



BRIEFING REPORT

Analysis of the Effect of First Time Secure Detention Stays due to Failure to Appear (FTA) in Florida

Prepared by:
Meghan Ogle, M.S.
Office of Research & Data Integrity

Issue:

In keeping with the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) and the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's (FDJJ) Roadmap to System Excellence, the Department has examined the relationship between first time detention stays for failures to appear (FTA) in court and subsequent recidivism and re-confinement. The findings from this analysis will aid in understanding the way FDJJ handles youth who fail to appear in court for misdemeanor offenses. Specifically, does detaining this population of youth lead to significantly worse outcomes for youth than if they had been allowed to await their court date in the community?

Methodology:

All youth included in this study were either released from secure detention or probation during calendar year 2012 and had never previously been confined in either detention or residential placement. The youth included in the study were either placed on probation for a misdemeanor offense or detained for an FTA-court order that was associated with a misdemeanor offense. Thus, the sample consisted of youth who were relatively non-serious offenders. Youth who were 16 or older at the time of release from secure detention or probation were removed from the sample to allow for a two year follow-up period within the juvenile justice system. The FTA-detained youth were matched to the youth released from probation based on demographic, familial, juvenile justice system involvement, and individual characteristics so that the two groups were statistically identical. This allowed for the effect of FTA-detention stays to be isolated. The final sample consisted of 857 youth, 340 of which were detained for an FTA and 517 youth who released from probation during the same time period.

FTA youth were matched to probation youth using a propensity score which reflects the estimated likelihood of receiving an FTA-related detention stay, based on the youth's demographic, familial, prior offense, and individual characteristics. Three outcomes were investigated: 1) "official recidivism" (a new law offense that was adjudicated or had adjudication withheld within two years of release from detention), 2) "technical recidivism" (the same definition of recidivism, but for technical offenses only), and 3) subsequent detainment in a juvenile detention facility.

Results:

FTA-detention stays significantly increase the likelihood of all 3 measured forms of recidivism above and beyond the prior offense history and individual characteristics of the youth:

- For the average youth detained for failing to appear, an FTA detention stay increases the probability of "official" recidivism by 8.5 percentage points
- For the average youth detained for failing to appear, an FTA detention stay increases the probability of technical recidivism by 28 percentage points
- For the average youth detained for failing to appear, an FTA detention stay increases the probability of subsequent detainment by 26.8 percentage points

Brief Overview of FTA Detention Stays in Florida:

Supporting statutory language can be found in Florida Statute 985.215 subsection (1):

“The child is detained on a judicial order for failure to appear and has previously willfully failed to appear, after proper notice, for an adjudicatory hearing on the same case regardless of the results of the risk assessment instrument. A child may be held in secure detention for up to 72 hours in advance of the next scheduled court hearing pursuant to this paragraph. The child's failure to keep the clerk of court and defense counsel informed of a current and valid mailing address where the child will receive notice to appear at court proceedings does not provide an adequate ground for excusal of the child's nonappearance at the hearings.”

The potential inefficiency of this short detention stay is highlighted by the fact that reducing FTA detention stays is a primary objective for both FDJJ’s Roadmap to System Excellence and JDAI. This report not only assesses the validity of this implication, but goes one step further in determining whether FTA detention stays actually lead to significantly worse outcomes for youth than if they had been allowed to await their court date in the community.

Methodology:

All data in this briefing sheet were derived from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and analyzed by the Office of Research and Data Integrity. These tables represent youth charged with misdemeanor offenses aged 16 or younger at the time of their release (to allow for a two year follow-up) from secure detention or probation during the 2012 calendar year.

Using logistic regression and propensity score matching (PSM) techniques to control for other factors known to influence criminal propensity and the probability of re-arrest, this report examines the effect of being securely detained for failing to appear in court over the alternative of never experiencing confinement by the juvenile justice system. In order to assess various measures of recidivism that may be impacted by securely detaining a youth for failing to appear, three different outcomes were compared between the two groups, all with a two-year follow up period. The following outcomes were assessed:

1. *Official recidivism* – For the purposes of this analysis, official recidivism was defined as a new adjudication for a felony or misdemeanor within two years of the release date.
2. *Technical recidivism* - A new technical or status offense within two years of the release date.
3. *Subsequent detainment* - Any stay in secure detention whose begin date was within two years of release from probation or the FTA detention stay.

Propensity score matching creates an appropriate counterfactual (control group), meaning that for all intents and purposes, the youth in the probation group are identical to the youth in the FTA detention group after matching. This assures that any significant impact of the treatment (FTA detention stay) on the outcome can be attributed to the treatment itself rather than selection bias caused by fundamentally different youth routinely ending up in one group over the other. This method is used to estimate the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT)¹. The ATT estimates the average difference in recidivism that would be found if all youth who failed to appear for court were detained versus if all youth who failed to appear in court were not detained and instead awaited their subsequent court date in the community. In the multivariate analyses presented in this report, the following control variables were included in order to isolate the impact of FTA detention stays on the likelihood of recidivism:

- Gender: Male, Female
- Race: Black, White, Other non-White
- Ethnicity: Hispanic, Non-Hispanic
- Prior Misdemeanors
- Prior Felonies
- Overall Risk Score on the PACT: Low Risk, Moderate Risk, Moderate/High Risk²
- Age at First Offense
- Age at Referral for Current Offense
- Judicial Circuit of Disposition³
- Arrested for Current Offense
- Current Household Jail History
- DCF Placement
- Victim of Abuse or Neglect
- Current Drug Use
- Parent Substance Use
- History of Running Away
- GPA
- Habitual Truancy
- History of Depression
- Mental Health Problems
- Gang Member or Affiliate

¹ Li defines the ATT as, “the average difference that would be found if everyone in the treated group received treatment compared with if none of these individuals in the treated group received treatment” (2013:190).

² Risk to reoffend is measured categorically by the PACT. These categories were dichotomized (high, moderate/high, moderate, and low) and since low risk to reoffend was the most common (83% of the sample), this was used as the reference category. There were 11 high risk cases which were eliminated since there was no variation on the treatment variable (all were in the FTA detention sample).

³ Circuit of disposition was measured dichotomously, using circuit 13 as the reference category since it was the most commonly occurring circuit (12% of cases). Cases from judicial circuits 3 and 16 were eliminated from the analysis since they included no variation on the treatment variable. (There were 3 cases from judicial circuit 3, all belonging to the probation sample and 1 case from judicial circuit 16 which was in the FTA detention sample.)

- Delinquent Peers
- Prosocial Peers
- Presenting Offense: Alcohol or Drug Offense, Non-aggravated Battery/Assault, Petty Larceny, Trespassing, Vandalism, Weapon Offense, or Other Misdemeanor Offense

Comprehensive Results:

The present study included 857 youth charged with a misdemeanor offense who were subsequently detained for an FTA or placed on probation and were 16 years or younger when they were released from this placement between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. This sample included 340 youth who were securely detained for an FTA and 517 youth who were placed on probation.

The first step of the analysis was ensuring that each of the three measures of recidivism were significantly correlated with FTA detention stays which they were: official recidivism ($r = 0.08$, $p = 0.015$), technical recidivism ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$), and subsequent detainment ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$). These p values indicate that the probability of finding a significant association between FTA detention stays and official recidivism by chance alone when in fact no association exists is less than 0.6% and less than 0.1% for technical recidivism and subsequent detainment.⁴

Next, difference in means t -tests were run to ensure that the FTA-detention and probation groups were significantly different from one another before matching to support the use of propensity score matching. For the sake of brevity,⁵ only variables that were significantly different between the groups are displayed in Table 1.⁶

⁴ The standard p value used to indicate statistical significance is 0.05. Therefore, any p value less than 0.05 is generally considered to be significantly different from finding the result by chance alone. A p value of less than 0.05 corresponds to a less than 5% chance that the result in question was obtained purely by chance rather than reflecting an actual association between the two concepts.

⁵ For interested readers, a table with full descriptive statistics of the samples is included in Appendix A.

⁶ Unless otherwise noted, variables were measured dichotomously with 1 = yes, 0 = no

TABLE 1: Significant Differences between FTA-Detained and Probation Youth (Before Matching)

Variable	FTA Youth Mean	Probation Youth Mean	<i>t</i> value ⁷	<i>p</i> value
Official Recidivism	0.48	0.39	2.43	0.015
Technical Recidivism	0.69	0.36	9.99	< 0.001
Subsequent Detainment	0.67	0.35	9.57	< 0.001
Black	0.59	0.47	3.52	< 0.001
Age at First Offense ⁸	1.81	1.72	2.06	0.040
Prior Misdemeanors ⁹	1.58	1.44	3.05	0.002
Prior Felonies ¹⁰	1.22	1.35	3.73	< 0.001
Moderate Risk	0.17	0.10	2.91	0.004
Moderate/High Risk	0.08	0.02	4.52	< 0.001
Age at Current Referral ¹¹	14.04	13.59	5.86	< 0.001
Arrested for Current Offense	0.55	0.74	5.99	< 0.001
Current Household Jail History	0.35	0.25	3.03	0.003
Victim of Abuse or Neglect	0.14	0.09	2.50	0.013
Current Drug Use	0.30	0.21	3.02	0.003
Habitual Truancy	0.12	0.06	3.26	0.001
History of Running Away ¹²	1.66	1.25	6.15	< 0.001
Gang Member or Affiliate	0.04	0.01	2.12	0.034
Delinquent Peers	0.72	0.64	2.42	0.016
GPA ¹³	2.44	2.64	2.90	0.004
Current Offense: Misd. Other	0.17	0.12	2.30	0.022
Circuit 1 Disposition	0.03	0.09	3.18	0.002
Circuit 5 Disposition	0.03	0.06	2.26	0.024
Circuit 11 Disposition	0.10	0.05	2.52	0.012
Circuit 19 Disposition	0.03	0.07	2.35	0.019

Table 1 shows that without accounting for inherent differences (selection biases) between the two groups, the FTA-detained youth are significantly more likely to recidivate than the probation youth. As expected from prior recidivism research, this group is more likely to be: Black, current drug users, habitually truant and have lower GPAs in school, be more likely to run

⁷ The *t* value refers to the distribution of probabilities used to calculate the *p* value. This distribution is primarily determined by the size of the sample used to obtain the results. In a normal distribution of probabilities (such as is assumed here), a *t* value of 1.96 corresponds to a *p* value of 0.05.

⁸ Age at first offense was measured categorically as follows: 1=12 and under, 2=13 to 14, and 3=15

⁹ Prior misdemeanors were measured categorically as follows: 1=none or 1 prior misdemeanor referral, 2=2 prior misdemeanor referrals, and 3=3 or more prior misdemeanor referrals

¹⁰ Prior felonies were measured categorically as follows: 1=no prior felony referrals, 2=1 prior felony referral, and 3=2 or more prior felony referrals

¹¹ Age at referral for current offense was calculated by subtracting the date of referral from the youth's date of birth and rounding down to nearest whole number

¹² History of running away was measured categorically as follows: 1=no instances of running away/being kicked out, 5=over 5 instances of running away/getting kicked out

¹³ GPA was measured categorically as follows: 1=below 1.0 (some Ds and mostly Fs), 5=honor student (mostly As). Youth not currently enrolled in school (N = 29) were coded as GPA = 0, habitual truancy = 0.

away/get kicked out of their home, have at least one member of their current household with a history of imprisonment, have more prior misdemeanors, associate with delinquent peers, and have a greater PACT overall risk score. Contrary to prior recidivism research, however, youth in the FTA group are less likely to be: younger at the time of their first offense, arrested for their current offense, and have more prior felonies.

The next step in the analysis was to estimate the propensity for each youth to receive an FTA detention stay, given all of the covariates previously listed, using logistic regression. The significant results from this logistic regression analysis are highlighted below in Table 2:

TABLE 2: Significant Variables in Predicting the Likelihood of an FTA-Detention Stay¹⁴

Variable	Odds Ratio	p value
Black	3.13	< 0.001
Hispanic	2.10	0.010
Prior Misdemeanors	0.69	0.016
Prior Felonies	0.19	< 0.001
Moderate Risk to Reoffend	3.97	< 0.001
Moderate/High Risk to Reoffend	15.03	< 0.001
Age at Referral for Current Offense	1.67	< 0.001
Arrested for Current Offense	0.10	< 0.001
History of Running Away/Getting Kicked Out	1.36	0.004
Current Offense: Misdemeanor Other	1.90	0.027
Current Offense: Petty Larceny	2.09	0.003

Having a history of running away/getting kicked out of the home, being Black or Hispanic, having a higher PACT overall risk score, being older at the time of referral, and presenting with a petty larceny or misdemeanor other charge all significantly increase the odds that a youth will be detained for failing to appear in court. Conversely, being arrested for the current offense and having more prior felonies or misdemeanors significantly decrease the odds that a youth will be detained for failing to appear in court.

Next, individuals from each group were matched based on this estimated propensity score. To ensure that these matches were actually “good” matches, a 0.034 caliper was used which means that the two individuals matched from each group can only differ in their likelihood of receiving an FTA detention stay (propensity score) by a *maximum* of 3.4%. The matched sample was then used to calculate the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), that is, the average gain from treatment for those who were actually treated. In this context, the ATT refers to the average increase in recidivism for youth who were securely detained for an FTA. The estimated ATT for each of the three recidivism measures is displayed below in Table 3.

¹⁴ All circuits were also significantly predictive of FTA detention stay at the 0.05 level, but for the sake of brevity were excluded from this table. For interested readers, the full results of this logistic regression are presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 3: Estimated Average Treatment Effects of the Treated for FTA-Detained Youth

Outcome	ATT	<i>p</i> value
Official Recidivism	0.085*	0.031
Technical Recidivism	0.280***	< 0.001
Subsequent Detainment	0.268***	< 0.001

As can be seen in Table 3, the average treatment effect on the treated was significant for all three measures of recidivism.

These results should be interpreted in the following manner:

- For the average youth in the treatment group an FTA detention stay increases the probability of official recidivism by 8.5 percentage points
- For the average youth in the treatment group, an FTA detention stay increases the probability of technical recidivism by 28 percentage points
- For the average youth in the treatment group, an FTA detention stay increases the probability of subsequent detainment by 26.8 percentage points

After matching there were no significant differences between the two groups on any of the covariates previously mentioned.¹⁵ This, combined with the results of the sensitivity analysis¹⁶ offer great reason to believe that the results reported in table 3 reflect real criminogenic effects of detaining misdemeanor youth for failing to appear in court and highlight the importance of diverting these youth from detention whenever possible. Overall, these results offer empirical support to the missions of JDAI, FDJJ's Roadmap to System Excellence, and similar juvenile justice reform efforts.

¹⁵ For interested readers, the covariate difference in means and percent bias reduction after matching are included in Appendix C.

¹⁶ For interested readers, the results of these analyses appear in Appendices D and E

References

- Li, Mingxiang. (2013). Using the Propensity Score Method to Estimate Causal Effects: A Review and Practical Guide. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 188-226.

Appendix A. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

Variable	Full Sample (<i>N</i> = 857)	
	Mean or % (SD)	Range
<i>Treatment Variable</i>		
FTA-detention stay	39.7%	0-1
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
Official Recidivism	42.6%	0-1
Technical Recidivism	49.5%	0-1
Subsequent detainment	47.6%	0-1
<i>Covariates</i>		
Male	67.1%	0-1
Black	51.4%	0-1
Hispanic	14.8%	0-1
Other non-White Race/Ethnicity	0.5%	0-1
Prior Misdemeanors	1.498 (0.680)	1-3
Prior Felonies	1.295 (0.516)	1-3
Moderate Risk	13.0%	0-1
Moderate/High Risk	4.0%	0-1
Age at First Offense	1.755 (0.588)	1-3
Age at Referral for Present Offense	13.770 (1.106)	9-15
Arrested for Current Offense	66.4%	0-1
Current Household Jail History	28.9%	0-1
DCF Placement	9.6%	0-1
Victim of Abuse or Neglect	10.8%	0-1
Current Drug Use	24.3%	0-1
Parent Substance Use	5.5%	0-1
History of Running Away	1.410 (0.983)	1-5
GPA	2.560 (1.002)	0-5
Habitual Truancy	8.0%	0-1
History of Depression	27.5%	0-1
Mental Health Problems	17.2%	0-1
Gang Member or Affiliate	2.2%	0-1
Delinquent Peers	67.0%	0-1
Prosocial Peers	88.0%	0-1
Alcohol or Drug Offense	14.4%	0-1
Misdemeanor Other/Sex Offense	14.0%	0-1
Petit Larceny	24.6%	0-1
Trespassing	7.5%	0-1
Vandalism	4.8%	0-1
Weapon Offense	1.5%	0-1
Circuit 1 Disposition	6.5%	0-1
Circuit 2 Disposition	2.3%	0-1
Circuit 4 Disposition	8.8%	0-1
Circuit 5 Disposition	5.0%	0-1
Circuit 6 Disposition	3.0%	0-1
Circuit 7 Disposition	5.6%	0-1
Circuit 8 Disposition	3.2%	0-1
Circuit 9 Disposition	11.3%	0-1
Circuit 10 Disposition	8.4%	0-1
Circuit 11 Disposition	7.0%	0-1
Circuit 12 Disposition	1.8%	0-1
Circuit 14 Disposition	1.9%	0-1
Circuit 15 Disposition	2.3%	0-1
Circuit 17 Disposition	8.2%	0-1
Circuit 18 Disposition	2.4%	0-1
Circuit 19 Disposition	5.5%	0-1
Circuit 20 Disposition	5.0%	0-1

Note: The following reference categories were omitted for brevity: Female, White, Low Risk, Non-Aggravated Assault/Battery, & Circuit 13 Disposition

Appendix B. Logistic Regression of FTA on Matching Variables

Variable	Failure to Appear (FTA)		
	<i>b</i>	(SE)	OR
Male	0.133	(0.208)	1.143
Black	1.140***	(0.223)	3.128
Hispanic	0.744*	(0.288)	2.104
Other non-White Race/Ethnicity	0.788	(1.160)	2.200
Prior Misdemeanors	-0.375*	(0.156)	0.687
Prior Felonies	-1.672***	(0.244)	0.188
Moderate Risk	1.380***	(0.327)	3.973
Moderate/High Risk	2.710***	(0.610)	15.031
Age at First Offense	-0.100	(0.195)	0.908
Age at Referral for Current Offense	0.511***	(0.108)	1.667
Arrested for Current Offense	-2.313***	(0.258)	0.099
Current Household Jail History	0.376	(0.207)	1.457
DCF Placement	0.262	(0.327)	1.299
Victim of Abuse or Neglect	0.210	(0.306)	1.234
Current Drug Use	0.115	(0.245)	1.122
Parent Substance Use	-0.170	(0.421)	0.843
History of Running Away	0.308**	(0.107)	1.361
GPA	-0.114	(0.097)	0.892
Habitual Truancy	0.142	(0.364)	1.152
History of Depression	0.055	(0.223)	1.057
Mental Health Problems	0.043	(0.272)	1.044
Gang Member or Affiliate	0.036	(0.613)	1.036
Delinquent Peers	0.083	(0.207)	1.087
Prosocial Peers	0.564	(0.293)	1.757
Alcohol or Drug Offense	0.310	(0.326)	1.364
Misdemeanor Other/Sex Offense	0.642*	(0.290)	1.900
Petit Larceny	0.736**	(0.248)	2.088
Trespassing	0.085	(0.394)	1.088
Vandalism	0.348	(0.460)	1.416
Weapon Offense	0.063	(0.809)	1.065
Circuit 1 Disposition	-2.468***	(0.505)	0.085
Circuit 2 Disposition	-2.949***	(0.691)	0.052
Circuit 4 Disposition	-1.155**	(0.412)	0.315
Circuit 5 Disposition	-3.188***	(0.545)	0.041
Circuit 6 Disposition	-2.368***	(0.625)	0.094
Circuit 7 Disposition	-2.748***	(0.490)	0.064
Circuit 8 Disposition	-3.812***	(0.657)	0.022
Circuit 9 Disposition	-1.915***	(0.417)	0.147
Circuit 10 Disposition	-2.450***	(0.452)	0.086
Circuit 11 Disposition	-1.010*	(0.422)	0.364
Circuit 12 Disposition	-1.793**	(0.673)	0.166
Circuit 14 Disposition	-3.690***	(0.752)	0.025
Circuit 15 Disposition	-2.511***	(0.683)	0.081
Circuit 17 Disposition	-1.174**	(0.396)	0.309
Circuit 18 Disposition	-2.776***	(0.741)	0.062
Circuit 19 Disposition	-2.748***	(0.510)	0.064
Circuit 20 Disposition	-1.026*	(0.459)	0.358
Constant	-2.954*	(1.466)	0.052

Note: Entries represent unstandardized regression coefficients (*b*), robust standard errors (SE), and odds ratios (OR).

N = 857 (340 FTA youth; 517 probation youth).

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001 (two-tailed test).

Appendix C. Descriptive Statistics and Balance Statistics for Matched Samples.

Variable	Before Matching			After Matching		
	FTA Youth (n = 340)	Probation Youth (n = 517)	Mean Difference	FTA Youth (n = 340)	Probation Youth (n = 517)	Mean Difference
	Mean	Mean	t -test	Mean	Mean	t -test
Male	0.635	0.694	1.80	0.637	0.660	0.61
Black	0.588	0.466	3.52***	0.590	0.537	1.39
Hispanic	0.153	0.145	0.32	0.153	0.180	0.93
Other non-White	0.006	0.004	0.42	0.006	0.002	0.72
Prior Misdemeanors	1.585	1.441	3.05**	1.587	1.505	1.52
Prior Felonies	1.215	1.348	3.73***	1.215	1.189	0.75
Moderate Risk	0.170	0.102	2.91**	0.171	0.130	1.48
Moderate/High Risk	0.076	0.015	4.52***	0.077	0.051	1.38
Age at First Offense	1.806	1.722	2.06*	1.808	1.821	0.28
Age at Referral for Current Offense	14.038	13.594	5.86***	14.044	13.957	1.11
Arrested for Current Offense	0.547	0.741	5.99***	0.546	0.486	1.57
Current Household Jail History	0.347	0.251	3.03**	0.348	0.313	0.96
DCF Placement	0.118	0.081	1.77	0.118	0.088	1.29
Victim of Abuse or Neglect	0.141	0.087	2.50*	0.142	0.103	1.52
Current Drug Use	0.297	0.207	3.02**	0.298	0.275	0.66
Parent Substance Use	0.059	0.052	2.90	0.059	0.032	1.66
History of Running Away	1.659	1.246	6.15***	1.661	1.563	1.07
GPA	2.438	2.640	2.90**	2.434	2.461	0.35
Habitual Truancy	0.118	0.056	3.26**	0.118	0.077	1.82
History of Depression	0.306	0.255	1.62	0.307	0.265	1.21
Mental Health Problems	0.165	0.176	0.43	0.165	0.151	0.50
Gang Member or Affiliate	0.035	0.014	2.12*	0.035	0.018	1.38
Delinquent Peers	0.718	0.638	2.42*	0.717	0.716	0.02
Prosocial Peers	0.894	0.870	1.04	0.894	0.875	0.77
Alcohol or Drug Offense	0.153	0.137	0.64	0.153	0.175	0.75
Misdemeanor Other/Sex Offense	0.174	0.118	2.30*	0.174	0.138	1.29
Petit Larceny	0.268	0.232	1.18	0.268	0.249	0.58
Trespassing	0.059	0.085	1.43	0.059	0.065	0.32
Vandalism	0.032	0.058	1.72	0.032	0.016	1.34
Weapon Offense	0.009	0.019	1.23	0.009	0.007	0.26
Circuit 1 Disposition	0.032	0.087	3.18**	0.032	0.011	1.89
Circuit 2 Disposition	0.018	0.027	0.89	0.018	0.005	1.51
Circuit 4 Disposition	0.076	0.095	0.93	0.077	0.056	1.08
Circuit 5 Disposition	0.029	0.064	2.26*	0.030	0.036	0.52
Circuit 6 Disposition	0.041	0.023	1.50	0.041	0.024	1.25
Circuit 7 Disposition	0.056	0.056	0.01	0.056	0.058	0.10
Circuit 8 Disposition	0.018	0.041	1.89	0.018	0.011	0.78
Circuit 9 Disposition	0.129	0.102	1.22	0.130	0.142	0.47
Circuit 10 Disposition	0.065	0.097	1.65	0.065	0.047	1.00
Circuit 11 Disposition	0.097	0.052	2.52*	0.097	0.129	1.31
Circuit 12 Disposition	0.024	0.014	1.09	0.024	0.023	0.05
Circuit 14 Disposition	0.015	0.021	0.69	0.015	0.013	0.20
Circuit 15 Disposition	0.015	0.029	1.36	0.015	0.006	1.05
Circuit 17 Disposition	0.100	0.070	1.59	0.100	0.123	0.95
Circuit 18 Disposition	0.012	0.033	1.96	0.012	0.010	0.22
Circuit 19 Disposition	0.032	0.070	2.35*	0.030	0.030	0.00
Circuit 20 Disposition	0.056	0.046	0.62	0.056	0.085	1.47

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001 (two-tailed test)

Appendix D. Results from MH Bounds Sensitivity Analysis

Outcome	ATT	(SE)	Critical Level of Hidden Bias (Γ)
Official Recidivism	0.085*	(0.040)	1.15 – 1.20
Technical Recidivism	0.280***	(0.043)	3.10 – 3.15
Subsequent Detainment	0.268***	(0.041)	2.90 – 2.95

* $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed test).