

C013353 ABSTRACT: The object of the study was to identify gender differences in psychiatric disorder among youth at probation intake. The authors measured disorder on the Voice Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (V-DISC) in randomly selected youth at probation intake in eight Texas counties. Logistic regression analyses predicted diagnostic clusters from gender, adjusting for demographics and offense characteristics. The study concluded that among youth with conduct problems, girls demonstrate elevated risk for co-occurring anxiety or affective disorder. (authors)

Title Gender Differences in Psychiatric Disorders at Juvenile Probation Intake.

Authors Wasserman, G., McReynolds, L, Ko, S., Katz, L., Carpenter, J.

Type Journal Article

Source American Journal of Public Health (In Press), 2004.

Year 2004 **Length** 23 pages

Medium Paper

Control No: 013353

IN PRESS, American Journal of Public Health

(Accepted January 2004)

Gender Differences in Psychiatric Disorders at Juvenile Probation Intake

**Gail A. Wasserman PhD, Larkin S. McReynolds MPH, Susan J Ko PhD,
Laura M. Katz MPH, and Jennifer R. Carpenter MA**

ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify gender differences in psychiatric disorder among youths at probation intake.

Methods: We measured disorder on the Voice Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children in 991 randomly selected youths (200 girls) at probation intake in eight Texas counties. Logistic regression analyses predicted diagnostic clusters from gender, adjusting for demographics and offense characteristics.

Results: Demographic and offense characteristics explained small, but interpretable and specific, variance in diagnostic profile. Girls' rates of anxiety and affective disorder were higher than boys' (ORs = .59 and .32, respectively). Girls with violent offenses, compared to other groups, were three to five times as likely to report anxiety disorders.

Conclusions: Among youths with conduct problems, girls demonstrate elevated risk for co-occurring anxiety or affective disorder.

Introduction

Antisocial behavior is far more characteristic of young males than of young females: girls' Conduct Disorder (CD) rates are approximately half boys' rates¹; across all types of criminal activity, only 28% of arrested youths are female². This gender disparity has led some³⁻⁷ to propose a "gender paradox", whereby the gender less likely to be disordered has a more severe form/presentation of the disorder.

This suggests that antisocial females will be more impaired across co-occurring dimensions than are antisocial males, and accordingly, may have elevated mental health problems.^{5,8} While community samples report moderate co-occurrence of internalizing (anxiety and affective) and externalizing (disruptive behavior and substance use) disorders in both genders,⁹ and sometimes higher co-occurrence in adolescent and young adult females than in males,^{10,11} even stronger associations might be expected when conduct problems are sufficiently severe as to result in justice system contact.¹¹ Associations between conduct and mood symptoms or diagnoses increase with age, particularly for females, perhaps reflecting secondary adverse mental health consequences for antisocial girls.⁹

A growing body of literature, predominantly focusing on males, considers the epidemiology of psychiatric disorder among youths in justice settings.¹² With few exceptions¹³ little is known about the mental health status and service needs among the strongly increasing proportion of girls with justice system contact.

Recently, Teplin¹³ reported higher disorder rates for females than males in juvenile detention, consistent with studies of adult female detainees.¹⁴ Recently, we¹² reported high levels of psychiatric disorder among incarcerated male youths. Here, we extend these findings to study justice system girls, comparing their rates of disorder to that of boys at probation intake, and

examining the contribution of both demographic and justice-related characteristics to presence and co-occurrence of disorder. We hypothesize that prevalence of disorder, beyond those expectably related to delinquency (disruptive behavior and substance use), will be higher in females, while externalizing disorders will occur at similar rates for boys and girls.

Methods

In 2001, the Texas Legislature provided for a prevalence survey of mental health needs among youths in the care of the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC). TJPC conducted diagnostic screening assessments during the intake process for youths formally referred to juvenile probation departments in Texas' eight most populous counties (Bexar, Cameron, Dallas, El Paso, Harris, Hidalgo, Tarrant, and Travis). In general, complaints by parents, police, or other agencies regarding a youth's delinquent conduct, conduct indicating a need for supervision (CINS), or violation of probation are brought to the attention of probation authorities ("intake"). Those authorities determine whether the referral should be the subject of formal court action ("formal referrals"), with less serious cases receiving less serious sanctions. The present report only considers youths who were formally referred.¹⁵ Participation was voluntary.

Subjects

Because universal assessment was unfeasible, and in order to eliminate biases that might result from certain delinquent activities occurring on certain days, each county was randomly assigned a day of the week when youths formally referred were asked to complete the Voice DISC on that same day or shortly thereafter. The start date for assessments varied across counties, resulting in a 24-28 week window in 2002, resulting in a sample of 1244 approached youths (10-17 years of age) referred to probation authorities who were asked to complete the DISC; we retrieved diagnostic data for 991 youths (79.7% of those approached; 200 girls). For

the seven counties for which TJPC had complete information on monthly totals of youths meeting inclusion criteria, approached youths represented 34-100% of all formal referrals on the assigned day; rates were higher in smaller counties with more manageable caseloads.

The 253 non-participating approached youths included 17 (1.4% of those approached) who refused, six (<1%) with oral English skills judged insufficient to complete assessment, and 12 (1%) excluded because of technical or logistical difficulties. Records for 14.1% of approached youths (n=176) were excluded because of problems with data retrieval; 3.4% of approached youths did not participate for other, unspecified, reasons (n=42). Reasons for non-participation did not differ by gender.

Procedure

Soon after arriving at the probation office, youths were asked to self-administer the DISC interview; 41.4% (n=410) youths were assessed on the day they were referred, 83.5% (n=827) were assessed within 14 days after referral. For further procedural details, see TJPC's report.¹⁶

Measures

Demographic and justice information: Information on age, race, school grade, with whom youth resided, date of juvenile probation intake, age at first referral (since 1999 automation of records), number of prior referrals (since 1999), and most serious offense for the current referral was extracted from automated justice records. Youths living with a natural, adoptive or step-parent or grandparent were coded as living with a close relative. Current offenses were designated as violent (persons- or weapons-related) or non-violent. Violent offenses included rape, assault, robbery, arson, homicide and all weapons charges; non-violent offenses included all others (e.g., non-confrontational property offenses). Components in this violence construct differed somewhat from those in the FBI's Violent

Crime Index¹⁷ primarily because few youths committed more seriously violent acts.

Psychiatric assessment: The Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (DISC)^{18,19} is a family of highly structured psychiatric interviews, based on DSM-IV criteria¹, and has been used in research investigating prevalence of disorder among justice youths.^{13,20-23} The Voice version generates past-month disorders, based on pre-recorded questions delivered via headphones (viewed simultaneously on computer screen).

We examined 21 disorders grouped into four diagnostic clusters:¹² *Disruptive Behavior Disorders (DBD), Substance Use Disorders (SUD), Affective Disorders, and Anxiety Disorders.* We considered Disruptive Behavior Disorders and Substance Use Disorders to be externalizing disorders; Affective Disorders and Anxiety Disorders reflect internalizing disorders. Because of questions regarding justice youths' capacity to accurately report impairment,¹² analyses consider criteria without impairment.

Statistical Methods

We examined gender differences in disorder, with and without controlling for demographic and offense characteristics. Logistic regression analyses predicted the likelihood of each diagnostic cluster from gender, controlling for county, ethnicity, age, academic grade, residence with close relative, days between referral and DISC, age at first referral, number of prior referrals, and whether or not the most serious current offense was violent. Because of expectably elevated rates of Separation Anxiety disorder,²⁴ analyses for the anxiety cluster were based on all other measured anxiety disorders. Interactions with gender were considered, with significant interactions retained in final models. Regression equations²⁵ including dummy variables evaluated differences among groups, at $p < .05$.

Results

Sample characteristics

Table 1 shows sample characteristics by gender, for participating and non-participating youths. Most juveniles were male (79.8%), and Hispanic (50.9%) or African American (28.7%); mean age was approximately 15 years. Most (94%) lived with close relatives. For about a third, current charges were at the felony level; for approximately a quarter, most serious current offense was characterized as violent. On average, youths had 1.5 prior TJPC referrals. Reflecting the wide range of presenting offenses, only eight youths (<1%) were transferred to adult court, and only 42 (4.2%) were remanded for secure out-of-home placement. Juveniles charged with more serious crimes began their criminal careers at slightly younger ages; for youths with violent current offenses, mean age of first referral was 13.8 vs. 14.0 years ($t_{334.4} = 2.06, p=.041$).

Among approached youths, participants had more prior referrals ($t_{604.2} = 5.26, p=.000$) and had completed more years of school ($t_{1210} = 2.95, p=.031$) than non-participants; there were no other significant differences between participants and non-participants.

---Insert Table 1 here---

For the most part, the present sample reflected the statewide composition of the Texas juvenile probation population (see Table 1). The current sample was similar to the statewide sample in gender, age, and grade but included somewhat fewer white and more Hispanic youths. Likely reflecting our focus on larger population centers, there were more felony offenses in the current sample.

Gender differences

Males and females differed somewhat in demographic and offense characteristics (Table

1). Males were slightly older than females ($t_{989} = 2.93, p = .004$), had more prior justice contacts ($t_{989} = 2.04, p = .042$), and were more likely to have felony charges ($\chi^2_1 = 22.94, p = .000$). There were no other significant gender differences in demographic or offense characteristics.

---Insert Table 2 here---

Table 2 shows rates of disorder and diagnostic clusters for the sample as a whole and by gender. Nearly half the sample reported meeting criteria for at least one disorder. Although males and females reported similar proportions of disruptive and substance use disorders, significantly more females reported anxiety ($\chi^2_1 = 13.42, p = .000$) and affective ($\chi^2_1 = 11.66, p = .000$) disorders. Significantly more females reported Social Phobia ($\chi^2_1 = 4.90, p = .027$), Specific Phobia ($\chi^2_1 = 6.64, p = .010$), Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) ($\chi^2_1 = 10.47, p = .001$), and Oppositional Defiant Disorder ($\chi^2_1 = 6.85, p = .009$). Girls' rates were elevated, though not significantly, for PTSD, Separation Anxiety Disorder, and Agoraphobia.

While boys and girls did not differ in their rates of CD, we examined whether they differed in which particular symptoms they endorsed. Boys were significantly higher only in breaking and entering (10.6% vs. 4.7%, $\chi^2_1 = 6.11, p = .013$) and staying out late (6.2% vs. 2.1%, $\chi^2_1 = 4.92, p = .026$). Girls were significantly higher only in lying (10.0% vs. 5.2%, $\chi^2_1 = 5.95, p = .015$), non-confrontational stealing (32.6% vs. 17.9%, $\chi^2_1 = 20.00, p = .000$), and running away (16.3% vs. 6.0%, $\chi^2_1 = 21.73, p = .000$). In order to determine whether the substantial gender difference in non-confrontational stealing strongly influenced our finding of no gender difference in CD, we re-ran analyses without this symptom; boys and girls remained similar in rates of CD.

As in our earlier reports, we did not include Separation Anxiety Disorder when calculating the anxiety diagnostic cluster. Rates of Separation Anxiety Disorder (Table 2) are

extraordinarily high (overall 26.5%, criteria only) in this, and other justice samples (e.g., Teplin et al.¹³) perhaps reflecting a contextual reality-based reaction to pending incarceration, as opposed to clinical disorder.²⁴

Predicting disorder from demographic and criminal offense characteristics

Table 3 presents results of logistic regression, predicting diagnostic clusters from demographic and offense characteristics. Because neither county nor days between referral and assessment yielded significant or substantial effects in any analysis, both were dropped from final models. Because results for analyses comparing associations with age and school grade, were essentially identical (data not shown), analyses are presented with age, rather than grade, in models. Final analyses controlled for gender, age, race, residence, age at first offense, number of prior referrals, and whether or not the current offense was violent. Even in adjusted analyses, females remained significantly more likely to report anxiety and affective disorders (OR=.59, $p=.023$; OR=.32, $p=.000$, respectively), with no gender differences for disruptive or substance abuse clusters.

Anxiety disorders were significantly more common in females, those younger at first referral, and those charged with a violent offense. The significant gender interaction indicated that girls charged with violent crimes were three to five times more likely than other groups to report anxiety disorders; for comparisons with non-violent girls, violent boys, and non-violent boys, ORs = 3.17, 5.51, and 4.29, p 's=.005, .000 and .000, respectively (Figure 1). Affective disorders were significantly more common in females, in older juveniles, and in those with more prior justice contacts. There were no significant gender interactions for the affective diagnostic cluster.

Youths reporting disruptive behavior disorders had significantly more prior justice

contacts and were less likely to be African American, rather than white. Living with a close relative somewhat decreased the likelihood of a disruptive disorder. The significant gender interaction (Figure 1) reflected that girls charged with violent crimes were three times as likely as their male counterparts to endorse a DBD (OR= 3.02, $p=.013$).

Those with substance use disorders were older, had significantly more prior referrals, and were less likely to be African American (compared to white). There was a significant gender by violence interaction (Figure 1): males with violent offenses were less likely than those with non-violent offenses to endorse a SUD (OR= .54, $p<.05$), while SUD was equally common in females regardless of current offense. Twenty-two percent of boys (9% of girls) whose most serious offense was non-violent were charged with substance-related crimes; by definition, current violent offenses included only persons- and weapons-related charges. Although substance disordered youth overall are somewhat less likely to be charged with a violent offense, this specificity was more characteristic of boys. Girls' substance use disorders were high in this sample, regardless of offense type.

Co-occurring Disorders

Internalizing and externalizing disorders commonly co-occurred, particularly in girls. Among youths with externalizing disorders common to justice samples, significantly more females than males with substance disorders also reported anxiety (43.2% vs. 22.1%, $\chi^2_1=8.41$, $p=.004$) or affective disorders (27.3% vs. 12.0%, $\chi^2_1=6.75$, $p=.009$). Similarly, significantly more females than males with disruptive disorders also reported anxiety (42.5% vs. 25.9%, $\chi^2_1=4.22$, $p=.040$) or affective disorders (35.0% vs. 12.0%, $\chi^2_1=12.13$, $p=.000$).

Discussion

Compared to boys, girls at probation intake report more internalizing disorders,

consistent with community samples, even controlling for personal and offense characteristics. Expectably, given that youths had to have engaged in serious misbehavior for inclusion, gender differences in externalizing disorders were not found. Despite the lack of a gender difference in rates of CD overall, girls were more likely to report covert CD symptoms than boys. Given the presence of a disorder “expectable” in a justice sample (disruptive behavior or substance use), girls are more likely to also endorse internalizing disorders. Demographic and offense characteristics explained small, but interpretable and specific, variance in diagnostic profile. Girls charged with violent offenses, compared to other groups, were three to five times as likely to report anxiety disorders. Among youths already demonstrating conduct problems by virtue of their probation processing, findings demonstrate elevated risk for internalizing disorder in girls. Regarding co-occurring disorders, then, we find support for the operation of a gender paradox for antisocial girls whereby they are more impaired across co-occurring dimensions than are male counterparts.

Gender differences in co-occurring internalizing disorders

Affective disorders. Although not all of the present sample acknowledged CD, rates for its co-occurrence with both sets of internalizing disorders are comparable to those found in community samples (i.e., approximately 15%) with slightly greater proportions of conduct disordered community youths also reporting anxiety disorders.²⁶

Higher rates of internalizing disorders are consistently found in females with CD compared to males.^{6,7} While rates of most disorders, including internalizing disorders, are higher overall in the present justice sample than in community samples²⁶ the relatively higher prevalence for females’ internalizing disorders persists.

Longitudinal comparisons demonstrate⁹ that from age 13 across adolescence, the severity

of depressive symptoms worsens substantially more for conduct disordered girls than for other groups of girls or boys. Over time, having CD predicted subsequent affective disorder substantially more strongly for girls. Our cross-sectional data, at mean age of 15, are consistent in demonstrating girls' higher rates of co-occurring affective disorder in those with demonstrated conduct problems. What remains unclear is the process by which girls' conduct problems elevate risk for subsequent affective disorder.

Anxiety disorders. Girls' rates were elevated, though not significantly so, for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Separation Anxiety Disorder, and Agoraphobia. Although the present sample size is quite large, power to detect gender differences in low prevalence disorders is limited (e.g., power to detect the significance of the nearly doubled rate of girls' PTSD was only 42.4%). With a smaller sample, Abram²⁷ reports significantly higher rates of PTSD in girls in a Chicago detention center than in boys, and higher rates for both sexes than in the current sample (overall 12% vs. 4%), highlighting again the setting-specific nature of prevalence rates. Since only 32% of TJPC's intakes statewide are detained more than 24 hours,²⁸ the present sample likely includes fewer youths with more serious criminal activity and correspondingly fewer with traumatic exposures. Although we did not find PTSD rates to be significantly different, we found gender differences in the reported PTSD triggering events: girls were more likely to report forced sexual activity (25.9% of girls vs. 5.7% of boys, $\chi^2_1 = 72.0$, $p=.000$), with boys more likely to report being threatened by a weapon (21.8% of girls vs. 43.3% of boys, $\chi^2_1 = 30.1$, $p=.000$).

Characterizing juvenile justice samples

In the present probation intake sample, substantially fewer youths meet criteria for some diagnostic clusters than previously reported for incarcerated youths, based on similar or identical

assessments; for example current rates for DBD and SUD are only 50%-60% of those found earlier.^{12,13} While it is possible that differences in rates reflect geographical factors (Texas vs. Illinois or New Jersey), they most likely reflect present inclusion criteria. Relatively few of the youths referred to TJPC would actually be detained, and probably even fewer go on to a secure facility after adjudication. Given differences in the seriousness of both criminal activity and likely future sanctions, rates of anxiety disorder are quite comparable to those reported earlier for both sexes for incarcerated samples,^{12,13} especially considering cross-study variation in assessment of anxiety disorders. It is likely that justice processing itself heightens anxiety.

This also underscores the importance of clear sample definitions in such studies. The juvenile justice system is anything but monolithic: differences occur across jurisdictions in characteristics of youths who enter, and across settings (secure/community) and processing (intake, post-adjudication). Unfortunately, prior investigations have not always been clear about the point in processing when justice youths are assessed or have combined youths assessed at multiple points. For example, one recent study of juveniles with justice system contact included youths regardless of their current placement (secure or community) and without consideration of when in processing they were assessed.^{22,29} In another recent investigation, based on checklist data with detained youths³⁰ only 30% were assessed within a day after intake (compared to 70% of the present sample): declining rates of depressive symptoms across days detained³⁰ perhaps eliminated a gender difference that might have been detected at intake.³¹

Researchers and policy makers alike must strive for clarity in defining the juvenile justice samples on which prevalence estimates are based. Because setting and processing variations impact importantly on reported mental health concerns, a recent report by the National Council on Disability³² called for research assessing the prevalence of disabilities (including psychiatric)

that move beyond incarcerated samples to examine all stages of juvenile justice system processing. The present findings suggest that, if we assess youths at system entry, rates of disorder may well be lower than those generated from systematic studies of incarcerated youth.^{12,13} Importantly, anxiety disorders appear to be comparably high at various transitions in justice processing (the current probation intake, entry into detention¹³ or entry to lengthier incarceration,¹² perhaps reflecting youths' concerns about future sanctions. As the implications for case identification and intervention are substantial, researchers need to provide juvenile justice agencies with accurate prevalence estimates so that they can anticipate such differences in rates of disorder across processing.

Programming implications

Recognizing the trend toward increasing numbers of girls, Section 223(a)(8) of the JJDP Act was modified in 1992 to require that states address gender bias in the juvenile justice system. While justice agencies have recently expressed interest in gender-specific programming to meet girls' unique needs, there is little systematic evidence to date documenting gender-unique mental health factors that might be addressed by such programming. Programs highlight increased risk for mood disorder and victimization in adolescent girls in general (e.g., Oregon Criminal Justice Commission).³³ The current investigation clarifies the unique needs of girls in a number of related areas. Beyond the expectably high rates of girls' PTSD and affective disorder, we found elevated rates of other anxiety disorders as well. Importantly, we found that girls charged with more violent and confrontational crimes are at particular risk for anxiety disorders; boys engaging in similar criminal activities do not show higher rates of anxiety disorders. If the secondary consequences of these confrontational activities are dealt with very differently by boys and girls, clinicians working with justice girls might want to consider this connection a

focus of therapy.

Limitations

Our findings, drawn from one state's most urban counties, may only apply to youths at probation intake with similar characteristics. Although we found that confrontational criminal activities may elevate risk for anxiety disorders in girls, we were unable to examine the direction of causality (i.e., does a pre-existing anxiety disorder elevate risk for girls' confrontational activity?). Clarification of this process, as well as the ways in which delinquent activity may heighten girls' risk for affective disorders, requires longitudinal studies of girls at high risk for criminal activity.

Finally, as noted, despite large sample size, power was limited to detect gender differences for low prevalence disorders; systematic study with larger samples across multiple processing points would allow researchers and policy-makers alike to better characterize the scope of mental health needs in this very vulnerable population.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by funding from the Carmel Hill Fund to the Center for Promotion of Mental Health in Juvenile Justice, Columbia University (www.promotementalhealth.org). We thank Erin Espinosa, Vonzo Tolbert, and Bill Bryan at TJPC for assistance with data collection.

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 1994.
2. Snyder H. Juvenile Arrests 2000. OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin 2002;1-11.
3. Tiet QQ, Wasserman GA, Loeber R, McReynolds L, Miller LS. Developmental and sex differences in types of conduct problems. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 2001; 10(2):181-197.
4. Eme RF, Kavanaugh L. Sex differences in conduct disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology* 1995; 24(4):406-426.
5. Eme RF. Selective female affliction in the developmental disorders of childhood: A literature review. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 1992; 21:354-364.
6. Keenan K, Loeber R, Green S. Conduct disorder in girls: A review of the literature. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 1999; 2(1):3-19.
7. Loeber R, Keenan K. Interaction between conduct disorder and its comorbid conditions: Effects of age and gender. *Clinical Psychology Review* 1994; 14(6):497-523.
8. Kataoka SH, Zima BT, Dupre DA, Moreno KA, Yang X, McCracken JT. Mental health problems and service use among female juvenile offenders: Their relationship to criminal history. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2001; 40(5):549-555.
9. Moffitt TE, Rutter M, Silva PA. Sex differences in antisocial behaviour: Conduct disorders, delinquency, and violence in the Dunedin longitudinal study. Cambridge University Press. 2000.
10. Ferdinand RF, Stijnen T, Verhulst FC, Van der Reijden M. The prevalence of self-reported problems in young adults from the general population. *Social and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 1996; 31:10-20.
11. Overbeck G, Vollebergh W, Meeus W, Engels R, Luijpers E. Course, co-occurrence, and longitudinal associations of emotional disturbance and delinquency from adolescence to young adulthood: A six-year three-wave study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 2002; 30(4):401-426.
12. Wasserman GA, McReynolds L, Lucas C, Fisher PW, Santos L. The Voice DISC-IV with incarcerated male youth: Prevalence of disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2002; 41(3):314-321.
13. Teplin LA, Abram KM, McClelland GM, Dulcan MK. Psychiatric disorders in youth in juvenile detention. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 2002; 59:1133-1143.

14. Teplin LA, Abram KM, McClelland GM. Prevalence of psychiatric disorders among incarcerated women: Pretrial jail detainees. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1996; 53:505-512.
15. Desktop guide to good juvenile probation practice. Griffin P, Torbet P, editors. 6-2-0002. Pittsburgh, PA, National Center for Juvenile Justice.
16. Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. Mental Health and Juvenile Justice in Texas. 2003. Austin, Texas, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. Website: <http://www.tjpc.state.tx.us/publications/Reports/RPTOTH200302.pdf> (Accessed: January 21, 2004).
17. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Crime in the United States 1998: Uniform crime reports. 2003. Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Justice.
18. Shaffer DM, Fisher PW, Dulcan MK, Davies M, Piacentini JC, Schwab-Stone ME et al. The NIMH Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (DISC-2.3): Description, acceptability, prevalence and performance in the MECA study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 1996; 35(7):865-877.
19. Shaffer DM, Fisher PW, Lucas C, Dulcan MK, Schwab-Stone ME. NIMH Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): Description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2000; 39(1):28-38.
20. Atkins DL, Pumariega AJ, Rogers K. Mental health and incarcerated youth. I: Prevalence and nature of psychopathology. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 1999; 8(2):193-204.
21. Duclos CW, Belas J, Novins DK, Martin C, Jewett CS, Manson SM. Prevalence of common psychiatric disorders among American Indian adolescent detainees. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 1998; 37(8):866-873.
22. Garland AF, Hough RL, McCabe KM, Yeh M, Wood PA, Aarons GA. Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in youths across five sectors of care. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2001; 40(4):409-418.
23. Randall J, Henggeler SW, Pickrel SG, Brondino MJ. Psychiatric comorbidity and the 16-month trajectory of substance-abusing and substance-dependent juvenile offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 1999; 38(9):1118-1124.
24. Schalling D. Psychopathy-related personality variables and the psychophysiology of socialization. In: Hare RD, Schalling D, Editors. *Psychopathic behavior approaches to research*. New York, New York: Wiley, 1978.
25. SPSS 11.0 for Windows. Chicago, Illinois: SPSS, Inc., 2001.
26. Angold A, Costello EJ, Erkanli A. Comorbidity. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 1999; 40(1):57-87.

27. Abram KM, Teplin LA, Charles DR, Longworth SL, McClelland GM. Posttraumatic stress disorder and trauma in youth in juvenile detention. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 2004, in press.
28. Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. The state of juvenile probation activity in Texas: Statistical and other data on the juvenile justice system in Texas for calendar year 2001. 2002. Austin, Texas.
29. McCabe KM, Lansing AE, Garland A, Hough R. Gender differences in psychopathology, functional impairment, and familial risk factors among adjudicated delinquents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2002; 41(7):860-867.
30. Dolamanta DD, Risser WL, Roberts RE, Risser JMH. Prevalence of depression and other psychiatric disorders among incarcerated youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 2003; 42(4):477-484.
31. Wasserman GA, McReynolds LS, Fisher PW, Lucas CP. Psychiatric disorders in incarcerated youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 2002; 42(9):1011.
32. National Council on Disability. Addressing the needs of youth with disabilities in the juvenile justice system: The current status of evidence-based research. 1-213. 2001. Washington, DC, National Council on Disability.
33. Oregon Criminal Justice Commission. Juvenile Crime Commission Gender Specific Programming. 2001. Website: www.ocjc.state.or.us/JCP/JCPGenderSpecific.htm (Accessed January 21, 2004).

Table 1. Sample Demographic and Offense Characteristics

	Participants						Non-participants		TJPC
	Total N=991		Males N=791		Females N=200		N=253		CY 02 ^a
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Age (years) ^b	14.7	1.4	14.7***	1.4	14.4	1.4	14.6	1.5	14.7
Last completed school grade ^c	8.3**	1.5	8.3	1.5	8.2	1.5	8.0	1.6	7.7
Number of prior formal referrals									
(since 1999) ^{b, c}	1.5	2.2	1.6*	2.2	1.3	2.0	0.9	1.4	1.1
Age at first referral	14.0	1.4	14.0	1.4	13.9	1.4	14.1	1.6	14.1
Days between referral and DISC	13.6	37.5	12.9	37.3	16.4	38.1	---	---	---
Gender									
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	%
Male	791	79.8	791	100.0	---	---	190	75.1	75.0
Female	200	20.2	---	---	200	100.0	63	24.9	25.0
Residence with close relative	812	94.3	643	94.1	169	94.9	206	92.4	91.2
Ethnicity									
African-American	279	28.2	223	28.2	56	28.0	70	27.7	26.8
Hispanic	504	50.9	409	51.7	95	47.5	134	53.0	46.9
White	195	19.7	148	18.7	47	23.5	43	17.0	24.9
Other	13	1.3	11	1.4	2	1.0	6	2.4	1.4
Most Serious Current Offense									
Violent	224	22.6	179	22.6	45	22.5	62	24.5	28.6
Felony charges ^b	357	36.0	314	39.7***	43	21.5	86	34.0	26.9

^a Population of formal referrals to juvenile probation authorities in eight participating counties for Calendar Year (CY) 2002, N=21,476.

^b Significant gender difference. ^c Participants > non-participants, $p < .001$. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 2. Voice DISC Diagnostic Profiles for Overall Sample and by Gender (N=991)^a

Disorder	Overall		Males (n= 791)		Females (n= 200)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No DISC Disorder	538	54.3	437	55.2	101	50.5
Any DISC Disorder	453	45.7	354	44.8	99	49.5
Any Anxiety Disorder (w/o SA)^b	196	19.8	138	17.4	58	29.0***
Agoraphobia	90	9.2	65	8.3	25	12.8
Generalized Anxiety Disorder	34	3.5	28	3.6	6	3.1
Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder	52	5.4	41	5.3	11	5.7
Panic Disorder	28	2.9	22	2.8	6	3.0
PTSD	39	4.0	27	3.5	12	6.2
Social Phobia	53	5.4	36	4.6	17	8.5*
Specific Phobia	69	7.1	47	6.1	22	11.4*
Separation Anxiety	204	26.5	160	25.1	44	32.8
Any Affective Disorder	73	7.4	47	5.9	26	13.0**
Manic Episode	9	0.9	8	1.0	1	0.5
Hypomanic Episode	12	1.2	8	1.0	4	2.1
Major Depressive Disorder ^c	61	6.3	39	5.1	22	11.4**
Dysthymic Disorder	2	0.2	1	0.1	1	0.5
Any Disruptive Disorder	198	20.0	158	20.0	40	20.0
ADHD	10	1.1	9	1.2	1	0.5
Conduct Disorder ^d	172	18.0	140	18.3	32	16.8
Oppositional Defiant	61	6.4	41	5.3	20	10.5**

Any Substance Use Disorder	252	25.4	208	26.3	44	22.0
Alcohol Abuse	66	7.0	56	7.3	10	5.4
Alcohol Dependence	31	3.1	24	3.0	7	3.5
Marijuana Abuse	90	9.5	75	9.9	15	8.1
Marijuana Dependence	121	12.8	100	13.2	21	11.3
Other Substance Abuse	28	3.0	21	2.8	7	3.8
Other Substance Dependence	34	3.6	25	3.3	9	4.9

^a Because of early termination, prevalence for some diagnoses is based on slightly reduced N; ^b W/o SA = Anxiety diagnostic cluster does not consider presence of Separation Anxiety; ^c Present State DISC and DSM-IV criteria necessitate that youth with MDD do not also receive a disorder of Dysthymia; ^d Past six months.

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Table 3. Predictors of DISC Diagnostic Clusters


Predictor Variables	Any Anxiety Disorder		Any Affective Disorder		Any Disruptive Disorder		Any Substance Use Disorder	
	OR (95% CI)	R ² ^a	OR (95% CI)	R ²	OR (95% CI)	R ²	OR (95% CI)	R ²
Gender (male vs. female)	.59 (.37-.93) **	.025	.32 (.18-.56) ***	.028	1.32 (.80-2.18)	.000	1.40 (.88-2.24)	.003
Age	1.22 (.96-1.55)	.026	1.44 (1.01-2.04) *	.046	.85 (.65-1.10)	.004	1.29 (1.02-1.63) *	.057
Race		.028		.046		.014		.109
<i>African Amer. vs. White</i>	.99 (.60-1.65)		.79 (.38-1.68)		.50 (.30-.85) **		.27 (.16-.46) ***	
<i>Hispanic vs. White</i>	.81 (.51-1.28)		.75 (.38-1.47)		.71 (.46-1.10)		.86 (.57-1.28)	
Close kin residence	.83 (.41-1.68)	.030	.79 (.29-2.15)	.048	.54 (.28-1.04)	.022	1.07 (.52-2.23)	.109
Age at first offense	.72 (.57-.91) **	.065	.79 (.57-1.10)	.098	1.26 (.98-1.63)	.025	1.08 (.87-1.36)	.120
Number prior referrals	1.04 (.94-1.15)	.066	1.20 (1.06-1.36) **	.119	1.22 (1.11-1.35) ***	.055	1.20 (1.09-1.31) ***	.142
Violent current offense	2.67 (1.29-5.74) *	.067	1.58 (.86-2.91)	.124	1.87 (.77-4.58)	.057	1.62 (.66-4.00)	.148
Violent offense * Gender	.34 (.14-.84) *	.077			.32 (.11-.90) *	.065	.33 (.12-.92) *	.154

^a Cumulative Nagelkerke's R² for Logistic Regression from SPSS


*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Figure 1. Interaction between gender and violent offense in predicting DISC diagnostic clusters^a

a. Anxiety Disorder



b. Disruptive Behavior Disorder



^a Exponentiated sum of unstandardized beta coefficients controlling for age, ethnicity, residence with close relative, age at first referral, and number of prior referrals.

c. Substance Use Disorder

