get as close to the answer to a reviewers question, if it can be done. So, being deliberate, being thorough, I think is really important there. I think also, obviously, ensuring that you're you're being responsive and not diminishing, the feedback that you've been given, is going to be important. But I think a lot of it is sort of psychological, especially that first, if when you get an r&r, sometimes they say, wow, this is just a lot to do. I'm not sure how they're gonna get this done. But I think if you start and build slowly and get momentum, then you can work through those by being responsive to the editors and or through the editor, and then to the to the reviewers. On the reject side that you know that the other part of your question. You know, I think, again, I would try to glean whatever you can from those reviews as much as possible. Again, that might sting at first, especially are rejections going to sting, if you kind of take a step back and say are what can I, what can I learn from this? And then I think also formulating a plan that sort of, you know, finds, you know, finds a path forward with that paper that moves it along so it's not sitting on your desk for months and months and months, but also deals with maybe you know, the bigger issues, maybe the reviewers have identified. And the reason, you know, the reason I say that is even if you can't fully resolve something, before sending it to another journal, in our field, a lot of times, we are going to quite honestly be using similar, the same reviewers maybe across you know, across papers, we're in a we're in a space now where it's really, really difficult to find good reviewers. I think I hear this from editors, probably every time I'm at a conference or every time I talk to someone else who's editing a journal. And so, by extension, what that means is if you've sent your paper to Criminology, for example, and it unfortunately doesn't get accepted there, and then it comes to JRCD, we might be looking at the same reviewers, in part because it could be a specialized paper, we're looking for good reviewers. And so, we're not necessarily going to exclude them. And you know, what ends up happening is, if you haven't really dealt with anything from the previous stage, you know, where was rejected, well, then the reviewer is going to say, you know, this



person didn't really take my advice seriously, on the previous version of the paper, and that's frustrating. And so, the idea should be across the entire sort of life, lifespan of a paper, that it's being progressively improved whether or not it's rejected at one journal or not, or whether it's, you know, getting an r&r, the idea is with each piece of feedback that you're getting is to improve the paper. And so, I think that there's some signaling that comes into play where if authors don't engage in that process fully, it can kind of come back to haunt them later on. So that's one of the things I would say with reject is, you know, try to minimize the sting, think about getting it back out as soon as possible. Realizing it's part, you know, it's part of the process. I mean, I think, you know, those of us who submit a lot of papers, you're gonna get a lot of rejections too. And you, so you just kind of have to steel yourself for some of that at times. And then, you know, identify what the path is for the next phase of the paper.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:08:53

Yeah, good tips. It definitely does sting when you get pages and pages, feedback, though.



Chris Sullivan 1:09:03

You can take it as they just really cared a lot about paper.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:09:07

Exactly. That's the good thing to it. Alright, so you have you did mention a few tips for being a good reviewer. So things like being constructive, and make sure to be thoughtful and caring and not just completely mean and rude. Are there any other tips you would give people like, especially grad students who are just starting to be a reviewer for how to write reviews?



Chris Sullivan 1:09:36

Yeah, absolutely. I think, you know, I think a few things that I would keep in mind, you know, one, one would be to try to think about the paper a bit holistically in terms of how the pieces fit together. You know, so how does the argument that's being built up front phase into the study, how did the study results then inform the discussion, you know, those kind of links in the chain, aren, aren't there, that's something that can be problematic from the standpoint of a paper. And so, you know, I think you always want to be thinking about that from the standpoint of, you know, what holistically, what is this paper getting at, does the study fit with the objectives kind of laid out upfront in terms of research questions, or

hypotheses, I think, you know, being you know, in terms of being a good reviewer, especially as a graduate student, I usually encourage, you know, encourage students to, you know, think about the fact that we're in a field where we both have to understand the substance of what's being studied. So that could be theory, or it could be the policy and practice, in particular areas of the field, but then also sort of the methods. So, the more you can kind of relate the methods to the theory and substance and thinking about your review, and thinking about that piece of work. I think that's really helpful within giving a good review, and then also giving a review that allows for the author, the editor to see kind of how those pieces fit together, or maybe in some cases don't, I would, you know, encourage people to, you know, to get involved in the process, the more that you see, the more papers you see, kind of the more you develop, you know, an eye towards what to look for in a manuscript, I think, you know, correlated with that is if the reviews come back to you, and certainly we we practice doing that, you know, take a look at, you know, did your conclusions about a paper align with the other reviewers, that they, were they different from the reviewers and the editor? And in which ways did they differ? And so, I think that that can be beneficial as a reviewer, I would also argue, if you're going to be involved in sending your own papers for review, which, you know, that's kind of another part of all of this process, right? If you're mindful of that, that can also help you in your writing, as you're submitting to journals to so I think that has kind of some spillover, positive effects as well there. Yeah, I mean, I think that you definitely just want to be thorough and thoughtful. As far as your, you know, your understanding of things. I don't think, you know, if you don't feel comfortable with a particular part, or you're unclear about it, I think you can just let the editor know that even in the comments, the editor, usually, we're looking for three, you know, three people across, you know, across different points of emphasis in the review. And so, you know, if someone doesn't understand particular, I mean, I think I had this happen the other day where someone basically, in their comments, the editor says, say, Oh, I can definitely comment on this part of the paper, but I'm unsure about this particular technique. And then I have two other reviewers who are a little more versed with that technique. And so I think that can be helpful to set the context for the editor. And that way I know how to consider that particular review. And all of those reviews can be helpful. They're just going to have different points of emphasis. So, you know, play to your strengths, I think, you know, processing the reviews and thinking about how they can help your own work. also makes it feel as though you're doing service, but you're also sort of growing along the way too.



Jose Sanchez 1:13:06

Yeah, definitely. Well, Chris, that was great. Thank you for all your insights, and tips and tricks.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:13:13

Very helpful.



Jose Sanchez 1:13:15

Is there anything else you'd like to add any closing remarks about Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, disproportionate minority contact or journal editing?



Chris Sullivan 1:13:26

No, I mean, I think we covered a lot of ground, obviously, I think in each of those topics, there's so much more that we can cover. And so you know, I think that's why I like to write books about the things that I write about at this point. There is, there's a lot of ground to cover, there's so many interesting facets to what we do. And even you know, I think some of the conversation today touched on our each of our kind of research points of research emphasis, but found, found some different parallels between them that I think are really interesting and worth probably going into in the future.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:14:01

Yeah, absolutely. All right. Well, then, thank you so much for taking the time to talk with us today. It's been a pleasure. And we could talk for a lot longer. Yeah. Is there anything that you would like to plug anything coming out? Or anything we should be on the lookout for?



Chris Sullivan 1:14:19

Yeah, no. I mean, I would say that the pleasure is mine. And thank you both for, you know, having me on, but then also, I think, for doing this, doing this podcast in general, and I'm certainly impressed with the variety of topics at different, you know, different points, whether they're related to grad student life, whether they're related to different aspects of the discipline and different topics within research and publishing, publishing. You know, in terms of some things to look out for was a mentioned at the start and introduction. I do have a book coming out in the fall. It's on juvenile risk and needs assessment. And so when we're talking about for example, DMC, that's something that's been proposed as a way to kind of mitigate and reduce some of that disproportionality. Whether or not it sort of fully does that is a question. And so in that book, Christina Childs and I really take on a lot of different aspects of, you know, risk and needs assessment and unpack that. So I think that that's something just to be on the lookout this fall.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:15:17

And then where can people find you Twitter email?



Chris Sullivan 1:15:21

Yeah. So Twitter, you can find me @prof\_cjsullivan, and I'm fairly responsive on Twitter. So that's a place you can find me and keep up with what I'm doing. And then also, I like to tweet about grad students related topics, like the tweet on occasion about academic leadership. And so those are some things that I'm passionate about, and then addition to lots of different aspects of research too. Yeah. And then you'll be able to find me soon on the Texas State criminal justice and criminology website as well. So that will be another place you can find me via email or reach out that way, too.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:16:00

Perfect. Well, thank you again, Chris. It was great having you on. Yeah, thank you both so much. This is fantastic. Thank you. The criminology Academy is available wherever you listen to podcast. Make sure to follow us on Twitter, Facebook and Instagram at the crime Academy. If you're on Apple podcasts, please rate review and subscribe. Alternatively, let us know what you think of the episode by leaving us a comment on our website, [thecriminologyacademy.com](http://thecriminologyacademy.com). And lastly, share The Crim Academy episodes with your friends and family.