



## **Briefing Report**

### **Effectiveness of the Domestic Violence Alternative Placement Program: (October 2014)**

#### **Prepared:**

Mark A. Greenwald, M.J.P.M &  
Kevin Wolff, Ph.D.  
Bureau of Research and Planning

#### **Introduction:**

The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice works with the Florida Network in seeking respite alternatives for all appropriate juvenile justice domestic violence (DV) cases. Respite care provided in shelters operated by The Florida Network includes a number of services unavailable to youth held in secure detention. Therefore, it's plausible that receiving this care may impact the probability of re-arrest in the period following the initial arrest for a domestic violence-related offense. To that end, the purpose of this briefing sheet is to examine the re-arrest rates between eligible youth who received respite care in comparison to a statistically identical cohort of youth who were placed in secure detention.

#### **Highlighted Results:**

- Of the 1,383 youth included in the current analysis, 534 received respite services while 849 were held in secure detention following their arrest for misdemeanor domestic violence.
- Overall, respite care was associated with a lower probability of re-arrest during the 92-day period following the misdemeanor domestic violence arrest (*chi-square*=4.19; *p*<.05).
  - The effect holds for the probability of felony re-arrest (*chi-square*=5.46; *p*<.05).
  - However, the difference in misdemeanor re-arrest between placed and detained youth was not statistically significant (*chi-square*=2.57; *p*>.05).
- Of the youth who received respite services 14% were re-arrested within the 92-day period following their initial arrest, compared to 18.3% of the youth who were detained.
- Similarly, 5.4% of youth who received respite care incurred a subsequent felony arrest during the follow up period, in comparison to 8.8% of the detained youth.

- The results of a number of multivariate statistical analyses suggest that much of the difference in re-arrest between groups appears to be a function of the individual differences between those groups (youth receiving DV services may have been inherently less likely to recidivate).
  - However, these analyses did not provide any indication that there is an increased threat to public safety by placing youth in respite beds versus secure detention.
- This analysis provides preliminary support for the idea that domestic violence youth can be effectively and safely served in respite beds, which are a less expensive alternative to secure detention.

### ***Brief Overview of the Domestic Violence Alternatives Program:***

Supporting statutory language can be found in Florida Statute 985.24 subsection (4).

*“The department shall continue to identify alternatives to secure detention care and shall develop such alternatives and annually submit them to the Legislature for authorization and appropriation and Florida Statute 985.601 subsection (3)(a). The department shall develop or contract for diversified and innovative programs to provide rehabilitative treatment, including early intervention and prevention, diversion, comprehensive intake, case management, diagnostic and classification assessments, individual and family counseling, shelter care, diversified detention care emphasizing alternatives to secure detention, diversified probation, halfway houses, foster homes, community-based substance abuse treatment services, community-based mental health treatment services.”*

Respite care provided in shelters operated by The Florida Network includes a number of services unavailable to youth held in secure detention. Therefore, it’s plausible that receiving this care may impact the probability of re-arrest in the period following the initial arrest for a domestic violence related offense. The Domestic Violence Alternative Placement Program has three primary goals:

- Divert all appropriate youth with a DV charge from secure detention to a county jurisdictional respite facility. Additionally, the department will insure an adequate inventory of respite beds, by coordinating with the current contracted provider of respite bed facilities, the Florida Network.
- Reduce secure detention volume and associated costs by placing youth charged with a domestic violence-related offense in contracted alternative respite beds.
- Provide access to specialized therapeutic respite services for both the youth and family in domestic violence cases.

**Methodology:**

All data in this briefing sheet were derived from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and analyzed by the Bureau of Research and Planning. These tables represent youth charged with misdemeanor domestic violence and held in a secure detention facility or placed in respite care between February 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. Data for youth who were alternatively placed in and received respite care were extracted from The Florida Network NETMIS system. Information on the youth served was combined with data from the JJIS system to facilitate an analysis of both successfully placed youth, as well as those who were detained.

In order to assess the prevalence of re-arrest among youth who received respite services in comparison to youth who qualified for respite care but were detained, a 92-day period following the initial arrest for misdemeanor domestic violence was examined. 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 receiving respite care over the alternative (secure detention) for a sample of youth who qualified for placement in a DV respite facility.

Propensity score matching ensures an appropriate counterfactual (control group), that is, a group that for all intents and purposes is identical to those youth who received treatment (respite care) and assures that any significant impact of treatment is not due to selection effects. In the multivariate analyses presented in this report, the following control variables were included in order to isolate the impact of receiving DV respite care on the probability of re-arrest during the follow-up period.

- Gender: Male, Female
- Race: Non-white, white
- Ethnicity: Hispanic, Non-Hispanic
- Young Offender: Youth's age of first offense <12 years of age
- Prior Detention: Youth had be previously detained
- Prior Felony Referral: Previously arrested for felony
- Prior Violent Offense: Previously adjudicated for violent offense
- Antisocial Peers: has anti-social friends or is a gang-member
- Parental Authority: Generally obeys parents
- School Enrollment: Enrolled in school full-time
- History of Running Away
- Drug or Alcohol Abuse: History or current use of drugs or alcohol
- Prior Sex Offense: Previously arrested for sex offense
- History of Physical Abuse
- History of Sexual Abuse
- History of Neglect

**Comprehensive Results:**

The present study included 1,383 youth charged with a domestic violence-related offense and determined to be eligible for respite placement between February 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. This sample included 534 youth who received respite services and 849 youth who were placed into secure detention. Table 1 (next page) presents bivariate relationships between placement type and subsequent re-arrest. Respite care was associated with a lower probability of incurring a subsequent re-arrest during the 92-day follow-up period. Of the youth who received respite services, 14% were subsequently re-arrested within 92-days, compared to 18.3% of youth who were placed in secure detention.

**Table 1: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest by Placement Type (n =1,383)**

|                 | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |       | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|                 | (n)                    | %     | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>Detained</b> | 694                    | 81.7% | <b>155</b>         | <b>18.3%</b> | 849          | 100% |
| <b>Respite</b>  | 459                    | 86.0% | <b>75</b>          | <b>14.0%</b> | 534          | 100% |
| <b>Total</b>    | 1,153                  | 83.4% | <b>230</b>         | <b>16.6%</b> | 1,383        | 100% |

Youth receiving respite care were less likely to subsequently incur subsequent misdemeanor or felony offense (chi-square=4.19;  $p < .05$ ). Table 2 (next page) presents relationships between placement type and subsequent re-arrest by offense category. 5.4% of youth who received respite care subsequently incurred a felony arrest during the 92-day follow-up period, compared to 8.8% of youth placed in secure detention. Similarly, 11.8% of youth who received respite care subsequently incurred a misdemeanor arrest during the 92-day follow-up period, compared to 14.8% of youth placed in secure detention.

**Table 2: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest by Placement Type and Offense Category (n=1,383)**

|  |          | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |       | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|--|----------|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|  |          | (n)                    | %     | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>Any Rearrest</b><br>(Chi-Square= 4.19; p<.05)         | Detained | 694                    | 81.7% | <b>155</b>         | <b>18.3%</b> | 849          | 100% |
|  | Respite  | 459                    | 86.0% | <b>75</b>          | <b>14.0%</b> | 534          | 100% |
| <b>Felony Rearrest</b><br>(Chi-Square= 5.46; p<.05)      | Detained | 774                    | 91.2% | <b>75</b>          | <b>8.8%</b>  | 849          | 100% |
|  | Respite  | 505                    | 94.6% | <b>29</b>          | <b>5.4%</b>  | 534          | 100% |
| <b>Misdemeanor Rearrest</b><br>(Chi-Square= 2.57; p>.05) | Detained | 723                    | 85.2% | <b>126</b>         | <b>14.8%</b> | 849          | 100% |
|  | Respite  | 471                    | 88.2% | <b>63</b>          | <b>11.8%</b> | 534          | 100% |

This analysis revealed significant differences in the proportion of youth who were rearrested across racial and ethnic groups. Table 3 presents relationships between placement type and subsequent re-arrest by race/ethnicity. Black youth saw the largest difference in the proportion of youth who were rearrested following placement (15.5% of youth who received respite services compared to 23.5% of youth who were detained). The difference for Hispanic youth was smaller (9.7% vs. 14.7%). For White youth, the difference between youth who received respite services and detained youth was rather small (14.3% vs 15.5%).

**Table 3: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest by Placement Type and Race/Ethnicity (n=1,383)**

|                 |          | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |        | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|                 |          | (n)                    | %      | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>White</b>    | Detained | 310                    | 84.5%  | <b>57</b>          | <b>15.5%</b> | 367          | 100% |
|                 | Respite  | 203                    | 85.7%  | <b>34</b>          | <b>14.3%</b> | 237          | 100% |
| <b>Black</b>    | Detained | 244                    | 76.5%  | <b>75</b>          | <b>23.5%</b> | 319          | 100% |
|                 | Respite  | 185                    | 84.5%  | <b>34</b>          | <b>15.5%</b> | 219          | 100% |
| <b>Hispanic</b> | Detained | 133                    | 85.3%  | <b>23</b>          | <b>14.7%</b> | 156          | 100% |
|                 | Respite  | 65                     | 90.3%  | <b>7</b>           | <b>9.7%</b>  | 72           | 100% |
| <b>"Other"</b>  | Detained | 7                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 7            | 100% |
|                 | Respite  | 6                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 6            | 100% |

Table 4 presents relationships between placement type and subsequent re-arrest by race/ethnicity, and gender. In general, the differences in re-arrest between youth receiving respite services and detained youth is much smaller for females than for males. Across race/ethnicity, the largest difference is for Black youth. However, one interesting finding is that the differences by gender do not hold for Hispanic youth. Hispanic females who received respite care were rearrested at a lower rate (13.2%) than did those who were detained (15.7%). However, Hispanic males that received DV care actually were rearrested at a higher rate than those who were detained. The largest difference in re-arrest between youth receiving respite services and detained youth was found for Black males (16.1% vs 28.6%).

**Table 4: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest  
by Placement Type, Race/Ethnicity and Gender (n=1,383)**

|                        |          | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |        | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|------------------------|----------|------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|                        |          | (n)                    | %      | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>White Male</b>      | Detained | 202                    | 84.5%  | <b>37</b>          | <b>15.5%</b> | 239          | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 115                    | 86.5%  | <b>18</b>          | <b>13.5%</b> | 133          | 100% |
| <b>White Female</b>    | Detained | 108                    | 84.4%  | <b>20</b>          | <b>15.6%</b> | 128          | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 88                     | 84.6%  | <b>16</b>          | <b>15.4%</b> | 104          | 100% |
| <b>Black Male</b>      | Detained | 137                    | 71.4%  | <b>55</b>          | <b>28.6%</b> | 192          | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 99                     | 83.9%  | <b>19</b>          | <b>16.1%</b> | 118          | 100% |
| <b>Black Female</b>    | Detained | 107                    | 84.3%  | <b>20</b>          | <b>15.7%</b> | 127          | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 86                     | 85.1%  | <b>15</b>          | <b>14.9%</b> | 101          | 100% |
| <b>Hispanic Male</b>   | Detained | 92                     | 86.0%  | <b>15</b>          | <b>14.0%</b> | 107          | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 86                     | 85.1%  | <b>15</b>          | <b>14.9%</b> | 101          | 100% |
| <b>Hispanic Female</b> | Detained | 41                     | 83.7%  | <b>8</b>           | <b>16.3%</b> | 49           | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 33                     | 86.8%  | <b>5</b>           | <b>13.2%</b> | 38           | 100% |
| <b>Other Male</b>      | Detained | 3                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 3            | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 2                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 2            | 100% |
| <b>Other Female</b>    | Detained | 4                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 4            | 100% |
|                        | Respite  | 4                      | 100.0% | <b>0</b>           | <b>0.0%</b>  | 4            | 100% |

Table 5 presents relationships between placement type and whether or not the youth had previously been detained. Differences in re-arrest between youth receiving respite services and detained youth were larger among youth who had been previously detained (20.6% of youth receiving respite services compared to 28.3% of detained youth).

**Table 5: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest by Placement Type and Previous Detention Status (n=1,383)**

|                                      |          | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |       | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|                                      |          | (n)                    | %     | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>Youth Not Previously Detained</b> | Detained | 570                    | 84.3% | <b>106</b>         | <b>15.7%</b> | 676          | 100% |
|                                      | Respite  | 409                    | 86.8% | <b>62</b>          | <b>13.2%</b> | 471          | 100% |
| <b>Youth Previously Detained</b>     | Detained | 124                    | 71.7% | <b>49</b>          | <b>28.3%</b> | 173          | 100% |
|                                      | Respite  | 50                     | 79.4% | <b>13</b>          | <b>20.6%</b> | 63           | 100% |

Table 6 (next page) presents relationships between placement type and age group. The Department's research previously identified youth arrested under the age of 12 as being at an increased risk to develop into serious, violent and chronic offenders (SVC) (Baglivio, 2013). Youth under age 12 were re-arrested at higher rates than any other age group. Differences in re-arrest between youth receiving respite services and detained youth were larger among 16 year olds (5.3% of youth receiving respite services compared to 17.2% of detained youth).

**Table 6: Proportion of Youth Rearrested Following Initial DV Arrest by Placement Type and Age Group (n=1,383)**

|                     |          | <u>Not Re-Arrested</u> |       | <u>Re-Arrested</u> |              | <u>Total</u> |      |
|---------------------|----------|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------|
|                     |          | (n)                    | %     | (n)                | %            | (n)          | %    |
| <b>17 and older</b> | Detained | 67                     | 87.0% | <b>10</b>          | <b>13.0%</b> | 77           | 100% |
|                     | Respite  | 40                     | 87.0% | <b>6</b>           | <b>13.0%</b> | 46           | 100% |
| <b>16</b>           | Detained | 96                     | 82.8% | <b>20</b>          | <b>17.2%</b> | 116          | 100% |
|                     | Respite  | 89                     | 94.7% | <b>5</b>           | <b>5.3%</b>  | 94           | 100% |
| <b>15</b>           | Detained | 151                    | 86.3% | <b>24</b>          | <b>13.7%</b> | 175          | 100% |
|                     | Respite  | 83                     | 85.6% | <b>14</b>          | <b>14.4%</b> | 97           | 100% |
| <b>13 to 14</b>     | Detained | 253                    | 82.4% | <b>54</b>          | <b>17.6%</b> | 307          | 100% |
|                     | Respite  | 180                    | 84.9% | <b>32</b>          | <b>15.1%</b> | 212          | 100% |
| <b>12 and Under</b> | Detained | 127                    | 73.0% | <b>47</b>          | <b>27.0%</b> | 174          | 100% |
|                     | Respite  | 67                     | 78.8% | <b>18</b>          | <b>21.2%</b> | 85           | 100% |

The bivariate results suggest that receiving respite care may have reduced the probability of re-arrest in the sample of youth considered in this analysis. However, in order to isolate the effect of receiving respite care, it is necessary to perform a number of additional analyses which account for additional factors known to be associated with the probability of re-arrest.

Results of logistic regression models suggest that once confounding variables are controlled for, the impact of receiving DV respite care is no longer statistically significant. However, in all models explored, the likelihood of re-arrest was lower for youth who were placed in DV shelters than for those who were detained (OR=.793,  $p>.05$ ). This suggests that while not statistically significant, youth who received respite care were less likely to reoffend after controlling for all a large number of variables known to impact reoffending. Results of the logistic regression models described are presented in Appendix A.

Results of a propensity score matching (PSM) analysis mirror those of the logistic regression discussed above. While the probability of re-arrest was lower for youth who were placed in DV respite care, after controlling for other factors known to predict re-arrest, the difference between the groups was no longer statistically significant. Importantly, however, results suggest that while not



statistically significant, DV respite care may have led to a substantively important reduction in re-arrest. Specifically, within the matched sample, 14% of the youth within the treatment group (respite services) were rearrested compared to 16.1% of the youth who were detained. Out of the 1,016 youth included in the matching analysis, this translates to the prevention of 22 re-arrests by youth who received DV respite care. Results of the PSM analysis are included in Appendix B.

### ***Discussion:***

Overall, this preliminary analysis of the Domestic Violence alternatives program suggests that since its start in February 2013 the program has successfully diverted a substantial number of eligible youth away from secure detention and into respite care. Much of the evidence presented here suggests that youth who received respite care following the initial arrest for misdemeanor domestic violence were less likely to be rearrested during the 92-day follow-up period compared to those youth who were placed in secure detention. This was especially true for black youth and is an encouraging indicator toward this program reducing racial and ethnic disparities (RED) in secure detention. However, results of a number of multivariate statistical analyses suggest that much of the difference in re-arrest between groups appears to be a function of the individual differences between those groups (youth receiving respite services versus youth detained). This suggests that youth who received DV care may have been inherently less likely to reoffend in the first place and the program did little to impact their probability of desisting. However, these analyses did not provide any indication that there is an increased threat to public safety by placing youth in respite beds versus secure detention. This analysis provides preliminary support for the idea that domestic violence youth can be effectively and safely served in respite beds, which are a less expensive alternative to secure detention.

There is reason to believe that the differences observed between groups are substantively important. Specifically, DV respite care has the potential to reduce reoffending within youth who are arrested for misdemeanor domestic violence. Additional data and further research is necessary to explore by what mechanisms DV respite care may translate into lower levels of reoffending as well as identify those subgroups for which this program may be the most effective as well as how it may be improved to benefit other subgroups of youth.

### ***References:***

Baglivio, M. T. (2013) Analysis of Serious Violent & Chronic Delinquency in Florida. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. Available at:  
<http://www.djj.state.fl.us/docs/research2/briefing-report-analysis-of-svc-delinquency-in-florida-08-21-14.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

**Appendix A, Table 1: Logistic Regression Results For Youth Rearrest**

|                            | <b>Model 1</b>   | <b>Model 2</b>  | <b>Model</b>   |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
|                            | <b>Any New<br/>Arrest within<br/>92 Days of DV<br/>Offense</b> | <b>New Felony<br/>Arrest within<br/>92 Days of DV<br/>Offense</b> | <b>New<br/>Misdemeanor<br/>Arrest within<br/>92 Days of DV<br/>Offense</b> |
| Received DV Respite Care   | .793<br>(.127)   | .653<br>(.154)  | .824<br>(.142)   |
| Gender                     | 1.13<br>(.195)   | 1.34<br>(.335)  | 1.23<br>(.232)   |
| Race                       | 1.38*<br>(.218)  | 1.56*<br>(.347)   | 1.40*<br>(.237)  |
| Ethnicity                  | .872<br>(.180)   | .915<br>(.272)  | .911<br>(.204)   |
| Young Offender             | 1.78*<br>(.319)  | 2.06*<br>(.499)   | 1.57*<br>(.307)  |
| Prior Detention            | 1.25<br>(.248)   | 1.06<br>(.283)  | 1.19<br>(.307)   |
| Prior Felony Referral      | 1.90*<br>(.450)  | 1.46<br>(.487)  | 2.10*<br>(.512)  |
| Prior Violent Offense      | .583*<br>(.145)  | 1.13<br>(.377)  | .415*<br>(.112)  |
| Antisocial Peers           | 1.60*<br>(.296)  | 1.76*<br>(.503)   | 1.45<br>(.287)   |
| Parental Authority         | .903<br>(.172)   | 1.10<br>(.293)  | .803<br>(.168)   |
| School Enrollment          | .776<br>(.141)   | .696<br>(.170)  | .720<br>(.139)   |
| History of Running Away    | 1.21<br>(.194)   | 1.56*<br>(.354)   | 1.16<br>(.203)   |
| Drug or Alcohol Use        | 1.15<br>(.192)   | 1.96*<br>(.500)   | 1.03<br>(.185)   |
| Prior Sex Offense Referral | .198<br>(.207)   | --<br>(--)  | .301<br>(.315)   |
| History of Physical Abuse  | 1.02<br>(.196)   | .833<br>(.236)  | .967<br>(.203)   |
| History of Sexual Abuse    | 1.12<br>(.279)   | .885<br>(.330)  | 1.58<br>(.409)   |
| History of Neglect         | .992<br>(.274)   | 1.15<br>(.432)  | .902<br>(.274)   |
| Constant                   | .100*<br>(.031)  | .020<br>(.009)  | .099<br>(.032)   |
| N                          | 1383   | 1383  | 1383   |
| Pseudo R-Squared           | .0521  | .0843   | .0466  |

**Appendix B, Table 1: Matching Results For Youth Rearrest****Panel A: Any Rearrest within 92-Days Following Placement or Detention**

|                            | <u>Unmatched</u> |          | <u>Matched</u> |          | % Bias | % Bias Reduct |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------|----------------|----------|--------|---------------|
|                            | Placed           | Detained | Placed         | Detained |        |               |
| Matching Covariates        | Mean             | Mean     | Mean           | Mean     |        |               |
| Gender                     | .537             | .637     | .549           | .569     | -4.0   | 80.3          |
| Race                       | .446             | .389     | .419           | .417     | .4     | 96.5          |
| Ethnicity                  | .150             | .219     | .152           | .134     | 4.6    | 74.4          |
| Young Offender             | .159             | .205     | .165           | .156     | 2.6    | 78.5          |
| Prior Detention            | .118             | .204     | .122           | .114     | 2.2    | 90.8          |
| Prior Felony Referral      | .245             | .396     | .256           | .272     | -3.4   | 89.5          |
| Violent Felony             | .174             | .283     | .181           | .188     | -1.9   | 92.8          |
| Prior Sex Offense Referral | .002             | .022     | .002           | .002     | 0      | 100           |
| Antisocial Peers           | .669             | .700     | .687           | .687     | 0      | 100           |
| Parental Authority         | .240             | .214     | .232           | .207     | 6.1    | -1.0          |
| School Enrollment          | .835             | .792     | .829           | .803     | 6.6    | 41.4          |
| History of Running Away    | .444             | .432     | .441           | .429     | 2.4    | -2.3          |
| Drug and Alcohol use       | .552             | .564     | .561           | .557     | 0.8    | 66.5          |
| History of Physical Abuse  | .243             | .219     | .242           | .224     | 4.2    | 27.3          |
| History of Sexual Abuse    | .119             | .116     | .122           | .116     | 1.8    | -82.1         |
| History of Neglect         | .097             | .073     | .086           | .094     | -2.8   | 67.7          |

**Appendix B, Table 2: Average Treatment Effects For Youth Rearrest**

|   | <u>Unmatched</u>        |                           |            |      |        | <u>Matched</u>          |                           |            |      |       |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------|--------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------|-------|
|   | Placed Youth<br>(n=534) | Detained Youth<br>(n=849) | Difference | SE   | T      | Placed Youth<br>(n=508) | Detained Youth<br>(n=508) | Difference | SE   | T     |
| Any New Referral within 92 days of DV Offense         | .140                    | .186                      | -.042      | .021 | -2.05* | .140                    | .161                      | -.022      | .022 | -0.96 |
| New Felony Referral within 92 days of DV Offense      | .054                    | .088                      | -.034      | .014 | -2.34* | .055                    | .075                      | -.020      | .015 | -1.27 |
| New Misdemeanor Referral within 92 days of DV Offense | .118                    | .148                      | -.030      | .019 | -1.60  | .117                    | .132                      | -.016      | .021 | -0.76 |

Note. N=1,383 (534 Placed, 849 Detained); Caliper= .01

\*p<.05; two-tailed test