

The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: Family Attachment and Juvenile Justice Outcomes: An Assessment of Visitation of Juvenile Delinquents in Residential Facilities

Author(s): Brae Campion Young Melissa Nadel, George Pesta, William Bales

Document Number: 254454

Date Received: December 2019

Award Number: 2013-R2-CX-0009

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Research Project #2

Family Attachment and Juvenile Justice Outcomes: An Assessment of Visitation of Juvenile Delinquents in Residential Facilities

**Principal Investigator
William Bales**

**Authors
Brae Campion Young
Melissa Nadel
George Pesta
William Bales**

Florida State University

This project was supported by Award No. 2013-R2-CX-0009, awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Goals and Objectives	1
Literature Review	2
Visitation in Adult Correctional Facilities	3
Visitation in Juvenile Placement Facilities	4
Data and Methods	6
Current Study	6
Data	6
Variables	8
Outcome Variables	8
Predictor Variables	9
Methods	12
Findings	12
Description of Visitation	12
Frequency of Visitation.....	13
Youth Demographics and Visitation	14
Predictors of Visitation	15
Barriers to Visitation	18
Suggestions to Improve Visitation	18
Juvenile’s Perceptions of the Effects of Visitation	19
Visitation and Recidivism	21
Conclusion	24
Implications for policy	25
Directions for Future Research	27
Limitations	29
References	31
Tables	35
Figures	59
Appendix	62

INTRODUCTION

The extent to which family members are involved in the lives of delinquent youths is a critical theoretical component of both the short- and long-term effects of involvement with the juvenile justice system. Several prominent criminological theories justify the use of visitation programs within juvenile facilities, including life course perspectives, social bonding, social capital, strain, and labeling theories (Adams & Fischer, 1976; Bales & Mears, 2008; Glaser, 1964; Hairston, 1988; Hairston, Rollins & Han-jin, 2004; Schafer, 1994). However, the literature on visitation has primarily focused on the adult offender populations. As a result, little is known about the degree to which families provide support, assistance, and guidance to youth during residential commitment.

Research considering the importance of family visitation for committed youths is needed to understand the factors that may help juveniles successfully reintegrate into their communities. To this end, the current study will examine the use and effects of visitation within juvenile residential facilities throughout the state of Florida. This study provides analyses on (1) the use of visitation across commitment facilities, (2) the likelihood that certain youth receive visitation and other forms of family contact, (3) the potential barriers to visitation, and (4) the impact of visitation on recidivism. In addition, this report includes recommendations for practitioners and policymakers.

Goals and Objectives

Research has found that visitation is an important factor for improving offender outcomes such as behavior while incarcerated and recidivism in adult populations. Prior literature suggests that family relationships improve a variety of outcomes among youth and that youth may be

more susceptible than adults to family influences (Jang, 1999; Sampson & Laub, 1993). It follows then that a similar relationship would exist for juvenile offenders. However, little to no research has explored the particular policy and its effects. This report addresses the following research objectives:

- Objective #1: Develop and implement a survey instrument to capture data on each visitation event of youth in selected residential facilities and youths' perception of the impact of being visited or not being visited prior to release. Match data to the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (FDJJ) database to obtain criminal history and recidivism measures for each surveyed youth.
- Objective #2: Measure the number of visits youth received, their perceptions of the impact of being visited on their institutional experiences, family relationships, and future outcomes, and the impact of visitation on recidivism.
- Objective #3: Determine the effect of being visited, and the frequency of visitation among committed youth, on post-release delinquency and adjudications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several prominent criminological theories, including Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory, Sampson and Laub's (1993) age-graded theory of crime, Agnew's (1992) general strain theory, and Lemert (1951) and Becker's (1963) labeling perspective, highlight the importance of family among delinquent juveniles. The theoretical foundations of these theories also indirectly provide justification for visitation programs within correctional institutions. Subsequent tests of these theories on incarcerated populations have found that visitation programs can produce positive effects on inmates. Visitation reduces recidivism and institutional misconduct and improves family relationships after release (Bales and Mears, 2008; Nelson et al., 1999; La

Vigne et al., 2005; Siennick et al., 2013). However, most existing studies have focused on adult inmate populations, and have not yet explored the impact on juvenile populations. This omission exists despite evidence suggesting that family relationships can improve a number of outcomes among youthful offenders (Massey & Krohn, 1986; Monahan, Goldweber, & Cauffman, 2011; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Wright, Cullen, & Miller, 2001), including delinquency and mental health. In addition, some scholars have indicated that youth might be more susceptible than adults to the influence of family intervention (Jang, 1999; Sampson & Laub, 1993).

The following sections summarize the visitation literature, focusing on studies conducted among adult inmates, as well as describing the limited number of studies that have focused on juvenile visitation. Also discussed are the limitations of prior research.

Visitation in Adult Correctional Facilities

Drawing from several theoretical perspectives (social bonding, labeling, and strain), a prominent body of research has explored how family visitation can improve a variety of outcomes among adults, including recidivism. In general, research finds inmates who receive family visitation have more positive outcomes than those who do not (Bales & Mears, 2008; Duwe & Clark, 2011; Duwe & Johnson, 2016; Mears et al., 2012; Siennick et al., 2013).

First, visitation strengthens family relationships and increases social support post-prison (Bales & Mears, 2008; Nelson et al., 1999). A study by La Vigne and colleagues (2005) examined the effect of family visitation on family attachment and instrumental social support (measured as assistance with housing, employment, substance abuse issues, and financial support) received during reentry. The authors found that family visitation increased the odds of receiving instrumental support during reentry and that visitation, particularly from a romantic partner, strengthened family attachment after release (La Vigne et al., 2005).

Second, studies have found that visitation reduces inmates' involvement in prison misconduct (Cochran, 2012; Siennick et al., 2013). Siennick and colleagues (2013), for example, found that the probability of misconduct is reduced in the week leading up to a visit and shortly thereafter. Specifically, the odds of misconduct were 30 percent lower during a visitation week and this effect is larger in the week just prior to an anticipated visit (Siennick et al., 2013). Finally, researchers have found that visited inmates have lower recidivism than non-visited inmates. For example, Bales and Mears (2008), using a sample of 7,000 adult prisoners released from Florida Department of Corrections facilities, found that visited inmates had 31 percent lower odds of recidivism than those that received no visits. Furthermore, the authors reported that for each additional visit an inmate received, the odds of recidivism were reduced by nearly four percent. Moreover, Cochran (2014) reported that visitation produces greater reductions in recidivism when visits occur consistently throughout an inmate's sentence, as well as when visits occur closer to prison admission.

Visitation in Juvenile Placement Facilities

To date, only four studies have examined visitation in a juvenile context (Agudelo, 2013; Borgman, 1985; Monahan, Goldweber &Cauffman, 2011; Ryan and Yang, 2005). The earliest study examined the effect of visitation on institutional misconduct among a sample of 47 adjudicated males housed in a reform school in the southeast (Borgman, 1985). Using chi-square analysis, the author compared misconduct between boys who were frequently visited by family and those who were infrequently visited by family. The author reported that a smaller percentage of visited boys committed disciplinary infractions, compared to non-visited boys. Specifically, Borgman (1985) reported that 29 percent of frequently visited boys committed a major

disciplinary infraction compared to 61 percent of boys infrequently visited. The author reported similar patterns for minor disciplinary infractions.

A more recent study examined the effect of visitation on recidivism among a sample of 90 adjudicated males in Michigan (Ryan & Yang, 2005). In this study, the authors used Cox regression analysis and found that family-initiated visitation reduced the likelihood of a juvenile being charged in adult court within two-and-a-half years of release.

Monahan and colleagues (2011) examined the effect of visitation on mental health outcomes and also found encouraging results. They found that among a sample of 265 males housed in one juvenile facility in Southern California, youth who received visits from parents experienced greater reductions in depressive symptoms between the baseline and follow-up periods. This reduction was larger among those who received a greater number of visits from family members regardless of the quality of the parent-child relationship.

The most recent study, by Agudelo (2013), examined 290 juveniles housed in four placement facilities in Ohio. The author reported that visited youth had fewer behavioral incidents than those who were visited less than once a week. Further, youth who received weekly visits had grade point averages that were 2.1 points higher than juveniles who were infrequently visited (less than one visit per week) or never visited.

These studies all lend credibility to the assumption that visitation has the potential to improve long-term outcomes among residentially committed juveniles. Given that most prior research studies have employed relatively small all-male samples, our understanding of the effects of juvenile visitation is limited.

DATA AND METHODS

Current Study

The following research questions were addressed in our study of the use and impact of visitation within Florida's juvenile residential facilities:

1. What proportion of youth is visited in delinquent residential programs, how often are youth visited, and what factors (such as youth demographics, justice system records, etc.) are associated with the likelihood of visitation and number of visits among those visited?
2. Does visitation differ by level of family involvement?
3. What barriers exist that hinder family visitation for youth in residential placements?
4. Does the geographical distance from where delinquent youth are housed relative to the location of their family's home impact the likelihood and frequency of visitation?
5. Does family visitation with delinquent youth in residential facilities impact the institutional adjustment of youth in residential facilities?
6. What policies and strategies can juvenile justice agencies use to improve family involvement, through visitation and other means, with youth in residential placements?
7. What best practices exist that result in more involvement of families of delinquent youth?
8. What is the relationship between visitation and the likelihood of post-release recidivism?
9. Does the link between visitation and recidivism differ across gender, race, age, and type of commitment offense?

Data

The data for this study came from a visitation survey instrument developed by researchers at Florida State University in collaboration with the FDJJ. FDJJ administered the survey, via an online format (Survey Monkey), to juveniles released from Florida residential

commitment facilities between August 2015 and March 2017. The surveys were included as a voluntary addition to traditional release paperwork. The survey had two versions: one for juveniles who received a visit during their placement, and a second for juveniles who did not receive a visit. The appropriate survey was administered after youth indicated whether or not they had received a visit.

The questions on the two surveys, copies of which are available in Appendix A, were largely similar. For example, both surveys included questions such as, “before your commitment, how would you describe your relationship with your family,” and, “how often have you received letters from your family?” However, several questions were tailored to whether the juvenile received a visit. For example, both surveys asked juveniles how visitation affected their commitment experience. However, for visited juveniles the survey asked, “Has being visited by family made your commitment experience easier?” While for non-visited youth, the survey asked, “Has not being visited by family made your commitment experience more difficult?” The survey for visited juveniles also included a number of additional questions intended to elicit information about their visitation experience, such as who visited them, the length of the visits, and the quality of the visits. The “not visited” survey also contained a number of unique questions intended to explore the juvenile’s perceptions of why they did not receive visits. As a result, the visited survey included 22 questions, and the not visited survey included 17 questions. FDJJ collected and compiled the responses and matched the survey responses to demographic information and follow-up offense data for each respondent. 1,202 youth out of 3,935 juveniles released during this time period completed surveys prior to release constituting a response rate of approximately 31 percent. Furthermore, 59 out of the 67 residential commitment facilities, or 88 percent, participated.

In addition, FDJJ matched the survey responses to a number of risk assessment instruments. FDJJ performs two different risk assessments on juveniles when they are committed to a residential facility: the Community Positive Achievement Change Tool (CPACT) and the Residential Positive Achievement Change Tool (RPACT). Each of these assessments measures juveniles on a number of personal and family risk factors. The CPACT is administered once, while the RPACT is administered soon after admission to a residential placement facility, numerous times during the course of their stay, and upon release. The juvenile's closest RPACT to their admission to the residential facility was used in the analyses.

Finally, the survey responses were matched with follow-up offense data provided by FDJJ. The follow-up data included any new offense for which a juvenile was arrested or adjudicated after their release. These recidivism measures do not include technical or probation violations. Because the data was limited to the juvenile justice system, these data included only delinquency recidivism measures and not offenses committed as an adult. The analytical sample for recidivism included only youth under the age of 17, resulting in a sample of 484 youth.

Variables

Outcome Variables

The primary outcomes of interest are visitation and recidivism. Four variables were used to measure visitation. The first was a dummy variable indicating whether or not the youth received a visit from a family member during their commitment in the residential facility. For the purposes of this study, family members include legal guardians, parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, children, or friends of the family. The second variable measured the frequency of visitation, or how many visits the juvenile received per month. The third measure captured the average duration of visits. As part of the survey, juveniles estimated, on average,

how many minutes their visits lasted. The final visitation outcome measured visit quality. The survey asked youth to estimate, on a scale of 1 to 5, “What was the quality of the family visits during your commitment?”

The analyses also included other forms of family contact as outcome measures. The survey asked juveniles to report the frequency with which they received phone calls and letters during their commitment. From these responses, two dummy variables were created, one indicating if the juvenile had ever received a phone call from a family member (0=no, 1=yes), and one indicating if the juvenile had ever received a letter from a family member (0=no, 1=yes). In addition, the outcomes included the relative frequency with which juveniles received phone calls or letters. The survey asked juveniles if they received phone calls never, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, or daily. The survey asked the same question about letters. Finally, outcome measures also included dummy variables that captured whether the juvenile had ever been on a home visit (the juvenile gets to go home for 1 or 2 days) (0=no, 1=yes), or if they ever contacted their family through a video messaging service such as Skype (0=no, 1=yes).

The final outcome analyzed for this report was recidivism, which was measured using six dummy variables: new offense within 3-months, 6-months, and 12-months of release, and a new adjudication within 3-months, 6-months, and 12-months of release from residential commitment. These variables excluded technical and probation violations.

Predictor Variables

A number of variables were included as predictors in the visitation models and as controls in the recidivism models. The demographic predictors included race, ethnicity, gender, and age measures. The race, ethnicity, and gender variables were all dummies, that indicated if the juvenile was black, Hispanic, or male respectively. Age was a continuous measure indicating

the age of the juvenile at the time they took the survey. These models also included offense variables (dummy variables that indicated whether the commitment offense was a felony, misdemeanor, or other) and the type of offense (violent, property, drug, or other). Finally, the models included the average length of stay in months and the distance between the juvenile's home and the residential facility as predictors.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The visitation models also included predictor variables from both the visitation survey and the CPACT. The survey provided a measure of family attachment. The survey asked juveniles to respond on a scale of 1 to 5, "Before your commitment, how would you describe your relationship with your family?" The CPACT risk assessment provided several prior-offending measures including age at first offense, number of prior felony and misdemeanor adjudications, and number of prior commitments to a residential facility. Prior misdemeanors was measured on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 indicating no or one prior referral, and 4 indicating 5 or more. Prior felonies was also measured on a 1 to 4 scale, however, a score of 1 indicates no felonies, and 4 indicate 3 or more felonies. Finally, prior commitment was a 3-category scale, where 1 indicates no prior commitments, and 3 indicates two or more commitments.

The risk assessment also provided several measures of community participation. These included history of expulsions from school (categorical variable ranging from 1 "no expulsions" to 6 "more than 7 expulsions"), pro-social community ties (categorical variable, where a score of 1 indicates no pro-social community ties, a score of 2 indicates some community ties, and a score of 3 indicates strong community ties), participation in structured pro-social activities (where 1 indicates participation in multiple activities, a score of 2 indicates participation in one activity, and a score of 3 indicates no participation), and participation in unstructured pro-social activities.

The CPACT also provided a number of variables that captured the quality and stability of the juvenile's home life. The first was a dummy variable indicating whether the juvenile had ever been removed from the home by the court or the Florida Department of Children and Families (FDCF). The second variable measured the juvenile's history of running away or being kicked out of the home on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 indicating the juvenile had never run away or been kicked out, and 5 indicating more than instances in which the juvenile had either run away or been kicked out of the home). And, the CPACT included a dummy variable that indicated whether or not the juvenile's parents had ever been in jail or incarcerated.

Finally, these models included several CPACT variables that capture the family's ability or willingness to support or visit the juvenile. First, the CPACT asked juveniles if their families were consistently willing to support them. Juveniles who answered yes received a score of "1". Juveniles who responded that family support was inconsistent, there was little support, or that their family berated them received a score of "0". Second, a dummy variable captured whether youth lived in a single parent household before confinement (0 = no, 1 = yes). Finally, a categorical variable measured the juvenile's family combined annual income. A score of 1 indicated an income of less than \$15,000, 2 indicated an income between \$15,000 and \$34,999, 3 indicated an income of \$35,000 to \$49,999, and 4 for incomes of \$50,000 or more per year.

Although the RPACT and the CPACT are very similar in the types of information collected on the juveniles, four additional variables from the RPACT were included as control variables. The first was a measure of the juvenile's perceptions about education. The juvenile was asked if they believed education had no value, if they somewhat believed it had value, or if they fully believed it had value. A higher score on this variable indicated a belief in the value of education. The second RPACT variable was a dummy variable indicating whether or not the

juvenile had any siblings residing in the household. The third dummy variable indicated whether the youth felt close to or had a good relationship with any family members or caretakers. Finally, these models included a dummy variable that indicated if the juvenile had received a diagnosis as a sex offender.

Methods

This report includes a series of difference-of-means tests, including chi-square and t-tests to explore the association between relevant variables. In addition, this report uses Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression and logistic regressions to predict visitation and recidivism. The majority of analyses employed logistic regression, as most of the outcome variables were either dichotomous or categorical. However, the models that predicted the frequency of visitation used OLS, as it is a continuous outcome. All predictors were tested for multicollinearity and no issues were found. Tests were also performed for heteroskedasticity with the OLS models, and in instances of heteroskedasticity, robust standard errors were used as a correction.

FINDINGS

Description of Visitation

The first research question involves describing the use of visitation and the demographic characteristics of youth who had a greater likelihood of visitation. The following sections present the rates of visitation and other forms of contact, as well as information on the frequency, duration, and quality of the visits, along with the types of visitors. In addition, the report provides descriptive information as well as difference-of-means tests on the juvenile demographics associated with the likelihood of visitation and contact.

Frequency of Visitation

The first objective of this report was to describe the frequency of contact between youth in juvenile commitment facilities and their families, including the percentage of juveniles who received visits and other forms of contact (phone calls, letters, home visits, and Skype communication), and the frequency with which they received contact. Among this sample, 74.7 percent of juveniles received at least one visit from family members during their residential commitment. However, youth were more likely to receive phone calls and letters than they were to receive visits, 95 percent of youth received at least one phone call and 82 percent received at least one letter (Table 2). Some juveniles were also eligible for home visits, which allowed the youth to return home to visit family for a limited amount of time, and a number of facilities allowed video contact through Skype. As displayed in Table 2, approximately 15 percent of youth returned home for a visit and close to 4 percent used Skype as a means of communicating with family.

[Table 2 about here]

Visited youth received an average of 8.26 visits during their commitment, were visited approximately once per month, and these visits lasted about 2.5 hours. Furthermore, results revealed that among all juveniles surveyed, youths received phone calls more frequently than they received letters (Figure 1). Eighty-seven percent of youth received at least one phone call per week compared to only 15 percent who received a weekly letter.

[Figure 1 about here]

The survey also gathered information on the relationship between the youth and their visitors and the average quality of those visits. As shown in Figure 2, the most common visitors were mothers (82%), followed by sisters (48%), fathers (43%) and brothers (42%), followed by

grandmothers (33%), aunts (15%), cousins (8%), legal guardians (7%), uncles (6%), and children (4%).¹ A small percentage of juveniles also reported visits from nieces or nephews (4%), mentors (2%), or FDCF workers (1%).

[Figure 2 about here]

Of those who were visited, the majority (69%) reported their visitation as high quality. The survey asked the visited youth, “On a scale of 1 to 5, what was the quality of the family visits during your commitment” (1 was "poor" and 5 was "good"). The frequency distribution for these responses (Figure 3) indicates that relatively few youth reported negative visitation experiences.

[Figure 3 about here]

Youth Demographics and Visitation

As displayed in Table 4, certain youth were more likely to receive a visit than others. The results suggest that more white juveniles received a visit (85%) than black juveniles (69%), and that more Hispanic juveniles received a visit (86%) than non-Hispanic juveniles (73%). Furthermore, the results suggest that visitation differs by age and offense type. Fewer older juveniles (those 17 and 18 years old) received a visit (70% each) compared to 16 year olds who had the highest percentage of visits (81%). In addition, a larger percentage of juveniles who committed a felony offense or other offense (75% and 79% respectively) received a visit than those with a misdemeanor offense. Similarly, a larger percentage of juveniles diagnosed as a sex offender received a visit (90%) than those who were not (74%). Chi-square analyses determined that race, ethnicity, age, offense level, and offense type all had significant associations with

¹ The categories of mother, father, brother, and sister also included any visits from step-mothers, fathers, and siblings respectively.

visitation. Furthermore, t-tests also indicated that length of stay and distance from home were significantly associated with visitation.²

[Table 4 about here]

The percent of youth—disaggregated by various characteristics—who received letters and phone calls is displayed in Table 4. Overall, there are smaller racial and ethnic disparities for phone calls and letters as compared to visits. However, these disparities are often in the opposite direction. For example, 16 percent fewer blacks received a visit than whites, but 1 percent more black juveniles received a phone call than white youth. Similar patterns emerged for ethnicity; while 13 percent more Hispanics received a visit than non-Hispanics, approximately two percent more non-Hispanics received a phone calls or letter than Hispanics. Similar to visitation, 7 percent more whites received a letter than blacks. Nevertheless, chi-square analysis did not find significant associations between most of these variables and contact, with the exception of gender and phone calls and race and letters. These results suggest that the majority of youth received at least one visit, phone call, and letter during confinement, but that certain youth were more likely to have contact with their family than others.

Predictors of Visitation

The second research question asked what factors are associated with differential levels of family involvement and visitation among committed juveniles. Logistic regression models estimated the effect of a number of demographic, offense, and risk factors on the likelihood of receiving an in-person visit, a phone call, or a letter during the juveniles' commitment. As presented in Table 5, several variables were significant predictors of visitation. Black juveniles were 50 percent less likely to receive a visit than white juveniles, while males were 39.2 percent

² Chi-square analyses also determined whether family attachment prior to confinement (as perceived by youth) was significantly associated with visitation. These associations were not significant. Results are available upon request.

less likely than females to receive a visit. Juveniles whose families had a higher annual income were significantly more likely to receive an in-person visit. Specifically, for each unit increase in annual income, the odds of receiving a visit increased by 88 percent. Family support was also positively associated with receiving a visit during commitment. Juveniles with a history of out-of-home placement by FDCF, prior commitments, and siblings in the household were significantly less likely to receive visitation. The number of months a juvenile was committed was positively associated with receiving a visit; for every additional month a juvenile served, they were 9.5 percent more likely to receive visits. Finally, the distance between a juvenile's home and the residential facility was negatively associated with visitation; for every additional mile away from home, the juvenile was 0.6 percent less likely to receive a visit.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Different factors were also associated with the likelihood of receiving a phone call or letter. Four variables were significant predictors of receiving phone calls: gender (male) and a history of out-of-home placements were both negatively associated with receiving a phone call, while participation in pro-social unstructured activities and feeling close to a family member or caretaker were both positively associated with phone calls. Several variables were also significantly associated with the likelihood of receiving a letter. A history of running away or being kicked out of the home, a history of out-of-home placements, and race were associated with a reduced likelihood of receiving a letter. Five variables had a positive association with receiving a letter: prior misdemeanor referrals, age at first offense, length of stay, distance from home, and feeling close to a family member or caretaker.

The second series of analyses examined the predictors in relation to the frequency of contact. As displayed in Table 6, several variables were associated with receiving a larger

number of visits per month. The presence of family support, feeling close to a family member or caretaker, and a sex offender designation were all significantly and positively associated with the frequency of visits per month. Black and male juveniles had a significant negative association with the frequency of visits. In addition, family jail history, participation in pro-social unstructured activities, prior commitments, prior misdemeanor referrals, length of stay in the residential facility, distance from home, and siblings in the household were all associated with a fewer number of visits per month.

[Table 6 about here]

Logistic regression models also estimated the frequency of phone calls and letters. The results are displayed in Table 6. Juveniles who are black, male, and have a history of out-of-home placements were significantly less likely to receive more frequent phone calls during their commitment. Juveniles who participated in more pro-social unstructured activities, juveniles with siblings, and juveniles that reported being close to a caretaker or family member were significantly more likely to receive a higher frequency of phone calls. When predicting the frequency of receiving letters, OLS regression estimates showed that both black and Hispanic juveniles were significantly less likely to receive letters at a higher frequency. Out-of-home placement was also significantly associated with a lower frequency of receiving letters. Finally, participation in unstructured pro-social activities, siblings, and feeling close to a family member or caretaker were all positively associated with the frequency of receiving letters.

The fourth research question asked if the distance between the residential facility and the youth's home had a significant impact on the likelihood of visitation. As displayed in Tables 5 and 6, youth housed farther away from home were both less likely to be visited (O.R. = 0.944) and received fewer visits per month ($\beta = -0.002$).

Barriers to Visitation

This section addresses research question three, which asked, what barriers exist that inhibit family involvement and visitation? To answer this question, the survey asked youth who were not visited to provide reasons for why they believed they were not visited. The results in Table 7 indicate that these reasons can be grouped into three categories, family was unable to visit (76%), youth did not want a visit (11%), and family did not want to visit (5%). Youth most commonly cited the distance between home and the residential facility as the main reason they believed they were not visited (48%). The youth's second most common reason for not being visited was transportation problems (19%). Further, 11 percent of non-visited youth did not receive a visit because they requested that their families not visit them. In addition, 7 percent of youth said they were not visited because family members had to work, 3 percent indicated that their family members had other priorities, and 2 percent cited lack of financial resources to come visit. These findings indicate that the primary barriers to visitation are distance between the juvenile's home and the residential facility, and a lack of resources available to enable the family to visit.

[Table 7 about here]

Suggestions to Improve Visitation

Research questions six and seven both explore possible strategies or practices that could potentially be employed to increase visitation or family involvement. To address these questions, the survey asked all juveniles to provide suggestions for what FDJJ could do to improve the likelihood that they would receive visits from their family. Specifically, youth were asked, "Is there anything the Department of Juvenile Justice could have done to make it more likely that you would have been visited?" Most youth (80%) offered no suggestions or believed that FDJJ

did all that they could to facilitate visitation. The first percentage column in Table 8 includes these responses from youth who offered no suggestions, while the second percentage column was calculated after excluding these youth. The findings presented in this section reference only the youth who offered suggestions (Table 8, column 2).

[Table 8 about here]

As displayed in the second column of Table 8, a large percentage of youth (49%) suggested that FDJJ could increase visitation if youth were placed closer to home. Both visited and non-visited youth offered this as a suggestion. Non-visited youth believed that closer placement might facilitate visits, while visited youth believed that this could increase the number of visits over the course of confinement. Youth also commonly suggested assistance with transportation as a means of facilitating visitation (13%), including the provision of shuttles and car services. Further, youth suggested extending the opportunities for family contact (12%) by increasing the number of visitation days and the number of phone calls allowed. In addition, some youth suggested that FDJJ provide better provisions during visits, including food and games for visitors (7%), provide funds for visitation (5%), and extend the approved list of visitors (3%).

Juvenile's Perceptions of the Effects of Visitation

This section answers the fifth research question: how family visitation impacts youth's perceptions of their institutional adjustment, family relationships, and post-release success. To assess the relationship between visitation and these outcomes, both the visited and non-visited survey asked about how visitation, or lack there-of, affected their family relationships, their commitment experience, and the likelihood of a successful transition post-release.

Most visited youth reported that receiving visitation improved a variety of outcomes. As displayed in Table 9, 86 percent of visited youth believed visitation helped improve their relationships with family members. Furthermore, over 90 percent of visited youth reported that family visitation made their commitment experience easier, over 80 percent predicted that their life will be better after release as a result of visitation, and the majority indicated that visitation would at least "somewhat" help them avoid getting into trouble after release.³

[Table 9 about here]

The survey asked non-visited youth the same series of questions. However, the survey also asked non-visited youth whether they believe their outcomes were worse because they were not visited. Very few non-visited youth reported that their relationships and behaviors would be negatively impacted by not receiving a visit. As displayed in Table 10, a small percentage of non-visited youth (3%) felt that not being visited negatively impacted their family relationships, twenty-five percent indicated that not being visited worsened their confinement experience⁴, and less than one percent indicated that not being visited would make life more difficult after release.

[Table 10 about here]

The surveys administered to both visited and non-visited juveniles asked youth to respond, on a scale of 1 to 5, “How well do you think you will transition to a successful life after your release?” Ordered logistic regression models tested for an association between the juveniles’ perceptions of their likelihood of successful post-release transition and the various visitation measures (yes/no received visitation, the frequency of visits, and the quality of visits). Visitation, frequency of visitation, and the quality of visits were all significantly associated with a stronger belief in post-release success.

³ Responses for this question were coded 1 for “No”, 2 for “Somewhat”, and 3 for “Yes”.

⁴ Responses for this question were coded 1 for “No”, 2 for “Somewhat”, and 3 for “Yes”.

[Table 11 about here]

Visitation and Recidivism

The eighth and ninth research questions asked about the relationship between visitation and post-release recidivism and whether this relationship varies by gender, race, age, and type of offense. To answer these questions, difference-of-means t-tests and logistic regression models assessed the effects of visitation and visitation quality on recidivism. These analyses included only new arrests and new adjudications processed by FDJJ. Arrests and adjudications for youth over the age of 18 are processed by the adult system. In order to ensure that all youth were eligible for a 12-month follow-up within the juvenile system, the analytical sample excluded youth that would mature out of the FDJJ system within a year. This means that the sample excluded all youth 17 or older at the time of release, which limited the sample in the recidivism analyses to 484 youth (40% of the original sample).

The results in Table 12 and 13 document that within 12 months of release, approximately 65 percent of youth were re-arrested and roughly 45 percent had a new adjudication. Difference of means t-tests examined whether there were differences in recidivism among those who were visited, compared to those who were not. There were no significant differences in re-arrests or adjudications (within 3, 6, or 12 months of release) for those youth who were visited compared to those who were not.⁵

[Table 12 about here]

[Table 13 about here]

To determine the relationship between visitation and recidivism, 12 logistic regression models estimated the effects of visitation and visitation quality on re-arrest and new

⁵ Correlation matrixes reveal similar results—that visitation was not significantly correlated with any of the reoffending or re-adjudication measures.

adjudications within the FDJJ system (within 3-, 6-, and 12-months of release).⁶ These models included numerous control variables, including gender, race, age, commitment offenses, prior offending measures, and length of stay. The results are displayed in Tables 14 through 17.

First, logistic models estimated the effects of visitation on six recidivism outcomes. The results are displayed in Tables 14 and 15. Contrary to prior literature, visited youth had greater odds of re-arrest within 3- and 6-months of release. However consistent with prior literature, visited youth had lower odds of re-arrest within 12-months of release and lower odds of new adjudications across all three time intervals. Nevertheless, none of these relationships were statistically significant.⁷ In each of these models, the control variables were in the expected direction.

[Table 14 about here]

[Table 15 about here]

Next, six models estimated the effects of the quality of visit on the odds of re-arrest and new adjudications. Tables 16 and 17 reveal that higher quality of visits is associated with lower odds of re-arrest and new adjudications. However, these results were only significant for re-arrest and new adjudications within 12-months of release. The results show that as visitation quality increases (i.e., as visitation quality increases from a “4” to a “5”), the odds of a new arrest within 12-months of release is reduced by 46.8 percent and the odds of a new adjudication is reduced by 37.6 percent.

[Table 16 about here]

⁶ Recidivism does not include technical or probation violations.

⁷ Models were also estimated with visitor type and reoffending and new adjudications to determine whether type of visitor mattered. The results indicate that visits from parents, grandparents, other family members, and non-family members all increase recidivism. Visits from children were also positively, but not significantly related to new adjudications, but were negatively related to reoffending. The latter relationships were also not significant.

[Table 17 about here]

In addition, this report includes a set of exploratory models that examined the effect of visitation on recidivism, after controlling for the quality of visits, to determine whether visitation quality confounded the relationship between visitation and recidivism. Table 18 displays the results of these analyses. For parsimoniousness, these tables include only the odds ratios for visitation and visit quality.⁸ The results are mixed, after controlling for visitation quality, the effects of visitation on new offenses 3-months after release and new adjudications 3- and 6-months after release were reversed; while the positive effect of visitation on new offenses 3- and 6-months after release and new adjudications 12-months after release were amplified. However, none of these odds ratios were significant. Furthermore, in all but the 3-month adjudication model, visit quality was still negatively related to recidivism.

[Table 18 about here]

Finally, to answer research question nine, a series of logistic regression models examined the effect of visitation on recidivism across various demographic variables, including gender, race, age, and type of offense.⁹ These models tested interaction effects using seven different multiplicative interactions terms, gender x visitation; black x visitation; Hispanic x visitation; age at release x visitation; violent offense x visitation; property offense x visitation; and drug offense x visitation. Different models estimated each interaction term separately. The results are displayed in Tables 19 through 24. Among all the interactions tested, only the interaction between male and visitation was significant and only for re-arrest and new adjudications 12-months after release. The results, displayed in Tables 21 and 24, illustrate that the odds of

⁸ All models included a full set of controls.

⁹ All continuous variables in interaction terms were grand mean centered.

visitation on re-arrest is reduced by .133 and that the odds of visitation on new adjudications is reduced by .077 for males compared to that effect among females.

[Tables 19-24 about here]

CONCLUSION

With recidivism rates among juvenile delinquents estimated at over 60 percent (Bezruski et al., 1999; Benda and Tollet, 1999), a large body of research has attempted to understand what factors might improve future outcomes among this group. Despite theoretical and empirical evidence in support of visitation policies, virtually no studies have examined whether family visitation within juvenile facilities improves outcomes, including institutional adjustment and recidivism, among this population.

This project contributes to the existing literature by answering a series of research questions on family visitation for residentially committed juveniles. These questions were addressed using descriptive statistics, OLS regression, and logistic regression analyses conducted on data from the survey administered to residentially committed juveniles in Florida (available in Appendix A), the CPACT and RPACT risk assessments, and new delinquency offense data. The results revealed that most youth (75%) received at least one visit during confinement, but that certain youth are more likely to receive a visit than others, namely white, female youths (see Table 5). Differences of means t-tests and chi-square analyses revealed that differences in visitation across these demographic variables are significant. Furthermore, visited youth received an average of 8 visits (or one visit per month) over the course of confinement and these visits lasted an average of 2.5 hours. Among those who did not receive a visit, the most common explanation was distance from home and transportation issues. This is not unexpected given that, on average, youth are housed in facilities 170 miles from home (with distance from home

ranging from 12.5 to 664 miles). Logistic regression models found that a number of demographic and risk assessment variables were significant predictors of visitation. Black and male juveniles were less likely to receive a visit, as were juveniles with a history of delinquency and problems in the home. Notably, a juvenile's distance away from their home was a strong predictor of visitation, with a greater distance resulting in lower odds of visitation and a lower frequency of visitation.

The majority of visited youth reported that they expected visitation to produce positive effects on both behavioral outcomes and family relationships. Specifically, most visited youth reported that both their institutional experience and their family relationships were improved because they were visited. As a result of visitation, youth also anticipated that their post-release lives and behavior would be more positive. Most non-visited youth did not expect worsened outcomes because they were not visited.

Consistent with a large percentage of youth perceiving positive effects of visitation on reentry outcomes, the majority of the re-arrest and new adjudication models (10 out of the 12) illustrated a negative relationship between the visitation measures and recidivism. Nevertheless, these effects were significant in only 2 of the 12 models. However, the analyses did not find, with the exception of gender, that the effect of visitation on recidivism varied across different demographic characteristics.

Implications for policy

Although a large percentage of the sample (approximately 75 percent) received a least one visit from a family member during their commitment, these youth only received, on average, one visit per month. As a result, it is beneficial to consider policies that might reduce any potential barriers to visitation to better facilitate increased levels of visitation. The non-visited

youth in this sample, in response to a question posed in the survey, provided several suggestions to better facilitate visitation. Non-visited youth indicated that distance from home and issues with transportation were the two main reasons they were not visited. They indicated that removal of these barriers could increase visitation. These suggestions provide practical solutions for juvenile justice systems. First, juvenile placement processes could consider more heavily factoring the location of the youth's immediate family when determining the facility in which the youth will be placed. Second, juvenile justice systems could consider offering shuttle services from designated locations across the state to increase the percentage of youth that receive visits. Similar shuttle service programs are currently operating in Pennsylvania and New York (Brook, 2015; Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, 2016). However, it is important to note that research has not been conducted on the success of these programs.

Both visited and non-visited juveniles also provided several additional suggestions to improve visitation. A number of youth suggested that visitation hours be extended and that more days be included in the visitation schedule in order to be more accommodating to the families' schedules. Youth often cited family work schedules or other responsibilities as possible reasons for lack of visitation. Several youth also suggested greater use of video visitation (i.e., Skype visits). Many youth believed that Skype or other types of video visits would be an acceptable alternative to in-person visitation. However, given that video visits are relatively new, little research has been conducted on the prevalence of video visitation or its potential costs and benefits. Nevertheless, some facilities have replaced phone calls with video visitation as a cost-saving alternative (McCarthy, 2017). As a result, a wider availability of video conferencing might lessen the financial burden of visitation and facilitate more frequent contact. In addition, a number of youth suggested making improvements to the visitation experience itself. For

example, providing accommodations such as better food or activities for families to engage in while at the facility might encourage families to return more often.

A final policy recommendation concerns the collection of visitation data. The visitation information used in the current study was collected from one-time surveys administered to youth. FDJJ does not maintain reliable or electronic visitation logs, does not routinely collect information about the quality of visits, and does not collect information from visitors. As a result, information from these surveys is all that are available with regards to juvenile visitation within the State of Florida. FDJJ would benefit from establishing a system that collects and maintains information on visitation within their facilities. This information could then be used to inform policy and future research on the topic of juvenile visitation.

Directions for Future Research

Despite the contributions of the current project, there are still many unanswered questions regarding juvenile visitation. First, a significant body of literature has examined the effect of visitation among adult inmates, but to date no study has examined how juveniles whose cases are transferred to the adult court system are impacted by visitation policies. Transferred juveniles are significantly different from adult inmates and their fellow juveniles in a number of ways. Transferred juveniles receive longer sentences and are more resistant to change than those in juvenile placement facilities. They often receive less and/or lower quality programming than their counterparts in juvenile facilities. Furthermore, they are more likely to be physically and/or sexually victimized during incarceration than adult inmates, and have higher rates of recidivism than adult inmates (Beck et. al., 2013; Bishop, 2000; Bishop & Frazier, 2000; Mulvey & Schubert, 2012). As a result, it is possible that visitation might have differential effects among this victimized group.

Second, the majority of studies on visitation employ multivariate analyses to examine visitation. While multivariate analysis is standard practice, an argument can be made for using matching techniques. However, no study has employed matching to study visitation. Propensity score matching, in theory, creates two groups that are otherwise equal except with regard to the treatment (i.e., visitation). This would allow estimates of the visitations' effect with more accuracy and less error than multivariate analysis.

Third, future research should examine the effects of visitation on a variety of other outcomes besides reoffending. Institutional behavior is one such outcome. Currently, only one study has examined the relationship between visitation and institutional misconduct among youth, despite ample tests of this association among adults (Borgman, 1985; Cochran, 2012; Siennick et al., 2013) and of evidence of a link between misconduct and recidivism (Bales and Mears, 2008). Examining the effect of visitation on institutional behavior might have important implications for reoffending among this group. Another outcome that has received attention among adult inmates, but not among juveniles, is family attachment. One study found that visitation increased family attachment after release (La Vigne et al., 2005). This finding coupled with evidence that family holds greater influence over youth and the relationship between family and offending among youth suggests that this might be a worthwhile line of inquiry.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that visitation might increase instrumental support among adults upon release (La Vigne et al., 2005). Research on juveniles might benefit from examining this association, given that many aspects of instrumental support, including assistance with housing, finances, education, and employment are crucial for a successful transition into adulthood. Similarly, research would benefit from examining whether visitation facilitates pro-social transformations, including changes in self-control, changes in pro-social values, and

improvement in pro-social relationships. Such transformations are central to the desistance process (Giordano et al., 2002; Maruna, 2001; Sampson & Laub, 2003). Such studies, specifically on the effect of visitation on instrumental support and pro-social transformations, could have implications for visitation policies.

Limitations

There are several limitations in this study that warrant mention and should be addressed in future research. First, because completion of the survey was voluntary, not all youth completed the survey upon their release during the data collection period. Out of 3,935 youth that were released, 1,202 surveys were completed. This constitutes a 31 percent response rate. Because surveys were not given randomly, the final sample (n=1,202) may not be representative of all youth that exited FDJJ facilities during the study period. Future research would benefit from examining visitation among a random sample of youth or an entire release cohort.

Second, the recidivism analyses included only new offenses and new adjudications processed by FDJJ. Arrest records for those 18 and over are processed through the adult system and maintained by FDLE. Since, the follow-up period in this study was 12-months, youth 17 and older, were dropped from recidivism analyses to ensure all youth in the analytical sample had a full 12 months to be included in the FDJJ data. This resulted in a 60 percent reduction in sample size for the recidivism models. As a result, the analytical sample may be biased in ways that could affect the results. This also means that this project was restricted to acts of delinquency only. The exclusion of adult recidivism events could have further biased the results and presents an important avenue for future research.

Third, given the nature of the study, analyses included only visitation information from the youth's most recent residential placement. According to the descriptive statistics, 79 percent

of the sample had no prior commitments while 21 percent of the sample was on at least their second confinement. Future analysis would benefit from examining the effect of visitation across multiple confinements.

Fourth, the survey did not contain information on visitors with the exception of their relationship to the youth. Visitor information, including the visitor's perception of the visits, the prior offending history, and background information could provide more accurate estimates of the effect of visitation on behavior while in confinement and post- release outcomes.

Finally, survey collection occurred upon the youth's release from confinement and asked youth to recall information about visits. Survey researchers caution that memory is more unreliable the longer the recall period (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009). Youth in this sample spent an average 257 days in residential placement. As a result, it is possible that some of their estimates of visitation (i.e., the number of visits) are inaccurate.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D., & Fisher, J. (1976). The effects of prison residents' community contacts on recidivism rates. *Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavioral Technology, Methods, and Therapy*, 22, 21-27.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30(1): 47-88.
- Agudelo, S.V. (2013). The impact of family visitation on incarcerated youth's behavior and school performance. Findings from the families as partners project. New York, NY: VERA Institute of Justice.
- Bales, W.D. & Mears, D.P. (2008). Inmate social ties and the transition to society. Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3): 287-321.
- Becker, H.S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in sociology and deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Bezruki, D., Varana, D. & Hill, C. (1999). An Evaluation of Secure Juvenile Detention. Madison WI: Legislative Audit Bureau.
- Benda, B.B. & Tollet, C.L. (1999), "A Study of Recidivism of Serious and Persistent Offenders Among Adolescents," *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol. 27, No. 2 111-126.
- Borgman, B. (1985). The influence of family visiting upon boys' behavior in a juvenile correctional facility. *Child Welfare*, 64(6): 629-638.
- Brook, P. (2015, March) "The big apple to the big house, and back". Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/vantage/prison-bus-the-big-apple-to-the-big-house-and-back-20391a4740a7>

- Cochran, J.C. (2012). The ties that bind or the ties that break: Examining the relationship between visitation and prisoner misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40: 433-440.
- Cochran, J.C. (2014). Breaches in the wall: Imprisonment, social support, and recidivism. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(2): 200-229.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2009). Internet, phone, mail and mixed-mode surveys: A tailored design method. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley Publishing.
- Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2011). Blessed be the social tie that binds: The effects of prison visitation on offender recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(3): 271-296.
- Duwe, G. & Johnson, B.R. (2016). The effects of prison visits from community volunteers on offender recidivism. *The Prison Journal*, 96(2): 279-303.
- Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (2012). Residential Services. Retrieved From: <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/services/residential>.
- Giordano, P., Cernkovich, S., & Rudolph, J. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107:990-1064.
- Glaser, D. 1964. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Hairston, C.F. (1988). Family ties during imprisonment: Do they influence future criminal activity? *Federal Probation*, 52: 48-52.
- Hairston, C.F., Rollins, J., & Han-jin, J. (2004). Family connections during imprisonment and prisoners' community reentry. Chicago, IL: Jane Addams Center for Social Policy and Research.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency* (1969th ed.). California: University of California Press.

- Jang, J. S. (1999). Age-varying effects of family, school, and peers on delinquency: A multilevel modeling test of interactional theory. *Criminology*, 37(3): 643-686.
- La Vigne, N.G., Naser, R.L., Brooks, L.E., & Castro, J.L. (2005). Examining the effect of incarceration and in-prison family contact on prisoners' family relationships. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21(4): 314-335.
- Lemert, E. (1951). *Social pathology: A systematic approach to the study of sociopathic behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Massey, J. & Krohn, M. (1986). A longitudinal examination of an integrated social process model of deviant behavior. *Social Forces*, 65(1), 106-130.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychology Association.
- McCarthy, K. (2017, July). Want to visit your loved one in jail? How about Skype instead? Retrieved from: https://www.theregister.co.uk/2017/07/25/jail_video_conferencing/
- Mears, D.P., Cochran, J.C., Siennick, S.E., & Bales, W.D. (2012). Prison visitation and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(6): 888-918.
- Monahan, K.C., Goldweber, A., & Cauffman, E. (2011). The effects of visitation on incarcerated juvenile offenders: How contact with the outside impacts adjustment on the inside. *Law and Human Behavior*, 35(2): 143-151.
- Nelson, M., Deess, P., & Allen, C. (1999). *The First Month Out: Post Incarceration Experiences in New York City*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. (2016, October). Transportation Services. Retrieved from: <http://www.cor.pa.gov/Inmates/Visiting/Pages/Inmate-Family-Transportation-Services.aspx#.WSRMm1PytsM>

- Ryan, J.P., & Yang, H. (2005). Family contact and recidivism: A longitudinal study of adjudicated delinquents in residential care. *Social Work Research*, 29(1): 31-39.
- Sampson, R. & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Schafer, N.E. (1994). Exploring the Link Between Visits and Parole Success. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 38:17-32.
- Siennick, S.E., Mears, D.P., & Bales, W.D. (2013). Here and gone: Anticipation and separation effects of prison visits on inmate infractions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 50(3): 417-444.
- Snyder, H.N. & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Wright, J.P., Cullen, F.T., & Miller, J.T. (2001). Family social capital and delinquent involvement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(1): 1-9.

TABLES

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics for Full Sample

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	1202	16.45	1.26	12	20
Black	1201	.624	.48	0	1
Hispanic	1202	.116	.32	0	1
Male	1202	.794	.40	0	1
Current Offense: Felony	1202	.682	.46	0	1
Current Offense: Misdemeanor	1202	.126	.33	0	1
Current Offense: Other	1202	.192	.39	0	1
Offense Type: Violent	1202	.311	.45	0	1
Offense Type: Property	1202	.357	.48	0	1
Offense Type: Drug	1202	.034	.18	0	1
Offense Type: Other	1202	.297	.46	0	1
Length of Stay in Facility (months)	1202	9.15	4.62	.49	48.45
Miles from Home	1202	169.95	115.89	12.5	663.7
Family Relationship	1198	3.65	1.32	1	5
Age at First Offense	1202	2.04	.99	1	5
Prior Misdemeanors	1202	2.14	1.08	1	4
Prior Felonies	1202	3.00	1.01	1	4
Prior Commitments	1202	1.25	.51	1	3
Expulsion History	1194	3.87	1.76	1	6
Pro-Social Community Involvement	1194	1.61	.57	1	3
Pro-Social Structured Activities	1194	2.24	.67	1	3
Pro-Social Unstructured Activities	1194	2.21	.66	1	3
Out of Home Placement	1202	.192	.39	0	1
Family Jail History	1202	.595	.49	0	1
Run Away/Kicked Out of Home	1202	2.21	1.44	1	5
Single Parent Household	1202	.517	.50	0	1
Annual Income	1173	1.79	.74	1	4
Family Support	1175	.691	.46	0	1
Values Education	1181	2.30	.62	1	3
Siblings	1196	.627	.48	0	1
Close to Family or Caretaker	1196	.886	.32	0	1
Sex Offender Diagnosis	1196	.034	.18	0	1

Table 2. Proportion of Youth who Received Contact While in a Residential Facility

Variable	N	Mean	Min	Max
Youth received an in-person visit	1202	.747	0	1
Youth received phone calls	1197	.950	0	1
Youth received letters	1195	.823	0	1
Youth went on a home visit	1194	.152	0	1
Youth was contacted through Skype	1196	.037	0	1

Table 3. Frequency of Visitation Among Youth Visited in Residential Facilities

Variable	N	Mean	Min	Max
Total number of visits	864	8.26	1	235
Length of visits in minutes	881	146.1	7	480
Frequency of visits (number of visits per month)	864	0.95	.04	13.04

Table 4. Reports of Contact by Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Age, and Offense

Demographics	Types of Contact Received		
	Visits	Phone Calls	Letters
Gender			
Male	713 (74.6%)	951 (94.3%)*	788 (82.9%)
Female	185 (74.9%)	240 (97.5%)*	196 (80.0%)
Race			
White	381 (84.5%)**	422 (94.4%)	386 (86.5%)**
Black	516 (68.8%)**	714 (95.3%)	697 (79.8%)**
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	119 (85.6%)**	130 (93.5%)	113 (81.9%)
Non-Hispanic	779 (73.3%)**	1007 (95.2%)	871 (82.4%)
Age			
14 or younger	123 (76.8%)*	157 (98.1%)	128 (80.0%)
15	176 (74.3%)*	224 (94.5%)	195 (82.3%)
16	264 (80.5%)*	311 (95.4%)	275 (84.6%)
17	254 (70.2%)*	334 (93.0%)	288 (80.4%)
18 or older	81 (70.4%)*	111 (96.5%)	98 (85.2%)
Current Offense			
Felony	619 (75.5%)**	775 (94.9%)	676 (82.8%)
Misdemeanor	96 (63.6%)**	145 (96.0%)	124 (82.7%)
Other	183 (79.2%)**	217 (94.8%)	184 (80.3%)
Offense Type			
Violent	279 (74.6%)	357 (95.4%)	299 (80.4%)
Property	316 (73.5%)	404 (94.6%)	354 (82.9%)
Drug	24 (58.5%)	40 (97.6%)	33 (80.5%)
Other	279 (78.1%)	336 (94.6%)	289 (83.9%)
Sex Offender			
Yes	37 (90.2%)*	37 (90.2%)	35 (85.4%)
No	855 (74.0%)*	1094 (95.1%)	945 (82.3%)
Length of Stay	9.42**	9.14	9.34**
Miles from Home	150.3**	170.6	173.0*

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 5. Logistic Regressions on the Predictors of Visitation

Predictor Variables	Occurrence of Contact					
	Visits (N = 1150)		Phone Calls (N = 1148)		Letters (N = 1146)	
	O.R.	SE	O.R.	SE	O.R.	SE
Black	0.439 ***	0.09	1.005	0.35	0.429 ***	0.09
Hispanic	1.124	0.35	0.794	0.37	0.631	0.19
Age	0.928	0.07	0.804	0.11	0.923	0.07
Gender	0.608 **	0.13	0.373 *	0.19	0.744	0.17
Current Offense: Felony	1.264	0.41	1.186	0.66	1.291	0.45
Current Offense: Misdemeanor	0.872	0.30	0.984	0.63	1.443	0.55
Offense Type: Violent	0.682	0.18	1.221	0.57	0.675	0.20
Offense Type: Property	0.705	0.19	0.994	0.45	0.726	0.22
Offense Type: Drug	0.519	0.24	2.130	2.35	0.591	0.29
Family Relationship	1.057	0.07	1.088	0.13	1.101	0.07
Single Parent	0.813	0.13	1.026	0.31	1.169	0.20
Annual Income	1.883 ***	0.24	0.940	0.18	1.141	0.14
Family Support	1.338 *	0.23	1.401	0.45	1.031	0.19
Family Jail History	0.781	0.13	1.588	0.48	1.215	0.21
Run Away/Kicked Out of Home	0.985	0.06	1.038	0.12	0.847 **	0.06
Out of Home Placement	0.560 ***	0.12	0.411 **	0.14	0.604 **	0.13
Pro-Social Community Ties	0.962	0.14	0.678	0.18	0.806	0.12
Pro-Social Structured Activities	1.018	0.16	0.943	0.26	0.893	0.15
Pro-Social Unstructured Activities	0.924	0.15	1.645 *	0.46	0.995	0.17
School Expulsion	1.026	0.05	0.978	0.08	0.983	0.05
Prior Commitments	0.512 ***	0.08	0.943	0.29	1.063	0.19
Prior Felony Referral	1.050	0.10	0.949	0.17	1.126	0.11
Prior Misdemeanor Referral	1.002	0.08	1.099	0.16	1.165 *	0.10
Age at First Offense	0.885	0.09	1.039	0.18	1.371 ***	0.15
Length of Stay (months)	1.095 ***	0.03	1.011	0.04	1.102 ***	0.03
Distance from Home	0.994 ***	0.00	1.001	0.00	1.002 **	0.00
Values Education	1.085	0.14	1.245	0.29	0.945	0.13
Siblings	0.613 ***	0.10	1.424	0.42	1.065	0.18
Close to Family/Caretaker	1.267	0.32	1.968 *	0.76	1.776 **	0.42
Sex Offender	1.567	1.06	0.519	0.36	0.557	0.30

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 6. OLS and Ordered Logistic Regressions on the Predictors of Frequency of Contact

Predictor Variables	Frequency of Contact					
	Visits (N = 1117)		Phone Calls (N = 1148)		Letters (N = 1146)	
	β	SE	O.R.	SE	O.R.	SE
Black	-0.439 ***	0.10	0.578 **	0.14	0.485 ***	0.07
Hispanic	-0.085	0.14	0.628	0.21	0.552 ***	0.10
Age	-0.002	0.03	0.822 **	0.07	0.988	0.05
Gender	-0.284 ***	0.09	0.772	0.21	1.222	0.19
Current Offense: Felony	0.080	0.13	1.067	0.41	1.378	0.30
Current Offense: Misdemeanor	-0.146	0.13	0.688	0.28	1.443	0.36
Offense Type: Violent	-0.088	0.11	1.046	0.33	0.856	0.16
Offense Type: Property	-0.219 **	0.10	0.884	0.28	0.827	0.15
Offense Type: Drug	0.012	0.22	0.928	0.50	0.626	0.20
Family Relationship	-0.004	0.02	1.128	0.08	1.123 ***	0.05
Single Parent	0.011	0.07	1.058	0.21	1.126	0.13
Annual Income	0.090	0.06	0.953	0.13	1.122	0.09
Family Support	0.191 ***	0.07	1.347	0.28	1.078	0.13
Family Jail History	-0.185 ***	0.07	1.118	0.22	1.134	0.13
Run Away/Kicked Out of Home	-0.032	0.02	0.962	0.07	0.942	0.04
Out of Home Placement	-0.009	0.10	0.567 **	0.14	0.697 **	0.11
Pro-Social Community Ties	0.112	0.08	0.832	0.14	0.882	0.09
Pro-Social Structured Activities	0.027	0.06	0.781	0.15	1.065	0.12
Pro-Social Unstructured Activities	-0.118 *	0.07	1.529 **	0.29	0.925	0.10
School Expulsion	-0.006	0.02	1.011	0.06	1.020	0.03
Prior Commitments	-0.094 *	0.05	0.953	0.19	0.842	0.10
Prior Felony Referral	-0.059	0.04	0.956	0.11	0.984	0.06
Prior Misdemeanor Referral	-0.060 *	0.04	1.087	0.11	1.052	0.06
Age at First Offense	-0.031	0.04	1.176	0.14	1.169 **	0.08
Length of Stay (months)	-0.025 ***	0.01	0.993	0.02	1.039 ***	0.01
Distance from Home	-0.002 ***	0.00	1.000	0.00	1.001 *	0.00
Values Education	0.031	0.05	1.055	0.16	1.077	0.10
Siblings	-0.142 *	0.07	1.580 **	0.31	1.008	0.12
Close to Family/Caretaker	0.177 **	0.09	1.973 **	0.52	1.621 ***	0.29
Sex Offender	0.770 ***	0.26	0.858	0.47	0.781	0.26

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 7. Juvenile Responses to Why They Believe They Were Not Visited

Reason for No Visits	Number	Percentage
Distance to residential facility too far	146	48%
Family had transportation problems	57	19%
Juvenile did not want visitation	33	11%
Family had to work and could not visit	21	7%
Family had other priorities	10	3%
Family did not have enough money to visit	6	2%
Family practicing “tough love”	6	2%
Juvenile does not know why they were not visited	10	3%
Other reason	13	4%

N = 305

Table 8. Juvenile Suggestions for How the DJJ Could Increase Visitation

Suggestion to Increase Visitation	Number	Percentage ¹	Percentage ²
Place juvenile in facility closer to home	105	10%	49%
Provide transportation support for visitors	29	3%	13%
Approve/allow for more home visits	17	2%	8%
More and extended opportunities for contact	26	2%	12%
Provide better food and recreation during visitations	14	1%	7%
Provide funds for visitation	10	1%	5%
Approve a greater variety of visitors	7	.6%	3%
No suggestion for improvement	851	78%	--
Positive perception of DJJ efforts	19	2%	--
Other	26	2%	12%

N = 912

Percentage¹ = Percent of total responses

Percentage² = Percent of responses with a suggestion (*N* = 192)

Table 9. Visitation and Youth Perceptions of Institutional Adjustment and Post-Release Outcomes

Survey Questions	N	Mean	Min	Max
Has your relationship with your family improved because you were visited?	891	0.86	0	1
Do you think that your life after release will be better because you were visited?	892	0.81	0	1
Has being visited by family made your commitment experience easier? ^a	890	2.60	1	3
Because you were visited, are you less likely to get into trouble after your release? ^a	892	2.49	1	3
Do you plan to live with someone who visited you after your release?	886	0.88	0	1

^a Response scale is “1” = No; “2” = Somewhat; “3” = Yes

Table 10. No Visitation and Perceptions of Institutional Adjustment and Post-Release Outcomes

Survey Questions	N	Mean	Min	Max
Has your relationship with your family been negatively affected because you were not visited?	299	0.03	0	1
Do you think your life after release will be more difficult because you were not visited?	298	0.02	0	1
Has not being visited by family made your commitment experience more difficult? ^a	297	1.28	1	3
Has not being visited by your family made it more likely you will get into trouble after your release? ^a	297	1.03	1	3

^a Response scale is “1” = No; “2” = Somewhat; “3” = Yes

Table 11. Visitation and Juveniles Perceptions of Post-Release Success

Predictor Variables	Post-Release Success					
	Visited (N = 1147)		Visitation Rate (N = 1114)		Visitation Quality (N = 856)	
	O.R.	SE	O.R.	SE	O.R.	SE
Visited	1.546 ***	0.25				
Number of Visits per Month			1.144 *	0.09		
Visit Quality					1.907 ***	0.19
Age	1.160 **	0.08	1.141 **	0.08	1.180 **	0.10
Black	0.934	0.17	0.951	0.18	0.894	0.19
Hispanic	1.258	0.34	1.325	0.37	1.064	0.32
Age	1.133	0.22	1.060	0.21	1.363	0.33
Gender	1.268	0.41	1.470	0.49	0.865	0.33
Current Offense: Felony	1.130	0.38	1.322	0.46	0.821	0.35
Current Offense: Misdemeanor	0.590	0.16	0.507	0.14	0.745	0.24
Offense Type: Violent	0.842 *	0.23	0.770 **	0.22	0.881	0.28
Offense Type: Property	0.766	0.34	0.669	0.31	1.939	1.38
Offense Type: Drug	1.232	0.07	1.230	0.07	1.182	0.08
Family Relationship	0.933 ***	0.14	0.935 ***	0.14	0.919 **	0.17
Single Parent	1.169	0.13	1.217	0.13	0.925	0.12
Annual Income	0.746	0.12	0.774 *	0.13	0.627	0.13
Family Support	0.926 *	0.14	0.927	0.14	0.849 **	0.16
Family Jail History	1.046	0.06	1.064	0.06	1.065	0.08
Run Away/Kicked Out of Home	0.912	0.18	0.884	0.17	0.961	0.23
Out of Home Placement	0.898	0.12	0.887	0.12	0.870	0.14
Pro-Social Community Ties	1.093	0.16	1.081	0.16	1.213	0.22
Pro-Social Structured Activities	0.824	0.12	0.841	0.13	0.801	0.15
Pro-Social Unstructured Activities	0.965	0.04	0.946	0.04	0.912	0.05
School Expulsion	0.869	0.13	0.850	0.13	0.795 *	0.15
Prior Commitments	0.955	0.08	0.985	0.08	0.928	0.10
Prior Felony Referral	0.987	0.07	0.979	0.08	1.047	0.10
Prior Misdemeanor Referral	0.919	0.09	0.906	0.09	0.941	0.11
Age at First Offense	1.124	0.13	1.070	0.13	1.097	0.17
Values Education	0.911	0.14	0.965	0.15	1.020	0.19
Siblings	1.197	0.27	1.165	0.27	1.351	0.38
Close to Family/Caretaker	1.546	0.25	1.144	0.09	1.907	0.19

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics of the Analytical Sample for Visitation and Recidivism Models

Variable	New Arrest 3 Months (n=431)		New Arrest 6 Months (n=371)		New Arrest 12 Months (n=237)		Adjudication 3 Months (n=423)		Adjudication 6 Months (n=363)		Adjudication 12 Months (n=230)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Recidivism	0.32	0.47	0.52	0.50	0.66	0.48	0.19	0.40	0.32	0.47	0.46	0.50
Visit	0.78	0.42	0.78	0.41	0.77	0.42	0.78	0.42	0.78	0.42	0.77	0.43
Male	0.77	0.42	0.78	0.42	0.81	0.39	0.77	0.42	0.77	0.42	0.81	0.39
Hispanic	0.12	0.32	0.12	0.33	0.13	0.34	0.12	0.32	0.12	0.33	0.13	0.34
Black	0.63	0.48	0.62	0.49	0.57	0.50	0.64	0.48	0.62	0.49	0.58	0.50
White	0.24	0.43	0.25	0.43	0.29	0.45	0.23	0.42	0.25	0.43	0.28	0.45
Age at release	15.38	0.82	15.37	0.81	15.35	0.87	15.38	0.82	15.36	0.82	15.34	0.88
Age at first offense	3.35	0.63	3.34	0.63	3.34	0.64	3.35	0.63	3.34	0.63	3.34	0.64
Violent offense	0.34	0.48	0.33	0.47	0.31	0.46	0.35	0.48	0.33	0.47	0.31	0.47
Property offense	0.35	0.48	0.35	0.48	0.38	0.49	0.34	0.47	0.34	0.48	0.37	0.48
Drug offense	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.21	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.21
Other offense	0.28	0.45	0.29	0.45	0.27	0.45	0.29	0.45	0.29	0.46	0.27	0.45
Prior felonies	1.99	1.07	1.97	1.07	1.92	1.08	1.97	1.07	1.96	1.07	1.90	1.08
Prior misdemeanors	1.05	1.04	1.02	1.03	1.04	1.04	1.05	1.04	1.03	1.03	1.05	1.04
Prior confinements	2.21	1.01	2.21	1.01	2.19	1.02	2.20	1.01	2.19	1.01	2.17	1.03
Length of stay	8.60	3.19	8.53	3.07	8.54	3.09	8.61	3.22	8.54	3.09	8.56	3.13

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics of the Analytical Sample for Visit Quality and Recidivism Models

Variable	New Arrest 3 Months (n=336)		New Arrest 6 Months (n=291)		New Arrest 12 Months (n=183)		Adjudication 3 Months (n=329)		Adjudication 6 Months (n=284)		Adjudication 12 Months (n=177)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Recidivism	0.33	0.47	0.53	0.50	0.65	0.48	0.19	0.39	0.31	0.46	0.45	0.50
Visit Quality	4.55	0.83	4.53	0.85	4.53	0.82	4.55	0.83	4.53	0.86	4.53	0.83
Male	0.77	0.43	0.78	0.42	0.82	0.39	0.76	0.43	0.77	0.42	0.81	0.39
Hispanic	0.13	0.34	0.14	0.35	0.14	0.35	0.13	0.34	0.14	0.35	0.14	0.35
Black	0.61	0.49	0.59	0.49	0.54	0.50	0.61	0.49	0.60	0.49	0.55	0.50
White	0.25	0.43	0.26	0.44	0.31	0.46	0.25	0.43	0.26	0.44	0.30	0.46
Age at release	15.39	0.79	15.40	0.77	15.38	0.82	15.39	0.80	15.39	0.78	15.37	0.82
Age at first offense	3.33	0.64	3.31	0.64	3.32	0.65	3.33	0.64	3.31	0.64	3.32	0.66
Violent offense	0.35	0.48	0.32	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.36	0.48	0.33	0.47	0.33	0.47
Property offense	0.35	0.48	0.37	0.48	0.38	0.49	0.33	0.47	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.48
Drug offense	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.17	0.04	0.21	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.21
Other offense	0.28	0.45	0.28	0.45	0.26	0.44	0.28	0.45	0.29	0.45	0.27	0.44
Prior felonies	1.97	1.08	1.97	1.08	1.91	1.10	1.96	1.08	1.96	1.08	1.89	1.11
Prior misdemeanors	1.03	1.02	1.01	1.01	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.04
Prior confinements	2.19	1.04	2.19	1.04	2.16	1.05	2.17	1.04	2.17	1.04	2.13	1.06
Length of stay	8.71	3.13	8.62	3.08	8.71	3.21	8.73	3.16	8.64	3.11	8.75	3.25

Table 14. The Effect of Visitation on New Arrests

Predictors	New Offense Recidivism Outcomes					
	3 months		6 months		12 months	
	(n=431)		(n=371)		(n=237)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit	1.411	0.383	1.124	0.306	0.778	0.295
Male	2.979***	1.007	2.865***	0.872	4.544***	1.877
Hispanic	1.084	0.466	1.526	0.603	2.046	1.084
Black	2.106**	0.624	1.792**	0.496	1.855*	0.653
Age at release	0.841	0.126	0.883	0.135	0.923	0.178
Age first offense	0.904	0.190	0.965	0.203	0.644	0.186
Violent offense	1.287	0.413	1.173	0.360	1.652	0.679
Property offense	1.811*	0.555	1.665*	0.504	1.795	0.726
Drug offense	2.306	1.509	1.528	0.985	2.511	2.167
Number prior felonies	1.391***	0.184	1.230	0.158	1.234	0.212
Number prior misdemeanors	1.134	0.133	1.384**	0.173	1.521**	0.268
Number prior confinements	1.367**	0.189	1.173	0.148	1.357	0.224
Length of stay (months)	0.950	0.039	0.985	0.038	0.968	0.051

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 15. The Effect of Visitation on New Adjudications

Predictors	New Adjudication Recidivism Outcomes					
	3 months		6 months		12 months	
	(n=423)		(n=363)		(n=230)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit	0.878	0.263	0.829	0.235	0.836	0.285
Male	2.916**	1.227	3.644***	1.348	3.228***	1.374
Hispanic	0.924	0.517	1.066	0.498	1.216	0.593
Black	2.131**	0.790	2.295***	0.735	2.243**	0.777
Age at release	0.804	0.133	0.731**	0.116	0.707*	0.128
Age first offense	1.026	0.256	0.932	0.212	0.747	0.192
Violent offense	1.672	0.655	1.202	0.409	1.142	0.457
Property offense	2.485**	0.932	1.727*	0.571	1.509	0.578
Drug offense	1.547	1.325	1.376	0.949	1.230	0.866
Number prior felonies	1.095	0.172	0.945	0.133	1.193	0.194
Number prior misdemeanors	1.117	0.148	1.148	0.145	1.186	0.179
Number prior confinements	1.373*	0.230	1.208	0.169	0.966	0.155
Length of stay (months)	0.975	0.046	0.961	0.042	0.902*	0.048

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 16. The Effect of Visitation Quality on New Arrests

Predictors	New Offense Recidivism Outcomes					
	3 months		6 months		12 months	
	(n=336)		(n=291)		(n=183)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit Quality	0.857	0.130	0.813	0.126	0.532**	0.140
Male	2.571***	0.945	2.412**	0.830	2.876**	1.409
Hispanic	1.766	0.843	1.499	0.655	2.189	1.333
Black	3.081***	1.077	2.234**	0.704	2.043*	0.829
Age at release	0.896	0.163	0.901	0.165	0.935	0.214
Age first offense	0.922	0.219	0.985	0.234	0.564*	0.188
Violent offense	1.045	0.386	0.954	0.348	1.620	0.781
Property offense	1.738	0.614	1.279	0.456	1.800	0.886
Drug offense	1.462	1.158	1.172	0.874	1.466	1.361
Number prior felonies	1.468***	0.220	1.365**	0.200	1.491**	0.301
Number prior misdemeanors	1.153	0.158	1.490***	0.222	1.695	0.356
Number prior confinements	1.369**	0.213	1.188	0.168	1.354	0.255
Length of stay (months)	0.91**	0.045	0.971	0.044	0.962	0.056

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 17. The Effect of Visitation Quality on New Adjudications

Predictors	New Adjudication Recidivism Outcomes					
	3 months		6 months		12 months	
	(n=329)		(n=284)		(n=177)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit Quality	0.984	0.175	0.809	0.126	0.624**	0.131
Male	2.441*	1.127	3.050***	1.250	1.706	0.834
Hispanic	1.202	0.729	0.998	0.507	1.481	0.809
Black	2.371**	1.024	2.091**	0.745	2.159*	0.853
Age at release	0.881	0.181	0.758	0.144	0.746	0.160
Age first offense	1.067	0.305	0.919	0.235	0.680	0.197
Violent offense	1.547	0.708	1.018	0.402	0.866	0.402
Property offense	2.621**	1.139	1.433	0.543	1.221	0.557
Drug offense	1.068	1.222	0.752	0.654	0.757	0.641
Number prior felonies	1.109	0.200	1.037	0.164	1.485**	0.277
Number prior misdemeanors	1.097	0.171	1.160	0.172	1.188	0.205
Number prior confinements	1.494**	0.295	1.225	0.195	0.968	0.177
Length of stay (months)	0.941	0.054	0.948	0.049	0.917	0.054

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 18. Recidivism Models with Visit & Visit Quality

Predicting New Arrests Using Visitation & Visit Quality						
	3 months (n=336)		6 months (n=291)		12 months (n=183)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit	0.402	0.541	1.165	1.519	6.484	9.706
Visit Quality	0.886	0.141	0.8084	0.1331	0.4876***	0.1296
Predicting New Adjudications Using Visitation & Visit Quality						
	3 months (n=329)		6 months (n=284)		12 months (n=177)	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visit	0.121	0.174	0.211	0.504	1.054	1.490
Visit Quality	1.088	0.211	0.840	0.138	0.622**	0.139

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

Table 19. Moderating Relationships for New Arrests at 3 Months

Moderators	New Arrests at 3 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	1.418	0.386	0.792	0.416	1.265	0.352	5.379	5.846	1.716	0.577	1.231	0.429	1.485	0.413
Age	0.769	0.202												
Visit x Age	1.134	0.346												
Black			1.141	0.645										
Visit x Black			2.155	1.320										
Hispanic					0.000	0.001								
Visit x Hispanic					-	-								
Male							10.595**	11.392						
Visit x Male							0.227	0.255						
Violent Offense									2.010	1.087				
Visit x Violent									0.561	0.317				
Property Offense											1.395	0.731		
Visit x Property											1.400	0.768		
Drug													6.318	8.188
Visit x Drug													0.256	0.378

N = 431

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

- indicates a nonsensical number

Table 20. Moderating Relationships for New Arrests at 6 months

Moderators	New Arrests at 6 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	1.121	0.306	0.436	0.227	1.263	0.359	3.622	2.597	0.886	0.311	1.429	0.476	1.141	0.316
Age	0.903	0.238												
Visit x Age	0.969	0.298												
Black			0.611	0.350										
Visit x Black			3.772**	2.315										
Hispanic					6.613	7.813								
Visit x Hispanic					0.190	0.233								
Male							9.064***	6.555						
Visit x Male							0.241	0.188						
Violent Offense									1.173	0.393				
Visit x Violent									0.884	0.499				
Property Offense											3.026**	1.711		
Visit x Property											0.468	0.281		
Drug													2.097	2.704
Visit x Drug													0.659	0.958

N =371

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

- indicates a nonsensical number

Table 21. Moderating Relationships for New Arrests at 12 Months

Moderators	New Arrests at 12 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	0.763	0.295	0.636	0.416	0.800	0.319	3.558	2.955	0.748	0.332	0.795	0.373	0.819	0.314
Age	1.006	0.332												
Visit x Age	0.883	0.345												
Black			1.445	1.075										
Visit x Black			1.357	1.084										
Hispanic					2.630	3.238								
Visit x Hispanic					0.740	0.976								
Male							20.864***	17.871						
Visit x Male							0.133**	0.127						
Violent Offense									1.478	1.134				
Visit x Violent									1.151	0.950				
Property Offense											1.881	1.348		
Visit x Property											0.940	0.740		
Drug													-	-
Visit x Drug													0.000	0.002

N = 237

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

- indicates a nonsensical numbers

Table 22. Moderating Relationships: New Adjudications at 3 months

Moderators	New Adjudications at 3 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	0.890	0.268	1.039	0.732	0.813	0.248	2.799	3.123	1.100	0.412	0.701	0.273	0.900	0.274
Age	0.723	0.196												
VisitxAge	1.174	0.380												
Black			2.505	1.800										
VisitxBlack			0.813	0.635										
Hispanic					0.000	0.001								
VisitxHispanic					-	-								
Male							8.151	8.824						
VisitxMale							0.276	0.320						
Violent Offense									2.681	1.603				
VisitxViolent									0.526	0.325				
Property Offense											1.691	0.983		
VisitxProperty											1.686	1.014		
Drug													2.500	3.284
VisitxDrug													0.463	0.779

N=423

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

-indicates a nonsensical number

Table 23. Moderating Relationships: New Adjudications at 6 months

Moderators	New Adjudications at 6 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	0.832	0.238	1.235	0.770	0.815	0.239	2.251	1.910	0.886	0.311	0.916	0.322	0.876	0.254
Age	0.713	0.190												
VisitxAge	1.037	0.326												
Black			3.471	2.283										
VisitxBlack			0.597	0.421										
Hispanic					0.829	0.992								
VisitxHispanic						1.333	1.662							
Male							8.909***	7.357						
VisitxMale							0.315	0.284						
Violent Offense									1.377	0.751				
VisitxViolent									0.829	0.486				
Property Offense											2.153	1.217		
VisitxProperty											0.751	0.448		
Drug													3.806	5.012
VisitxDrug													0.238	0.367

N=363

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

-indicates a nonsensical number

Table 24. Moderating Relationships: New Adjudications 12 months

Moderators	New Adjudications at 12 Months													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.	O.R.	S.E.
Visited	0.843	0.289	1.793	1.180	0.711	0.257	7.514	8.585	0.922	0.369	0.929	0.400	0.874	0.306
Age	0.650	0.213												
VisitxAge	1.125	0.425												
Black			5.458**	4.011										
VisitxBlack			0.338	0.262										
Hispanic					0.299	0.365								
VisitxHispanic						5.346	6.876							
Male							23.447***	26.277						
VisitxMale							0.077**	0.092						
Violent Offense									1.493	1.048				
VisitxViolent									0.706	0.525				
Property Offense											1.858	1.202		
VisitxProperty											0.755	0.531		
Drug													2.244	2.996
VisitxDrug													0.438	0.668

N=230

*p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01

-indicates a nonsensical number

FIGURES

Figure 1. Frequency of Phone Calls and Letters




Figure 2. Percent of Responses by Visitor Type (N = 898)





Figure 3. Average Quality of Visits



APPENDIX

Appendix A. Juvenile Residential Exit Survey

Initial question: Did you receive a visit during your time at the facility? (home visits do not count)

Juvenile Residential Exit Survey – Visited

For the purposes of this survey, family members include legal guardians, parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, children, or friends of the family.

For all of the following questions, please refer only to your time spent in this facility:

5. How many times have you been visited by family members or friends of the family while in this program?
6. Who visited you while in this program (check all that apply)?
 - a. Mother, father, legal guardian, brother, sister, aunt, uncle, cousin, grandfather, grandmother, child, other (please specify)
7. If you were to drive or ride home from this facility, about how long would it take you? (Hours and Minutes)
8. On average, how long did your visits last? (hours and minutes)
9. Do your visitors typically have to stay overnight when they come to visit you? (yes/no)
10. What was the quality of the family visits during your commitment? (poor=1 to fair=3 to good=5)
11. How well do you think you will transition to a successful life after your release? (poor=1 to fair=3 to good=5)
12. Before your commitment, how would you describe your relationship with your family? (poor=1 to fair=3 to good=5)
13. Has your relationship with your family improved because you were visited? (yes/no)
14. Do you think that your life after release will be better because you were visited? (yes/no)
15. How often have you received phone calls from your family?
 - a. Never, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily
16. How often have you received letters from your family?

a. Never, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily

17. Why do you think you did not receive letters or phone calls from your family?

18. Have you had contact with your family through a computer messaging survey, such as skype? (yes/no)

19. How many times?

20. Do you think your commitment experience will help you stay out of trouble after release? (no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

21. Has being visited by family made your commitment experience easier? (no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

22. Because you were visited, are you less likely to get into trouble after your release? (no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

23. Have you ever gone on a home visit? (yes/no)

24. How many times?

25. The following questions refer to how connected you are to your family.

	Not at All		Neutral		Very Much
12a. How much do you feel that your family understands you?	1	2	3	4	5
12b. How much do you feel that you and your family have fun together?	1	2	3	4	5
12c. How much do you feel that your family pays attention to you?	1	2	3	4	5
12d. How close do you feel to your family?	1	2	3	4	5
12e. How much do you think your family cares about you?	1	2	3	4	5
12f. Most of the time, your family is warm and loving towards you.	1	2	3	4	5
12g. Overall, you are satisfied with your relationship with your family.	1	2	3	4	5

26. Do you plan to live with someone who visited you after your release? (yes/no)

Juvenile Residential Exit Survey – Not Visited

For the purposes of this survey, family members include legal guardians, parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, children, or friends of the family.

For all of the following questions, please refer only to your time spent in this facility:

28. Why do you believe that you were not visited by your family?

29. How likely do you think it is that you will transition to a successful life after release?
(unlikely=1 to somewhat likely=3 to likely=5)

30. Before your commitment, how would you describe your relationship with your family?
(poor=1 to fair=3 to good=5)

31. Has your relationship with your family been negatively affected because you were not visited? (yes/no)

32. Do you think your life after release will be more difficult because you were not visited?
(yes/no)

33. How often have you received phone calls from your family?

a. Never, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily

34. How often have you received letters from your family?

a. Never, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily

35. Why do you think you did not receive letters or phone calls from your family?

36. Have you had contact with your family through a computer messaging service, such as Skype? (yes/no)

37. How many times?

38. Do you think your commitment experience will help you stay out of trouble after release?
(no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

39. Has not being visited by family made your commitment experience more difficult? (no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

40. Has not being visited by your family made it more likely you will get into trouble after your release? (no=1, somewhat=2, yes=3)

41. Have you ever gone on a home visit? (yes/no)

42. How many times?

43. The following questions refer to how connected you are to your family.

	Not at All		Neutral		Very Much
12a. How much do you feel that your family understands you?	1	2	3	4	5
12b. How much do you feel that you and your family have fun together?	1	2	3	4	5
12c. How much do you feel that your family pays attention to you?	1	2	3	4	5
12d. How close do you feel to your family?	1	2	3	4	5
12e. How much do you think your family cares about you?	1	2	3	4	5
12f. Most of the time, your family is warm and loving towards you.	1	2	3	4	5
12g. Overall, you are satisfied with your relationship with your family.	1	2	3	4	5

44. Is there anything the Department of Juvenile Justice could have done to make it more likely that you would have been visited?