5-14-2010

Do Objective Measures reduce the Disproportionate Rates of Minority Youth Placed in Detention: Validation of a Risk Assessment Instrument?

Tiffany Simpson
University of New Orleans

Do Objective Measures reduce the Disproportionate Rates of Minority Youth Placed in Detention: Validation of a Risk Assessment Instrument?

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Applied Developmental Psychology

by

Tiffany P. Simpson

B.S., B.A., Louisiana State University, 2002
M.A., Texas Southern University, 2005
M.S., University of New Orleans, 2008

May 2010

Dedication

This manuscript is dedicated to the most important people in my life

My son Gary
For being the joy of my life

My husband Gary
For always believing in and supporting me

My parents Alvin and Monica Pitts
For expecting great things and holding me to that standard

You have made me who I am today

Acknowledgement

This study was made possible through a grant supported the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change Initiative. There are some people who I owe a great deal of appreciation. These people include Dr. Paul Frick, my mentor who has always provided invaluable assistance and advice and Shauna Epps for her guidance. This study would not have been possible without participation by the Rapids Parish Department of Juvenile Services, in particular Larry Spottsville and Sylvia Singleton, the juvenile detectives from the Alexandria Police Department, Pineville Police Department, and the Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office. I would also like to thank The Honorable Patricia Koch and Darnell Franklin for their help in obtaining court and detention center records. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Lisa Evans, Dr. Robert Laird, Dr. Monica Marsee, and Dr. R. Denis Soignier for their valuable input and continued dedication.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The overrepresentation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system, often referred to as disproportionate minority contact (DMC) can be found at many stages of the juvenile justice continuum. Further, research has shown that overrepresentation is not necessarily related to higher rates of criminal activity and suggests that case processing disparities can contribute to DMC. Risk assessment instruments (RAI) are objective techniques used to make decisions about youth in the juvenile justice system. This study examined the effects of implementing an RAI designed to make detention decisions, in a predominantly rural parish in Louisiana. Police officers from three law enforcement agencies investigated 202 cases during the evaluation period. The measures included an objective detention risk screening instrument, a contact form which contained juvenile demographic information, a two-item questionnaire assessing law enforcement's impression of the youth's need for detention placement and risk to public safety, and an arrest coding sheet which assessed subsequent police contacts and arrests among youth over 3 and 6 months of street time (i.e., time outside of secure confinement). Results revealed that overall law enforcement was unwilling to consistently complete the tool and continued to use subjective decision making, with completion rates ranging from 61% to 97% across the participating agencies. Also, subjective decision making by law enforcement actually helped minority youth as law enforcement consistently disregarded formal overrides included in the RAI, resulting in fewer minority youth being detained than were indicated by the RAI. Further, implementation of the tool, as constructed, resulted in small but insignificant reductions in the rates of overall confinement and rates of minority confinement when compared to the rates of confinement during the same time period of the previous year. Additionally, the RAI did not significantly predict future police contact due to items that did not predict recidivism in this sample. Use of a three-item version resulted in a significant increase in the tool's predictive ability. This study demonstrates the

importance of additional validity testing following the implementation of detention risk assessment instruments to ensure that these tools reduce unnecessary confinement while protecting public safety.

KEY WORDS: Risk assessment; pre-adjudication detention; juvenile delinquency

Disproportionate Minority Contact

The overrepresentation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system is well-established and has garnered widespread attention over the last few decades. This overrepresentation is often referred to as Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). The prevalence of DMC can be found in every step of the juvenile justice system. According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP) Easy Access System (Sickmund et al., 2008) in 2005 minorities made up 19% of the United States juvenile population but accounted for 36% of the referrals to juvenile court, 45% of detention placements, and 42% of transfers to adult criminal court. Much of the disproportionality is found within the Black community, as during that same year Blacks made up 13% of the juvenile population but accounted for 33% of referrals to juvenile court, 42% of detention placements, and 39% of transfers to criminal court. Empirical research has found that overrepresentation persists among youth at all stages of the juvenile justice system including, arrest, detention, prosecution, transfer to adult court, disposition, and commitment to secure facilities (Welsh, Jenkins, & Harris, 1999).

One possible explanation for the overrepresentation of minorities is that youth of color commit proportionately more crimes than White youth (OJJDP, 1999). Minority youth are subject to a greater number of risk factors as they are significantly more likely to live in poverty than White youth (Annie E. Casey, 2003). Youth raised in poverty often experience a greater number of environmental and societal inequalities such as underperforming schools, poor health care, violence, and easy access to guns and drugs (Burkstein, 1994). After following 481 boys from childhood to early adulthood, Fite and colleagues (2009) found that most racial discrepancies in juvenile delinquency were accounted for by increased exposure to childhood risk factors such as low academic achievement, family SES, and neighborhood problems. A higher incidence of early risk factors accounted for racial disparities among juvenile arrests in general, as well as differences among violent and theft related offenses.

A second explanation of minority overrepresentation is discrimination. This explanation suggests that because of bias and discrimination by juvenile justice decision makers, minority youth are more likely to be arrested, have their cases handled formally, be placed in pre-adjudication detention, be adjudicated delinquent, and be confined in a secure juvenile facility (OJJDP, 1999). This explanation is supported by research showing that overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system is not necessarily related to higher participation rates in criminal activity, as self-report data has failed to reveal significantly different rates of offending (Rivaux et al., 2006). In a report issued by OJJDP (1999) describing self-reported delinquency among a sample of 9000 youth, there were no significant differences found between White and Black youth in rates of marijuana use, the sale of drugs, destruction of property, theft, and assault. Black youth were more likely than Whites to belong to a gang but were less likely to carry a gun. Piquero and Brame (2008) examined racial and ethnic differences in offending using both self report data and official record information on a sample of youth from two metropolitan cities in two different parts of the country. Little evidence was found for racial or ethnic differences in self-reported offending (either by frequency or variety), whereas there were significant difference in their offending according to official records.

In a given jurisdiction either or both of these explanations may be at work to increase DMC. Substantial evidence does exist to suggest that case processing disparities are at least partially to blame for the high rates of minority incarceration (Rivaux et al., 2006), as minority youth are often treated differently from White youth within the juvenile justice system (OJJDP, 1999). For example, analyses of national juvenile court records revealed that in 1996 secure detention placement was nearly twice as likely for cases involving Black youth as for cases involving White youth, even after controlling for severity of offense. In a review of the existing literature, Pope and Feyerherm (1992) found that race/ethnicity influenced decision making in two-thirds of the studies. Racial and ethnic effects were also found at every stage of processing but were more pronounced at the arrest and detention stages.

The juvenile court, unlike the adult criminal system, is not established under the principle of equality before the law (Miethe & Moore, 1986). The early reformers envisioned a separate system using a treatment –oriented approach where the issue of guilt or innocence was to be less significant than the issue of the child's welfare. This treatment-oriented approach rested on the *parens patriae* doctrine which called for the court to respond to the needs of youth with paternalistic protection, care, and assistance and was organized around informal, nonadversarial proceedings. While this doctrine served the goals of early reformers, it also gave immense power to those charged with the responsibility to control and rehabilitate delinquent youth (Frazier & Bishop, 1985). The *parens patriae* doctrine philosophy accepts and justifies that high levels of discretion are necessary if each youthful offender is to receive the level of individualized attention and care necessary for rehabilitation (Cohen & Kluegel, 1978; Marshall & Thomas, 1983). However this doctrine creates the potential for discretionary abuse in decision making, particularly if decision makers harbor bias against certain social groups.

Despite social norms and laws governing against discrimination and racial bias, there is consistent evidence that negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities in general, and Blacks in particular, continue to exist often in subtle and indirect ways (Dovidio, Kawakami & Gaertner, 2002; Johns et al, 2008). The power of cultural stereotypes and bias lie in their ability to operate under the radar. Biases toward various social groups can persist regardless of the presence of conscious prejudice and affect our thoughts, feelings, and actions, whether we consciously acknowledge or want to reveal them (Devine, 1989). When faced with an overwhelming amount of relevant information and limited resources, decision makers often rely on their intuition or "gut" feelings. Relying on gut feelings may be particularly problematic when legitimate concerns are colored by bias towards various social groups (Highhouse, 1997). Attribution theory and law enforcement bias provide two explanations for how bias contributes to DMC in the juvenile justice system.

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory is a social psychology theory that explores the process through which individuals define causal explanations for events as either internal or external. Internal factors include aspects of personal disposition and attitudes, while external factors include situational factors surrounding an act (Heider, 1958). According to this theory, people are more likely to attribute the negative behavior of another as internal or dispositional if that person is a member of an out-group but will attribute the same negative behavior as external or situational if performed by an in-group member. Likewise positive behaviors by out-group members will be seen as external, while the positive behaviors of in-group members will be seen as internal (Gorham, 2006). Group membership can be defined by a variety of social constructs such as race, gender, or social status. According to attribution theory, members of the out-group are seen as relatively homogenous in that their attributes are assumed to hold true for most members of the group (Gorham, 2006).

To illustrate the potential influence of attributions in the justice system, Gilliam et al (1996) manipulated the race of suspects in a crime story and found significant main effects for suspect race. Subjects expressed more concern for crime and were more likely to attribute the causes of crime to group characteristics for the Black suspects compared to the White suspects. Also examining attributions about criminality, Johnson and colleagues (1997) used a priming experiment to assess how the level of violence in a crime story primed readers to evaluate Black defendants differently than White defendants. These researchers found that attributions of defendant behavior did not vary with story violence for Whites and when the race of the defendant was unspecified. However for Black defendants, attributions were more internal for violent stories. Overall, attributions were more dispositional for the Black defendants than either the White or race unspecified defendants.

Thus, attribution theory could be very helpful for understanding how decisions are made in the juvenile justice system. Decision-makers may not have complete information about a youth; therefore they often try to reduce uncertainty by not only relying on a youth's present offense and prior delinquency history but also on attributions linked to the defendant's gender, race, social class, or other social positions (Albonetti, 1991; Schlesinger, 2005). If a negative attribution is attached to particular groups, there is an increased likelihood that all subsequent members of those groups will be categorized in a negative light which could influence adjudication decisions (Liska, Logan, & Bellair, 1998; Peterson & Hagan, 1984; Swigert, & Farrell, 1976). This position was supported by a study by Bridges and Steen (1998) which found that probation officers assigned different causal attributions to the delinquent behavior of Black and White youth. Delinquent involvement among Black youth was viewed as being related to internal dispositional attributions, whereas delinquency among White youth was attributed to external causes. Because internal attributions resulted in increased perceptions that the Black youth were at an increased risk for recidivism, they were given longer sentences than White youth.

Biased Law Enforcement

Another line of research suggests that racial disparity in arrest rates may also be influenced by structural opportunities for biased law enforcement. Spatial opportunity and police discretion are two variations of this theory. The spatial opportunity model suggests that the spatial distribution of Blacks and Whites can impact racial disparities in arrest rates. In a study surveying the impressions of 3585 persons residing in 196 Chicago census tracts, Sampson and Raudenbush (2004), found that as the concentration of minority groups and poverty increases, residents perceive heightened disorder (e.g. crime, litter, graffiti, abandoned cars, etc), even after controlling for personal characteristics and independently observed neighborhood conditions. Additionally, in a second study using neighborhood studies of almost 8000 residents in three American cities, Quillian and Pager (2001) found that the

percentage of young Black men in a neighborhood was positively associated with perceptions of neighborhood crime level, even after controlling for neighborhood crimes rates. Using data from the Federal Bureau of Investigations Uniform Crime Report (FBI, 2000; 2001; 2002) for 136 American cities, Ousey and Lee (2008) found that even after controlling for actual crime rates, a higher proportion of Black residents within the community was associated with higher arrest rates for drug and weapon charges. Similar, disparities were not found for property and violent arrests. The authors suggest that uneven racial distribution can set the stage for implicit or explicit biases to result in racially disparate arrest rates, particularly for crimes where the lack of a victim, body, or complaining third party provides police with more discretionary authority for arrest decisions (Ousey & Lee, 2008).

In addition to public perception of crime, considerable support has been raised for the argument that both the resources and coercive strategies of policing are distributed according to the community's social and ethnic makeup (Holmes, 2000; Kent & Jacobs, 2005; Smith & Holmes, 2003; Stucky, 2005). Because racial segregation in neighborhoods often makes it easy to designate entire city sections as Black or White areas, implicit biases based on cultural stereotypes linking Blacks with crime, social disorder, and violence can easily influence the geographic deployment of officers (Bobo, 2001; Quillian & Pager, 2001; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004). The work of Holmes and colleagues (2008) supports this theory. Analyzing the allocation of police resources in large communities (more than 100,000 residents) in the Southwestern United States, the authors found a strong positive linear relationship between percent Black and both per capita police expenditures and number of police officers per 100,000 residents. However, there was no relationship between crime rates and use of police resources (Holmes et al, 2008). Thus, these findings suggest that the allocation of police resources are not necessarily tied to crime rates within the community and may be influenced by extra legal factors such as race.

In studies of adult offenders, Bridges and Crutchfield (1988) note that levels of imprisonment are substantially higher for Blacks than Whites in jurisdictions with a high concentration of Blacks among the poor. Because law enforcement resources are limited, decisions about geographic distribution of resources are typically based on a myriad of considerations including known racial, economic, and geographic crime distributions along with any cultural stereotypes that exist (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004). Therefore decisions that begin as legitimate attempts to efficiently deploy finite resources may result in concentrating police attention on distinct Black communities perceived as crime "hot spots." Even if not intended, this practice makes it more likely that Blacks (as well as other minority groups) will be observed, questioned, and arrested at rates that overstate objective racial differences in offending (Beckett, Nyrop, & Pfingst, 2006).

Police are a critical component of the juvenile justice system and are afforded a vast amount of discretion, but surprisingly researchers have paid little attention to contacts between police and juveniles (Piquero, 2008). The police discretion model complements the spatial opportunity model by suggesting that opportunity for racial disparity is greater for some offenses than others. Similar to sentencing research that has suggested that racial bias is more pronounced for less serious cases where the judge yields more discretion (Spohn & Cederblom, 1991), this model contends that racial disparity in arrest rates is more evident for offenses for which the police have more discretion with regard to arresting decisions. Discretion is most prevalent for weapon and drug charges which typically do not have a victim seeking justice (Piquero, 2008). Hartstone and Richfield (2009) used regression analyses to examine police decision making in Connecticut over a one year period. The researchers used a stratified random sample of one-third of the state's police stations and state police barracks resulting in an evaluation of 1564 incident reports. Analyses revealed that both Black and Hispanic youth apprehended for non-serious felony juvenile offenses and Black youth apprehended for misdemeanors were significantly more likely than White youth to be referred to court. Additionally, Black youth

charged with a non-serious felony juvenile offense or misdemeanor were more likely than White youth to be placed in secure holding at the police station than White youth. Lastly, both Black and Hispanic youth charged with serious felony juvenile offenses were significantly more likely than White youth to be transported to a detention center.

Surprisingly, little attention has been paid to the impact of officer race in decision making. Researchers have hypothesized that when an officer and citizen are the same race or ethnicity that the officer will be more lenient (Mastrofski et al., 1996). That is, Black officers would be less likely to exercise formal authority against Black youth and White officers would be more likely to use formal authority against Blacks. However research does not support this theory and suggests that Black officers are either as likely as or more likely to use their discretion unfavorably against Black youth than White officers (Brown & Frank, 2006; Ricksheim & Chermol, 1993).

Juvenile Justice in Rural Communities

Juvenile justice officials face a variety of challenges in rural communities. These challenges primarily stem from a large land area with a small population, low income, and low tax base (Gibson, 2006). Research has consistently found large differences between rural and urban communities for every category of index crime. Examining official police data from 1966 through 1997, Weisheit and Donnermeyer (2000) concluded that violent crime rates were between five to ten times higher and property crime rates were between four to five times higher in metropolitan communities. However, once youth become involved in the juvenile justice system, rural communities often lack the resources necessary to provide an array of services designed to rehabilitate youth and prevent recidivism (Wells & Weisheit, 2004). For example, probation officers in rural communities are often assigned to regions which may cover several hundred miles, thus limiting their monitoring abilities and increasing risk for recidivism (Gibson, 2006). Several authors also suggest that risk factors associated with crime may be

different in urban and rural areas. Studying the impact of economic growth on crime rates, authors have suggested that urban crime rates decline as the economy becomes more prosperous (Blumstein, Rivara, & Rosenfeld, 2000; Grogger, 2000) but in rural areas economic growth is often accompanied by substantial increases in crime (Lee & Ousey, 2001). It has also been suggested that social factors such as family instability and racial diversity are much more predictive of delinquency in rural communities than economic conditions (Wells & Weisheit, 2000).

Decision Making in the Juvenile Justice System

As noted previously, racial disparities have been found not only at the point of arrest but also at other places in the system where authorities have discretionary power. Decision making within the juvenile justice system is to some extent guided by statutes, administrative guidelines, and operating procedures. However, evidence suggests that because of a lack of clear decision criteria, considerable variability exists. This discretion is well documented and has been observed in all phases of the juvenile justice continuum from arrest to disposition following adjudication (Corrado & Turnbull, 1992; Grisso, Tomkins, & Casey, 1988; Johnson & Secret, 1995). Police, prosecutors, and juvenile court judges are the key figures in these decisions but other important personnel such as psychologists, social workers, and probation officers also play an important role (Hoge, 2002). For these officials, decisions are often based on judgments which are typically based on information about a youth, such as history of previous offenses or role in the offense. While it is clear that some level of discretion is necessary, if the needs of each youth are to be fully met, this indeterminancy in rules also provides room for personal prejudices and biases to operate and may contribute to what Gottfredson and Gottfredson (1988) refer to as “irrational decisions”.

These irrational decisions are inconsistent with the objectives of the justice system and may contribute to unfairness. Inconsistencies in the processing of offenders and the operation of biases

have been demonstrated in the juvenile justice system by numerous researchers (Minor, Hartmann, & Terry, 1997; Sanborn, 1996; Schissel, 1993). Mitchell's (2005) meta-analysis of 71 published and unpublished studies found inconsistencies in sentencing such that Blacks were given more restrictive dispositions than Whites who committed the same offense and had the same prior record in 76% of the studies. However among the 116 effects analyzed, a random effects mean odds ratio of 1.28 was found. While statistically significant, these results are substantively small as most effect sizes were small and clustered around zero. Assuming a punishment rate of 50% for Whites, these effect sizes translate into a 56% punishment rate for Blacks.

Risk Assessment in the Juvenile Justice System

Assessment of risk is a critical and essential component of the juvenile justice process. Judgments about the level of risk of young offenders form the basis of many of the decisions made in the juvenile justice system (Lodewijks et al., 2008). Risk assessments are used to predict future behavior such as the likelihood an individual will engage in future criminal activity, future violence, and failure to appear for court dates. These estimates of risk underlie many judicial decisions such as whether a youth should be detained prior to adjudication (Hoge, 2002). Incorrect classification of youths can have negative implications for both the youth and the community. Under-prediction may result in others being harmed by allowing dangerous youth to be free in the community, while over-prediction interferes with the rights and freedoms of a youth (Catchpole & Gretton, 2003). The quality of these decisions depends on the validity of these judgments.

Forensic risk assessment plays an important role in law enforcement and the criminal justice system and can be performed at many stages of the juvenile justice process (Olver et al., 2009). Risk assessments are typically conducted through one of two methods: unstructured assessment or through the use of actuarial methods. Historically, risk assessment and classification has been a highly informal

and discretionary process carried out by individuals in an often unsystematic manner. Decisions made through unstructured assessment are typically based on personal judgments (Hoge, 2002). These judgments should be based on legal matters, such as the facts of the case and prior contact with the youth. However, the lack of structure contributes to the lack of consistency and allows the operation of biases (Grove et al., 2000). Over the last few decades, research has led to the development of standardized risk assessment instruments. Structured or actuarial risk assessment instruments are designed to reduce racial, ethnic, and gender disparities and biases by increasing the consistency of assessment through a structured process (Schwalbe et al., 2006). Most risk assessment scores use empirically derived risk factors that are added together to produce a cumulative risk score. These scores are typically classified in terms of low, medium, and high risk. These classifications correspond to an array of graduated sanctions and court interventions designed to prevent recidivism (Howell, 1995; 2003).

In the adult literature, ample evidence exists suggesting that actuarial assessments of risk are significantly superior to clinical assessments, even for diverse populations such as offenders with mental illness and sex offenders (Bonta, 2002). For example, Klieman et al. (2007) evaluated an objective risk assessment instrument designed to assess offender risk for recidivism and suitability for diversion. The researchers conducted a study of 555 offenders over a two and a half year period. Survival analyses revealed that the objective instrument was able to distinguish nonviolent offenders who were both more and less likely to recidivate. Further, in a study investigating the Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY: Borum et al., 2002), researchers were unable to find any empirical evidence to suggest that either unstructured or structured clinical judgments were able to achieve levels of accuracy outperforming the use of objective risk scores. Additionally, when unstructured risk judgment was used to make disposition decisions, there was no predictive accuracy for violent re-offending above chance (Lodewijks, et al., 2008). Thus, the use of objective risk measures have

consistently been found to provide a more valid and consistent assessment of risk than unstructured assessments (Hoge, Lodewijks et al., 2008).

The Importance of Pretrial Detention in the Juvenile Justice System

One place in the juvenile justice system where risk assessment has been the focus of great debate and concern is for pretrial detention. Unlike the adjudicatory stage of court processing, the detention stage is traditionally void of strict substantive or procedural legal safeguards. In *Schall v. Martin* (1984), the Supreme Court approved preadjudication detention of juveniles based on the prediction of further law violations. As a result, all fifty states and the District of Columbia have preventive detention statutes which allow detention decisions to be based on predictions of a youth's risk for recidivism and dangerousness to the public. However, these statutes rarely provide specific criteria to make this prediction. This statutory vagueness may result in arbitrary decisions that may be based on legitimate factors such as prior record and seriousness of the offense or on extralegal factors such as race, gender, or socioeconomic status (Frazier & Bishop, 1985). Some scholars have argued that pretrial detention of juveniles involves greater abuses of law and power than any other aspect of the juvenile justice system (Bookin-Weiner, 1984; Tripplet, 1978).

Evidence suggests not only that Black youth are more likely to be detained than Whites, independent of legal and social factors (Wordes et al., 1994), but that also a growing proportion of nonwhite youths are placed in detention (McGarrell, 1993). In 1997, 19% of all juvenile delinquent referrals resulted in detention placement, with African American youth comprising 47% of the cases (Hoytt, Schiraldi, Smith, & Zeidenberg, 2002). Between 1983 and 1997, the overall detention population increased by 47%. However, White youth detention rates increased by 21%, whereas the minority youth rates increased 76% (Justice Policy Institute, 2002). Leiber and Fox (2005) studied the impact of race and detention on decision making using logistic regression to analyze twenty one years of

juvenile court data. Findings suggest that Black youth were more likely to be detained than White youth and that being detained increased the likelihood of receiving a more severe outcome at intake by 19%. Overall, Black youth were more likely to receive a more sever outcome at detention, initial appearance, and adjudication, even after controlling for relevant legal factors such as crime severity. In a second study using a large data set of over 200,000 delinquency cases, Frazier and Bishop (1985) found that pre-adjudication detention had a significant effect on case processing decisions. Specifically, youth who were detained faced an increased likelihood of formal as opposed to informal case disposition. The effects of detention on case processing decisions are important as informal disposition typically results in much more lenient sanctions lasting for a shorter duration than sanctions imposed through formal disposition.

Importantly, there is some evidence to suggest that there are some serious long-term consequences of youth being in detention, making it important that only those required for community safety are detained. For example, research has suggested that the length of pretrial detention is relatively highly correlated with final dispositions, even after controlling for relevant legal factors like severity of crime (McCarthy & Smith, 1986). Also, research has found that pretrial detention significantly increases the chance that a formal petition will be filed and that detained youth are consistently more likely to receive a more severe disposition than those not detained after controlling for crime severity (Cohen, 1978; Frazier & Bishop, 1985). Several studies have found that even after controlling for multiple factors, such as severity of crime, juveniles detained before disposition receive more severe treatment at the adjudication and disposition stages and a higher likelihood of secure confinement than youth who are not detained (Bishop & Frazier, 1988, 1992, 1996; Bortner & Reed, 1985; Frazier & Bishop, 1985; Johnson & Secret, 1995; Secret & Johnson, 1997; Wu, 1997).

Consistent with findings from studies of adult offenders demonstrating the influence of race/ethnicity on pretrial decisions (Bridges, 1997; Zatz, 1987), research on juveniles has found a relationship between race and pre-adjudication detention (Bishop & Frazier, 1996; Bortner & Reed, 1985; Secret & Johnson, 1997; Wu & Fuentes, 1998). Using logistic regression to analyze a sample of 2003 cases, Wu and colleagues (1997) found that after controlling for crime severity, minority youth were more likely to be detained, while White youth were more likely to be adjudicated. Wu et al. suggest that detention decisions are typically made without detailed information and consequently based on personal discretion allowing personal bias to influence decisions. If minority offenders are seen as having a higher probability of re-offending or failing to appear in court, they may be more likely to be detained.

In summary, research has shown the negative effects of pre-adjudication detention. Youth who are detained are more likely to face formal processing and often receive more severe dispositions with sanctions lasting for longer periods of time than youth who are not detained. Decisions made early in the juvenile justice continuum are extremely important as they have the ability to thrust youth deeper into the system. Further, there is some evidence that detention decisions may be biased against minority youth and, thus, play an important role in the DMC found in many juvenile justice systems. Thus, one potentially important way to reduce DMC is to develop standardized risk assessment instruments (RAI) that can reduce the subjectivity in pre-adjudication detention decisions.

Detention Risk Assessment Instruments

Detention risk assessment instruments evaluate arrested youth to determine the need for secure, locked confinement prior to their adjudication hearing. These tools have been effective in reducing subjective and inappropriate decisions to incarcerate children in secure facilities. They have also been effective in controlling admissions to secure detention by reducing unnecessary or

inappropriate secure confinement and reducing overcrowding to improve conditions, while reducing government costs and liabilities (Hoytt, Schiraldi, Smith, & Zeidenberg, 2002; Schwartz, et al., 1991; Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, 2004). More importantly, objective risk assessments have been shown to reduce rates of minority confinement compared to personal judgment. For example, Hoytt et al (2002) and colleagues reported that in Cook County, Illinois, over a four period following the implementation of a detention risk screening instrument, the number of minorities in confinement were reduced by 31%. These authors also reported that in Santa Cruz, California from 1997 to 2000, the Latino detention rates decline 22% after an objective detention screening instrument was implemented. Over that same time period the detention rate for Latinos was reduced by 43% and the average daily population in the detention center saw a 25% reduction. However, these findings are limited by a lack of evidence showing the impact of reductions in confinement on arrest rates and rates of recidivism.

Some key principles associated with detention screening instruments include objectivity, uniformity, and risk-based assessment (Steinhart, 2006). There are two specific risks addressed by these instruments: public safety risk which is described as the risk of committing another public offense prior to adjudication and disposition of the case, and failure to appear (FTA) risk which is the risk of "failing to appear in court" after release. Detention RAIs are time-linked and therefore designed to guide an administrative custody decision covering the time period between arrest and adjudication. At adjudication and disposition, the court assumes control of the case and becomes directly responsible for the minor's future custody status (Steinhart, 2006).

RAI's are typically locally designed, and vary across jurisdictions; however, each is rooted in the same principles of objectivity, uniformity, and risk-based assessment (Steinhart, 2006). Detention RAIs may be completed by police officers or detention center intake staff. The risk instrument is a written checklist of criteria that are applied to youth on specific detention related risks. The overall risk score

then guides the decision to detain or release the youth. Nature of the offense and delinquency history are the two core risk factors used to assess need for secure placement. Local jurisdictions may also consider additional risk factors such as aggravating and mitigating factors (Steinhart, 2006). Detention RAI's typically use a point scale where points are assigned for each risk factor to produce a total risk score which is linked to an outcome. Low scores indicate that the youth should be released; scores in a middle range indicate a detention alternative may be appropriate; finally scores above the cutoff value indicate secure placement (Wiebush et al., 1995). Cut off scores are established after careful consideration of point totals assigned for individual risk factors. Normally, the cutoff score will mirror the number of points assigned to serious/violent crimes for which secure detention is essentially automatic. For example, if the serious/violent crime score is 15, the detention cut off score will also be 15. Additionally, overrides may be built into the instrument to accommodate the needs of the community. An override is a decision to detain or release a youth, although the decision is not warranted based on the scores from the RAI. Examples of overrides may include the decision to detain youth who commit a new offense while on probation regardless of the RAI score (Steinhart, 2006).

In a study evaluating the inter-rater reliability and predictive validity of a North Carolina RAI, Schwalbe and colleagues (2004) found that the structured RAI had higher reliability, as compared to clinical judgment, and risk scores were significantly correlated with re-arrest over a two year period. Looking at public safety outcomes, validation of a Virginia RAI revealed that use of a structured instrument was a better predictor of recidivism and failure to appear to court over a twelve month period than clinical judgment (Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, 2004). Thus, these studies have shown that structured detention screening instruments have the ability to reduce disproportionate minority confinement rates by improving risk prediction without increasing the threat to public safety.

Limitations in Existing Research

Thus, RAI are a promising way to reduce DMC at one point in the juvenile justice system. However, limitations still exist in the available research. First, limited testing of risk assessment instruments has been conducted with juveniles in rural communities. Second, limited data exists studying the willingness of agencies to fully adopt an RAI. Completing an RAI requires some moderate time commitment from juvenile justice agencies using it. Further, using an RAI also requires law enforcement agencies to give up some of their discretion in deciding on whether or not to detain a youth, which could also limit their willingness to implement an RAI. Also, while ample data exists showing the ability of RAI's to reduce minority confinement rates; these studies often do not address the effects of reduced confinement rates on public safety. That is, most studies do not track rates of recidivism and appearance for court dates among youth who are released. Next, mandatory and administrative overrides are typical features of RAI. However, they also create an opportunity for abuse and could allow for bias in decision making but these effects have not been systematically studied. Lastly, limited direct comparisons exist between risk scores and subjective decisions for the same youth. Most studies compare confinement rates pre and post the use of RAI at different points in time. As a result, cohort effects are possible. The proposed study will seek to bridge these gaps within the literature on the use of an RAI to reduce DMC at the pre-adjudication detention stage.

Statement of the Problem

The overrepresentation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system, often referred to as disproportionate minority contact (DMC) is well established and can be found at many stages of the juvenile justice continuum. However, research has shown that overrepresentation is not necessarily related to higher rates of criminal activity among minorities. There is evidence that case processing disparities can contribute to this DMC. Although social norms and laws are in place to prevent

discrimination and racial bias, there is evidence that negative attitudes toward Blacks especially in relation to risk for criminal behavior, continue to exist. Bias, even when unconscious or unintentional, can effect decision making and may contribute to the overrepresentation of youth of color found within the juvenile justice system. This is a particular problem in the juvenile justice system, where there is often more discretion available for how juveniles are processed than is the case for adults.

One method for attempting to reduce such biases is to use objective techniques, such as risk assessment instruments, to make decisions about a youth. These objective tools lessen the ability of personal beliefs to affect an individual's judgment and influence their decisions. Specifically, risk assessment instruments (RAI) are designed to serve as an objective way to assess a youth's level of threat to public safety and future legal sanctions. One particular point in the juvenile justice system in which such techniques can be used to reduce DMC is at the point of arrest when the decision is made whether or not to detain the youth before a decision on adjudication is made. This decision point is important because there is evidence that youth who are detained are more likely to penetrate deeper in the juvenile justice system than youth who are not detained, equating for crime severity. Unfortunately, there is limited published evidence supporting the use of objective detention screening instruments for safely reducing DMC.

As a result, this study examined the effects of implementing a risk assessment instrument in three police jurisdictions in a predominantly rural parish in Louisiana, overcoming several limitations in past research. First, the study tested the police agencies' ability and willingness to use a standard detention screening instrument. It also tested the measure's ability to reduce DMC without creating an increased threat to public safety by comparing youth detained after implementation of the objective screening instrument with youth detained during the same period the previous year. Also, scores on the objective indicator of risk were compared with subjective judgments of risk made by the police

agency on the same group of youths. Additionally, the impact of overrides on DMC was studied. Finally, the ability of the screening instrument to predict a youth's failure to appear (FTA) and risk for recidivism over short periods of time (3 and 6 months of street time after arrest) were examined and compared to subjective judgments of the police agency.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Determine whether law enforcement would be willing to consistently use an objective tool that impinges upon their decision making ability and that requires extra work. Law enforcement willingness to consistently use the RAI was defined by the percentage of police contacts during the evaluation period that have a completed RAI.

Hypothesis 2: Rates of minority confinement would be lower following implementation of the RAI in comparison to confinement rates during the same period of the previous year, while increasing the rates of violent offenders placed in secure confinement. That is, use of the RAI would result in reductions in confinement rates among youth in general and would result in an increase in the percentage of detained youth charged with a violent offense (i.e. youth charged with an offense against a person).

Hypothesis 3: The RAI would result in a smaller proportion of youth of color being detained than law enforcement's impression

Hypothesis 4: Police discretion in detention decisions would reduce the impact of a risk assessment instrument on DMC and would result in increased minority confinement.

Hypothesis 5: The RAI would be a better predictor of short term recidivism and failure to appear for court than law enforcement impression, after accounting for time in confinement.

Methods

Participants

Juvenile detectives from the Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office, Alexandria Police Department, and Pineville Police Department participated in this study. They investigated 202 cases from August 15 – October 31, 2008 which served as the study period. Rapides Parish is designated by the U.S. Census Bureau as a rural parish. There are 133,131 residents according to 2008 estimates; 34,215 of those persons are juveniles. In Rapides as a whole, 66% of the population self-identifies as White, 31% as Black, and 3% as another race. The lone metropolitan center in the parish, Alexandria accounts for 34% of the parish population. In Alexandria, 55% of the population self-identifies as Black, 43% as White, and 2% as another race (US Census Bureau, 2010). Minorities were somewhat overrepresented in the current sample as the majority (63%) self-identified as African American, 37% as Caucasian, and less than 1% as Hispanic. The three participating law enforcement agencies investigated cases involving youth ranging in age from 7 to 17 years of age. Youth had an average of 1.27 charges (SD = .84) and came into contact with law enforcement for a variety of offenses. The most common offenses were status offenses (27%), followed by public order misdemeanors (19%), property misdemeanors (18%), and violent misdemeanors (14%). Felony cases made up a small proportion of the charges (12%).

A comparison group of youth who were detained during the same two and a half month period in 2007 were used as a comparison group for some analyses. These data were obtained from official detention center records. Among the 27 youth in the comparison group, 82% self-identified as African American and 18% as Caucasian. Youth were detained ranging in age from 12 to 16 years of age. Youth had an average of 1.15 charges (SD= .46) for a variety of offenses. The most common offenses

were non-violent felonies (37%), followed by violent felonies (15%), property misdemeanors (15%), public order misdemeanors (15%), violent misdemeanors (11%), and status offenses (7%).

Measures

The Rapides Parish Juvenile Detention Screening Instrument (DSI). The DSI was created over a five month period under the leadership of the Department of Juvenile Services with input from the juvenile court judge, local law enforcement agencies, the district attorney's office, indigent defense counsel, and other juvenile justice professionals. The DSI was created to be an objective measure of a youth's threat to public safety and need for secure placement as one of the goals for reducing Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in Rapides Parish. Its content is very similar to other risk assessment instruments that have been used to make decisions on pre-adjudication confinement of juveniles. Specifically, the DSI assigns numerical values for the most serious current offense, additional offenses, prior criminal history, history of failing to appear, history of escape or runaway, and aggravating factors (i.e. "Juvenile has significant mental health issues"). Points are subtracted for mitigating factors (i.e. "Juvenile is less than 12 years of age"). The DSI also includes a list of mandatory and administrative overrides (i.e. use/possession of a firearm during current offense, juvenile is currently on probation or parole). Points totaling 13 or above, or the presence of an override, indicate that the youth should be placed in secure detention. Totals of 8 -12 indicate that the youth should be involved in a detention alternative, such as an electronic monitoring program. Totals of seven points or less indicate that the youth should be released. To achieve inter-rater reliability, juvenile detectives received extensive DSI training. During monthly meetings, sample cases were presented and officers were asked to use the DSI to make fictitious detention decisions. The ratings were then reviewed and discrepancies were discussed. A copy of the DSI is included in Appendix A.

Juvenile Contact Form. The Juvenile Contact Form was created to obtain demographic information about all youth who come into contact with law enforcement, even if the youth is not arrested. A copy of the Juvenile Contact Form is included in Appendix B. The Juvenile Contact Form obtains basic demographic information such as name, race, ethnicity, gender, date of birth, and address. In addition, offense information such as charge(s), offense zone/ward, disposition, complaint source, and referrals made are also collected.

Impression Questionnaire. The Impression Questionnaire is a 2-item questionnaire designed for this study, which assesses the impression of the law enforcement officer who completed the DSI. A copy of the Impression Questionnaire is included in Appendix C. This measure was compared with the results of the DSI to determine the level of correspondence between the judgment of law enforcement officials and an objective tool for determining the need for secure placement. The Impression Questionnaire asks the officer to give their opinion on the youth's level of threat to public safety, as well as if they would detain the child if the decision was theirs.

Arrest Coding Sheet. The arrest coding sheet was created to track recidivism and failures to appear among study participants. Subsequent police contacts were collected from each of the participating law enforcement agencies for six months of street time among the youth included in the initial evaluation phase. Street time, rather than initial contact date was used to ensure that each youth had an equal number of days to re-offend and began the date of initial contact for youth who were released immediately and upon the date of release for youth confined to detention or state custody following arrest. For each youth, the coding sheet collected the number of police contacts, as well as offense types, and total number of charges. The coding sheet also used court records to track each youth's appearance for the first court date. A copy of the arrest coding sheet is included in Appendix D.

Procedures

The current study was conducted to evaluate the DSI, as part of the University of New Orleans' role in the Louisiana Models for Change (LA-MfC) project. Local authorities adopted the measures used in this study as their standard procedures when processing youth and requested that UNO code the data from their official files to evaluate the effectiveness of their procedures; principally, whether the use of the DSI would reduce secure placements, particularly for minority youth, without increasing the risk for public safety in their jurisdictions.

The Juvenile Contact Form, Impression Questionnaire, and DSI were completed by the juvenile detectives of each agency. When a line officer made contact with a juvenile suspected of an offense, they would contact the detective and supply the youth's demographic information, charge(s), and facts of the case. The juvenile detective would complete the Juvenile Contact Form and Impression Questionnaire prior to completing the DSI. The detective would then instruct the officer to release the youth, bring him or her into the station, or transport the youth to Renaissance Home for Youth. All of the documentation was submitted to the researcher monthly. The juvenile detectives were responsible for collecting the Juvenile Contact Form, DSI, and Impression Questionnaire from their respective agencies. Six juvenile detectives participated in the validation study, five of the six were Black males and the sixth was a White male. Law enforcement was required to participate in the creation of the DSI as part of the parish's efforts to reduce DMC, but were given no incentives for participation.

Following the initial evaluation period, a file review was conducted to track failures to appear (FTA) and recidivism over short periods of time. Court records were used to track each youth's appearance for the first court date following arrest. Additionally, the number and type of offenses was

collected over six months of street time and comparisons were made to evaluate the DSI's ability to predict recidivism over periods of three and six months.

Results

Law Enforcement Buy-In

The first hypothesis investigated whether law enforcement agencies would be willing to consistently use an objective tool to make decisions on preadjudication detention that impinges upon their decision making ability and requires extra work. The proportion of cases investigated by each of the three law enforcement agencies with a completed DSI are described in Table 1. Of the 202 contacts investigated by law enforcement, 38 did not have a completed DSI. Completion rates among the three agencies ranged from 61% to 97%, as chi- square analyses revealed that cases investigated by the Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office were significantly more likely to have a completed DSI than cases investigated by the other police agencies ($X^2(2) = 40.87$; $p < .01$).

Table 1

Presence of DSI among Police Contacts by Arresting Agency

	DSI N = 164	No DSI N = 38	X^2 (df)
Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office	97% (n = 113)	3% (n = 4)	40.87(df = 2)**
Alexandria Police Department	61% (n = 43)	39% (n = 28)	
Pineville Police Department	67% (n = 8)	33% (n = 4)	

Note: Analysis represents the total number of contacts investigated by the three law enforcement agencies during the evaluation period; therefore, some youth are represented several times if additional contacts were made; Two cases without a DSI are missing arresting agency information; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

Each of the cases reviewed by law enforcement were included in the analyses reported in Table 1. The 202 contacts consisted of 140 original contacts, 38 contacts without a completed DSI, 23 additional contacts by study participants, and one technical violation. The types of contacts investigated by law enforcement are presented in Table 2. All subsequent analyses will only include the initial police contacts for the 140 youth with a completed DSI.

Table 2
Youth Contacts by Law Enforcement during Evaluation Period

Type of Police Contact	Number of Contacts N = 202
Original Police Contacts with a DSI	69% (n = 140)
Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office (n = 97)	
Alexandria Police Department (n = 36)	
Pineville Police Department (n = 7)	
Police Contacts Missing a DSI	19% (n = 38)
Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office (n = 4)	
Alexandria Police Department (n = 28)	
Pineville Police Department (n = 4)	
Recidivism by Study Participants	13% (n = 23)
Technical Violation	<1% (n = 1)

Note: Technical violation = bench warrant, contempt of court, or probation violation.

Thus, the rate of completed DSI across the various police departments varied considerably, suggesting that the buy-in across the police departments also varied. As another index of the police department's buy-in, the rate of DSI completion for youth actually detained during the study period was also evaluated. Among the 22 youth detained during the evaluation period, only four youth were

detained with a completed DSI. The other 18 detention placements were among youth without a completed DSI. Thus, actual detention decisions during the study period were not largely influenced by the use of the DSI.

A Comparison of Youth Detained in 2007 and 2008

The second hypothesis predicted that rates of minority confinement would be lower after implementation of the DSI than during the same period in the previous year while increasing the percentage of youth detained for a violent offense. Table 3 shows a comparison of youth detained August 15th through October 31st 2008, when the use of the DSI was initiated by the participating police departments, with youth detained during the same time period in 2007. Youth detained due to bench warrants, contempt of court, and probation violations were removed from the 2007 data (n= 7). This was done because DSI's were typically not completed for those youth in 2008. However, one youth with a contempt of court violation for whom a DSI was completed in 2008 was excluded. Additional detention placements by one youth were also removed from the 2008 data to make the 2007 and 2008 data comparable. While statistically insignificant, these comparisons show that there was a small reduction in the number of youth detained (27 in 2007 versus 22 in 2008) across the two years, showing a decline of 19%, as well as a smaller percentage of African-Americans (77% vs. 82%) detained in 2008 compared to 2007, a higher percentage of felony offenders (64% vs. 52%), and a higher percentage of offenders charged with a violent crime (41% vs. 26%). Also, as noted previously, the majority of youth (82%) who were detained in 2008 did not have a DSI completed for them.

Table 3

Comparison of Youth Detained August 15th – October 31st 2007 and 2008

	2007 N = 27	2008 N = 22	X^2 (df)
Black	82% (n = 22)	77% (n = 17)	.13(df = 1)
Felony	52% (n = 14)	64% (n = 14)	.69(df = 1)
Violent	26% (n = 7)	41% (n = 9)	1.99(df = 1)

Note: Youth detained for bench warrants, contempt of court, and probation violations are excluded from this analysis; One youth was detained multiple times during the validation period; Violent crime = crime against a person.

Descriptive Statistics

In Table 4 the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the main study variables are provided. Race was not significantly associated with any of the study variables. As expected the total DSI score was significantly associated with the DSI indicated decision to either detain or release the youth (r = .56; p < .01), actual detention decision (r = .32; p < .01), and the youth's most serious offense (r = .84; p < .01). Significant associations with the total DSI score were also found for law enforcement's impression of need for secure placement (r = .50; p < .01) and law enforcement's impression of the youth's threat to public safety (r = .70; p < .01). In general, the DSI score was not highly correlated with recidivism variables only yielding a significant association for additional arrests within three months (r = .17; p < .05). However, there were no significant associations found for both additional police contacts and arrest within six months. Importantly, significant associations were found between law enforcement impression of need for secure placement and additional contacts at both three (r = .21; p < .05) and six months (r = .22; p < .05). Additionally, youth detention placement

was significantly correlated with re-arrests at both three (r = .24; p < .01) and six months (r = .19; p < .05). Unexpectedly, there were no significant associations found between the youth's most serious offense and any of the recidivism variables, as correlations ranged from .06 to .10.

Table 4

Correlations among Main Study Variables (n = 124)

	Mean(SD)/ % Positive	Race	DSI Score	DSI Decision	Imp1	Imp2	Offense	Contact3	Contact6	Arrest3
DSI Score	3.33(3.51)	.02								
DSI Decision	10%	.16[a]	.56**							
Imp1	12%	-.02	.50**	.25**						
Imp2	1.82(1.52)	.01	.70**	.31**	.79**					
Offense	2.45(2.26)	-.06	.84**	.36**	.42**	.58**				
Contact3	22%	.04	.15[b]	.02	.21*	.12	.06			
Contact6	25%	.13	.13	.06	.22*	.08	.10	.82**		
Arrest3	13%	.08	.17*	.03	.07	.01	.09	.74**	.66**	
Arrest6	18%	.12	.14	.12	.14	.02	.06	.76**	.81**	.82**

Note: DSI Score= continuous Detention Screening Instrument score; DSI Decision = DSI indication of need for detention placement; Imp1 = need for secure placement based on law enforcements response to the question, "If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?"; Imp2= threat to public safety based on law enforcements response to the question, "What do you think is this child's level of dangerousness to public safety?"; Offense = Most serious current offense; Contact3 = any additional police contact within three months; Contact6 = any additional police contact within six months; Arrest3 = any additional arrest within three months; Arrest6 = any additional arrest within six months; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; [a] $p < .06$; [b] $p < .08$.

A Comparison of the DSI and Law Enforcements Impression

The third hypothesis predicted that use of the DSI would result in a smaller proportion of youth being detained than would be detained if law enforcement's impression was used to make this decision. Table 5 examines the associations between law enforcement's impression of need for secure placement with the results of the DSI. Overall, law enforcement's impression of youth threat (r= .50; $p< .01$) and need for secure placement (r = .70; $p < .01$) were significantly associated with DSI scores, indicating significant levels of agreement among the two methods. A chi-square test was conducted to examine the characteristics of youth judged to be in need of secure placement from the two methods. These analyses focused on four groups: cases where both law enforcement impressions and the DSI indicated that secure placement was unnecessary (n = 104), cases in which both law enforcement and the DSI (including mandatory and administrative overrides) agreed that secure placement was appropriate (n = 5), cases where the DSI did not indicate the need for secure placement but law enforcement believed it was appropriate (n = 11), and cases where the DSI indicated secure placement but law enforcement believed it was unnecessary (n = 9).

A comparison of the four groups revealed that they were significantly different in rates of violent offenses ($X^2(3) = 11.51$; $p < .01$) and felony offenses ($X^2(3) = 26.78$; $p < .01$). The results of these comparisons are provided in Table 5. The use of pairwise comparisons indicate that the rates of felony offenses among youth where both the DSI and law enforcement agreed that secure placement was appropriate and for cases where the DSI did not indicate detention but law enforcement believed it appropriate were significantly higher than the rates of felony offenses among cases where the DSI and law enforcement impression agreed that detention was inappropriate. No other significant differences were found between the groups. Looking at violent offenders, youth who would have been detained by the DSI but not law enforcement were significantly more likely to have been charged with a violent

offense than youth who would not have been detained by either method. No other significant differences emerged among the groups. These results indicate that when the DSI and law enforcement impression differed, the DSI detention decisions resulted in a greater number of youths with violent offenses being detained, whereas the impression questionnaire resulted in more felony offenses being detained. As indicated in Table 5, when the DSI and law enforcement impression differed in whether the youth should be detained, the DSI was more likely to recommend secure placement for African American youth who had committed violent offenses. Specifically, each of the nine cases where the DSI recommended secure placement but law enforcement did not were African-American and five were charged with violent offenses. However, these youth were typically charged with relatively minor offenses. Of the five cases, four youth were charged with simple battery and one was charged with aggravated assault, suggesting that the DSI's focus on violence may not appropriately weigh the seriousness of the offense.

Table 5

Comparisons of Youth Characteristics by DSI and Law Enforcement Impression Indicated Decisions

	No on Both N =104	Yes on Both N = 5	No DSI, Yes Imp N = 11	Yes DSI, No Imp N = 9	X^2 (df)
Black	63% (n= 65)	60% (n = 3)	64% (n = 7)	100% (n = 9)	5.20 (df = 3)
Felony	6% (n = 6)[a]	60% (n = 3)[b]	46% (n = 5)[b]	22% (n = 2)[a b]	26.78 (df = 3)**
Violent	12% (n= 13)[a]	20% (n= 1)[a b]	18% (n = 2)[a b]	56% (n = 5)[b]	11.51 (df = 3)**

Note: **$p < .01$; *$p < .05$; percentages with different subscripts differ significantly using pairwise comparisons at $p < .05$.

Law Enforcement Discretion

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the police discretion in detention decisions, which allows the use of both informal and formal overrides, would reduce the impact of a risk assessment instrument on DMC and would result in increased minority secure placement. Informal overrides, occurred when the DSI did not indicate the need for secure placement (i.e., either due to the child's score or the lack of a mandatory or administrative override) but the youth was still detained or the DSI indicated the need for secure placement but the youth was not detained. Thus, the next set of analyses explores the use of these overrides in the implementation of the DSI in Rapides Parish.

The first analyses focused on the use of informal overrides among the 125 youth who had low DSI scores with no mandatory or administrative overrides. Of these youth, three were detained. Two of the three detained youth were Black and each was charged with a non-violent felony offense. Among the youth with low DSI scores and no overrides who were not detained 60% (73) were Black, 7% (9) committed a felony offense, and 15% (18) committed a violent offense. In terms of the other type of informal override, of the five youth who had high scores on the DSI indicating the need for secure placement, only one was detained. This youth was a White male detained for a violent felony. Of the four youth not detained, three were Black, two of whom were arrested for a non-violent felony.

Additional analyses focused on the use of formal overrides of the DSI. Formal overrides were defined as any administrative or mandatory override included in the DSI. Of the 9 youth with low DSI scores who had either a mandatory or administrative override suggesting secure placement, none were detained. Each of the nine youth who were not detained were Black (100%), one (11%) was charged with a felony crime, and five (56%) were charged with a violent crime.

Threat to Public Safety

The final hypothesis predicted that the DSI would be a better predictor of short term recidivism and failure to appear than law enforcement impression, after accounting for length of time in confinement. Recidivism was broken into four categories, youth who had at least one additional police contact within three months, youth with at least one additional police contacts within six months, youth who were arrested for an additional offense within three months, and youth who were arrested for an additional offense within six months following the initial offense. Police contacts consisted of all additional offenses regardless of whether the youth was arrested or counseled and released. Four youth were removed from this portion of the analyses; two youth aged out of the juvenile system during the follow up period and two were released from detention directly into state custody and are not scheduled for release until 2011. During the follow up period, 35 youth had additional contacts with law enforcement with an average of 1.82 additional contacts. Of the 35 youth, 15 (45%) committed a more serious offense, 14 (42%) committed an offense of equal severity, and four (12%) committed a less severe offense. Two cases were missing charge information. Offense severity was defined such that violent felonies were considered most serious followed by non-violent felonies, violent misdemeanors, non-violent misdemeanors, and finally status offenses. Recidivism and failure to appear data were analyzed collectively as only two youth failed to appear for court and both youth had additional police contacts. A breakdown of the offense severity by contact is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Additional Offense Severity by Contact Type

	Contact3 (n = 30/21%)	Contact6 (n = 35/25%)	Arrest3 (n = 18/13%)	Arrest6 (n = 25/18%)
Violent Felony	3% (n = 1)	3% (n = 1)	5% (n = 1)	4% (n = 1)
Non-Violent Felony	17% (n =5)	14% (n =5)	17% (n =3)	16% (n = 4)
Violent Misdemeanor	13% (n =4)	14% (n =5)	17% (n =3)	16% (n=4)
Non-Violent Misdemeanor	27% (n =8)	34% (n =12)	22% (n =4)	24% (n =6)
Status Offense	40% (n=12)	34% (n=12)	39% (n=7)	40% (n=10)

Note: Contact3 = any additional police contact within three months; Contact6 = any additional police contact within six months; Arrest3 = any additional arrest within three months; Arrest6 = any additional arrest within six months.

To determine if DSI score or law enforcement impression was a better predictor of recidivism, a series of logistic regression analyses were conducted. Because the two impression questions were highly correlated with each other ($r = .79$; $p < .01$), they were tested separately. The first set of analyses tested law enforcement's impression of the youth's need for detention placement. In step 1, the dichotomous variable indicating the presence of additional police contact at three months was regressed onto youth race and the DSI indicated detention decision to assess the independent effects of both predictors. In step 2, law enforcement impression of need for detention placement was added to the equation. The logistic regression was rerun controlling for the most serious original offense. Similar logistic regressions were conducted for each of the recidivism variables. The results of these regression analyses are reported in Table 7. As evident in this table, there were no significant main effects for race or the DSI in predicting recidivism. However, law enforcement's impression

significantly predicted additional police contacts at both three (B = 4.06; $p < .07$) and six months (B = 3.98; $p < .07$) after controlling for the severity of the initial offense.

Table 7

Logistic Regression Analyses Testing the Role of Race, DSI Indicated Detention Decision, and Law Enforcement Impression of Need for Detention Placement in Predicting Additional Police Contacts

	Contact3 Odds Ratio	Contact6 Odds Ratio	Arrest3 Odds Ratio	Arrest6 Odds Ratio
Race	1.20	1.88	1.92	1.89
DSI Decision	1.10	1.26	1.09	2.21
Race	1.24	1.99	1.94	1.96
DSI Decision	.76	.88	.96	1.80
Impression 1	3.86*	4.21*	1.69	2.42
Race	1.22	2.02	2.03	1.93
DSI Decision	.79	.84	.79	1.90
Impression 1	4.06*	3.98*	1.37	2.57
Offense	.98	1.03	1.11	.97

Note: DSI Decision = DSI indicated detention decision; Impression 1 = need for secure placement based on law enforcements response to the question "If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?"; Offense = most serious current offense; *$p < .05$; [a] $p = .05$; [b] $p < .06$; [c] $p < .07$; [d] $p = .09$.

The next set of analyses tested law enforcement's impression of the youth's threat to public safety following the same procedures described above. The results of these analyses are provided in Table 8. As evident in this table, race, DSI indicated detention, nor law enforcement's impression of the youth's threat to public safety predicted recidivism.

Table 8

Logistic Regression Analyses Testing the Role of Race, DSI Indicated Detention Decision, and Law Enforcement Impression of Threat to Public Safety in Predicting Additional Police Contacts

	Contact3	Contact6	Arrest3	Arrest6
	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Race	1.20	1.88	1.92	1.89
DSI Score	1.10	1.26	1.09	2.21
Race	1.20	1.88	1.92	1.89
DSI Score	.84	1.09	1.09	2.19
Impression 2	1.20	1.13	1.00	1.01
Race	1.19	1.96	2.08	1.92
DSI Score	.86	.97	.84	2.11
Impression 2	1.22	1.06	.87	.99
Offense	.98	1.08	1.19	1.03

Note: DSI Decision = DSI indicated detention decision; Impression 2 = ratings of threat to public safety based on law enforcements response to the question, "What do you think is this child's level of dangerousness to public safety?"; Offense = most serious current offense.

DSI Modifications

Need for secure confinement, as indicated by the DSI was less predictive of later police contacts than law enforcement's impression of need for secure confinement. Thus, three modifications were tested to determine if the DSI's predictive utility could be enhanced. The first modification tested whether the DSI cut-off score was too high. Later modifications tested if certain items from the DSI

were more predictive of risk for recidivism than others. Each modification excluded the mandatory and administrative overrides included in the DSI as they were generally disregarded by law enforcement agencies during the study period and they were not associated with later police contact.

The first modification tested the original DSI's cut-off score of thirteen, which recommended detention placement for five youth. The mandatory and administrative overrides included in the tool recommended detention placement for an additional nine youth. Thus, the DSI recommended detention placement for fourteen youth. Descriptive statistics revealed that using a 90% cut-off rate, a score of eight would indicate detention placement for sixteen youth, excluding overrides. Table 9 compares youth who would be detained based on either the original DSI indicated decision or detention placement based on the new DSI cut-off score.

Using a chi-square test, the characteristics of youth who would not be detained by either score (n = 114), cases where both scores indicated detention placement (n = 8), cases where detention placement was indicated using the new score but not the original score (n = 8), and cases where the original score indicated detention placement but the new score did not (n = 6) were compared. From the data reported in Table 9, comparisons of the four groups revealed significant differences in rates of felony offenses ($X^2(3) = 42.02$; $p < .01$) and violent offenses ($X^2(3) = 9.62$; $p < .05$). The groups also differed in their risk for later contacts and arrests, including additional police contacts at both three ($X^2(3) = 19.06$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 13.52$; $p < .01$), and arrests at three months ($X^2(3) = 20.94$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 18.89$; $p < .01$). Pairwise comparisons indicated that youth detained due to the new cut-off score were significantly more likely to have committed a felony (63% vs. 0%). In terms of later contacts and arrests, those detained due to the new cut-off were more likely to have at least one additional police contact within three months (75% vs. 0%) and six months (75% vs. 17%), and were more likely to have been arrested at least once within three months (63% vs. 17%).

Table 9

Comparison of Youth Detained using the Original DSI Cut-Off Score and the New DSI Cut-Off Score

	No Both N = 114	Yes Both N = 8	No Original, Yes New N = 8	Yes Original, No New N = 6	X^2 (df)
Black	59% (n = 67)	75% (n = 6)	63% (n = 5)	100% (n = 6)	4.74(df = 3)
Felony	6% (n = 7)[a]	63% (n = 5)[b]	63% (n = 5)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	42.02(df = 3)**
Violent	12% (n=14)[a]	38% (n = 3)[b]	25% (n = 2)[a b]	50% (n = 3)[b]	9.62(df = 3)*
Contact 3	18% (n = 20)[a]	50% (n = 3)[b]	75% (n = 6)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	19.06(df = 3)**
Contact 6	21% (n = 24)[a]	50% (n = 3)[a b]	75% (n = 6)[b]	17% (n = 1)[a]	13.52(df = 3)**
Arrest 3	10% (n = 11)[a]	33% (n = 2)[a b]	63% (n = 5)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	20.94(df = 3)**
Arrest 6	13% (n = 15)[a]	50% (n = 3) [b]	63% (n = 5)[b]	17% (n = 1)[a b]	18.89(df = 3)**

Note: New DSI Decision was created using a 90% cut-off rate among DSI total scores; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at *p < .05.*

The next set of analyses tested the ability of race, the DSI decision based on the new cut off score, and law enforcement impression to predict recidivism even after controlling for the most serious current offense. Analyses were conducted using similar logistic regression analyses as described previously. The results of these analyses are described in Table 10 and reveal that lowering the cut-off score significantly predicted additional police contact at three months (B = 35.54; $p < .01$), additional police contacts at six months (B = 10.03; $p < .01$), re-arrest at three months (B = 96.06; $p < .01$), and re-arrest at six months (B = 65.68; $p < .01$) even after controlling for the most serious current offense.

Table 10

Logistic Regression Analyses Testing the Role of Race, New DSI Decision, and Law Enforcement Impression of Need for Detention Placement in Predicting Additional Police Contacts

	Contact3 Odds Ratio	Contact6 Odds Ratio	Arrest3 Odds Ratio	Arrest6 Odds Ratio
Race	1.12	1.89	1.86	2.07
New DSI Decision	8.56**	6.73**	9.85**	9.07**
Race	1.13	1.93	1.75	2.05
New DSI Decision	7.17**	4.80*	20.41**	10.32**
Impression 1	1.43	2.03	.26	.78
Race	.97	1.82	1.74	1.95
New DSI Decision	35.54**	10.03**	96.06**	65.68**
Impression 1	1.79	2.22	.32	.95
Offense	.69*	.83	.69[a]	.65[a]

Note: New DSI Decision = DSI indicated decision using cut off score of eight; Impression 1 = decision to detain based on law enforcements response to the question, "If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?"; Offense = most serious current offense; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; [a] $p = .06$.

Hypothesis three was re-tested using the DSI decision based on the new cut-off score of the DSI. Table 11 describes the associations between law enforcement's impression of the youth's need for secure placement with the results of the DSI decision using the new cut-off score. A chi-square test was conducted to examine the characteristics of youth judged to be in need of secure placement from the two methods. These analyses focused on four groups: cases where both law enforcement

impressions and the DSI decision based on the new cut-off score indicated that secure placement was unnecessary (n = 104), cases in which both law enforcement and the modified three- item DSI (not including mandatory and administrative overrides) agreed that secure placement was appropriate (n = 9), cases where the new cut-off score did not indicate the need for secure placement but law enforcement believed it was appropriate (n = 7), and cases where the new DSI cut-score indicated secure placement but law enforcement believed it was unnecessary (n = 7). A comparison of the four groups revealed that they were significantly different in rates of felonies in their original offense ($X^2(3) = 46.30$; $p < .01$). They also differed in additional police contacts within three ($X^2(3) = 16.51$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 13.41$; $p < .01$), and re-arrest within three ($X^2(3) = 20.78$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 16.40$; $p < .01$). The results of these comparisons are provided in Table 11. Pairwise comparisons indicate that when detention decisions based on the new DSI score and the law enforcement impressions differed, the DSI would have detained youth who were later re-arrested at significantly higher rates than law enforcement impression.

Table 11

Comparisons of Youth Characteristics by New DSI Decision and Law Enforcement Impression Indicated Decisions

	No on Both N =104	Yes on Both N = 9	No New DSI, Yes Imp N = 7	Yes New DSI, No Imp N = 7	X^2 (df)
Black	63% (n= 65)	56% (n = 5)	71% (n = 5)	86% (n = 6)	1.92 (df = 3)
Felony	5% (n = 5)[a]	78% (n = 7)[b]	14% (n = 1)[a c]	43% (n = 3)[b c]	46.30 (df = 3)**
Violent	13% (n= 13)	22% (n= 2)	14% (n = 1)	43% (n = 3)	5.15 (df = 3)
Contact3	16% (n = 17)[a]	63% (n = 5)[b]	29% (n = 2)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	16.51 (df = 3)**
Contact6	20% (n = 21)[a]	63% (n = 5)[b]	43% (n = 3)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	13.41 (df = 3)**
Arrest3	10% (n = 10)[a]	38% (n = 3)[b c]	0% (n = 0)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[c]	20.78 (df = 3)**
Arrest6	14% (n = 14)[a]	50% (n = 4)[b]	14% (n = 1)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	16.40 (df = 3)**

Note: New DSI decision = DSI indicated decision using cut off score of eight; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at $p < .05$.

The second possibility that was tested was whether certain items from the DSI would predict risk for later contact and recidivism better than others. Correlations among the items on the DSI and recidivism variables are provided in Table 12. Based on these results, two modified DSI's were created using only those items from the DSI most predictive of recidivism. Overall, prior criminal history (correlations ranging from .20 to .26) and mitigating factors (correlations ranging from -.15 to -.22) were most associated with recidivism.

Table 12

Correlations among Offense and Recidivism Variables

	Contact 3 Months r	Contact 6 Months r	Arrest 3 Months r	Arrest 6 Months r
Offense	.06	.11	.09	.06
Additional Offenses	.14	.10	.09	.14
Priors	.23**	.20*	.26**	.22*
Escape	-.13	-.11	-.10	-.07
Aggravating Factors	.05	.03	.05	.07
Mitigating Factors	-.16[a]	-.15[d]	-.22**	-.18*

Note: Offense = most serious current offense; Additional offenses = additional current offenses; Priors = prior criminal history; Escape = history of escape or runaway; Contact 3 Months= any additional police contact within three months; Contact 6 Months = any additional police contact within six months; Arrest 3 Months = any additional arrest within three months; Arrest 6 Months = any additional arrest within 6 months; ** $p < .01$; *$p < .05$; [a] $p = .06$; [b] $p = .08$; [c] $p = .10$; [d] $p = .09$.

First, a two-item DSI was created using point values of prior criminal history then subtracting points for mitigating factors. Descriptive statistics revealed that using a 90% cut-off rate, a score of two would indicate detention placement and result in fourteen youth being detained. In comparing these youth to youth who would have been detained by the original DSI, five youth would be designated for detention placement by either version. Table 13 shows a comparison of the youth who would be detained by the new two item DSI and the original DSI (original cut score and overrides). These results show significant differences among the four groups in severity of original offenses (felony offenses-(X^2 (3) = 16.98; $p < .01$; violent offenses-(X^2 (3) = 14.30; $p < .01$). They also differed in additional contacts within three months (X^2 (3) = 18.36; $p < .01$) and six months (X^2 (3) = 14.98; $p < .01$), and re-arrest within

three (X^2 (3) = 25.52; $p < .01$) and six months (X^2 (3) = 18.89; $p < .01$). Pairwise comparisons indicate that youth detained using the two-item DSI were significantly more likely to have an additional police contact within three months (78% vs. 25%). No other significant differences were found.

Table 13

Comparison of Youth Detained using the Original DSI and the Two Item Version

	No Both N = 113	Yes Both N = 5	No Original, Yes 2-Item N = 9	Yes Original, No 2-Item N = 9	X^2 (df)
Black	79% (n = 66)	80% (n = 4)	67% (n = 6)	89% (n = 8)	4.14(df = 3)
Felony	8% (n = 9)[a]	60% (n = 3)[b]	33% (n = 3)[b]	22% (n = 2)[a b]	16.98(df = 3)**
Violent	11% (n=13)[a]	20% (n = 1)[a b]	33% (n = 3)[a b]	56% (n = 5)[b]	14.30(df = 3)**
Contact 3	17% (n = 19)[a]	25% (n = 1)[a b c]	78% (n = 7)[c]	25% (n = 2)[a b]	18.36(df = 3)**
Contact 6	21% (n = 23)[a]	25% (n = 1)[a b]	78% (n = 7)[b]	38% (n = 3)[a b]	14.98(df = 3)**
Arrest 3	9% (n = 10)[a]	0% (n = 0)[a]	67% (n = 6)[b]	25% (n = 2)[a b]	25.52(df = 3)**
Arrest 6	13% (n = 14)[a]	25% (n = 1)[a b]	67% (n = 6)[b]	38% (n = 3)[b]	18.89(df = 3)**

Note: Two item version of the DSI created by using point values of prior criminal history then subtracting points for mitigating factors and using a 90% cut-off rate for detention decision; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at *p < .05.*

The next set of analyses tested the ability of race, the modified two-item DSI's indication of need for detention placement, and law enforcement impression to predict recidivism even after controlling for the most serious current offense. Analyses were conducted using similar logistic regression analyses as described previously. The results of these analyses are described in Table 14 and reveal that after controlling for the most serious current offense the two-item DSI version

significantly predicted additional police contact at three months (B = 8.88; $p < .01$), additional police contacts at six months (B = 4.79; $p < .05$), re-arrest at three months (B = 13.49; $p < .01$), and re-arrest at six months (B = 11.29; $p < .01$). .

Table 14

Logistic Regression Analyses Testing the Role of Race, Two Item DSI Indicated Detention Decision, and Law Enforcement Impression of Need for Detention Placement in Predicting Additional Police Contacts

	Contact3 Odds Ratio	Contact6 Odds Ratio	Arrest3 Odds Ratio	Arrest6 Odds Ratio
Race	1.17	1.94	1.93	2.13
DSI Two Item	7.24**	5.82**	7.78**	7.53**
Race	1.16	1.95	1.97	2.13
DSI Two Item	5.54*	3.99*	11.56**	7.26**
Impression 1	1.85	2.43	.44	1.08
Race	1.11	1.92	1.98	2.11
DSI Two Item	8.88**	4.79*	13.49**	11.29**
Impression 1	2.38	2.67	.51	1.41
Offense	.84	.93	.93	.85

Note: DSI Two Item = Two-item DSI indicated detention decision using prior criminal history minus mitigating factors; Impression 1 = need for secure placement based on law enforcement's response to question, "If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?"; Offense = most serious current offense; * $p < .05$; [a] $p = .07$.

Hypothesis three, which predicted that use of the DSI would result in a smaller proportion of youth being detained than would be detained if law enforcement's impression was the deciding factor, was again retested using the modified two-item version of the DSI. Table 15 provides the associations between law enforcement's impression of the youth's need for secure placement with the results of the modified two-item DSI. A chi-square test was conducted to examine the characteristics of youth judged to be in need of secure placement from the two methods. These analyses focused on four groups: cases where both law enforcement impressions and the modified two-item DSI indicated that secure placement was unnecessary (n = 103), cases in which both law enforcement and the modified two- item DSI (not including mandatory and administrative overrides) agreed that secure placement was appropriate (n = 7), cases where the modified two-item DSI did not indicate the need for secure placement but law enforcement believed it was appropriate (n = 9), and cases where the modified two-item DSI indicated secure placement but law enforcement believed it was unnecessary (n = 7).

A comparison of the four groups revealed that they were significantly different in rates of felony offenses ($X^2(3) = 28.79$; $p < .01$). They also differed in additional police contacts within three months ($X^2(3) = 28.79$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 28.79$; $p < .01$), and arrests within three ($X^2(3) = 28.79$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 28.79$; $p < .01$). The results of these comparisons are provided in Table 15. Pairwise comparisons revealed that youth detained using the two-item DSI were significantly more likely to be re-arrested within three months (67% vs. 13%). No other significant differences were found.

Table 15

Comparisons of Youth Characteristics by Two-Item DSI and Law Enforcement Impression Indicated Decisions

	No on Both N =103	Yes on Both N = 7	No Two-Item, Yes Imp N = 9	Yes Two-Item, No Imp N = 7	X^2 (df)
Black	64% (n= 66)	71% (n = 5)	56% (n = 5)	71% (n = 5)	.61 (df = 3)
Felony	7% (n = 7)[a]	71% (n = 5)[b]	33% (n = 3)[b c]	14% (n = 1)[a c]	28.79 (df = 3)**
Violent	14% (n= 14)	29% (n= 2)	11% (n = 1)	29% (n = 2)	2.33 (df = 3)
Contact3	16% (n = 17)[a]	57% (n = 4)[b]	38% (n = 3)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	14.87 (df = 3)**
Contact6	20% (n = 21)[a]	57% (n = 4)[b]	50% (n = 4)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	12.55 (df = 3)**
Arrest3	10% (n = 10)[a]	29% (n = 2)[a b]	13% (n = 1)[a]	67% (n = 4)[b]	17.13 (df = 3)**
Arrest6	14% (n = 14)[a]	43% (n = 3)[b]	25% (n = 2)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	13.83 (df = 3)**

Note: DSI Two Item = Two-item DSI indicated detention decision; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at $p < .05$; **$p < .01$; *$p < .05$.

Use of a two-item DSI that only uses prior criminal history and mitigating factors in detention decisions may not be practical, as all first time offenders would be released regardless of offense. The second modification created a three-item DSI using point values of most serious current offense, prior criminal history, subtracting points for mitigating factors. Descriptive statistics revealed that using a 90% cut-off rate, a score of seven would indicate detention placement for fifteen youth. Table 16 shows a comparison of the youth who would be detained using this three-item DSI and the original DSI (using both cut-score and overrides). These results show significant differences among the four groups in their original offenses, including felony offenses ($X^2(3) = 46.09$; $p < .01$) and violent offenses ($X^2(3) = 13.61$; $p < .01$). They also differed in their rates of additional contacts within three months ($X^2(3) = 22.89$; $p < .01$), additional contacts within six months ($X^2(3) = 17.05$; $p < .01$), re-arrests within

three (X^2 (3) = 24.93; $p < .01$) and re-arrests with six months (X^2 (3) = 19.92; $p < .01$). Pairwise comparisons indicated that youth detained using the three-item DSI were significantly more likely to have committed a felony offense (71% vs. 0%). They also had higher rates of additional police contacts within three months (86% vs. 0%) and six months (86% vs. 17%), and had higher rates of re-arrests within three months (71% vs. 0%) and six months (71% vs. 17).

Table 16

Comparison of Youth Detained using the Original DSI and Three Item Version of the DSI

	No Both N = 116	Yes Both N = 8	No Original, Yes 3-Item N = 7	Yes Original, No 3-Item N = 6	X^2 (df)
Black	57% (n = 66)	75% (n = 6)	86% (n = 6)	100% (n = 6)	6.94 (df = 3)
Felony	6% (n = 7)[a]	63% (n = 5)[b]	71% (n = 5)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	46.09 (df = 3)**
Violent	11% (n = 13)[a]	38% (n = 3)[b]	43% (n = 3)[b]	50% (n = 3)[b]	13.61 (df = 3)**
Contact3	17% (n = 20)[a]	50% (n = 3)[b]	86% (n = 6)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	22.89 (df = 3)**
Contact6	21% (n = 24)[a]	50% (n = 3)[a b]	86% (n = 6)[b]	17% (n = 1)[a]	17.05 (df = 3)**
Arrest3	11% (n = 10)[a]	33% (n = 2)[a b]	71% (n = 5)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	24.93 (df = 3)**
Arrest6	13% (n = 15)[a]	50% (n = 3)[b]	71% (n = 5)[b]	17% (n = 1)[a]	19.92 (df = 3)**

Note: Three item version of the DSI created by combining point values for most serious current offense and prior criminal history then subtracting points for mitigating factors and then using a 90% cut-off for detention decisions; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at $p < .05$.

The next set of analyses tested the ability of race, the modified three-item DSI indicated detention decision, and law enforcement impression to predict recidivism even after controlling for the most serious current offense. Analyses were conducted using similar logistic regression analyses as

described previously. The results of these analyses are described in Table 17 and reveal that the three-item DSI significantly predicted additional police contacts at both three (B = 4.79; $p < .05$) and six months (B = 4.79; $p < .05$) and re-arrest at both three (B = 4.79; $p < .05$) and six months (B = 4.79; $p < .05$) even after controlling for the most serious current offense.

Table 17

Logistic Regression Analyses Testing the Role of Race, Three Item DSI Indicated Detention Decision, and Law Enforcement Impression of Need for Detention Placement in Predicting Additional Police Contacts

	Contact3 Odds Ratio	Contact6 Odds Ratio	Arrest3 Odds Ratio	Arrest6 Odds Ratio
Race	.90	1.59	1.42	1.63
DSI Three Item	11.17**	7.91**	11.03**	10.17**
Race	.92	1.66	1.27	1.61
DSI Three Item	9.29**	5.68*	21.07**	10.88**
Impression 1	1.51	2.14	.29	.87
Race	.62	1.39	.97	1.17
DSI Three Item	123.87**	19.48**	305.90**	200.84**
Impression 1	2.13	2.51	.39	1.15
Offense	.59**	.77	.58*	.56**

Note: DSI Three Item = Three-item DSI indicated detention decision combining most serious current offense, prior criminal history, and subtracting points for mitigating factors; Impression 1 = need for secure placement based on law enforcements response to the question "If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?"; * $p < .05$; [a] $p = .05$; [b] $p < .06$; [c] $p < .07$; [d] $p = .09$.

Hypothesis three was tested a fourth time using the modified three-item version of the DSI. Table 18 examines the associations between law enforcement's impression of the youth's need for secure placement with the results of the modified three-item DSI. A chi-square test was conducted to examine the characteristics of youth judged to be in need of secure placement from the two methods. These analyses focused on four groups: cases where both law enforcement impressions and the modified three-item DSI indicated that secure placement was unnecessary (n = 104), cases in which both law enforcement and the modified three- item DSI (not including mandatory and administrative overrides) agreed that secure placement was appropriate (n = 8), cases where the modified three-item DSI did not indicate the need for secure placement but law enforcement believed it was appropriate (n = 8), and cases where the modified three-item DSI indicated secure placement but law enforcement believed it was unnecessary (n = 7). A comparison of the four groups revealed that they were significantly different in their original offenses, including rates of felony offenses ($X^2(3) = 52.31$; $p < .01$) and violent offenses ($X^2(3) = 11.42$; $p < .01$). They also differed in additional contacts within both three months ($X^2(3) = 18.67$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 14.88$; $p < .01$), and re-arrests within both three months ($X^2(3) = 22.14$; $p < .01$) and six months ($X^2(3) = 18.18$; $p < .01$). The results of these comparisons are provided in Table 18. Pairwise comparisons indicate that youth detained using the three-item DSI were significantly more likely to be re-arrested within three months (67% vs. 0%) and six months (67% vs. 13).

Table 18

Comparisons of Youth Characteristics by Three-Item DSI and Law Enforcement Impression Indicated Decisions

	No on Both N =104	Yes on Both N = 8	No Three-Item, Yes Imp N = 8	Yes Three-Item, No Imp N = 7	X^2 (df)
Black	62% (n= 64)	63% (n = 5)	63% (n = 5)	100% (n = 7)	4.12 (df = 3)
Felony	5% (n = 5)[a]	88% (n = 7)[b]	13% (n = 1)[a c]	43% (n = 3)[b c]	52.31 (df = 3)**
Violent	12% (n= 12)[a]	25% (n= 2)[a b]	13% (n = 1)[a b]	57% (n = 4)[b]	11.42 (df = 3)**
Contact3	16% (n = 17)[a]	71% (n = 5)[b]	25% (n = 2)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	18.67 (df = 3)**
Contact6	20% (n = 21)[a]	71% (n = 5)[b]	38% (n = 3)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[b]	14.88 (df = 3)**
Arrest3	10% (n = 10)[a]	43% (n = 3)[b]	0% (n = 0)[a]	67% (n = 4)[b]	22.14 (df = 3)**
Arrest6	14% (n = 14)[a]	57% (n = 4)[b c]	13% (n = 1)[a b]	67% (n = 4)[c]	18.18 (df = 3)**

Note: DSI Three Item Score = detention screening instrument score combining most serious current offense, prior criminal history, and subtracting points for mitigating factors; percentages with different subscripts differed significantly using pairwise comparisons at $p < .05$; **$p < .01$; *$p < .05$.

Summary of Modified DSI Analyses

In summary, the various modifications to the DSI all increased its predictive utility for future police contacts and arrests. The most effective modifications involved lowering the DSI cut-off score and use of a three-item version. The three-item version combined the most serious current offense, prior criminal history, and mitigating factors. While use of these modifications would have resulted in a modest increase in the number of youth recommended for detention compared to the original DSI with overrides (14 to 16 and 14 to 15 respectively), they also would have significantly predicted additional police contacts and re-arrest at both three months and six months, even after controlling for severity of the initial offense. The use of a two-item DSI that only assigned points for prior criminal

history and mitigating factors would have resulted in an equal number of youth placed in secure confinement. This two-item version also significantly predicted arrest within three months after controlling for severity of the initial offense. Overlap, does exist among the methods as five youth would have been detained using any of the four methods (the original DSI and three modifications), while ten youth would have been detained using any of the three modifications. To summarize the effects of these modifications, the correlations among the DSI variations and recidivism variables are provided in Table 19.

Table 19

Correlations among DSI Variations and Recidivism Outcomes

	Contact 3 Months	Contact 6 Months	Arrest 3 Months	Arrest 6 Months
	r	r	r	r
DSI Score	.15[b]	.13	.17*	.14
DSI Decision	.02	.06	.03	.12
New DSI Decision	.36**	.31**	.37**	.35**
Three Item DSI Score	.13	.15[a]	.17*	.13
Three Item DSI Decision	.38**	.33**	.39**	.37**
Two Item DSI Score	.22**	.19*	.25**	.21*
Two Item DSI Decision	.32**	.27**	.32**	.31**

Note: DSI Score= continuous Detention Screening Instrument score ; DSI Detain = DSI indication of need for detention placement; New DSI Decision = DSI indicated decision using cut off score of eight; DSI Three Item Score = detention screening instrument score combining most serious current offense, prior criminal history, and subtracting points for mitigating factors; Three Item DSI Decision = DSI indicated decision using most serious current offense, prior criminal history, and mitigating factors; DSI Two Item Score = detention screening instrument score using prior criminal history minus mitigating factors; Two Item DSI Detain = DSI indicated decision using prior criminal history, and mitigating factors;** p < .01; * p < .05 [a] p <.07; [b] p < .08.

Discussion

The current study investigated the effects of implementing a detention risk assessment instrument in three police jurisdictions in a predominantly rural parish in Louisiana. We tested the willingness of law enforcement to complete the tool, the measure's ability to reduce DMC without increasing the risk to public safety, and the DSI's ability to predict recidivism and failure to appear for court.

Analyses revealed that overall law enforcement agencies were generally unwilling to consistently complete the measure, as two of the three agencies failed to complete the DSI for a significant number of contacts. This is inconsistent with research suggesting that participation in the creation of risk assessment instruments builds stakeholder consensus and greatly improves participation (Steinhart, 2006). Buy-in, which was present at the beginning of the process, may have eroded over time through a lack of clarity and consistency. Forms, particularly the juvenile contact form which accompanied the DSI, were repeatedly revised requiring the collection of new and different offense information. Law enforcement may have become confused or overwhelmed by the ever-changing requirements, thus affecting participation. Additionally, the lack of a strong advocate for objective decision making may have also affected the number of DSI's completed by the Alexandria Police Department. The highest ranking juvenile detective, who was very active in the creation of the tool, became ill and was absent for the majority of the evaluation period. Lacking a champion for change, participation among the remaining juvenile detectives in this police department may have eroded. Lastly, each of the juvenile detectives assigned to complete the DSI worked the day shift. Therefore, during the evenings and on weekends, line officers still made intermediate detention decisions. However, these effects could not be systematically evaluated as the Juvenile Contact Form frequently lacked the time of arrest.

Secondly, during the evaluation period, there was not a significant reduction in the rates of overall confinement, rates of minority confinement, nor an increase in the rates of confinement among violent offenders. This poor performance may actually be another indication of the lack of investment of the participating law enforcement agencies in using the DSI. While parish officials created an objective tool, they often continued to use subjective decision making throughout the evaluation period. As evident in Table 1, officers from two of the participating agencies frequently did not complete the DSI, choosing to subjectively make detention decisions. The majority of detention placements in 2008 were based on officer discretion as only four of the twenty-two youths who were detained had a completed DSI. Even when the DSI was used, officers typically did not follow its indicated decision. For example among the four youth who were detained with a completed DSI; three were not recommended for detention placement by the tool. Additionally, the DSI recommended detention placement for 14 youth (five receiving scores above the cut-off and nine having mandatory and administrative overrides). Of these 14 youth, only one was actually detained. Thus, 21 of the 22 youth actually detained during the evaluation period were detained based on officer discretion.

The pervasive nature in which informal overrides were used and formal overrides were disregarded provides support for both attribution theory and the police discretion model. Attribution theory suggests that individuals are more likely to attribute the negative behavior of another as dispositional, if that person is a member of an out-group but will attribute the same negative behavior as situational if performed by an in-group member (Gorham, 2006). Also, the police discretion model suggests that opportunity for racial disparity is greater for some offenses than others (Ousey & Lee, 2008). Consistent with these theories, of the informal overrides among youth with a high DSI score that were not detained, 75% were Black, of those youth 66% were arrested for a non-violent felony. Additionally, each of the nine youth with a formal override was Black and none were detained. Of

these youth, only one youth was charged with a felony while five were charged with violent misdemeanors. Inconsistent with our hypothesis, Black youth were not harmed by the use of mandatory and administrative overrides and were actually helped by the use of informal overrides as law enforcement consistently chose to release these youth. Decision making by the juvenile detectives (the majority of whom were Black) is inconsistent with research suggesting that Black police officers are just as likely, if not more likely, to arrest Black suspects as White suspects (Brooks, 2001; Brown & Frank, 2006; National Research Council, 2004) but consistent with the basic tenets of attribution theory. Black officers were more likely to use discretion and ignore overrides if the youth was Black and had committed an offense that law enforcement believed to be relatively minor. Officers were also more likely release youth, even when the DSI indicated detention, if those youth were Black. It is possible that in this small town setting, officers are more deeply tied to the community and therefore do not perceive the same sense of law enforcement/community division as officers in more urban communities. Therefore, in this sample, group membership may have been defined by more basic social factors such as race. However this could not be directly tested.

Comparisons of the DSI and law enforcement impression revealed differing emphases in terms of which types of cases warranted detention placement. As shown in Table 5, where disagreement existed in detention decisions, the DSI typically favored secure confinement for violent offenders, while law enforcement impressions favored placement for felony offenders. Many of the violent offenders for whom the DSI indicated secure placement, were arrested for misdemeanors, such as simple battery, suggesting that law enforcement saw these offenses as relatively minor. Consistent with the police discretion model, law enforcement officers were more likely to recommend detention placement for felony offenders, which they considered to be more serious offenses and which offered less latitude in decision making (Brown & Frank, 2006; Piquero, 2008).

Aside from reducing confinement rates, objective detention risk screening instruments are designed to predict risk of failing to appear for court and risk of recidivism (Steinhart, 2006). In general, the DSI in the way that it was implemented in Rapides Parish failed to accomplish this goal. As shown in Tables 7 and 8, the DSI failed to predict re-arrest better than law enforcement impression of need for detention placement. The type of offenses committed by these youth may have affected these findings. Status offenders represented the highest proportion of the sample and these youth were also most likely to recidivate. This finding is consistent with past research suggesting that because of large land areas consisting of small populations with a low tax base, rural communities lack many resources for justice involved youth (Gibson, 2004). Because the crimes of these youth did not rise to the level of seriousness to force court intervention, these youth were allowed back into the community with very few sanctions or court monitoring, allowing ample opportunity for recidivism.

Several modifications were made to the DSI to determine if its predictive ability could be enhanced. Each modification was successful in predicting recidivism and significant overlap existed among the three modifications as ten youth would have been detained using either modification. The most successful of these modifications involved using a three-item version. This version used the youth's most serious current offense as well as the two risk factors which were most associated with recidivism in this sample (prior criminal history and mitigating factors). Prior criminal history has long been suggested as a risk factor for later police contact (Fite, Wynn, & Pardini, 2009). Mitigating factors included in the DSI, such as guardian being able/willing to provide appropriate supervision, include factors which previous research has suggested are protective factors against later police contact (Rivaux et al., 2006). The three-item version is preferable over the two –item version because it does not consider the severity of the youth's current offense and, as a result, is not likely to be viewed as acceptable by most law enforcement agencies. Additionally, while use of a lower cut-off score was

predictive of recidivism, it is possible that the lower cut-off score could be too low so that detention placement would be recommended for relatively low level offenders with no other risk factors.

Use of the three-item DSI would have resulted in a reduction in the number of minority youth confined, but would have increased the proportion of minority youth confined. There would also have been a 32% reduction in rates of detention placement compared to the rates of confinement during the evaluation period. For example, during the evaluation period, 22 youths were detained and 17 (77 %) were Black. If the three-item DSI would have been used, without considering any overrides, 15 youths would have been detained and 12 (80%) would have been Black. This reduction in rates of overall detention placement is consistent with past research studying the effects of detention screening instruments on confinement rates (Hoytt et al., 2002; Schwartz et al., 1991; Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, 2004). Additionally, use of the three-item DSI would have resulted in a higher proportion of felony offenders and a slight reduction in the rates of violent offenders who were detained. Importantly, as shown in Tables 16 and 18, the three-item modification also significantly predicted both additional contact and arrests better than the original DSI cut-off score or law enforcement impression.

These findings should be interpreted cautiously due to several limitations of this study. First, lack of police buy-in prevented a comprehensive analysis of the DSI. Law enforcement was required to participate in the creation and implementation of the DSI as part of efforts to reduce DMC in Rapides as part of the parish's work in the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change initiative. However, law enforcement agencies were not awarded any grant dollars for their participation. Thus, lack of buy-in resulted in a large number of incomplete DSI's. Additionally, when DSI were completed, they often were not filled out completely or consistently. Also, the results of the DSI were often ignored as law enforcement chose to make detention decisions based on their own judgments. It was impossible

however, to make comparisons among the youth who had a completed DSI and were who detained as only four youth who were detained had a completed DSI. Second, while a strong positive correlation was found between law enforcement impression and the DSI decision, poor control over police responses limit interpretation of these results. While juvenile detectives were instructed to complete the Impression Questionnaire prior to completing the DSI, there were no safeguards in place to ensure this was done. It may be possible that most officers simply selected the detention recommendation that corresponded with the DSI decision. Third, the lack of information pertaining to offense location prevented analyses testing spatial opportunity theory which suggests that the spatial distribution of Blacks and Whites can impact racial disparities in arrest rates. Rural communities often have police districts that span several miles and may only have one or two zip codes, making it difficult to designate areas of high minority concentration. Lastly, DSI's were not completed for youth facing probation revocation. Probation revocation plays an important role in DMC found within the system. This missing information prevented analyses of discretion in revocation decisions and makes it impossible to obtain a full picture of all youth detained in Rapides Parish during the validation period.

Because of these limitations, these results need to be replicated. The inclusion of potential probation revocations and completed DSI's for each police contact may paint a clearer picture of detention decisions in Rapides Parish. However, these findings have several important implications. In general, these findings support research suggesting that the use of personal judgment in detention decisions allows bias to influence decision making and is a poor predictor of recidivism (Klieman et al., 2007; Lodewijks, et al., 2008). Subjective decision making in this sample resulted in confinement of youth whom the DSI indicated were not in need of detention placement and the release of youth whom the DSI indicated should have been confined. Contrary to previous research however, this discretion often benefitted Black youth. Another policy implication is the importance of analyzing objective risk

assessments after implementation and making modifications where appropriate. For example, the DSI created in Rapides parish used risk factors that were not associated with recidivism in this sample. Use of a three-item version would have reduced overall confinement rates. It also would have provided a better predictor of short-term recidivism.

This is one of the first studies comparing the use of objective and subjective detention decisions among the same group of justice involved youth in a rural community, which is important as rural communities often lack the resources necessary to properly monitor and provide interventions to low level offenders. While these findings deserve further testing, they suggest that objective decision making is a better predictor of threat to public safety than personal judgment. These findings support the need for additional validity testing of detention risk screening instruments. Communities commonly implement these tools and do not conduct analyses beyond determining the instrument's ability to reduce the number of youth who are detained. While reducing confinement rates is important, the true goal of detention risk assessment is to reduce **unnecessary** confinement among youth who pose a low risk for short-term recidivism and failure to appear for court. Tools which do not accurately predict short-term recidivism do not meet that goal and place the community at risk.

References

Albonetti, C. A. (1991). An integration of theories to explain judicial discretion. *Social Problems, 38,* 247-266.

Beckett, K. (1997). *Making crime pay: Law and order in contemporary American politics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Beckett, K., Nyrop, K., & Pfingst, L. (2006). Race, drugs, and policing: Understanding disparities in drug delivery arrests. *Criminology, 44,* 105-138.

Bishop, D.M., & Frazier, C.E. (1988). The influence of race on juvenile justice processing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 25*, 242-263.

Bishop, D.M., & Frazier, C.E. (1992). Gender bias in juvenile justice processing implications of the JJDP Act. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 82,* 1162-1186.

Bishop, D.M., & Frazier, C.E. (1996). Race effects in juvenile justice decision-making: Findings of s statewide analysis. *Journal of Criminal Law& Criminology, 86,* 392-414.

Blumstein, A., Rivara, F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2000). The rise and decline of homicide-and why. In J.E. Fielding (Ed), *Annual review of public health* (Vol. 21) (pp. 505-541). Palo A lot, CA: Annual Reviews.

Bobo, L. (2001). "Racial Attitudes and Relations at the Close of the Twentieth Century." Pp. 264-301. *In America becoming: Racial trends and their consequences*, Vol. 1, edited by N.J. Smesler, W.J. Wilson, and F. Mitchell. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bonta, J. (2002). Offender risk assessment: Guidelines for selection and use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29,* 355-379.

Bookin-Weiner (1984). Assuming responsibility: Legalizing preadjudicatory juvenile detention. *Crime and Delinquency, 30*, 39.

Bortner, M., & Reed, W. (1985). The preeminence of process: An examination of refocused justice research. *Social Science Quarterly, 66,* 413-425.

Borum, R., Bartel, P., & Forth, A. (2002). *Manual for the Structured Assessment for Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY)*. *Consultation version.* Tampa: Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida.

Bridges, G.S., Conley, D., Beretta, G., & Engen, R. (1993). *Racial disproportionality in the juvenile justice system* (Report to the Commission on African American Affairs and Management Services Division/Department of Social and Health Service). Olympia: State of Washington.

Bridges, G.S., & Crutchfield, R.D. (1988). Law, social standing, and racial disparities in imprisonment. *Social Forces, 66,* 601-616.

Bridges, G.S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review, 63,* 554-570.

Brooks, L. (2001). Police discretionary behavior: A study of style. In R.G. Dunham & G.P. Alpert (Eds)., *Crticical issues in policing: Contemporary readings* 4th ed., pp. 117-131. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Brown, R. & Frank, J. (2006). Race & officer decision making: Examination differences in arrest outcomes between Black and White officers. Justice Quarterly, 23, 96-126.

Burkstein, O.G. (1994). Substance abuse. In M. Hersen, R.T. Ammerman, & L.A. Sisson (Eds.), *Handbook of aggressive and destructive behavior in psychiatric patients*. New York: Plenum Press.

Catchpole, R.E.H., & Gretton, H.M. (2003). The predictive validity of risk assessment with violent young offenders: A 1-year examination of criminal outcome. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30,* 688-708.

Cohen, L.E., & Kluegel, J.R. (1978). Determinants of juvenile court dispositions: Ascriptive and achieved factors in two metropolitan courts. *American Sociological Review, 43,* 162-176.

Corrado, R.R., & Turnbull, S.D. (1992). A comparative examination of the Modified Justice Model in the United Kingdom and the United States. In R.R. Corrado, N. Bala, R. Linden, & M. LeBlanc (Eds.), *Juvenile justice in Canada: A theoretical and analytical assessment* (pp. 75-136). Toronto, Canada: Buttersworth.

Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 835-848.

Dovidio**,** J.F., Kawakami, K., Gaertner, S.L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 62-68.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2000). *Crime in the United States, 2000: Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2001). *Crime in the United States, 2001: Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2002). *Crime in the United States, 2002: Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fite, P.J., Wynn, P., & Pardini, D.A. (2009). Explaining discrepancies in arrest rates between Black and White male juveniles. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77,* 916-927.

Frazier, C.E., & Bishop, D.M. (1985). The pretrial detention of juveniles and its impact on case dispositions. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 76,* 1132-1152.

Gibson, S. (2004). The challenges of juvenile corrections in a rural state. *Corrections Today, 66*, 24-26.

Gorham, B.W. (2006). News media's relationship with stereotyping: The linguistic intergroup bias in response to crime news. *Journal of Communication, 56,* 289-308.

Gottfredson, M.R., & Gottfredson, D.M. (1988). *Decision making in criminal justice: Toward a rational exercise of discretion*. New York: Plenum.

Grisso, T., Tomkins, A., & Casey, P. (1988). Procedurial issues in the juvenile justce system. In N. Repucci, L. Weithorn, E. Mulvey, & J. Monohan (Eds.), *Children, mental health, and the law* (pp. 171-193). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Grove,W.M., Zald, D.H., Lebow, B.S., Snitz, B.E., & Nelson, C. (2000). Clinical vs. mechanical prediction: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment, 12,* 19-30.

Hagan, J. (1994). *Crime and disrepute*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Hartstone, E., & Richitelli, D. (2009). *A Second Reassessment of minority overrepresentation in Connecticut's juvenile justice system* (Prepared for the State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management Policy Development and Planning Division). Hartford, CT: Spectrum Associates.

Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley.

Highhouse, S. (1997). Understanding and improving job-finalist choice: The relevance of behavioral decision research. *Human Resource management Review, 7,* 449-470.

Hoge, R.D. (2002). Standardized instruments for assessing risk and need in youthful offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29,* 380-396.

Holmes, M.D. (2000). Minority threat and police brutality; Determinants of civil rights criminal complaints in U.S. municipalities. *Criminology, 38,* 343-365.

Holmes, M.D., Smith, B.W., Freng, A.B., & Munoz, E.A. (2008). Minority threat, crime control, and police resource allocation in the southwestern United States. *Crime & Delinquency, 54,* 128-152.

Howell, J.C. (1995). *Guide for implementing the comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Howell, J.C. (2003). *Preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency: A comprehensive framework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoytt, E., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B., & Zeidenberg, J. (2002). *Reducing racial disparities in juvenile detention: Pathways to juvenile detention reform*. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Johns, M., Cullum, J., Smith, T., & Freng, S. (2008). Internal motivation to respond without prejudice and automatic egalitarian goal activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,* 1514-1519.

Johnson, J.B. & Secret, P.E. (1995). The effects of court structure on juvenile court decisionmaking. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 23,* 63-82.

Justice Policy Institute (2002). *Reducing disproportionate minority confinement: The Multnomah County, Oregon success story and its implications.* Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute.

Kent, S.L., Jacobs, J. (2005). Minority threat and police strength from 1980 to 2000: A fixed-effects analysis of nonlinear and interactive effects in large cities. *Criminology, 43,* 731-760.

Leiber, M.J., & Fox, K.C. (2005). Race and the impact of detention on juvenile justice decision making. *Crime & Delinquency, 51,* 470-497.

Lee, M. , & Ousey, G. (2001). Size matters: Examining the link between small manufacturing, socioeconomic deprivation, and crime rates in nonmetropolitan communities. *Sociological Quarterly, 42,* 581-602.

Liska, A., Logan, J., & Bellair, P. (1998). Race and violent crimes in the suburbs. *American Sociological Review, 63*, 27-38.

Lodewijks, H.P.B., Doreleijers, T.A.H., & DeRuiter, C. (2008). Savry risk assessment in violent Dutch adolescents: Relation to sentencing and recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35,* 696, 709.

Marshall, I.H., & Thomas, C.W. (1983). Discretionary decion-makingand the juvenile court. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 34*, 47-59.

Mastrofski, S.D., Snipes, J.B., & Supina, A.E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33,* 269-305.

McCarthy, B.R. (1987) Preventive detention and pretrial custody in the juvenile court. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 15*, 185-198.

McCarthy, B.R., & Smith, B.L. (1986). The conceptualization of discrimination in the juvenile justice process: The impact of administrative factors and screening decisions on juvenile court dispositions. *Criminology, 24,* 41-64.

McGarrell, E.F. (1993). Trends in racial disproportionality in juvenile court processing: 1985-1989. *Crime and Delinquency, 39,* 29-48.

Miethe, T.D., & Moore, C.A. (1986). Racial differences in criminal processing: The consequences of model selection on conclusions about differential treatment. *The Sociological Quarterly, 27*, 217-237.

Minor, K.I., Hartmann, D.J., & Terry, S. (1997). Predictors of juvenile court actions and recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency, 43,* 328-344.

Mitchell, O. (2005). A meta-analysis of race and sentencing research: Explaining the inconsistencies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 21,* 439-466.

Mossman, D. (2000). Commentary: Assessing the risk of violence: Are accurate predictions useful? *Journal of American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 28,* 272-281.

National Research Council. (2004). Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence. Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices. W. Skogan & K. Frydl (Eds.). Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Olver, M.E., Stockdale, K.C., & Wormith, J.S. (2009). Risk assessment with young offenders: A meta-analysis of three assessment measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36,* 329-353.

Ousey, G.C., & Lee, M.R., (2008). Racial disparity in formal social control: An investigation of alternative explanations of arrest rate inequality. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45*, 322-355.

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108,* 937-975.

Peterson, R.D., & Hagan, J. (1984). Changing conceptions of race: Towards an account of anomalous findings of sentencing research. *American Sociological Review, 49,* 56-70.

Piquero, A.R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Future of Children, 18,* 59-79.

Piquero, A.R., & Brame, R.W. (2008). Assessing the race crime and ethnicity crime relationship in a sample of serious adolescent delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency, 54,* 1-33.

Pope, C. E. & Feyerherm, W.H. (1992). *Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System: Final Report.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Quillian, L. & Pager, D. (2001). Black neighbors, higher crime? The role of racial stereotypes in evaluations of neighborhood crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 107,* 717-767.

Riksheim, E., & Chermak, S. (1993). Causes of police behavior revisited. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 21,* 353-382.

Rivaux, S.L., Springer, D.W., Bohman, T., Wagner, E.F., & Gil, A.G. (2006). Differences among substance abusing Latino, Anglo, and African American offenders in predictors of recidivism and treatment outcome. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions, 6,* 5-29.

Sampson, R.J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of "broken windows." *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67,* 319-342.

Sanborn, J.B. (1996). Factors perceived to affect delinquent dispositions in juvenile court: Putting the sentencing decision into context. *Crime & Delinquency, 42,* 99-113.

Schall v. Martin 467 U.S. 253 (1984).

Schissel, B. (1993). *Social dimensions of Canadian youth justice.* Toronto, Canada: Oxford.

Schlesinger, T. (2005). Racial and ethnic disparity in pretrial criminal processing. *Justice Quarterly, 22,* 170 – 192.

Schwalbe, C.S., Fraser, M.W., Day, S.H., & Arnold, E.M. (2004). North Carolina Assessment of Risk (NCAR): Reliability and predictive validity with juvenile offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 40,* 1-22.

Schwalbe, C.S., Fraser, M.W., Day, S.H., & Cooley, V. (2006). Classifying juvenile offenders according to risk of recidivism: Predictive validity, race/ethnicity, and gender. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33,* 305-324.

Schwartz, I.M., Barton, W., & Orlando, F. (1991). Keeping kids out of secure detention. *Public Welfare, 46,* 20-26.

Secret, P.E., & Johnson, J.B. (1997). The effect of race on juvenile justice decision making in Nebraska: Detention, adjudication, and disposition, 1988-1993. *Justice Quarterly, 14*, 445-478.

Sickmund, M., Sladky, A., and Kang, W. (2008). "Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1985-2005." Online. Available: http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/

Smith, B.W., & Holmes, M.D. (2003). Community accountability, minority threat, and police brutality: An examination of civil rights criminal complaints. *Criminology, 41,* 1035-1063.

Spohn, C., & Cederblom, J. (1991). Racial disparities in sentencing: A test of the liberation hypothesis. *Justice Quarterly, 8,* 305-327.

Steinhart, D. (2006). *A practical guide to juvenile detention risk assessment.* Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Stucky, T.D. (2005). Local politics and police strength. *Justice Quarterly, 22,* 139-169.

Swigert, V.L., & Farrell, R.A. (1976). *Murder, inequality, and the law: Differential treatment in the legal process.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath Company.

Tripplet (1978). Pretrial detention of juvenile delinquents. *American Journal of Criminal Law, 6,* 137.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). State and County Quick Facts. Online Available: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice (2004). *2003 evaluation report of the detention assessment instrument (DAI).*

Weisheit, R., & Donnermeyer, J. (2000). Change and continuity in crime in rural America. In G. LaFree (Ed.), *Criminal Justice 2000, Volume 1. The nature of crime: Continuity and change* (pp. 309-357). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Wells, L., & Weisheit, R. (2004). Patterns of rural and urban crime: A county-level comparison. *Criminal Justice Review, 29,* 1 – 22.

Wells, L., & Weisheit, R. (2000). *Gang problems in nonmetropolitan America: A longitudinal assessment*. Paper presented to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Welsh, W.N., Jenkins, P.H., & Harris, P.W. (1999). Reducing minority overrepresentation in juvenile justice: Results of community-based delinquency prevention in Harrisburg. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 99,* 87-110.

Wiebush, R., Baird, C., Krisberg, B., & Onek, D. (1995). Risk assessment and classification for seriousness, violent and chronic juvenile offenders. In Howell, Krisberg, Hawkins, and Wilson (eds.) *Serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders: A sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.

Wordes, M., Bynum, T.S., & Corley, C.J. (1994). Locking up youth: The impact of race on detention decisions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 31,* 149-165.

Wu, B. (1997). The effect of race and juvenile justice processing. *Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 48*, 43-51.

Wu, B., Cernokovich, S., & Dunn, C.S. (1997). Assessing the effects of race and class on juvenile justice processing in Ohio. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 25,* 265-277.

Wu, B., & Fuentes, A. (1998). The entangled effects of race and urban poverty. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal, 49,* 41-53.

Zatz, M.S. (1987). The changing forms of racial bias in sentencing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 24*, 69-92.

Appendix A

Rapides Parish Juvenile Detention Screening Instrument

RAPIDES PARISH JUVENILE
DETENTION SCREENING INSTRUMENT

Juvenile – Last Name: _____ First Name: _____ DOB: _____/_____/_____

Intake Intake

Ethnicity: _____ Race: _____ Male / Female Date: _____/_____/_____ Time: _____ (Military Hours)

Screener: _____ Completed as Part of Detention Decision: ☐ Completed as Follow-Up: ☐

Arresting Agency: _____ Arrest Date: _____/_____/_____ Arrest Time: _____ (Military Hours)

SELECT ONLY ONE CHOICE PER SECTION **Score**

SECTION 1. Most Serious Current Offense LIST OFFENSE: _____
(See reverse for examples of offenses in each category)

Category A: "Very Violent" or Other "Assaultive/Violent" offense against persons	**Detain**
Category B: Felony narcotics	**7**
Category C: Other felonies	**6**
Category D: Major misdemeanors against persons	**5**
Category E: Other misdemeanors	**3**
Category F: Violation of probation or Contempt of Court order	**2** _____

SECTION 2. Additional Current Offenses

Two or more additional current felony offenses	**4**
One additional current felony offense	**3**
One or more additional misdemeanors **OR** violation(s) of probation/parole	**2**
One or more status offenses **OR** no additional current offense	**0** _____

SECTION 3. Prior Criminal History

Two or more arrests for a Cat. A offense	**6**
One arrest for a Cat. A offense	**4**
Two or more prior arrests for any other felonies	**3**
One prior felony arrest for a Cat. B through Cat. F offense	**2**
One or more misdemeanor arrests	**1**
No prior arrests	**0** _____

SECTION 4. History of Failure to Appear

Two or more warrants/detention orders for F.T.A. in past 12 months	**3**
One warrant/detention order for F.T.A. in past 12 months	**1**
No warrant/detention order for F.T.A. in past 12 months	**0** _____

SECTION 5. History of Escape/Runaway (within past 12 months)

One or more documented escapes from secure confinement or custody	**4**
Two or more instances of absconding from non-secure, court-ordered placements	**3**
Three or more runaways from home	**1**
No history within the past 12 months	**0** _____

SECTION 6. Aggravating Factors (+1 pt. each – Do not add more than +3 pts.)
(see list below) _____

SECTION 7. Mitigating Factors (-1 pt. each – Do not subtract more than -2 pts.)
(see list below) (-_____)

Total Indicated Score _____

Indicated Decision: _____ **0-7 Release** _____ **8-12 Alternative** _____ **13+ Secure**

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Aggravating factors (At time of Intake)

- ☐ A. Juvenile has significant mental health issues
- ☐ B. Juvenile has significant substance abuse issues
- ☐ C. Minor under influence of drugs or alcohol
- ☐ D. Juvenile is a considerable flight risk and/or pending investigation of additional offenses
- ☐ E. Juvenile has been released from detention within past 30 days
- ☐ F. Juvenile is currently on Probation
  - For: ☐ Felony ☐ Misdemeanor
  - With: ☐ Rapides Parish ☐ OYD
- ☐ G. Juvenile is currently on electronic monitoring program
  - For: ☐ Early Release ☐ Sanction as part of Probation

Mitigating factors (At time of Intake)

- ☐ A. Juvenile is less than 12 years of age
- ☐ B. Juvenile has no prior record
- ☐ C. Juvenile's involvement in offense was minimal
- ☐ D. Guardian able/willing to provide appropriate supervision
- ☐ E. Active case with Office of Mental Health / OCS

- ☐ CART notified
- ☐ CIT notified

Juvenile Name: _____ DOB: ____/____/____ Race: _____ Gender: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Offense Categories and Included Offenses
(Includes attempts or principals)

Category A: VERY VIOLENT FELONIES OR OTHER ASSAULTIVE/VIOLENT ACTS AGAINST PERSONS

Solicitation for Murder, 1st Degree Murder, 2nd Degree Murder, Manslaughter, Vehicular Homicide, Aggravated Rape, Forcible Rape, Simple Rape, Sexual Battery, 2nd Degree Sexual Battery, Aggravated Kidnapping, 2nd Degree Kidnapping, Aggravated Burglary, Aggravated Battery, Aggravated 2nd Degree Battery, Armed Robbery, Assault by Drive-by Shooting, Aggravated Incest, Aggravated Crime against Nature, Aggravated Arson, Carjacking, Terrorism, Disarming of a Peace Officer, Aggravated Assault upon a Peace Officer with a Firearm, Aggravated Assault with a Firearm, 2nd Degree Battery, Mingling Harmful Substances, Intentional Exposure to AIDS Virus, Simple Kidnapping, Aggravated Criminal Damage to Property, 1st Degree Robbery, Simple Robbery, Illegal Use of Weapons or Dangerous Instrumentalities, Stalking, Aggravated Flight from an Officer, Purse Snatching, 2nd Degree Robbery, Attempted Strangulation

Category B: FELONY NARCOTICS

Distribution of Schedule I, II, III, IV, or V drugs, Possession of Schedule II, III, IV, or V drugs

Category C: OTHER FELONIES

All other felony charges not specifically enumerated in Categories A, B, or C including Possession of Schedule I drugs

Category D: MAJOR MISDEMEANORS AGAINST PERSONS

Aggravated Assault, Battery of a Police Officer, Battery of a School Teacher, Battery of a Correctional Facility Employee, Battery of a Child Welfare Worker, Simple Battery of the Infirm, Domestic Abuse Battery, Assault on a School Teacher, Assault on a Child Welfare Worker, Negligent Injuring, Vehicular Negligent Injuring, False Imprisonment

Category E: OTHER MISDEMEANORS

All other Misdemeanor charges not specifically enumerated in Category E

Category F: VIOLATIONS OF PROBATION OR CONTEMPT OF COURT ORDERS

Specific charges for "Violation of Probation", usually arrested by Department of Juvenile Services, or O.Y.D., or Contempt of Court Orders with new Offenses

Category G: VIOLATIONS OF PROBATION TECHNICAL OFFENSE

Specific charges for violating while on Electronic Monitoring or Shadow Tracking

MANDATORY OVERRIDES:
(must be detained)

- ☐ A. Use/possession of firearm during current offense
- ☐ B. Escapee from secure custody
- ☐ C. Taken into custody via extradition
- ☐ D. Juvenile is on electronic monitoring program at time of this offense
- ☐ E. Juvenile is currently on Parole or Probation
- ☐ F. Arrested on "JU" or drug court docketed contempt order

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERRIDES:

- ☐ A. Parent, guardian, or responsible relative cannot be located
- ☐ B. Parent, guardian refuses to take custody of juvenile
- ☐ C. The juvenile is DETAINED/RELEASED for below REASON:

_____

_____

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERRIDE APPROVAL:
(SUPERVISOR ONLY) _____

Actual Decision: _____ Law Enforcement Release _____ Judge Release _____ Alternative _____ Secure

Appendix B

Juvenile Contact Form

Juvenile Contact Report

Dept. Case # _____ **Juvenile #** _____

Contact Date: _____ **Arrest** ___yes or ___ no **Time** _____

Race/Ethnicity (Circle One): Black White Latino/Hispanic Asian American Indian Other

Gender (Circle One): Male Female **DOB:** _____

Juvenile's Name: _____

Juvenile's Address Zone/Ward: _____

Offense Zone/Ward: _____

Offense: _____

Louisiana Offense Code Section: _____

Complaint Source:

_____ Home/Parent _____ Officer _____ Judge _____Community

_____ School _____ Business _____ Secure Custody

Disposition:

_____ Counsel and Release

_____ Submit to DA for Prosecution

_____ Transported to Renaissance

_____ Released to Parent/Guardian

_____ Released to Probation Officer

_____ Other _____

Service Referrals:

_____ FINS

_____ Mental Health

_____ Substance Abuse

_____ Other _____

5/19/2008

Appendix C

Impression Questionnaire

Impression Questionnaire

Please answer these questions before completing the DSI

1. If the decision was yours, would you detain this child?

   Yes/No

2. What do you think is the child's level of dangerousness to public safety?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   None Moderate Extreme

Appendix D

Arrest Coding Sheet

Record Review Protocol

Demographic Information

1. Participant ID#: _____
2. Name: _____
3. Date of Birth: _____
4. Original Contact Date and Time: _____
5. Original Offense code: _____
   (If multiple, list most serious)
6. Follow Up Period: _____
   (If youth was detained begins once released from custody)

Court Information

7. Did youth appear for first court date?

   0 No 1 Yes Date of court appearance: _____ 98 Missing

Arrest Information

8. Did youth come into contact with police during follow up period?

   0 No 1 Yes

9. Number of additional contacts: _____

Recidivism Information

10. Additional Contact I

    Date/ Time: _____

    Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

    Number of charges: _____

    Arresting Agency: _____

    Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

11. Additional Contact II
    Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

12. Additional Contact III
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

13. Additional Contact IV
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

14. Additional Contact V
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

15. Additional Contact VI
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

16. Additional Contact VII
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

17. Additional Contact VIII
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

18. Additional Contact IX
Date/ Time: _____

Offense (If multiple list most serious): _____

Number of charges: _____

Arresting Agency: _____

Was youth detained? 0 No 1 Yes Date of release: _____

Appendix E

Institutional Review Board

Approval Letter

University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans

Campus Correspondence

Principal Investigator:	Paul Frick
Co-Investigator:	Tiffany Simpson
Date:	February 3, 2010
Protocol Title:	"Do Objective Measures reduce the Disproportionate Rates of Minority Youth Placed in Detention: Validation of a Risk Assessment Instrument?"
IRB#:	07Feb10

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures described in this protocol application are exempt from federal regulations under 45 CFR 46.101category 4 due to the fact that the research will involve the collection or study of existing data.

Exempt protocols do not have an expiration date; however, if there are any changes made to this protocol that may cause it to be no longer exempt from CFR 46, the IRB requires another standard application from the investigator(s) which should provide the same information that is in this application with changes that may have changed the exempt status.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best wishes on your project.
Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

Vita

Tiffany Simpson was born in Houston, Texas. She received her B.S. in Psychology and B.A. in Sociology, with a concentration in Criminology, from Louisiana State University. She later received her M.A. from Texas Southern University. Before obtaining her Doctoral degree, Mrs. Simpson also received a M.S. in Psychology from University of New Orleans.