

Factor	Source of data	Method Of Coding
Looked after Child (LAC) status	LAC information was taken from the Care/Criminal tab in the ASSET Context.	Young people were given one of two ratings: Current (1) or not current (0). This related to whether or not a young person was currently accommodated by the local authority under either Section 20 (voluntary agreement with parents) or Section 30 (Care Order) of the <i>Children Act 1989</i> (Eng. & Wales.).
Family/home situation	Information about living arrangements and parental support was taken from the Living Arrangements and Family and Personal Relationships Section of the ASSET and from the ASSET context. Given the wide variety and complexity of issues present for many of the young people, the researcher collected a range of data from these sections including reading the "Evidence" sections and used this information to rate this factor. It was decided that living situation and parental support would be combined into one factor because both variables are highly dependent on each other and separating them from the information available did not seem meaningful.	Young people who were rated as one for this section experienced any of the factors below in their current living situation. Factors were evaluated in relation to how they would impact on the young person's ability to attend appointments or comply with other requirements of an Order such as remaining at home when they were required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent boundaries, poor communication or lack of support from main parent/carer (including neglect and substance use) • Unsuitable or unstable home environments • Current Children's Social Care involvements • Experience or witnessing abuse (current or previous).
Substance use	Substance use evidence was taken from the Substance Use Section of the ASSET.	Young people who never used any substances (other than tobacco) were rated as 0. Young people who had ever used any substances other than tobacco (rated in YOIS as "Recent use" or "Ever used") were rated as 1.

Table 1: Sources of information and rating method for personal circumstances factors used in Study One Hierarchical Log-Linear Analysis.

Gender	Males			Females	
	89% (50%)			11% (50%)	
Ethnicity	White British	Black	Asian	Mixed	Comparison of other ethnic groups was not possible
	8% (26%)	54% (33%)	3% (13%)	23% (9%)	
Religion	Christian	Muslim	Other	None	Not Stated
	39% (39%)	23% (22%)	2% (14%)	20% (14%)	17% (10%)

Table2: Young people in sample compared with census data.

Please note that percentages are rounded; census comparator proportions are in parenthesis; all figures for the research sample are for age ranges 13 to 18 whereas all proportions for census data are for the age band 10 to 17.

		Study-Order outcome				Total
		Successful	Re-offended	Breached	Transferred	
Number of Orders		50	22	13	12	97
Mean & (S.D.) Order length in months		8.36 (3.43)	11.23 (5.00)	10.23 (3.24)	10.00 (5.61)	9.46 (4.23)
Mean & (S.D.) Dynamic ASSET Score*		20.66 (7.76)	26.36 (6.57)	30.08 (6.83)	23.00 (8.43)	23.51 (8.13)
Low		32	9	4	3	48
ROSH	Medium	17	8	6	7	38
Categorisation*	High	1	5	3	1	10

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of Study-Order by outcome.

*n=96 in these analyses.

	b (SE)	95% CI Odds Ratio		
		Lower	Odds Ratio	Upper
Revoked and resentenced vs. breached				
Intercept	3.07 (2.01)			
Dynamic ASSET Score	-0.08 (0.06)	0.82	0.92	1.03
ROSH low/High	-0.32 (1.05)	0.09	0.73	5.77
ROSH Medium/High	-0.41 (0.94)	0.11	0.67	4.18
Successfully completed vs. breached				
Intercept	3.99 (2.13)			
Dynamic ASSET Score	-0.17 (0.06)**	0.76	0.85	0.95
ROSH low/High	1.78 (1.36)	0.41	5.95	85.76
ROSH Medium/High	1.65 (1.30)	0.41	5.22	66.53
Revoked and resentenced vs. successfully completed ¹				
Intercept	-0.92 (1.68)			
Dynamic ASSET Score	0.09 (0.04)*	1.00	1.09	1.19
ROSH low/High	-2.10 (1.22)†	0.01	0.12	1.33
ROSH Medium/High	-2.06 (1.19)†	0.01	0.13	1.32

Table 4: Multinomial logistic regression analysing the effect of Dynamic ASSET Score and ROSH Category on Study-Order Outcome.

$R^2=0.25$ (Cox & Snell), 0.29 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2(6)=23.94$, $p=.001$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, † $p = 0.084$

1: Initially, the multinomial logistic regression was run with the breach outcome as the reference category.

It was then re-run with successful completion as the reference category to produce details of the relationship between a re-offend outcome and a successful outcome.

		Breach of Study-Order		Total
		No	Yes	
Supervising location		1	5	6
	Out of Borough	(5.1)	(0.9)	
		-1.8	4.3	
		71	8	79
	Eastmanor YOS	(66.9)	(12.1)	
		0.5	-1.2	
	Total	72	13	85

Table 5: Contingency table for supervising location by breach of Study-Order.

Quoted are observed score, expected score in brackets and standard residual below.

Note that the contingency table contained one cell with an expected count of less than 5

Effect	d.f.	Partial Association Chi-Square	Likelihood Ratio Chi-square Change
Breach Outcome by LAC Status by Family Score	1	3.03	
Breach Outcome by LAC Status by Substance Use	1	0.00	
Breach Outcome by Family Score by Substance Use	1	0.00	
LAC Status by Family Score by Substance Use	1	0.65	
Breach outcome by LAC Status	1	1.99	3.87*
Breach Outcome by Family Score	1	4.66*	5.42*
LAC Status by Family Score	1	1.15	
Breach Outcome by Substance Use	1	7.51**	8.12**
LAC Status by Substance Use	1	0.62	
Family Score by Substance Use	1	0.31	
Breach Outcome	1	45.11**	
LAC Status	1	25.08**	
Family Score	1	10.10**	
Substance Use	1	22.79**	

Table 6: Summary of the hierarchical model of breach outcome, LAC status, family situation and substance

use. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$