



Trauma-Informed Courts: A Review and Integration of Justice Perspectives and Gender Responsiveness

Nicole C. McKenna & Kristy Holtfreter

To cite this article: Nicole C. McKenna & Kristy Holtfreter (2020): Trauma-Informed Courts: A Review and Integration of Justice Perspectives and Gender Responsiveness, Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, DOI: [10.1080/10926771.2020.1747128](https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1747128)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1747128>



Published online: 14 Apr 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 230



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Trauma-Informed Courts: A Review and Integration of Justice Perspectives and Gender Responsiveness

Nicole C. McKenna^a and Kristy Holtfreter^b

^aSchool of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA; ^bSchool of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ, USA

ABSTRACT

As researchers and practitioners begin to understand the complex relationship between victimization and offending, there is an increased need to address prior trauma in the court context. This includes in court processes themselves, as well as through offender supervision conditions in the form of treatment referrals. While not all offenders have been victims themselves, trauma-informed practices recognize the possibility of trauma history in the lives of court-involved individuals. Trauma-informed practices seek to address abuse and trauma and respond in a person-centered and supportive manner. When implemented in juvenile courts, there is potential for disrupting the school-to-prison pipeline. This review seeks to understand how trauma-informed processes – already in use in juvenile courts – can be incorporated into adult courts to better address offender risks and needs, with the goal of facilitating rehabilitation. In doing so, we assess the extent to which extant justice perspectives (i.e., procedural justice, therapeutic jurisprudence, and restorative justice) and principles of gender-responsiveness are compatible with trauma-informed practices in adult courts. Implications for theory, future research, and practice are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 7 February 2019

Revised 30 May 2019

Accepted 13 March 2020

KEYWORDS

Trauma-informed practices; adult courts; procedural justice; gender-responsive treatment; abuse-to-prison pipeline

As researchers and practitioners begin to understand the complex relationship between trauma and criminal justice system involvement, there is an increasing need to evaluate courts and sentencing processes. Many offenders have victimization histories, yet past trauma is often ignored (Golladay, 2018). Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) – including trauma – are linked to numerous adult problems, including future victimization, substance abuse, mental health issues, and criminal justice system contact (Buffington et al., 2010; Centers for Disease Control & Prevention [CDC], 2013a; Felitti et al., 1998). Acknowledgment of trauma, along with education and adapted responses, can positively affect compliance, satisfaction, trust, and fairness.

The importance of trauma-informed justice practices has been recognized in school and criminal justice settings (Conradi et al., 2011; Crosby, 2016;

Rapp, 2016). Trauma-informed practices realize the impact of trauma, recognize signs and symptoms of trauma, and respond by integrating knowledge into policies and practices to reduce re-traumatization (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], 2014b). Principles of trauma-informed care include safety; trust and transparency; peer support; collaboration and mutuality; empowerment, voice, and choice; and acknowledgment of cultural, historical, and gender issues (SAMHSA, 2014b). This review integrates justice perspectives and gender-responsiveness for application to trauma-informed practices in adult courts.

The impact of trauma

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA] (2014a) describes trauma as a consequence of an event(s) or circumstances that has lasting, adverse physical or emotional effects on an individual's well-being. Trauma is exemplified by feelings of powerlessness, disconnection, and loss of control. Traumatic events replace normal and adaptive coping skills with maladaptive behaviors. The long-term effects of trauma can spill over into multiple quality of life aspects. Trauma can manifest in relationships, psychological or emotional distress, perceived safety, and inability to tolerate stress-inducing events or maladaptive coping mechanisms (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Penney 2013). Trauma increases risk of mental health and behavioral problems, substance abuse, and delinquency (Breiding et al., 2015; Buffington et al., 2010; Penney, 2013).

Long-term deleterious outcomes of trauma are documented in the groundbreaking work on ACEs (Centers for Disease Control & Prevention [CDC], 2013b; Felitti et al., 1998). This research identifies ten items including abuse, neglect, and substance abuse in the household. Untreated ACEs increase risk for mental and physical health issues later in life, suicide attempts, and early sexual activity (CDC, 2013a; Felitti et al., 1998). Other negative outcomes include future victimization, substance abuse, and contact with the criminal justice system. The CDC (2014) reported that women on average experienced a higher number of ACEs than men. Over two-thirds of participants in the study reported experiencing at least one adverse event before the age of 18, and 12 percent reported 4 or more ACEs (CDC, 2013b). Prior research finds that untreated ACEs contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline, highlighting the importance of developing interventions (Lowenstein, 2018).

The case for trauma-informed practices in adult court settings

Implementing trauma-informed practices can have positive impacts on individuals who interact with the legal system (Anyikwa, 2016; Campbell, 2006;

Drabble et al., 2013). Court and legal staff who employ trauma-informed practices report they have increased awareness and understanding that guides intervention and actions with clients (Anyikwa, 2016; Drabble et al., 2013), which reduces re-traumatizing clients and empowering them to cope with adaptive techniques and culturally competent responses (Anyikwa, 2016; Campbell & Raja, 2005; Drabble et al., 2013). Although not all individuals in the criminal justice system have experienced trauma or exhibit trauma responses, trauma-informed models allow for the understanding that past victimization is likely (Zelechowski, 2016).

Trauma-informed practices view trauma histories as a set of experiences that influence one's identity. These practices emphasize being respectful, avoiding negative behaviors, and modeling empathy (Levenson, 2017). According to Covington (1999) individuals and institutions utilizing trauma-informed practices should avoid triggering individuals, adjust behaviors to be supportive, and allow survivors to manage their trauma successfully. This is achieved by creating a calm environment, respecting boundaries, and using language and behaviors that communicate empowerment. Trauma-informed practices reduce punitive and shaming approaches, avoid intrusive monitoring, and use negotiation for conflict management. This model stresses client choice, but requires buy-in from correctional staff (Drabble et al., 2013).

Judges and other court actors can address power differentials in the courtroom, shifting to collaborative efforts and advocating for non-adversarial approaches to cases (Drabble et al., 2013). Trauma-informed courts should emphasize follow-up meetings and check-ins with clients. The stability of case-worker/client relationships is crucial. While employment and housing are valuable for success after involvement in the criminal justice system, barriers must be addressed before it is even possible for clients to achieve those goals. Community corrections officers can help clients by identifying state-sponsored programs and services that assist them with employment and housing (Holtfreter et al., 2004; Holtfreter & Wattanaporn, 2014). Courts can apply trauma-informed care principles in many processes including, but not limited to: intake, testimony, interventions, and sanctions (Arisco, 2014; SAMHSA, 2014b).

Trauma-informed practices: Theoretical connections

While trauma-informed practices are relatively new in criminal justice settings, their theoretical underpinnings overlap with justice perspectives, and with the principles of gender-responsive treatment. These perspectives are reviewed below.

Therapeutic jurisprudence

Wexler (1992) defines therapeutic jurisprudence as “the study of the role of law as a therapeutic agent” (p. 519). This perspective suggests that legal rules, procedures, and court actors can produce therapeutic or antitherapeutic consequences that impact individuals’ emotional well-being (Wexler, 1992, 1993; D. Wexler, 2000). Kaiser and Holtfreter (2016) integrated therapeutic jurisprudence and procedural justice as a framework for specialized court programs, arguing that these perspectives increase legitimacy, offender compliance, and treatment effectiveness. A therapeutic court system values autonomy, community safety, and integrity of the fact-finding process. Therapeutic jurisprudence rejects the use of coercion and paternalism on the side of the state, advocating for mental health (Wexler, 2018). At year-end 2016, 1 in 38 adults in the United States were under some form of correctional supervision, with the majority in the community on probation or parole (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018). From the point of arrest onward, individuals in the criminal justice system are subject to a variety of policies and procedures (e.g. random searches and loss of autonomy) that may trigger trauma responses (Clear et al., 2018). Wexler (2018) argued that the ACE interview itself can serve a therapeutic function, as opposed to potentially revictimizing individuals. Wexler’s model emphasizes the role of the judge and other court actors. Process-oriented judges are likely to employ procedural justice and trauma-informed tactics, increasing satisfaction and compliance with the courts (Wexler, 1992, 1993). Therapeutic jurisprudence is linked to trauma-informed lawyering, which relies on principles such as voice, validation, dignity, and respect (Katz & Haldar, 2016). This requires court actors to work with people using a trauma-informed lens regardless of whether their clients have trauma histories or diagnoses. Therapeutic jurisprudence prioritizes autonomy and safety, while trauma-informed practices see the potential for court actors to play a positive role.

Procedural justice

Tyler’s process-based model (Tyler, 2006) shows that personal and vicarious experiences with the police and courts influence perceptions of system legitimacy and fairness. Receiving fair treatment (procedural justice) is more important than receiving a favorable outcome (distributive justice). Perceptions of fairness are based on four characteristics of procedural justice: opportunity for voice, neutrality of authorities, being treated with dignity, and being respected (Tyler & Jackson, 2014). This perspective receives considerable support in a variety of criminal justice contexts (Kaiser & Reisig, 2019; Novich et al., 2018). Trauma-informed models rest on the similar assumption that fair treatment matters. Pemberton et al. (2017) offer insight

into implementing procedural justice in criminal courts. Voicing victim stories in the courtroom can provide a sense of community and connection, creating unity and support between court actors, victim, and offender.

Pemberton et al. (2017) argue that victim input can strengthen the bond with representatives of the justice system. This differs from the traditional adversarial approach of the criminal justice system (Feeley, 2017). While the overarching philosophy once emphasized rehabilitation, it became more punitive, compounded by moral panic and media sensationalism, which limits the ability to comprehensively address the implications of trauma for the offender, victim, and community (Pratt, 2019). In contrast, procedurally just tactics are designed to help restore social agency and improve mental health (Calton & Cattaneo, 2014).

Restorative justice

Restorative justice views offending as more than a legal infraction; rather, crime causes harm to individuals and communities and as such, a “just” sanction should not only punish the offender, but should also seek to address the harms created by the offense (Morris & Young, 2016). Restorative justice utilizes a relational theory of justice placing relationship healing as the central goal of justice (Randall & Haskell, 2013; Van Wormer, 2009). This model recognizes the traditional court system’s potential of revictimizing court-involved individuals. Randall and Haskell (2013) argue that restorative justice works best in tandem with trauma-informed practices to solve human problems. To increase positive outcomes for both victims and offenders, restorative justice must emphasize the role of trauma in offending. This acknowledgment is not an excuse, but rather a tool that all court actors can use to identify how trauma may create difficulties in one’s life, including victimizing others.

Used widely in Australia, restorative justice programs have aboriginal and Native American roots, and are designed to facilitate healing through conversations between offenders and their victims, assuming the victim is willing to participate in reconciliation (Daly, 2016; Van Wormer, 2009). The emphasis of restorative justice programs is on the offender accepting responsibility and being held accountable to the victim and the community (Miller & Hefner, 2015). Many victim advocates and judges express the belief that restorative justice practices may be more effective at reducing recidivism than the traditional criminal justice system (Belknap & McDonald, 2010; Curtis-Fawley & Daly, 2005). Restorative justice addresses the failings of the criminal justice system by allowing a space for victims to explain their experiences, and creating a sense of empowerment. With positive results for both victims and offenders, it is important to consider the expansion of restorative justice processes as an alternative to the formal justice processes.

Gender responsiveness

Gender-responsive treatment is frequently aligned with feminist criminological perspectives, such as Daly's (1992) pathways-to-crime framework. As a developmental approach, the pathways perspective documents the considerable overlap between victimization and offending (Wattapanorn & Holtfreter, 2014). In examining the circumstances that brought women to felony court, Daly (1992) identified five trajectories that women take to felony court, three of which include early onset of victimization and/or repeated exposure to violence and trauma as adults. The pathways perspective enjoys considerable empirical support in correctional contexts, with subsequent studies validating Daly's work, offering direction for targeting risks and needs present in the unique trajectories, and developing gender-responsive treatment plans (Reisig et al., 2006).

More specifically, gender-responsive treatment "reflects an understanding of the realities of females' lives" and addresses them in a therapeutic setting (Covington, 2014, p. 2). As an approach to treatment in correctional settings, gender responsiveness acknowledges how victimization and offending patterns differ based on gender, and how treatment plans should account for differences. For example, women are less likely to commit violent crime, but may be overrepresented in property and drug offenses (Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003). These treatments provide the same opportunities for males and females, with consideration for gender roles, interaction styles, and gendered socialization in delivering services (Covington & Bloom, 2000). Gender-responsive services seek to understand and properly respond to the influences of gender, relationships, environment, access and quality of services, socioeconomic status, and community on trauma manifestation. These practices acknowledge that a majority of substance-abusing women have been victims of sexual and/or physical violence. A gender-responsive lens views substance use as a coping mechanism rather than an act of defiance or criminality (Covington, 2008). In sum, gender-responsive treatment is both a starting point and a tenet of trauma-informed practices.

Current trauma-informed applications

Juvenile justice

Founded on the premise that children have a better capacity to be reformed than adults do, the juvenile justice system emphasized rehabilitation over retribution (Clear et al., 2018). The principles of rehabilitation that are a hallmark of juvenile justice system approaches could be extrapolated to adult correctional settings. The majority of youth in the juvenile justice system have been victimized at some point in their lifetime and up to half of those in custody have been diagnosed with posttraumatic stress disorder

(PTSD) (Adams, 2010; Ko et al., 2008). Trauma and delinquency have negative consequences for youth, particularly diminished school performance and attendance (Buffington et al., 2010). Repeated exposure to trauma can increase risk of low academic performance, high-risk behaviors, relational difficulties, increased use of mental health services, and engagement with the juvenile justice system (Ford et al., 2006). These negative consequences extend to adulthood (Garland et al., 2001). Juvenile courts that employ trauma-informed practices understand that victimization increases delinquency, patterns of aggression, rule breaking, and risky behavior (Buffington et al., 2010).

Juvenile justice settings are ideal for implementation of trauma-informed practices, as the charging and sentencing guidelines are more lenient compared to adults (Robinson & Kurlychek, 2019). The traditional court system uses coercion to ensure compliance and threats of incarceration for probation violations (Dierkhising & Branson, 2016). Traditional practices in both juvenile and adult settings utilize locked facilities, ankle bracelets, solitary confinement, scared straight tactics, and often include transient staff (Rapp, 2016). These practices forget that offenders are often likely to be victims themselves and may trigger panic and flashbacks among individuals who have experienced trauma (Rapp, 2016). These responses often escalate tense situations leading to worse outcomes. Rapp (2016) advocates that juvenile justice workers view traumatized youth not as rational actors, but instead as reactive actors seeking to prevent harm and danger to themselves at all costs. Juvenile courts have goals of reducing risk factors, increasing protective factors, and creating opportunities for youth to make meaningful decisions (Crosby, 2016). These courts may make decisions about out-of-home placement and treatment, transfer to the adult justice system, and adoption (Crosby, 2016). They must consider culture, trauma histories, and stigmas associated with early justice system involvement. Court actors need to understand the social, cognitive, and psychological factors that impede or limit youths' insight as it relates to motivations, actions, and consequences (Crosby, 2016).

Conradi and associates (Conradi et al., 2011), and Crosby (2016) suggest viewing behaviors as responses to trauma rather than "bad behavior," as successful trauma-informed practices in juvenile justice settings utilize knowledge of trauma in mental health assessments, case planning, and management. They also rely on system collaboration and connections with external services (Conradi et al., 2011; Crosby, 2016). Ko et al. (2008) explain that courts must address traumatic stressors such as exposure to coercion, cruelty, violence, neglect, and rejection. Ko et al. (2008) caution that untreated stressors can be exacerbated by the court system, resulting in defiance, aggression, deviance, risky behavior, re-traumatization, and chronic justice involvement.

Dual system involvement

Implications for comprehensive trauma-informed policy and practices are particularly relevant for dual system-involved youth (Ko et al., 2008). Dierkhising and Branson (2016) suggest this is an opportunity to include cross-disciplinary perspectives from the various legal settings in addition to utilizing trauma experts when working with these youth and developing treatment plans. Additionally, trauma-informed practices prioritize family involvement, working to eliminate shame, stigma, and barriers to family engagement. Rapp (2016) suggests the following principles for juvenile justice trauma-informed practices: safe physical environments, transparent processes that eliminate the need for coercion and fear tactics, empowerment of clients, rehabilitation of youth and families, collaboration with other agencies, avoiding repetitive interviews that require repeated disclosures with minimal utility, employing the least intrusive level of care, and addressing vicarious trauma among staff. To reiterate, practices used in juvenile court can be applied in adult court settings to provide safety and avoid re-traumatization of court-involved individuals with prior victimization histories.

School disciplinary processes

As the link between school performance, trauma, and delinquency is increasingly researched, schools are employing trauma-informed disciplinary processes to address both the school-to-prison and sexual violence-to-prison pipelines (Buffington et al., 2010). The school environment may be especially difficult for students with trauma as they are less likely to complete homework, score lower on tests, fail at higher rates than their counterparts, have lower GPAs, are more likely to be suspended, and have lower graduation rates (Day et al., 2015; Novak, 2019; Wiest-Stevenson & Lee, 2016).

Similar to the justice system, educators may misinterpret trauma (Day et al., 2015; Wiest-Stevenson & Lee, 2016). Nonetheless, the school environment can promote resiliency that can act as a protective factor across the lifespan. Schools can provide safety, supportive connections, and help students understand and manage their emotions, which is an important tool for lifelong, positive coping skills (Haight et al., 2016; Wilkins et al., 2014). They can also share information and collaborate with child welfare services, juvenile justice, and mental health services to improve the well-being of students. Lowenstein (2018) advocates for evidence-based processes that enhance coping and emotional regulation skills for youth, in addition to behavior management. Specific recommendations for children with academic or social difficulties include programs that provide counseling and help foster relationship and community building (Meiners, 2011; Wald & Kurlaender, 2003).

Wiest-Stevenson and Lee (2016) outline a three-pronged approach to identifying and assessing the needs of students impacted by trauma: school performance, responses in the classroom, and emotional and/or physical distress. School performance assesses GPA, dropout likelihood, and the effects of suspension and expulsion. Students experiencing trauma may display a variety of responses in the classroom including jumpiness, sleepiness, moodiness, anger, or social withdrawal. Poor emotional and impulse control may indicate emotional and/or physical distress (Wiest-Stevenson & Lee, 2016). Day et al. (2015) studied the impact of trauma-informed interventions at one school, where students initially reported a mean level of 22.7 on the Child Report of Post Traumatic Symptoms scale, which was significantly reduced ($t = -2.53$; $p < .05$) to a mean of 20.16 after implementation of trauma-informed practices. Simkins et al. (2004) suggest smaller class sizes, adapting instruction to meet the needs of students, flexibility in student support, and resources for students and families as promising trauma-informed practices in schools. They explain that teachers are in the most advantageous place to spot abuse and provide resources for students. This research suggests positive mental health outcomes when trauma is recognized and treated. Therefore, educators should consider the possibilities of sexual abuse, neglect, and domestic violence, which can help in identifying and referring students to trauma-informed services (Simkins et al., 2004).

Specialized courts

Compared to traditional courts, specialized courts use a team-based approach to solve legal problems. Clients – typically representing first time offenders identified as low to medium risk – are referred to specialized courts as an alternative to incarceration (Kaiser & Holtfreter, 2016). There are many types of specialized courts, ranging from domestic violence and family courts to substance abuse and mental health courts (Kaiser & Holtfreter, 2016). In one study of 192 participants in a family drug court, those who completed trauma treatment had significantly lower levels of depression and anxiety at a 6-month follow-up than those in traditional programming, and were also more likely to be reunited with their children (Powell et al., 2012). In this study, trauma treatment included weekly court sessions, alcohol and/or drug treatment, meetings with a case manager, and trauma-informed therapy.

The benefits of trauma-informed practices in family drug courts extend to service providers, who have reported increased awareness of trauma and increased sensitivity toward clients (Drabble et al., 2013). Similarly, in specialized domestic violence courts, prosecution is conducted with an active approach that prioritizes victim safety, offender accountability, and treatment. Both victims and offenders in this setting report perceptions of fair treatment and satisfaction with the overall process (Gover et al., 2007).

Across specialized court settings, the supportive role of the judge is important in promoting procedural justice and reducing recidivism (Somers & Holtfreter, 2018; Wales et al., 2010). In sum, procedural justice and trauma-informed practices have similar processes and goals that are implemented through perceived fairness, neutrality, respect and voice. Courts can play a therapeutic role by implementing practices that support needs of victims and offenders with the objective of moving beyond prosecution and addressing healing from trauma.

Proposed applications of trauma-informed practices in adult courts

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) has developed guidelines for trauma-informed practices. Here, each principle of trauma-informed practices is examined, addressing how principles are applied with implications for implementation in adult court settings.

SAMHSA model

According to SAMHSA, trauma-informed practices are person-centered and culturally competent. They advocate for the development of therapeutic alliances and engage in shared responsibility for decisions. These alliances allow for collaboratively designed recovery plans and interdisciplinary teams. Trauma-informed practices also employ evidence-based strategies, using recovery and resilience-oriented care principles (i.e., an approach which recognizes individuals' capacity for recovery) to advocate for the client (Anyikwa, 2016). The SAMHSA (2014b) model rests on the "four R's": realization about trauma, recognizing signs of trauma, responding through trauma principles, and resisting re-traumatization. Realization about trauma requires court actors to understand that many of the individuals they work with may be prior victims of trauma. Learning how to recognize the signs of trauma and how it manifests in various contexts across environments requires staff to identify trauma symptoms as coping mechanisms. SAMHSA's process acknowledges the potential triggers court-involved individuals may experience throughout the legal system. Court staff trained in this framework can actively minimize triggers, and promote the well-being and safety of all parties. There are six principles of trauma-informed practices: safety; trustworthiness and transparency; peer support; collaboration and mutuality; empowerment, voice, and choice; and consideration of cultural, historical, and gender issues (SAMHSA, 2014b). These principles, along with their theoretical connections, current practices, and proposed applications, are presented in [Table 1](#).

Table 1. Trauma-informed principles: Connecting theory to practice.

Trauma-Informed Principles	Theoretical Connections	Current Practices	Proposed Practices
Safety	Therapeutic Jurisprudence Gender Responsiveness	Juvenile Justice School Discipline Specialized Courts	Protective orders Private testimonies Maintaining confidentiality Safety planning in attorney-client conversations
Trust & Transparency	Procedural Justice Restorative Justice	Juvenile Justice Specialized Courts	Explaining potential outcomes Validating client emotions Referrals and support options Providing reasoning behind probation and parole decisions Communicating desire for fairness
Peer Support	Therapeutic Jurisprudence Restorative Justice	Juvenile Justice Specialized Courts	Open communication among staff Peer support groups for victims and defendants Peer mentors to navigate the courts process
Collaboration & Mutuality	Procedural Justice Restorative Justice Gender Responsiveness	Juvenile Justice School Discipline Specialized Courts	Team-based approach Monthly stakeholder meetings Collaborating with agencies to inform practices Referral services Implementing a “fact finder” role
Empowerment, Voice, & Choice	Therapeutic Jurisprudence Procedural Justice Restorative Justice Gender Responsiveness	Juvenile Justice Specialized Courts	Opportunity for victims and defendants to speak Attorneys prepare clients to speak Judges work with defendants to create plans for change Behavioral contracts Public commitment
Cultural, Historical, & Gender Issues	Therapeutic Jurisprudence Gender Responsiveness	Juvenile Justice School Discipline Specialized Courts	Defendants have an opportunity to speak rather than the attorney Understand how culture and identity relate to justice processes Define target behaviors specifically and clearly Incentives for follow through Reminders of court dates, avoid jargon Staff introductions to court-involved individuals Understanding of how trauma impacts memory and retelling of events

Safety

Safety is a primary goal of the criminal justice system. This principle is often considered in juvenile justice settings, and can be employed in other court settings as well. Safety includes three facets: community protection, safety of crime victims, and safety of offenders. The tenet of safety is particularly relevant for traumatized youth and adults involved in court proceedings, such as testifying against their perpetrator. Victims testifying against their abuser often experience anxiety and fear of retribution, which may deter full disclosure and cooperation in the legal environment (Patterson et al., 2018). Courts can aid victims by placing safety as a main concern. This may mean issuing protective orders, creating opportunities for private testimonies, and maintaining confidentiality. Attorneys can incorporate safety planning into client discussions to minimize triggers and re-traumatization, by promoting psychological safety of individuals during case processing (Katz & Haldar, 2016).

Trust and transparency

Trust and transparency, as discussed previously, can be employed by attorneys and judges at many stages of court proceedings by promoting fairness and equity. Specifically, survivors of trauma may experience difficulties developing trusting relationships (Penney, 2013). As Katz and Haldar (2016) acknowledge, the legal process can be terrifying and mysterious for many individuals. Demystifying the procedures and being transparent about the process and potential outcomes can help court-involved individuals, particularly those who may have been traumatized. Attorneys can build rapport with their clients during interviewing and client meetings, by validating the client's feelings and emotions while defining the roles of agents of the court (Katz & Haldar, 2016). Both judges and attorneys can implement transparency about all possible outcomes and likely solutions as well as options for support. Judges can communicate a desire to achieve fairness and justice during proceedings. Judges and attorneys can also discuss reasoning behind community supervision conditions (Wexler, 2000).

Peer support

Peer support can most directly be applied in specialized court settings as the individuals in those courts are coping with similar issues based on offending context. Primarily used in social work and therapeutic settings, peer support can be brought into the court setting for both staff and court-involved individuals (Arisco, 2014; Katz & Haldar, 2016). When addressing trauma, it is possible for court staff to experience vicarious trauma or mental health issues due to the emphasis and increased discussion around traumatic experiences. Staff can utilize peer support and embrace open communication about experiences of vicarious trauma (Arisco, 2014; Katz & Haldar, 2016). A task for future

research is to empirically assess the effects of a supportive work environment on outcomes such as staff mental health, turnover, morale, and support for clients. In sum, peer support groups, peer mentors, and other opportunities for engagement can be employed for court-involved individuals.

Collaboration and mutuality

Collaboration is important for successful implementation of trauma-informed practices as this principle integrates gender-responsive treatment and therapeutic jurisprudence. Social workers and victim advocates are the primary agents of the court who can implement these practices (Brubaker, 2019). The law does not operate in a vacuum as many agencies and systems can be working adjacently on the same criminal case (Hagan, 1989; Holtfreter & Wattanaporn, 2014; Maguire & Duffee, 2015). Accordingly, these agencies have an opportunity to incorporate these tenets into their practice. While it would be difficult to take a complete team-based approach for every court case, monthly stakeholder meetings or allowing other agency members to attend court proceedings to inform practices may be beneficial for model development. Specifically, courts can implement the continuum of care model to increase referral services for victims and offenders seeking help outside of the courtroom (Holtfreter & Wattanaporn, 2014). It is important to remember that risk for offending and victimization does not end at a legal decision. There are other factors that need to be comprehensively reviewed in order to establish a holistic solution. In discussing roles of court actors, Wexler (1992) suggests developing a role of the “fact-finder” in the courts system, which would combine the judge and prosecutor as a civil arbitrator. This role would require maintaining a knowledge of mental health law and the impacts of mental health challenges. Relevant to trauma-informed practices, the “fact finder” assists in incorporating knowledge of the signs and implications of trauma in court proceedings (Wexler, 1992).

Empowerment, voice, and choice

Research increasingly shows that when defendants and victims have an opportunity to voice their experience and participate in the decision-making process, both groups view court proceedings and actors as fair (Somers & Holtfreter, 2018; Walters & Bolger, 2019). Procedural justice, therapeutic jurisprudence, and gender-responsive treatment all rely on empowerment, voice, and choice. This principle can also be applied in cross-examination and sentencing. Cross-examination is intentionally adversarial and it is possible to retraumatize individuals (Segovia et al., 2016), however it also provides an opportunity to be heard. Among best practices, it is recommended that attorneys work closely with clients to prepare them to speak during the court proceedings, and judges can work with defendants to create plans for change and implement voice, creating buy-in and compliance.

Opportunities for victim empowerment occur in decisions for treatment options, transitional processes, and activities like arts and job programming (Penney, 2013). Wexler (1992, 2000) also suggests behavioral contracts, public commitment from defendants in front of family and friends, and involving the defendant in the plea and charging process with the judge to reinforce strategies for empowerment. In sentencing, incarceration is a practice that likely results in re-traumatization while community programming may be a more therapeutic alternative (Pratt, 2019). It is important to gain input from relevant parties including the victim, defendant, and related agencies (e.g. social work, health care, and victim advocates) in sentencing decisions (De La Rue & Ortega, 2019; Pratt, 2019). Wexler also discusses the importance of giving voice to those engaging with the court system. For example, many defendants are not directly addressed in the courtroom. Rather, the judge and other court actors speak to the defendant's attorney. Therapeutic jurisprudence suggests that judges should encourage the defendant to share what happened in their own words rather than simply agreeing with descriptions provided by their attorneys (Wexler, 1993).

Cultural, historical, and gender issues

An individual's background is comprised of racial, ethnic, gender, and cultural identities, all of which may shape opinions on court processes and views on fairness (Lowenstein, 2018). In the courts and sentencing literature, intersectional approaches involve moving beyond the recognition that disparities exist, to considering how different categories of disadvantage interact to produce cumulative disadvantage (Gaub & Holtfreter, 2015). Individual, family, and community factors intersect and influence how legal sanctions are experienced (Lowenstein, 2018). Historical trauma and discrimination also affect how individuals relate to the law (Hinton, 2016). For example, mass incarceration has different meanings and consequences for people of color compared to white individuals (Hinton, 2016). Similarly, Native Americans have historically been victimized by the government and legal system, altering their interactions and perceptions of the legal system (Deer, 2018). A gender-responsive lens considers how individual identity has implications for treatment and decision-making processes, which may influence other legal system interactions. Increasing overall knowledge by court actors on how trauma and legal consequences interact with client identities can create healthier outcomes for court-involved individuals, which is an avenue future research should address.

Wexler's (1992) concept of therapeutic jurisprudence works in tandem with this idea. Among the recommendations under therapeutic jurisprudence, court actors can assist victims and offenders by introducing themselves, avoiding court jargon, and eliciting suggestions and preferences. Defining target behaviors with specificity and clear understanding of the

positive and aversive consequences is also suggested by Wexler (2016). Pragmatically, attorneys can regularly follow up with their clients and remind them of court dates, review transportation plans, and prepare for court dates (Wexler, 1992, 2000). Attorneys can anticipate and work with clients who are consistently late or miss meetings without punishing them or treating them disrespectfully. These practices take into account one's access to resources and knowledge of court processes and consequences. Clients may share their experience with many inconsistencies in retelling. As detailed by Katz and Haldar (2016), it is especially helpful for lawyers to refocus clients when discussing traumatic events, help clients remember specific details, prepare in short sessions to minimize traumatization, and assist clients in preparing to tell their story in a consistent and credible way. Communicating with patience is interpreted as respectful and acknowledges the various ways trauma manifests across individuals (Wexler, 2018).

Implications for research and practice

The theoretical perspectives and prior research reviewed here provide a point of departure for future research and practice on trauma-informed adult courts. While preliminary results from juvenile justice, school discipline, and specialized court contexts are promising, replication and continued evaluation of existing practices are needed (Somers & Holtfreter, 2018). Research that examines the outcomes and effectiveness of trauma-informed practices would be a welcome addition to the literature. Future research should examine a range of outcomes, such as legal compliance, perceptions of court actors, satisfaction with court processes, and likelihood of future victimization. An exploratory study applying these integrated, trauma-informed practices in an adult court—coupled with a process evaluation—would be insightful for developing protocols, informing trainings and measuring efficiency. It is also important to further examine the extent to which the criminal justice system re-traumatizes court-involved individuals, which may occur in arrest, in court, and/or incarceration (Katz & Haldar, 2016). By identifying the stage(s) that are potentially most harmful, scholars and practitioners can collaborate to develop methods for minimizing re-traumatization. Lastly, more research on the link between trauma and future offending (i.e., the victim-offender overlap) is needed. These future research areas can inform the development of more trauma-responsive interventions across sectors.

Implementing trauma-informed practices into adult courts also has practical implications. It is important that attorneys, judges, and other court actors receive training on trauma-informed care and are well-versed in the application of these practices to the courtroom. This may lead to an increased need for and development of wraparound services. Trauma-informed

practices require building connections with other social services, such as mental health, housing, transportation, employment, childcare, and substance abuse treatment. Building these comprehensive collaborations takes time, as providers of wraparound services need working knowledge on how trauma may affect offenders. Specialized courts provide an example for providing integrated treatment and services that trauma-informed adult courts may consider replicating. Lastly, future research should evaluate outcomes such as revictimization, trauma, and recidivism in adults courts that have implemented restorative justice practices. Restorative justice practices used in tandem with trauma-informed principles can provide a greater sense of healing and can address underlying issues. While trauma-informed practices may have positive outcomes, it is important to consider the cost of implementing such practices. Trauma-informed practices would require increased time and resources dedicated to training and collaboration across social service systems. Attorneys, judges, juries, and community corrections officers would likely need additional trauma training.

Conclusion

This review explored how trauma-informed practices are inherently connected to several theories and practices already widely used in the criminal justice system, specifically, therapeutic jurisprudence, procedural justice, restorative justice, and gender-responsive treatment. Preliminary research indicates positive outcomes based on these theories, but more work is needed. Trauma-informed care, coupled with these theories and practices, creates an overarching model of justice that can be applied to traumatized individuals. Findings illustrate that trauma-informed care has effectively been implemented in specialized courts, juvenile justice, and school disciplinary processes with positive outcomes (SAMHSA, 2014b). The courtroom and its actors can provide a safe and supportive place for court-involved individuals that may otherwise be adversarial and re-traumatizing.

Acknowledgments

The authors very much appreciate the constructive feedback provided by the Editor, Guest Editor, and Reviewers.

Disclosure of interest

Authors declare that they have no conflicts to report.

References

- Adams, E. (2010). *Healing invisible wounds: Why investing in trauma-informed care for children makes sense*. Justice Policy Institute.
- Anyikwa, V. A. (2016). Trauma-informed approach to survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 13(5), 484–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2016.1166824>
- Arisco, A. (2014, November 3). *Trauma-informed correctional care (TICC)*. [web log post]. <https://www.acesconnection.com/blog/trauma-informed-correctional-care-ticc>
- Belknap, J., & McDonald, C. (2010). Judges' attitudes about and experiences with sentencing circles in intimate-partner abuse cases. *Canadian Journal of Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 52(2), 369–395. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.52.4.369>
- Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. R. (2015). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements, Version 2.0*. National Center for Injury Prevention, & Control, Centers for Disease Control & Prevention.
- Brubaker, S. J. (2019). Campus-based sexual assault victim advocacy and Title IX: Revisiting tensions between grassroots activism and the criminal justice system. *Feminist Criminology*, 13(3), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085118772087>
- Buffington, K., Dierkhising, C. B., & Marsh, S. C. (2010). Ten things every juvenile court judge should know about trauma and delinquency. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 61(3), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.2010.61.issue-3>
- Calton, J., & Cattaneo, L. B. (2014). The effects of procedural and distributive justice on intimate partner violence victims' mental health and likelihood of future help-seeking. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 84(4), 329–340. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0099841>
- Campbell, R. (2006). Rape survivors' experiences with the legal and medical systems: Do rape victim advocates make a difference? *Violence Against Women*, 12(1), 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801205277539>
- Campbell, R., & Raja, S. (2005). The sexual assault and secondary victimization of female veterans: Help-seeking experiences with military and civilian social systems. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(1), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00171.x>
- Centers for Disease Control & Prevention. (2013a). *Adverse childhood experience study: Major findings*. <http://www.cdc.gov/ace/findings.htm>
- Centers for Disease Control & Prevention. (2013b). *Adverse childhood experiences study: Prevalence of individual adverse childhood experiences*. <http://www.cdc.gov/ace/prevalence.htm>
- Centers for Disease Control & Prevention. (2014). *The adverse childhood experiences study 1995–1997*. <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy/index.html>
- Clear, T. R., Reisig, M. D., & Cole, G. F. (2018). *American corrections* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Conradi, L., Agosti, J., Tullberg, E., Richardson, L., Langan, H., Ko, S., & Wilson, C. (2011). Promising practices and strategies for using trauma-informed child welfare practice to improve foster care placement stability: A breakthrough series collaborative. *Child Welfare*, 90(6), 207–225.
- Covington, S. S., & Bloom, B. E. (2000, November). Gendered justice: Programming for women in correctional settings. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA.
- Covington, S. S. (1999). Creating gender-specific treatment for substance-abusing women and girls in community correctional settings. *Offender Programs Report*, 3(3), 1–43. https://www.civicrosearchinstitute.com/online/article_abstract.php?pid=15&iid=718&aid=4900

- Covington, S. S. (2008). Women and addiction: A trauma-informed approach. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 40(SARC Suppl. 5), 377–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2008.10400665>
- Covington, S. S. (2014). Creating gender responsive and trauma-informed services for women in the justice system. *Magistrate*, 70(5), 2–3. <https://www.stephaniecovington.com/assets/files/news/Magistrate-October-November-2014-SCs-Interview-low-res.pdf>
- Crosby, S. D. (2016). Trauma-informed approaches to juvenile justice: A critical race perspective. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 67(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12052>
- Curtis-Fawley, S., & Daly, K. (2005). Gendered violence and restorative justice: The views of victim advocates. *Violence Against Women*, 11(5), 603–638. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801205274488>
- Daly, K. (1992). Women's pathways to felony court: Feminist theories of lawbreaking and problems of representation. *Southern California Review of Law & Women's Studies*, 2(1), 11–52.
- Daly, K. (2016). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(1), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1107797>
- Day, A. G., Somers, C. L., Baroni, B. A., West, S. D., Sanders, L., & Peterson, C. D. (2015). Evaluation of a trauma-informed school intervention with girls in a residential facility school: Student perceptions of school environment. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 24(10), 1086–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2015.1079279>
- De La Rue, L., & Ortega, L. (2019). Intersectional trauma-responsive care: A framework for humanizing care for justice involved girls and women of color. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 28(4), 502–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2019.1572403>
- Deer, S. (2018). Native people and violent crime: Gendered violence and tribal jurisdiction. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 15(1), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X18000012>
- Dierkhising, C. B., & Branson, C. E. (2016). Looking forward: A research and policy agenda for creating trauma-informed juvenile justice systems. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 5(1), 14–30. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/249840.pdf>
- Drabble, L. A., Jones, S., & Brown, V. (2013). Advancing trauma-informed systems change in a family drug treatment court context. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, 13(1), 91–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533256X.2012.756341>
- Feeley, M. (2017). Two models of the criminal justice system: An organizational perspective. In M. Feeley (Ed.), *Crime, Law, & Society: Selected Essays* (pp. 119–137). Routledge.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood experiences (ACE) study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14(4), 245–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8)
- Ford, J. D., Chapman, J., Mack, M., & Pearson, G. (2006). Pathways from traumatic child victimization to delinquency: Implications for juvenile and permanency court proceedings and decisions. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 57(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.2006.57.issue-1>
- Garland, A. F., Hough, R. L., McCabe, K. M., Yeh, M. A. Y., Wood, P. A., & Aarons, G. A. (2001). Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in youths across five sectors of care. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(4), 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200104000-00009>
- Gaub, J. E., & Holtfreter, K. (2015). New directions in intersections, inequality, and sentencing. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 298–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2014.989299>

- Golladay, K. A. (2018). *Understanding victim-offender overlap taxonomies: A longitudinal study*. Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Gover, A. R., Brank, E. M., & MacDonald, J. M. (2007). A specialized domestic violence court in South Carolina: An example of procedural justice for victims and defendants. *Violence Against Women*, 13(6), 603–626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801207301553>
- Hagan, J. (1989). Why is there so little criminal justice theory? Neglected macro-and micro-level links between organization and power. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 26(2), 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427889026002002>
- Haight, W., Kayama, M., & Gibson, P. A. (2016). Out-of-school suspensions of black youths: Culture, ability, disability, gender, and perspective. *Social Work*, 61(3), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww021>
- Hinton, E. (2016). *From the war on poverty to the war on crime: The making of mass incarceration in America*. Harvard University Press.
- Holtfreter, K., Reisig, M. D., & Morash, M. (2004). Poverty, state capital, and recidivism among women offenders. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(2), 185–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cpp.2004.3.issue-2>
- Holtfreter, K., & Wattanaporn, K. A. (2014). The transition from prison to community initiative: An examination of gender-responsiveness for female offender reentry. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 41(1), 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813504406>
- Kaeble, D., & Cowhig, M. (2018). *Correctional populations in the United States. 2016*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Kaiser, K. A., & Holtfreter, K. (2016). An integrated theory of specialized court programs: Using procedural justice and therapeutic jurisprudence to promote offender compliance and rehabilitation. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 43(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815609642>
- Kaiser, K. A., & Reisig, M. D. (2019). Legal socialization and self-reported offending: The role of procedural justice and legal orientations. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 35(1), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-017-9375-4>
- Katz, S., & Haldar, D. (2016). The pedagogy of trauma-informed lawyering. *New York University Clinical Law Review*, 22(2), 359–393.
- Ko, S. J., Ford, J. D., Kassam-Adams, N., Berkowitz, S. J., Wilson, C., Wong, M., Brymer, M. J., & Layne, C. M. (2008). Creating trauma-informed systems: Child welfare, education, first responders, health care, juvenile justice. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice*, 39(4), 396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.39.4.396>
- Koons-Witt, B. A., & Schram, P. J. (2003). The prevalence and nature of violent offending by females. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(4), 361–371. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(03\)00028-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00028-X)
- Levenson, J. (2017). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work*, 62(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001>
- Lowenstein, K. (2018). *Shutting down the trauma to prison pipeline: Early, appropriate care for child-welfare involved youth*. Citizens for Juvenile Justice. Available at <https://ww.cfjj.org/trauma-to-prison>
- Maguire, E. R., & Duffee, D. E. (Eds.). (2015). *Criminal justice theory: Explaining the nature and behavior of criminal justice*. Routledge.
- Meiners, E. R. (2011). Ending the school-to-prison pipeline/building abolition futures. *The Urban Review*, 43(4), 547–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0187-9>
- Miller, S. L., & Hefner, M. K. (2015). Procedural justice for victims and offenders? Exploring restorative justice processes in Australia and the United States. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(1), 142–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2012.760643>

- Morris, A., & Young, W. (2016). Reforming criminal justice: The potential of restorative justice. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Restorative justice: Philosophy to practice* (pp. 11–32). Taylor and Francis.
- Novak, A. (2019). The school-to-prison pipeline: An examination of the associations between suspension and justice system involvement. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 46 (8), 1165–1180. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854819846917>
- Novich, M., Kringen, A. L., & Hunt, G. (2018). “They can’t search her.” How gender imbalances in the police force contribute to perceptions of procedural unfairness. *Feminist Criminology*, 13(3), 237–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085117753669>
- Patterson, M. J., Gover, A. R., & Trochmann, M. (2018). Victim rights and retribution. In O. H. Griffin & V. H. Woodward (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of corrections in the United States* (pp. 15–23). Taylor & Francis.
- Pemberton, A., Aarten, P. G. M., & Mulder, E. (2017). Beyond retribution, restoration and procedural justice: The Big Two of communion and agency in victims’ perspectives on justice. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 23(7), 682–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2017.1298760>
- Penney, D. (2013). *Creating a place of healing and forgiveness: The trauma-informed care initiative at the Women’s community correctional center of Hawaii*. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, United States Department of Health and Human Services. [http://www.nasmhpd.org/sites/default/files/7014_hawaiian_trauma_brief_2013\(1\).pdf](http://www.nasmhpd.org/sites/default/files/7014_hawaiian_trauma_brief_2013(1).pdf)
- Powell, C., Stevens, S., Dolce, B. L., Sinclair, K. O., & Swenson-Smith, C. (2012). Outcomes of a trauma-informed Arizona family drug court. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, 12(3), 219–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533256X.2012.702624>
- Pratt, T. C. (2019). *Addicted to incarceration* (2nd ed.). Sage Publication.
- Randall, M., & Haskell, L. (2013). Trauma-informed approaches to law: Why restorative justice must understand trauma and psychological coping. *Dalhousie Law Journal*, 36(2), 501–534.
- Rapp, L. (2016). Delinquent-victim youth—Adapting a trauma-informed approach for the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 13(5), 492–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2016.1166844>
- Reisig, M. D., Holtfreter, K., & Morash, M. (2006). Assessing recidivism risk across female pathways to crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(3), 384–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820600869152>
- Robinson, K., & Kurlychek, M. (2019). Differences in justice, differences in outcomes: A DID approach to studying outcomes in juvenile and adult court processing. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 2(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2019.1585927>
- Segovia, D. A., Strange, D., & Takarangi, M. K. T. (2016). Trauma memories on trial: Is cross-examination a safeguard against distorted analogue traumatic memories? *Memory*, 25 (1), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2015.1126608>
- Simkins, S. B., Hirsch, A. E., Horvat, E. M., & Moss, M. B. (2004). School to prison pipeline for girls: The role of physical and sexual abuse. *Children’s Legal Rights Journal*, 24(4), 56–72.
- Somers, L. J., & Holtfreter, K. (2018). Gender and mental health: An examination of procedural justice in a specialized court context. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 36(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.v36.1>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014a). *Trauma-informed care in behavioral health services*. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 57, HHS Publication No. (SMA) 13-4801. <https://store.samhsa.gov/product/TIP-57-Trauma-Informed-Care-in-Behavioral-Health-Services/SMA14-4816>

- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014b). *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach*. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884. https://www.nasmhpd.org/sites/default/files/SAMHSA_Concept_of_Trauma_and_Guidance.pdf
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2014). Popular legitimacy and the exercise of legal authority: Motivating compliance, cooperation, and engagement. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 20(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034514>
- van Wormer, K. (2009). Restorative justice as social justice for victims of gendered violence: A standpoint feminist perspective. *Social Work*, 54(2), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/54.2.107>
- Wald, J., & Kurlaender, M. (2003). Connected in Seattle? An exploratory study of student perceptions of discipline and attachments to teachers. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 2003(99), 35–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.53>
- Wales, H. W., Hiday, V. A., & Ray, B. (2010). Procedural justice and the mental health court judge's role in reducing recidivism. *International Journal of Law & Psychiatry*, 33(4), 265–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2010.06.009>
- Walters, G. D., & Bolger, P. C. (2019). Procedural justice perceptions, legitimacy beliefs, and compliance with the law: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 15(3), 341–372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9338-2>
- Wattanaporn, K. A., & Holtfreter, K. (2014). The impact of feminist pathways research on gender-responsive policy and practice. *Feminist Criminology*, 9(3), 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085113519491>
- Wexler, D. B. (2000). Therapeutic jurisprudence: An overview. *Thomas M. Cooley Law Review*, 17(1), 125–134.
- Wexler, D. B. (1992). Justice, mental health, and therapeutic jurisprudence. *Cleveland State Law Review*, 40(3), 517–526.
- Wexler, D. B. (1993). Therapeutic jurisprudence and the criminal courts. *William & Mary Law Review*, 35(1), 279–299.
- Wexler, D. B. (2016). Guiding court conversation along pathways conducive to rehabilitation: Integrating procedural justice and therapeutic jurisprudence. *International Journal of Therapeutic Jurisprudence*, 1(2), 367–372. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2677431>
- Wexler, D. B. (2018). Can an ACE screening interview itself be therapeutic? *Therapeutic Jurisprudence in the Mainstream*. Arizona Legal Studies Paper No. 18-35. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3287223>
- Wiest-Stevenson, C., & Lee, C. (2016). Trauma-informed schools. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 13(5), 498–503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2016.1166855>
- Wilkins, N., Tsao, B., Hertz, M., Davis, R., & Klevens, J. (2014). *Connecting the dots: An overview of the links among multiple forms of violence*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Oakland, CA: Prevention Institute.
- Zelechoski, A. D. (2016). Trauma, adverse experience, and offending. In K. Heilbrun, D. DeMatteo, & N. E. S. Goldstein (Eds.), *APA handbook of psychology and Juvenile Justice* (pp. 325–342). American Psychological Association.