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Background

• According to the FBI, in 2010, there were 1.6 million arrests of persons under the age of 18. (FBI, 2011)
  – 440,000 for violent or property-related crimes
• Involvement in the juvenile justice system is a risk factor for involvement in the adult system. (Winner, Lanza-Kadue, Bishop, & Frazier, 1997)

Background

• Adults who were arrested as youth are more likely to develop mental health and substance use concerns in adulthood. (Corneau & Lanctot, 2004)

• Significant unmet mental health needs in the juvenile justice system. (Cocozza & Skowyra, 2000)
Background

• Risk factors for juvenile arrest
  – Friends who have been arrested
  – Substance use
  – Lack of involvement with family

• Clinicians are often well-positioned to identify these risk factors and to intervene to mitigate them

System of Care Principles

• Coordinated care across multiple systems
• Evidence-based, developmentally appropriate services
• Youth-guided care, individualized treatment, cultural and linguistically competent services
National Evaluation of Systems of Care

• National evaluation of Children’s Mental Health Initiative (CMHI)
  – SAMHSA-funded initiative
  – Grantees initially funded from 2002 to 2010
  – Data collected up to December 2013 on outcomes of children and youth receiving system of care services

Arrest Rate at 6 Months

• Of the 2,835 youth, who reported at entry into system of care services that they had never been arrested
  – 188 (6.6%) were arrested within 6 months of entering services
Research Question

• What factors are associated with the chances of being arrested after 6 months in System of Care services?

Measures

• Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)
• Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS)
• Caregiver Strain Questionnaire (CGSQ)
• Youth Services Survey (YSS)
• Youth report on several questions
Demographics of Study Participants, Grantees Initially Funded 2002 - 2010

- 2,835 youth, aged 11 and older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At/Near Poverty</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Poverty</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

- Mean Age: 14.02

Race/Ethnicity

- American Indian/Alaska Native: 4.9%
- Asian: 4.3%
- Black/African-American: 27.1%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1.4%
- White/Caucasian: 44.5%
- Multiracial: 16.9%

Method

- To determine if initial symptoms and strengths are related to likelihood of arrest
- Binary logistic regression
  - Outcome at 6 months: Arrested or not
  - Stepwise model
  - Predictors: Age, gender, BERS Overall Strengths Scale, CBCL Internalizing Scale, CBCL Externalizing Scale, CGSQ Global Strain Scale (all at intake)
Preliminary Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Exp B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Externalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Externalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Internalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>(.049)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Externalizing symptoms are a risk factor
- Internalizing symptoms seem to be protective
- Baseline levels of strengths, age, and gender all non-significant in this regression
- Must control for these factors in subsequent analyses

Method

- Need to determine what factors at 6 months are associated with a reduction in likelihood of arrest
Method

- Binary logistic regression
  - Outcome at 6 months: Arrested or not
  - Stepwise model
  - Predictors
    - CBCL Internalizing and Externalizing T-Score (baseline)
    - Productive engagement - enrolled in school, work
    - Stable living environment
    - Presence of a supportive adult
    - Participation in services
    - Change in caregiver strain (Reliable Change Index; RCI)
    - Change in behavioral/emotional strengths (RCI)
    - Change in CBCL Symptoms (RCI)

Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Exp B</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Externalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Internalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>(.055)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Caregiver Strain (yes/no)</td>
<td>(.558)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Living Situation (yes/no)</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation in Services</td>
<td>(.288)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth is Working (yes/no)</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a Supportive Adult (yes/no)</td>
<td>(.374)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses

- Previous analyses only show association between variables. Need to see whether these cross-sectional effects on arrest rate hold over time.

- Looked to see whether the same variables were predictive of arrests at 12 months (n = 1,421)

- Logistic regression, including baseline externalizing and internalizing symptoms, and significant variables from previous analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Exp B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Externalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCL Internalizing T-Score (intake)</td>
<td>(.061)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Caregiver Strain (yes/no)</td>
<td>(.437)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Living Situation (yes/no)</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation in Services</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth is Working (yes/no)</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a Supportive Adult (yes/no)</td>
<td>(.736)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

• Changes in caregiver strain, presence of a supportive adult, and having a youth who actively participated in services was protective against arrest
  – Maintaining a stable living situation and being employed had negative effects
• Marginal evidence that caregiver strain reduction continued to have an effect at 12 months

Discussion and Implications

• Several factors associated with reduction in arrest
  – Supportive adults, engaging the youth, reducing caregiver strain
  – Support for not only treating the youth but also paying attention to the entire environment in which the youth lives
• Which way does the caregiver strain reduction and arrest relationship flow?
  – Perhaps it flows both ways
  – If reduction in caregiver strain really does predict reduction in the likelihood of arrest, it might be an argument for addressing the needs of both of the youth and the caregiver.
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