

Juvenile Justice Reform: Social and Legal Implications and the Effectiveness of Rehabilitation Programs

Syed Ali Abbas Abidi¹, Dr. Muhammad Shahid Sultan², Hamza Khalil Chaudhary³,
Zulfiqar Hussain⁴

1. Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto University of Law, Email: saaa@szabul.edu.pk
2. Assistant professor in Law, GC University, Faisalabad, Pakistan, Email: shahid6023@yahoo.com
3. Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto University of Law Karachi, Email: hamza.khalil@szabul.edu.pk
4. University of Geo-science China, Email: zulfiqarhussain745@gmail.com

Abstract

Juvenile justice systems worldwide are shifting from punitive approaches toward developmentally informed, rights-based, and evidence-driven models. This paper synthesizes legal frameworks, social science theory, and program evaluation evidence to assess how reform affects young people, communities, and public safety. Upon considering international norms and comparative domestic practice, we look at the social consequences of reform such as equity, stigma and long-term socioeconomic consequences and the legal consequences of due process, proportionality, and age at which the individual should be subject to criminal responsibility. We then assess the effectiveness of our most popular models of rehabilitation (e.g. diversion, restorative justice, cognitive-behavioural therapy, family-based treatments and re-entry supports) stating what works, to whom, and in what circumstances. The review demonstrates steady advantages of developmentally suitable, community-based interventions especially family-based therapies and skill-training programs, when administered with fidelity and combined with education, mental-health care, and planned aftercare. Custodial sanctions generally show neutral or iatrogenic effects on recidivism and life outcomes. The paper closes with a reform blueprint emphasizing legal alignment with international norms, targeted investment in proven programs, robust implementation infrastructure, and data transparency to ensure equitable, durable impact.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Human Rights Standards, United Nations Convention on The Rights of The Child (CRC), Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility (MACR), Rehabilitation, Reintegration, Beijing Rules

Introduction

Juvenile justice reform is in the intersection of developmental science, human rights, criminology, and fiscal stewardship. Modern neuroscience demonstrates that adolescence is a phase of high neuroplasticity characterized by an imbalance between limbic reward circuits that mature faster and more slowly developing cortical control systems; this maturational imbalance contributes to explain greater reward sensitivity, vulnerability to social context, and risk-taking without necessarily indicating reduced capacity to change (Zanolie et al., 2022). It is interesting to note that peer sensitivity is not necessarily neutral: in particular circumstances, it is possible to stimulate prosocial learning and influence affective regulation using peer processes, which is why it is necessary to argue in support of developmentally sensitive reactions, rather than retributive ones, strictly speaking (M. I. Khan & Qadri, 2023). Children against the law are

viewed by international human rights law as entities who deserve dignity, participation, and reintegration as rights-holders. This strategy is unified in the General Comment No. 24 of the U.N. Committee on the Rights of the Child: the authors argue that states should increase or set a reasonable minimum age of criminal responsibility, focus on diversion, no life imprisonment without parole should be used on children, and the latter should be imprisoned only as a last resort and as little as possible (Majeed et al., 2024). The much earlier soft law tools, i.e., the Beijing Rules and the Havana Rules, also focus on proportionality, responses that are individual and the use of rehabilitation as the first option in preference to punishment. Collectively these standards define that the core policy issue is not whether or not youth should be held accountable, but rather how this can be done in a manner that aligns with their developmental abilities and reintegration opportunities (F. A. Ahmed et al., 2025; Fatima et al., 2024). The empirical evidence emphasises that custodial strategies tend to fall short of public-safety indicators and may be iatrogenic. A massive quasi-experimental study and syntheses thereafter conclude that pretrial juvenile detention is linked with increased future felony and misdemeanor recidivism, and this finding is congruent with the mechanism including peer contagion and disruption of prosocial ties (Baron, 2024; Walker & Herting, 2020). Recent systematic reviews also find youth incarceration as associated with adverse developmental and social outcomes, which lends credence to the argument that decarceration and community-based alternatives are needed (Ackerman et al., 2024; Merlo, 2025). Meanwhile, the amount of short- and multi-year rear arrests can also be decreased with the help of the well-designed diversion which cannot contradict the restorative practices but is also a powerful randomized evidence to prove that it can be held responsible and safe instead of the traditional prosecution (Shem-Tov et al., 2024). It is against this backdrop that rehabilitation can be not only normative but empirical. A meta-review of 40 years of assessments shows that interventions targeting juveniles on average lead to major improvements in recidivism, and the effect sizes depend on the modality of the program and its quality of implementation (Pappas and Dent, 2021/2023). Family- and system-based models (e.g., Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and Functional Family Therapy (FFT)) exhibit small-to-moderate aggregate effects and may be cost-effective when done with fidelity, although recent revisions warn that they may have heterogeneous and context-specific effects (Sethi, 2025). The restorative youth justice, in its turn, is marked by quite low average rates of delinquency reduction compared to traditional processing, and the studies with the strictest design and supervision, confirming the benefits, only in a portion of the settings (Kimbrell et al., 2023). In general, science and law are converging to a more youth-oriented, rapidly evolving paradigm of juvenile justice that makes teenagers responsible adults; invests in diversion and family based services; and uses confinement only in exceptional circumstances- a more sensible approach to life path and to social safety.

Legal Architecture of Juvenile Justice

The international legal framework of juvenile justice is based on the sound principles of safeguarding the children who become the object of the criminal justice system. It is stipulated that juveniles should be treated with dignity, reformed, and restored to the community and that responsibility should be equated with the realization that children can be reformed.

United Nations Convention on The Rights of Children (CRC).

The international law of juvenile justice is led by the Convention on the Rights of the Child which was adopted in 1989 (CRC). Article 40 provides principles in the treatment of children who are in conflict with the law and that children should be treated in a manner that is congruent with their age. It upholds their right to privacy, legal protection and education too (Nwachukwu, 2023). Article 37 similarly prohibits torture or degrading treatment, but detention must only be employed as a last resort, and should be as brief as possible. Besides this, the CRC also emphasizes the importance of rehabilitating the child as well as reintegrating them into

productive life within the society (Ranta, 2023). In 2019, the Committee on the Rights of the Child adopted General Comment No. 24, which expounded the principles of the CRC, which in turn said that the minimum age of criminal responsibility (MACR) must be set at at least 14, and possibly between 15 and 16, depending on developmental science. It also highlighted the fact that life imprisonment without parole is something that should never be imposed on children, a concept that supports the argument that children are capable of change and rehabilitation (Iffan, 2023).

The Beijing Rules (1985)

The Beijing Rules are a set of rules that were established by the United Nations on the manner in which juvenile offenders are to be treated, commonly known as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules of the Administration of Juvenile Justice. The Rules further state that juvenile justice systems should be compared with adult justice systems and they should apply diversion, rehabilitation and reintegration in lieu of punitive detention. Under rule 5, it is specifically stated that the deprivation of liberty should be used in the last resort and within the shortest time possible. The Rules promote proceedings that are child sensitive, and where appropriate, restorative methods of justice (Agu, 2025).

The Riyadh Guidelines (1990)

The Riyadh Guidelines are designed to assist in the prevention of juvenile delinquency through the treatment of underlying causes of the disease via community-based approaches and early intervention. The need to enlist families, schools and communities in ensuring that children are not brought into the criminal justice system is highlighted in the Guidelines adopted in 1990. They also need a social, economic and educational approach to the life of children (Nurzakiah et al., 2025).

The Havana Rules (1990)

The Havana Rules are related with the treatment that juveniles who deprived of their liberty should be treated. Another area where they focus on treating juveniles is the humane treatment and dignity. Rehabilitation and returning to the society should be the main purpose of the detention. The Rules demand the right to learn, to professional training, to psychological help and the opportunity to stay in contact with the family (Cantwell, 2025).

Life imprisonment and Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility.

The collective assertion by international instruments is that juveniles should not be subjected to life imprisonment without parole because children do not deserve irrevocable and overly punitive actions. One of the crucial limits that must be taken into consideration is the minimum age of criminal responsibility (MACR), as at this stage a child can be questioned in relation to a crime using the law. The CRC and the General Comment No. 24 call on nations to establish the MACR as high as possible, preferably 14, 15 or 16 (O'Connor, 2025). This is an acknowledgment of the fact that younger children are still in the maturity phase so they cannot truly appreciate the outcomes of their behaviours. Another idea supported by the General Comment is that the youth should be abolished as a form of life imprisonment without parole since children can reform and change (Wong, 2024).

Domestic Trends

Most countries have been responding to international standards by making important reforms to their juvenile systems of justice in order to bring them in line with these international standards. These changes are based on an increased awareness of the differences in development between children and adults and the necessity of a justice system that recognizes these differences.

Another important juvenile justice reform is the increase of minimum criminal responsibility (MACR). To make sure that children below a certain age cannot be prosecuted, many countries have increased the age at which a child can be prosecuted. The MACR in England and Wales was increased to 12 in 2018 (previously 10), which is closer to the cognitive and emotional development of children. Likewise, in Scotland criminal responsibility increased to 12 years in 2019 (Crofts, 2023). There are a few jurisdictions that have embraced presumption-of-doli-incapax systems, where children under a specific age are considered to be incompetent because of their lack of understanding. According to these frameworks, exceptions are possible but the onus has been put on the prosecution to prove that the child had knowledge of what they were doing (Haysom, 2022). The other important reform is limiting transfers of juveniles to adult courts. The likelihood of a juvenile being tried in a juvenile court in many countries has increased nowadays in cases where the juvenile has committed a serious criminal offense. This metamorphosis is an indication that different children and adults should be subjected to different legal processes and punishment. An example of this is that in the United States, a number of states have amended the laws, which prevent transfer of children according to the seriousness of the offence, and the developmental stage of the child and the courts must evaluate the likelihood of the child being rehabilitated prior to passing the judgment (McAra & McVie, 2024). The end of life imprisonment without parole of juveniles can be considered one of the most important reforms of the recent years. The landmark *Miller v. In Alabama* (2012) the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that a juvenile life sentence without any chance of parole is invalid because it contravenes the Eighth Amendment, which forbids cruel and unusual punishment. After this decision, several jurisdictions eliminated or limited the use of life sentences in juveniles to no-parole status. Another point in favor of the child being spared the irreversible punishment is the fact that life imprisonment of minors without parole was also declared unconstitutional in Canada (Leslie, 2023). Most juvenile justice systems have also adopted diversion and restorative justice practices which focus on rehabilitating and reintegrating offenders instead of punishing them (DiCarlo, 2022). Diversion is the process of steering young offenders out of the formal system of justice through community-based initiatives, counselling or restorative justice meetings. Restorative justice is aimed at healing the damage and restoring the relationships between the offender, the victim and the community. Family Group Conferencing and Youth Court Diversion are two programs that are gaining popularity in the United States (Duncan, 2021).

Key Legal Implications

Juvenile justice and its operations are highly influenced by legal changes and trends in juvenile justice particularly in the areas of proportionality, due process, non-discrimination, and data and accountability. The assumption of lesser culpability of juveniles has the support of developmental science. Teenagers are more likely to make hasty decisions, and they are more susceptible to peer pressure; thus, they are not as responsible in the moral sense. There will be a proportionality principle, and the penalty will be proportional to the crime, and, also, the age of the minor. Juvenile justice systems will be more permissive and more rehabilitative-oriented (Johnson, 2022; McGreevy, 2020). The juvenile courts must grant juvenile offenders due process and the right to counsel, fair hearings and participation in their defence. A court must be approachable to a child and mindful of his emotional and psychological needs. What is more, procedural justice plays a significant role in ensuring the legitimacy of the system because any juvenile who feels that the justice process is not just might be reluctant to obey the law (Beer, 2025; Seeds, 2022). Juvenile justice is founded on non-discrimination, and race, ethnicity, gender, disability, and indigenous status should never play a role in the enforcement of the law. Research indicates that minority and marginalized youth are overrepresented in the justice system and usually receive harsher punishment. Legal changes are needed to correct these differences to protect all youth equally before the law (Fortenberry, 2022). Juvenile justice systems should be responsible by gathering and sharing information about arrests, detention, and

sentencing and post release outcomes. Disaggregated data can be used to identify racial differences or ethnic differences, and the success of the reforms can be measured. Some of the mechanisms that have been used to instil trust among the people and enable the juvenile justice systems to work and be fair towards the people include transparency and accountability (Isaac, 2025; McGinnis, 2014).

Social Implications of Juvenile Justice Reform

Social implications of juvenile justice reform do not accrue to juveniles alone, their families, or the society at large. The reforms are aimed at both the rehabilitation of the individual child, as well as, at the societal implications broadly, particularly, public safety, recidivism, education, economic mobility and equity. In this part the author will take one step further to clarify these social implications as a way of enhancing the nature of the evidence based practices the systemic biases and what the society needs to do to come up with a way of reversing juvenile delinquency and why it should not do more harm (Abbas et al., 2022). It is believed that among the fundamental aims of juvenile justice reform is to enhance the degree of citizen safety by reducing recidivism. Secure jail custody or institutionalized confinement of a juvenile has been observed to have retaliatory effects that are counterproductive in the long term. In contrast to the perception that prisons deter juveniles committing crimes in the future, studies have shown that protective detention in most cases encourages recidivism because juveniles are exposed to adverse influences of peer contagion, trauma, and loss of developmental and educational opportunities (Sati, 2024). Punitive incarceration is unlikely to be better than community-based options in minimizing recidivism. This is a fact and the likelihood of juveniles reoffending after being incarcerated in secure facilities surpasses the likelihood of juveniles reoffending after being diverted or placed under probation services (S. Khan, 2023). The negative effects of secure confinement are connected to the following factors: first, the fact that the juveniles are pronounced delinquents, which can lead to internalized stigma and the loss of self-esteem. It is also a stigma that can be linked with a crime recidivism because not only will it make the teens feel more attached to his or her crime, but it will also allow him or her to be prepared to commit a crime again (Nazim et al., 2024). Peer contagion is another important factor as well. Safe prisons typically contain juveniles in the same prison with individuals that have committed serious crimes. The more grave criminal attitudes and behaviour can be encouraged to cause such exposure (Shahidullah & Das, 2017). The peer pressure within these settings can destroy the rehabilitative quality of detention and predispose persons to recidivism.

Trauma, Educational Disruption.

Another way that incarceration leads to trauma among juveniles is through their exposure to violence in secure facilities, lack of family, friends, and community. Children have high rates of childhood trauma (battering, neglect, witnessing violence, etc.) and going through the institutionalization process can further worsen the state of those youths who were already exposed to the trauma (Hakeem et al., 2025). This is because trauma can affect the emotional control system and thinking capacity, so juveniles will find it harder to be successfully integrated back into society. Further, a major impact of detention is educational disruption. Young offenders who are incarcerated have little access to education and when they do receive education the quality of the education is usually of poor standards. Not only does this deprive these people of the intellectual and social opportunities it deprives them of economic opportunities in the future as well. Interruption of schooling, coupled with the stigma of incarceration, tends to lead to a decreased sense of self-efficacy and lower capacity to perform in school after release (W. A. Malik, 2019).

Community-Based Alternatives

As it is proved, a community-based program, i.e. diversion program, addressing probation and restorative justice practices is more appropriate in the prevention of recidivism than a detention punishment. Such programs are not typically aimed at punishing delinquency, but rather addressing the factors that lead to delinquent behavior, e.g. dysfunctional family members, substance abuse, mental health problems, etc. The Multi-systemic Therapy (MST) and the Functional Family Therapy (FFT) plus its mechanisms as graphically illustrated structures have been along the right track, or beyond any doubt, in terms of the containment of recidivism with regards to inclusion of the family and behavioral intercessions (Ullah & Bakhsh, 2024). These options can mitigate the negative effects of institutionalization since by keeping the juveniles within their communities and involving their families and social networks in the rehabilitation process juveniles can continue to enjoy good relationships and connections with their communities. Additionally, they provide a much more thorough picture of the issue of juvenile delinquency that will be more effective in the long-term in connection with recidivism and re-entry(Saeed et al., n.d.).

Education and Economic Mobility

Juvenile justice intervention can have a notable effect on the education and future economic mobility of a young person. Research has established that justice involvement disrupts education and has negative long term effects in employment and earnings. In the majority of juveniles in the justice system, particularly when prison is involved, a lifetime impact on education can occur (Kosar, 2024). A majority of juveniles are already in the justice system because they have been having problems with school work. Many young offenders also have a history of poor school performance, school absenteeism and school disengagement easily resulting in a higher risk of getting into the juvenile justice system (Faisal et al., 2024). However, when they are taken to the justice system, these educational issues are likely to get worse. Juvenile inmates are often taken out of their learning settings at length, which further disrupts their learning. The quality of education offered in most juvenile detention centres is inadequate, in addition to the infrequent opportunity to achieve academically or develop skills (Yousaf et al., 2025). The educational deprivation in the prisons is especially alarming since education is an important variable in the prevention of the poverty-crime cycle. Through education, people have the skills necessary to work, be financially independent and socially mobile, and lack of access to education in juvenile incarceration can greatly decrease the likelihood of a young adult attaining these life objectives(Shahab et al., 2020). The goal of effective juvenile justice reforms is to decrease school exclusion, expand access to education within institutions, and concentrate on credit transfer and release re-enrolment. Improving education results and reducing recidivism can be helped by detention centres providing programs to keep the juveniles connected with education to the juvenile justice system in a detention facility in school (Manzoor et al., 2024). Others which have contributed to the disruption of education and re-integration of juveniles in normal education facilities include policies which enable transfer of academic credits during the incarceration period and smooth re-enrolment of juveniles in the regular education facilities after release (Niazi et al., 2016). The economic cost in the long run of juvenile involvement to justice is astronomical. Education level is also associated with adolescent offence and then with work and income (Tabassam & Shehzad, 2023). Prison, in particular, reduces the chances of good employment due to the fact that a criminal record is stigmatized, not to mention the break in educational and vocational training. Juvenile reforms that focus on keeping juveniles in school and training them in education and professional skills play a major role in ensuring better economic mobility in future. It also can be work training or apprenticeship, and other instructional tools that will allow the juveniles to learn skills that will help them get better jobs in the future (Peer, 2024). Juvenile justice reform would have a colossal economic payback to the youth offenders; there would be less recidivism and the juvenile justice system would have

more avenues of integration into the society as it would no longer act as a liability to the education sector and provide more job opportunities.

Equity and the “School-to-Prison Pipeline”

The term school-to-prison pipeline describes how school disciplinary practices, the presence of law enforcement in schools, and racial/ethnic biases within the justice system all contribute to over representing minority youth within the juvenile justice system. Research has established that, Black and Latino as well as low income youths and youth tend to be more arrested, incarcerated and detained than their white counterparts (Ofori & Yankyerah, 2022). High rates of racial and ethnic minority youth in the juvenile justice are a dire problem and must be corrected by enacting systematically changes. One of the biggest issues that contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline is Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). Black and Latino children represent minority youth that are disproportionately arrested and placed in the juvenile justice system as a result of disciplinary problems (Liston, 2022). It has been found that zero-tolerance policy and other school disciplinary actions have a disproportionately negative effect on minority students and often result in minor offenders being suspended or expelled, which exposes this group to an increased risk of being involved in law enforcement and being placed in the juvenile justice system (Emidy, 2023). These punitive measures also help in the school-to-prison pipeline by sending students out of schools and into prisons. The Role of Police in Schools: This has worsened the school-to-prison pipeline because the presence of more police in schools has criminalized behaviour that was formerly addressed by school staff. More student arrests on non-violent misdemeanours (e.g. truancy or fighting) have also been associated with School Resource Officer (SRO) presence in schools (T. Baig et al., 2025). Although the rationale behind the deployment of police officers in schools is usually the desire to keep schools safe, it has also led to the criminalization of normal adolescent behaviour especially among minority students resulting in their early engagement with the justice system. Bias-Reducing/Culturally Responsible Services: Reforms to mitigate bias and culturally responsive services should be implemented to help reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth within the juvenile justice system. The aim of these changes is to minimise the racial gap in this system by attempting to change the implicit biases of the school employees, the police and the governors of the justice system. Others include practices that raise awareness among teachers, school resource officers and juvenile justice professionals regarding cultural competence and implicit bias (Yoon, 2022). Community partnership on top of this is central to narrowing the equity gap. Local stakeholders can play a key role in the development of equitable systems that are capable of meeting the needs of minority youth through community participation in the development and implementation of juvenile justice reforms or restorative justice programs (A. A. Ahmed, 2022).

Well-Being of Family and Community.

Juvenile offenders cannot be successfully rehabilitated without the contribution of families and communities. It is established that programs that included caregivers and natural supports, family members, mentors and community leaders performed better when working with juveniles. Not only can intervention of families meet compliance rate with rehabilitation programs, but also intervention of families can meet to affect the effects of stress reduction and healthy relationship which is the overall aim of designing long-term behavior change (Crawford & Burns, 2022). Family engagement in juvenile justice reform can be achieved in many forms such as: family therapy, parent training (one-on-one), and family group conferencing. Evidence exists that these programs do improve communications, reduce conflict, and increase family bonding which ultimately will yield good outcomes in the juvenile under concern. Moreover, family engagement can address certain factors that underlie dysfunctional family relationships, substance abuse and

mental health issues by providing families with resources and skills that enable their successful parenting (Niaz et al., 2024). The less recidivistic rehabilitative environment can be moved into the more developed community environment through investments in youth work and employment, violence intervention programmes and neighbourhood support system. Good role models will help occupy the juveniles and job training and educating the juveniles and inculcating skills in the juveniles which will reflect in future can be designed. Another program that also coincidentally happens to be effective, at least in the case of youth violence and safer communities in general, is the so-called violence interruption programs (Naseem et al., 2019). Moreover, the juveniles can be offered mechanisms and facilities to perform better in the extrajudicial system by developing infrastructure within the neighbourhood; cheap houses, mental health facilities and recreational facilities. These are community-based investments which are complementary to case-level interventions, and constitute an integrated approach to juvenile justice reform. The repercussions of juvenile justice reform are appallingly social in nature. Less punishment by detention, more rehabilitation, education, and community-based alternatives would reduce recidivism rates significantly, and youthful offenders would record more successful outcomes over time. Reforms in juvenile justice can assist in enhancing equity and community safety through reducing the systemic biases that underlie disproportional minority contact, more effectively engaging families and communities, and offering greater educational and economic opportunity (Raza et al., 2024). Finally, the justice system bringing about such reforms will be applied to prevent the formation of the criminal cycle and react positively to the welfare of the community in general and, in the most basic terms, the welfare of the children who belong to the community.

What Works in Rehabilitation? A Synthesis of Evidence

Few decades ago the idea of rehabilitation has turned out to be a main aspect of the juvenile justice reform, and gradually an increased focus is being given to the interventions that can correct the factors which result in development of delinquency and help the youth to be reintegrated in the society. It is part of a broader shift in focus towards models of purely punitive justice to models of recidivism reduction and accountability and positive outcomes among youth (Abdullah et al., 2025). The evidence indicates that one of the most promising interventions in terms of reoffending reductions and improved long-term outcomes includes interventions based on the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) framework and the complementary Good Lives Model (GLM). Patient and practice-based interventions grounded in these models and focusing on the significance of targeting risk factors, meeting the needs of individuals, and applying evidence-based interventions that are specific to each youth have proven consistently superior to generic sanctions or penalties (Nayyab et al., 2025).

Diversion and Early Intervention

The Role of Diversion Programs

Diversion programs are crucial in reforming juvenile justice in that the programs do not expose the juvenile to formal processing within the justice system, therefore, eliminating the stigma associated with criminal charges and reducing the likelihood of recidivism. In prosecutor or police diversion, the practices commonly include issuing a warning, conditionalized warnings, referring juveniles to community programs, or referring juveniles to community based programs rather than arresting them. These approaches will significantly reduce official handling and eradicate the negative effects of official handling of the justice system such as criminal records and institutionalization (Khadam et al., 2025). The evidence indicates that when implemented effectively, small-to-moderate reductions in recidivism are experienced in diversion programs. According to Bonta & Andrews, (2023), these diversion programs are linked with lower offense rates than other types of punitive intervention as they provide the right service (such as

counselling services, education, and family support) to young offenders. Interestingly, such programs are also cheaper than imprisonment and detention, and therefore, they are a more cost-efficient method of juvenile justice. Effective diversion programs should have clear eligibility criteria whereby, instead of going through the due process of law, the relevant juveniles should be diverted. Legitimacy also requires victim consent where necessary, to ensure that the requirements of the victims are taken into account during the process (Basra, 2022). In addition, quick service connection is crucial in providing the diverted youth with the support they require at an opportune moment. The faster juveniles are directed to mental health counselling services or education programs, the more they could get those services and avoid any further involvement in the justice system (F. A. Ahmed et al., 2025).

Restorative Justice (RJ)

Concept and Effectiveness: Restorative justice (RJ) is an approach that emphasizes the reconciliation of harm caused by criminal behavior, involving responsibility, dialogue between the victim and the offender and community involvement. Juveniles have the opportunity to learn the consequences of their actions on victims, accept the responsibility of their own actions and actively engage in the process of making amends through RJ programs, like family group conferencing and victim-offender mediation. Not only the victims would have been happier, but the sense of responsibility in the young offenders would be felt, and if it is felt in the overwhelming majority of cases, even when the property crime and minor offenders commit the violent offenses, that reduction in the recidivism rate would have taken place (Sherman et al., 2015). The evidence regarding effectiveness of RJ is encouraging but differs depending on the nature of the offense and quality of program implementation. Shah et al., (2020) found that in the presence of an adequately prepared facilitator and on a voluntary basis, RJ programs can lead to minor reductions in recidivism and higher victim satisfaction. Studies indicate that RJ best works with non-violent or low level violent juvenile offenses. This advantage of RJ, however, is most likely to reduce when more serious crimes are considered or repeat offenders (Din et al., 2021; Riaz & Amjad, 2019). Restorative justice requires that programs should be guided by trained professionals, since untrained facilitation may negate the process. In addition, the attendance of RJ programs must be voluntary because when forced, this can reduce the possible advantages. Finally, the program should be constructed to address the interests of the victim and the offender in such a way that both parties are addressed and the end result satisfactory to all (Chaudhary et al., 2024).

Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT) and Skills Training

Cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) is a popular treatment that focuses on negative thinking and maladaptive behaviours by replacing them with healthier and more beneficial reactions. CBT is especially useful when dealing with juvenile offenders, as the behaviours of anger, impulsivity, poor decision-making (A. Khan, 2023), are connected to delinquency. CBT has been identified to reduce the short-term and long-term recidivism of juveniles as they become aware of their negative thought patterns and correct them (Saxena & Sahai, 2024). Fidelity- how much a program is carried out within agreed guidelines determines the effectiveness of CBT. CBT requires qualified facilitators to ensure that juveniles are getting the desired benefits of CBT. Moreover, it is desirable that juveniles receive a sufficient amount of CBT (i.e. attending enough sessions) in order to record noticeable behavioral change (Saraf et al., 2019). Besides CBT, skills training programs that impart juveniles' skills on how to cope in real life like solving problems, communicating, and managing anger can contribute to prevent situations that can trigger delinquent behavior in them. Social skills training and emotion regulation programs are moderately successful in reducing antisocial behavior and in increasing more prosocial behavior in juveniles (Winicov, 2019). CBT is often used hand in hand with these programs to offer a more holistic approach to rehabilitation

Family-Focused, Multisystemic Models

Multisystemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy (FFT) and Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT).

Multisystemic models that focus on families have become one of the most effective methods of treating juvenile offenders because they target several areas of a youth's life such as family, peers, school, and community. Multisystemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy (FFT), and Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT) are evidence-based models that involve the family in the rehabilitation process, and often heavily emphasize altering interactions within the home environment that promote delinquency (Greenwald, 2021; Scott, 2022). MST specifically has been relatively successful in recidivism reduction with several randomized studies reporting a 20-40 percent decrease in recidivism among juvenile offenders who have completed the program (Bijlsma et al., 2024). These interventions are effective in that they improve the support systems around the youngster, teach parents and carers how to cope with problematic behaviours and improve family communication. It is a complex approach to addressing the root of the delinquency causes and providing the juvenile with a conducive and stable setting within which he or she will flourish (Boer et al., 2020). Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) that offers a high-structure and short-term family placement, as an alternative to institutional care, is the second intervention that could be considered. And, as they discovered, MTFC implies that a smaller number of placements will be stable and, by extension, lower levels of offending due to this type of institution being more treatment-based and more individual than the institution organized into groups (Greenwald, 2021). This approach has been particularly successful with juveniles that are in need of tight supervision and therapy but are ill suited to an institutional setting.

Substance Use and Mental-Health Treatment

Many juveniles in the justice system have substance use and mental health issues as well, which can be causes of delinquency. Combined services involving dual diagnosis (concurrent treatment of mental health problems and substance abuse), are the most effective in reducing recidivism and improving the overall well-being of such youth (Wright et al., 2016). Contingency management and motivational interviewing combined programs have demonstrated themselves as effective in attracting the juvenile population to treatment and enhancing their compliance with rehabilitation programs (Iqbal et al., 2025; Kar et al., 2025). Another important cause of juvenile delinquency is trauma, as most youth offenders undergo adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) such as abuse, neglect, or violence. Trauma-informed care is critical to treating the underlying causes of delinquent behaviour through identifying and acting on the consequences of trauma. Indeed, because it turned out, trauma-informed intervention targeting to ensure juveniles feel safe and cared about can turn out to be quite effective in case the concept of recovery and recidivism is taken into account (Khanna et al., 2025; Parmar et al., 2025).

Education, Vocational Training, and Youth Employment

High-dose tutoring, completion of secondary education, and vocational training are all necessary elements of rehabilitation because they bring a juvenile closer to success on his or her release after being detained or incarcerated. The answer is to put juveniles in career and technical education (CTE) or unpaid apprenticeships to provide them with the skills to get a steady job and lower the rate of recidivism (Pirzada et al., 2024). It has been shown that youthful justice centers that provide in-facility education or transfer of credits can significantly reduce the recidivism rates, as well as improve the post-release outcomes (T. Ahmed et al., 2022). Mentoring and cognitive-behavioral interventions that support educational programs lead to increased success

in the long run, through education persistence and further enhanced prospects of successful social reintegration (Balouch et al., 2023).

Re-entry and Aftercare

The re-entry is an important step in the rehabilitation process, because the re-integration into the community is usually a difficult task when the detention is over. Even re-entry models that start planning on day one, connecting juveniles to services including housing and healthcare insurance and returning to school, have been demonstrated in reducing technical violations and arrests on the day of release (Niaz et al., 2024). Another example of evidence-based work with youth is credible-messenger mentoring that presupposes that juveniles should be assisted in the re-entry process by those mentors who have a life experience (Zulfiqar et al., 2025).

Programs to Avoid

Other programs like the Scared Straight program and unstructured boot camps have been largely discredited because of their failure to decrease recidivism and have been shown to have detrimental impacts to juveniles in certain instances. Scared Straight Trying to educate juvenile offenders about prison life with the hope of scaring them out of delinquency has been shown to worsen the problem but not prevent it (Qasim & Webster, 2018). Similarly, boot camps based on unstructured physical punishment and military drills have been discovered to add no value to recidivism and even lead to more behavioural effects by normalising aggression and compliance with authority (Gul et al., 2021). Large institutional establishments are not likely to provide the type of personal care and attention to the juvenile that will allow them to overcome the underlying causes of the delinquency. Large-facility peer contagion can encourage delinquent behavior based on safety risks and discouragement of possible remedial action and inadequate therapy (Bonta & Andrews, 2023). In youth, however, small, therapeutic and home-like environments have been shown to be more effective in preventing recidivism and yielding positive results.

Implementation Matters:

Juvenile justice rehabilitation programs may not necessarily succeed due to the program itself, but due to the way the program is implemented within a specific environment. One can think of a variety of reasons why the same program would work in one district and fail in another. These include targeting, fidelity, quality of workforce, data infrastructure, cross-system governance and community partnership. This information about these matters can be used to give actual advice about how the reforms in juvenile justice can be applied in more appropriate situations. We have also found that more coherent and favorable outcomes are obtained in the cases where the supported programs are closely aligned with models (Gershenson, 2021). Exposure to the right group of juveniles is among the most factors that contribute to the success of any given program. There is evidence that high-risk youth (young people who exhibit consistent behavioural issues or have a history of violent or repeat offending) are highly likely to respond to intensive interventions (M. A. Malik & Shirazi, 2010). Rather, high-intensity services targeted at youth with low risk would only escalate the situation by invoking unnecessary criminalisation and labelling. Consequently, good programs must target high-risk people and not be diluted by targeting the wrong people. The other valuable aspect is fidelity- the extent to which a program has been conducted. Programs must use rigorous monitoring and outcome dashboards to gain compliance and to track the progress needed to ensure fidelity. Infrastructure: Do it Right, Keep on doing it. This allows corrective coaching when deviation in the desired model occurs since the program will not be rendered useless once it is used. The key to juvenile rehabilitation is the employees that will participate in delivering the provided interventions. The development of effective therapeutic relationships with juveniles is dependent on established, competent, and

seasoned teams, whose caseloads are manageable. Overworked or poorly trained staff members can offer less personal attention and support to juveniles than they need to succeed (Raza et al., 2024). In addition, such a relationship as a therapeutic alliance between the counsellor and a juvenile has been demonstrated to be one of the best predictors of good results. Thus, it is a requirement that staff members are well-trained, supported, and have an acceptable amount of work to do in order to be successful. These would be implemented as iterations to keep on improving the real-time data process and the program would also be changed to the new requirements and would further be simplified to fit the requirements (Shagufta, 2015). The success of the program depends also on an effective data infrastructure. A case management system which monitors the education, health, and recidivism outcomes of the juvenile can offer important information about the effectiveness of the program, as well as provide information on how the program can be improved. The improvement of the real time information and creation of the improvements with the help of which the new needs could be satisfied and the service providing could be further improved could be constantly introduced with the help of the process of iterations and the program (Jamil, 2021). Programs cannot detect inefficiencies, gaps in service delivery or differences in outcomes depending on demographic factors without an effective data infrastructure, which ultimately limits their success.

Cross System Governance: avoiding gaps and duplication.

The solution is cross-system governance, formal agreements among courts, probation, schools, and health agencies to avoid gaps in services and duplication of efforts. Juvenile justice systems themselves are complex, and they require the integration of various sectors to have the most promising results on youth. The service provided to juveniles is siloed and puts at risk that some juveniles will receive conflicting information or have limited service delivery (K. Baig et al., 2024). Making services comprehensive, integrated and mutually reinforcing Systems can formalize agreements among the different stakeholders involved. Lastly is community collaboration and the role of key stakeholders in developing the effective and legitimate programs that will involve community families, survivors, and youth with lived experience. Communities also feel trusted and interventions become culturally and contextually fitting when communities are involved. It also serves to avoid net-widening, i.e. to increase minor offences to a higher level of punishment as long as they are not referred to the community (I. Ahmed et al., 2025; Othmaniâ, 2008). Community-based program design and delivery creates a higher level of ownership and accountability, which may result in better outcomes and sustainability.

Measuring Effectiveness in Juvenile Justice

Outcomes

Juvenile justice interventions may be evaluated on the basis of more than re-arrest rates. To fully ascertain the impacts of rehabilitation programs, there are many outcomes that have to be considered. They include court filings, technical violation (e.g. violation of conditions of probation), school attendance/credits, educational attainment, employment status, health/mental health improvements, housing stability, family functioning and victim satisfaction. These factors will assist us in understanding better the long-term effects of programs on the general welfare of juveniles and their social integration into society. Ideally, successful interventions should lead to improved outcomes in most domains, such as academic success, family stability, long-term employment, rather than the reduction of recidivism. Various approaches are taken by researchers to identify the efficacy of the juvenile justice programs. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are considered to be the strongest approach to quantify causality, as they allow making a comparison between groups that received the intervention and those that did not. Nevertheless, RCTs are not always feasible to deploy in juvenile justice systems because of ethical and logistical concerns, including the lack of randomization in assigning youth to a treatment group

or control group. The most commonly used alternative quasi-experimental designs include propensity score matching, difference-in-differences and regression discontinuity. These approaches are informative and may present useful observations on program impacts, even in the absence of randomization, by comparing groups that are similar. Intervention economic value is also commonly measured by cost-benefit analysis. The costs the system has avoided, the extra gains, and the decreased time taken in the system are monetized by these analyses and are used to justify the investments in the rehabilitative programs. Family therapies and intensive mentoring have been widely proven as having a high benefit-cost ratio and have been shown to be cost-effective and effective. Since juvenile justice data is sensitive, it is important to provide privacy protection. No one should abuse or violate youth data. Evaluations that are designed through participatory evaluation (youth and family co-creating metrics and defining success) can better match the lived priorities of those directly affected. This not only makes the data more relevant, but also helps to be more trusted and transparent within the system.

A policy to long-term reform.

The long term juvenile justice reform answer to this is to make policies international, rehabilitative by nature and that they are able to touch on the inherent disparity within the system. The following blueprint outlines some of the key steps that must be undertaken to develop a just, effective and equitable juvenile justice system.

1. Align the Law with International Norms

- **Raise the Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility (MACR):** Align with international standards by setting the MACR to at least 14, ideally 15–16, reflecting a juvenile's cognitive and emotional development.
- **Make Juveniles Life without Parole illegal:** Repeal life sentences without parole and without minimum sentences, making sentencing individualized and oriented toward the development of the juvenile, their rehabilitation, and subsequent reintegration.
- **Limit Detention:** detention as an institution has to be limited, but it has to be limited in time. Provide regular court review to determine the need to remain in custody.

2. Build a Diversion-First System

- **Consider Statutory Diversion:** This approach is to be a choice of a few decision points which not only are statutory, and as such, have prescribed requirements to be eligible, but also possess procedural protection, and even some system referrals are automatically made to preclude unnecessary system contact.
- **Expand Restorative Justice:** Implement and expand restorative justice practices with trained facilitators and victim support, focusing on accountability, victim satisfaction, and community healing.

3. Invest in Proven, Community-Based Services

- **Scale Effective Interventions:** Invest in evidence-based programs like Multisystemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), and trauma-informed care.
- **Replace Large Institutions:** Transition from large, impersonal institutions to therapeutic, small, home-like placements for juveniles, where residential care is necessary.

4. Guarantee Education and Reentry Supports

- **Fund Educational Programs:** Ensure high-dosage tutoring and career and technical education (CTE), with immediate school re-enrollment and credit transfer upon release.
- **Provide Reentry Supports:** Offer benefits navigation for IDs, health coverage, housing stabilization, and family services, ensuring successful reintegration into the community.

5. Ensure Equity and Procedural Justice

- **Audit for Disparities:** Regularly audit for racial, ethnic, gender, and disability disparities in the juvenile justice system. Publish disaggregated data to ensure accountability.
- **Validate Risk/Needs Tools:** Use validated risk/needs assessment tools, continuously testing for bias and calibrating thresholds to ensure fair treatment.

6. Strengthen Implementation Infrastructure

- **Create Centres of Excellence:** Establish state-wide or national centres to provide training, ensure model fidelity, and offer technical assistance to maintain high standards.
- **Tie Funding to Outcomes:** Link funding to outcomes and program fidelity, adopting a model of continuous quality improvement to ensure ongoing efficacy and accountability.

Conclusion

Reform of juvenile justice is most effective when it is legal-rights-affirming, developmentally informed and evidence-implemented. Scientific data at hand supports the replacement of punitive alternatives like imprisonment with community and family-based interventions, which are characterized by a focus on skill-building, rehabilitation and reintegration. These strategies, combined with substantial investment in education and reentry services, reduce recidivism in addition to enhancing community security (when implemented with high fidelity). In addition, these systems increase life choices amongst the youth, reinforce families, and generate impacts that are beneficial to taxpayers through reduced long-term incarceration and recidivism. The issue here is not whether anything works anymore given the changing nature of the field but how to increase the number of success stories such that every youth regardless of his or her circumstances can receive effective rehabilitation. Scaling up what has worked most in the name of juvenile justice reform is the best strategy one can employ without compromising equity as the main objective. This must be achieved through transparency, developing relationships with the community, and serving marginalized and underserved communities first. Only to the further development of juvenile justice system will we have the means and the motivation to do so, that the youth not only will have the means and the motivation but it will need it also to be an efficient and active member and in the process we will be making the world a better place and the community stronger.

References

- Abbas, H. G., Chughtai, A. M., & Hussain, K. (2022). Juvenile justice system in Pakistan: A critical appraisal. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(1), 76–92.
- Abdullah, M., Khalily, M. T., & Hallahan, B. (2025). Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental Health in Pakistan. In A. Parmar, S. K. Kar, & S. M. Y. Arafat (Eds.), *Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental Health in South Asia* (pp. 65–80). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-7206-6_5
- Ackerman, E., Magram, J., & Kennedy, T. D. (2024). Systematic review: Impact of juvenile incarceration. *Child Protection and Practice*, 3, 100083.
- Agu, S. (2025). Convention on the Rights of the Child, Its Optional Protocols, and Work and Documents of the CRC Committee. In S. Agu, *The International Legal Protection of Children in Street Situations* (Vol. 29, pp. 121–190). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-78086-8_4

- Ahmed, A. A. (2022). *Pakistani Mestiza Consciousness, Multiplicity and Anti-Carcerality: How We Move Towards Transformative Justice as Mestizo People* [Master's Thesis, University of Georgia]. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/6e14027e32b0a22dddaae564348c88ad/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Ahmed, F. A., Irfan, A., Urooj, A., & Shaikh, H. L. (2025). Analyzing the Effectiveness of Rehabilitation vs. Punishment in the Criminal Justice System. *Review of Education, Administration & Law*, 8(1), 15–28.
- Ahmed, I., Faisal, A., Zia, W. A., Wazir, S., & Islam, M. U. (2025). Policy implementation gaps and institutional fault lines in the context of the erosion of purchasing power of the common citizens and its impact on poverty in Pakistan. *Khyber Journal of Public Policy*, 4(2), 26–57.
- Ahmed, T., Wassan, R., & Lashari, A. B. (2022). Impacts of vocational training and recreational activities on prison inmates: A case study of youthful offender's correctional facility, Hyderabad Pakistan. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 6(4), 238–246.
- Baig, K., Laghari, A. R., Akhtar, R., & Abbas, A. (2024). Comparative study of the Criminal Justice System in Pakistan and the UK. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 3, 105.
- Baig, T., Akbar, S., Bandiali, M. M., & Merchant, A. A. A. (2025). The Impact of Educational Policies on Reducing Socioeconomic Disparities in Education. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(1), 2589–2505.
- Balouch, Z. U. L., Lashari, A. A., Pervaiz, A., Jatoi, D. K., & Anjum, S. (2023). Vocational training to empower incarcerated women: Unlocking the potentials behind the bars. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 20(1), 1124–1134.
- Baron, S. W. (2024). Street Youth, Violence, and Hirschi's Redefinition of Self-Control. *Deviant Behavior*, 45(8), 1109–1125.
- Basra, R. (2022). Review of Evidence: Prison-based interventions targeting violent extremist detainees. *XCEPT Policy Brief*. <https://read-me.org/s/Review-of-Evidence.pdf>
- Beer, C. (2025). *Judging Juveniles: Public Attitudes Toward Life Without Parole & the Influence of Race and Academic Achievement in a Simulated Homicide Case* [PhD Thesis, Alliant International University]. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/4e312ce2563db964b38de737d25b9130/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Bijlsma, A. M. E., Assink, M., Stams, G. J. J. M., & Van Der Put, C. E. (2024). A Critical Evaluation of the Risk, Need, and Responsivity Principles in Family Interventions for Delinquent Youth: A Meta-Analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*, 49(3), 310–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07340168221140830>
- Boer, A., Ceulen, R., Moors, H., & Spapens, T. (2020). *Interveniëren in criminele families*. Sdu uitgevers. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hans-Moors-2/publication/341354081_Intervenieren_in_Criminele_Families/links/5ebc00a2299bf1c09aba45b7/Intervenieren-in-Criminele-Families.pdf
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2023). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781003292128/psychology-criminal-conduct-andrews-james-bonta>
- Cantwell, N. (2025). From 'children's rights' to the human rights of the child. *Protecting the World's Children: Public Health, Human Rights, Capabilities*, 21.
- Chaudhary, S. I., Asghar, U., & Afzal, M. (2024). Examining Restorative Justice: Different Approaches in Islamic Customary Law and International Practices. *PAKISTAN ISLAMICUS (An International Journal of Islamic & Social Sciences)*, 4(02), 41–54.
- Crawford, C., & Burns, R. (2022). School culture, racial composition, and preventing violence: Evaluating punitive and supportive responses to improving safety. *Social Sciences*, 11(7), 270.

- Crofts, T. (2023). Act now: Raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 35(1), 118–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2022.2139892>
- DiCarlo, A. (2022). Life Without Parole: An Eighth Amendment Analysis. *Buff. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.*, 29, 171.
- Din, M. U., Wisetsri, W., Khan, F., & Pinthapataya, J. (2021). Restorative Justice and its impact on Primary Schools Students of Swat, KP-Pakistan: In Psychological Perspective. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 58(2), 5526–5533.
- Duncan, H. (2021). Youth always matters: Replacing Eighth Amendment pseudoscience with an age-based ban on juvenile life without parole. *Yale LJ*, 131, 1936.
- Emidy, N. (2023). *Modeling the Effects of the School Responder Model (SRM) on Behavioral Health and the School-to-Prison Pipeline*. Capella University. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/d3215a73c7d0df02015687ddb798b247/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Faisal, S. M., Shah, S., & Ahmad, I. (2024). Social Structures and Criminal Behavior in Pakistan: Implications for Legal Policy. *International Journal of Social Science Archives (IJSSA)*, 7(2).
- Fatima, R., Rehman, T. U., & Brohi, R. (2024). Contemporary juvenile incarceration techniques. *Al-Mahdi Research Journal (MRJ)*, 5(5), 463–482.
- Fortenberry, A. (2022). *Juvenile Life Without Parole: Exposing the Parallels Between Juvenile Offenders and Those who Sentence Them*. https://egrove.olemiss.edu/hon_thesis/2721/
- Gershenson, S. (2021). *Identifying and producing effective teachers*. <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/232848>
- Greenwald, D. (2021). *Family Therapy as an Effective Method of Recidivism Prevention among Adult Offenders*. Alliant International University. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/0a7f923b82b25109f86e1cedb57f44ab/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Gul, R., Muhammad, B., & Hussain, R. (2021). An Analysis of Risk-Need-Responsivity Model to Reform Pakistan's Prisons. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 13(3). <http://www.pjcriminology.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/4.-An-Analysis-of-Risk-Need-Responsivity.pdf>
- Hakeem, A., Aleem, A., Mushtaq, S. A., Shahab, S., & Javed, K. (2025). Pathways to Redemption: A Legal Analysis of Youth Rehabilitation Mechanisms in Pakistan. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(1), 1748–1766.
- Haysom, L. (2022). Raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 14 years. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 58(9), 1504–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.16059>
- Iffan, A. (2023). The concept of fulfillment of children's rights in the United Nation Convention on the Right of the Child (UN-CRC). *Jurnal Peradaban Hukum*, 1(2). <https://jph.ubb.ac.id/index.php/jph/article/view/13>
- Iqbal, F., Nawaz, U., Khalid, M. T., & Noor, N. (2025). Understanding Involuntary Admission: A Qualitative Exploration of Persons with Substance Use Disorders in Rehabilitation Centers. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, 3(1), 621–639.
- Isaac, M. R. (2025). *Bright-Lines in Sentencing: A Legal and Moral Case Against Juvenile Life-Without-Parole*. https://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/2566/
- Jamil, S. (2021). Study of Juvenile Prisoners in Borstal Jail Bahawalpur. *Pakistan Journal of Criminal Justice*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Johnson, T. W. (2022). Prohibiting young adult life without parole: Examining diminished capacity and diminished culpability. *Harbinger*, 47, 83.
- Kar, S. K., Parmar, A., & Arafat, S. Y. (2025). Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental. *Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental Health in South Asia*, 97.
- Khadam, N., Bhutta, M. H., Zaheer, M. A., & Naz, M. F. (2025). Examining Legal Framework on Probation in Pakistan. *Social Science Review Archives*, 3(2), 1327–1341.

- Khan, A. (2023). Cognitive behavioral therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder in Pakistan. In *Handbook of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy by Disorder* (pp. 365–375). Elsevier. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780323857260000107>
- Khan, M. I., & Qadri, N. A. (2023). REFORMING CRIMINAL REHABILITATION PRACTICES: A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences*..... ISSN (E) 2959-2461 (P) 2959-3808, 2(3), 622–628.
- Khan, S. (2023). Critical analysis of the juvenile justice system in Pakistan: Challenges & way forward. *KJPP*, 2(3), 26.
- Khanna, A., Kaur, H., Sharma, P., Yanavar, P., & Kumar, R. (2025). Mental Health Rehabilitation Services After Release from Prison and the Risk of Reoffending in South Asia. In A. Parmar, S. K. Kar, & S. M. Y. Arafat (Eds.), *Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental Health in South Asia* (pp. 107–125). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-7206-6_8
- Kimbrell, C. S., Wilson, D. B., & Olaghere, A. (2023). Restorative justice programs and practices in juvenile justice: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis for effectiveness. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 22(1), 161–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12613>
- Kosar, F. (2024). Intergenerational social mobility and education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 7(2).
- Leslie, R. E. (2023). Juvenile Life With (out) Parole. *NYUL Rev.*, 98, 373.
- Liston, L. (2022). ‘Prepped for prison’? Experiences of exclusionary school practices and involvement with the justice system. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 30(3), 244–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07916035221108989>
- Majeed, M., Saleem, R., Ahmad, N., & Qudsia, B. (2024). Examining the Legislative Landscape: A Comprehensive Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency in Punjab. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 13(1). <https://bbejournal.com/BBE/article/view/787>
- Malik, M. A., & Shirazi, R. A. (2010). An analytical review of juvenile delinquents in jails of Sindh province: Some problems and suggestions to over come. *Indus Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 4(1), 43–54.
- Malik, W. A. (2019). The Juvenile Justice System and the Right to Dignity of Juvenile Offenders in Pakistan. *PLR*, 10, 141.
- Manzoor, B., Asghar, U., & Fatima, M. (2024). Investigating the Effects of Poverty on Pakistani Youth and Methods for Reaching the Sustainable Development Goals. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 337–347.
- McAra, L., & McVie, S. (2024). Raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility: Lessons from the Scottish experience. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 36(4), 386–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2023.2272362>
- McGinnis, M. S. (2014). Sentenced to Die in Prison: Life without Parole as an Eighth Amendment Violation for All Juveniles and Especially Those Who Have Not Killed. *Hastings Race & Poverty LJ*, 11, 201.
- McGreevy, J. (2020). Growing up in Prison: Rethinking Juvenile Offender Parole Hearings to Eliminate Essential Life Sentences. *U. Balt. L. Rev.*, 50, 221.
- Merlo, A. V. (2025). THE 2024 BRUCE SMITH SR. AWARD ADDRESS: Progress and Persistent Challenges in the Juvenile Justice System. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 8(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2024.2444923>
- Naseem, F., Tariq, M., & Rafique, M. Z. (n.d.). Correctional Facilities in Prisons of Punjab: Regional Best Practices and Lessons to be Learnt. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 5(3), 537–553.
- Nayyab, A., Khan, R., & Khan, A. A. (2025). The Rights of Female Prisoners in Pakistan: A Legal and Human Rights Analysis. *Journal of Political Stability Archive*, 3(1), 108–122.

- Nazim, M. F., Amjad, S., & Shahid, A. (2024). Juvenile justice reform: A comparative study of international practices. *PAKISTAN ISLAMICUS (An International Journal of Islamic & Social Sciences)*, 4(01), 42–53.
- Niaz, A., Yasin, G., Lak, T. A., Hussain, M., & Malik, A. S. (2024). Religiosity, family integration and social capital as predictors of post-incarceration reintegration of ex-prisoners in Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 63(4), 250–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2024.2331445>
- Niazi, S., Haider, K., & Sadruddin, M. M. (2016). Intellectual grooming and responsiveness: A remedial measures towards curbing juvenile delinquency among children in Pakistan. *Ma'arif Research Journal*, 11, 10–10.
- Nurzakiah, N., Wasis, W., & Wulandari, S. (2025). International Legal Framework for Children's Rights in Juvenile Criminal Justice in Indonesia. *International Conference on Law Reform (5th Inclar 2024)*, 139–145. <https://www.atlantispress.com/proceedings/inclar-24/126008745>
- Nwachukwu, I. (2023). Rights of Children under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: The Challenges of Implementation. *ACARELAR*, 4, 45.
- O'Connor, L. (2025). Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility: A Uniform Legal Age of Culpability That Matches Psychological Findings. *Suffolk Transnat'l L. Rev.*, 48, 66.
- Ofori, K. N., & Yankyerah, A. K. (n.d.). *Breaking the School-to-prison Pipeline: A Critical Review of Factors Responsible for Students' Truancy*. Retrieved September 3, 2025, from <https://www.academia.edu/download/99455314/56932.pdf>
- Othmaniâ, A. (2008). *Beyond Prison: The fight to reform prison systems around the world*. <https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5817472>
- Parmar, A., Kar, S. K., & Arafat, S. M. Y. (2025). Forensic Psychiatry in South Asia: An Overview. In A. Parmar, S. K. Kar, & S. M. Y. Arafat (Eds.), *Forensic Psychiatry and Prison Mental Health in South Asia* (pp. 1–18). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-7206-6_1
- Peer, B. (2024). Inequality and access to education: Bridging the gap in the 21st century. *Review Journal of Social Psychology & Social Works*, 1(3), 155–167.
- Pirzada, G., Tabassum, R., & Ahmad, N. (2024). WHY IS TVET NOT WORKING IN PRISONS? AN EXPLORATION OF PRISONS-BASED VOCATIONAL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES. *Journal of Social Sciences Development*, 3(3), 165–178.
- Qasim, M., & Webster, C. S. (2018). Muslim Pakistani prisoners and their experiences upon release from prison: A political economy approach. *The Prison Journal*. <http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/5909/>
- Ranta, M. (2023). 'Can we see our voices?' Young children's own contributions to authentic child participation as a pillar for sustainability under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 31(6), 914–931. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2023.2214716>
- Raza, K., Raza, A., & Tirmzi, S. F. (2024). University Students' Perceptions of Prisoner Reintegration in Pakistani Society: A Survey-Based Study in Lahore. *Journal of Management Practices, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 14–26.
- Riaz, N., & Amjad, S. (2019). The Status of Restorative Justice in Pakistani Legal System: An Analysis of Pakistani Laws with Special Reference to Certain Case Studies. *Restorative Justice in Pakistan*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3474255
- Saeed, M. A., Amin, S., & Imran, M. (n.d.). Juvenile Justice System Implications and Overview of Resolved Cases in Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 4(1), 98–112.
- Saraf, P., Rahman, T., & Jamison, J. C. (2019). Group-based cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) training improves mental health of SME entrepreneurs: Experimental evidence from

- conflict-affected areas of Pakistan. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 8872. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3430478
- Sati, S. O. (2024). Campus Network Design for Information Technology Faculty. *Eswar Publications*.
- Saxena, K., & Sahai, A. (2024). Understanding the Effectiveness of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy: A Study on Offenders. *Annals of Neurosciences*, 09727531241288609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09727531241288609>
- Scott, A. (2022). *The Comparison of Multisystemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy (FFT), and the Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach (A-CRA)*. The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/283643ac8bd8496974e0a449cadad2ed/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Seeds, C. (2022). *Death by prison: The emergence of life without parole and perpetual confinement*. Univ of California Press. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=U6RwEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Prohibition+of+Life+Imprisonment+without+Parole+among+Juveniles.+2022&ots=pCGFZ9YQ0U&sig=UE5yJ-hBVgFvm7HMi3ZoD3sEOlw>
- Sethi, A. H. (2025). Reimagining Juvenile Justice in the Digital Age: A Critical Review of the Juvenile Justice System Act, 2018. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, 4(3), 3689–3702.
- Shagufta, S. (2015). *Criminal Social Identity in a Sample of Incarcerated Juvenile Offenders in Pakistan* [PhD Thesis, University of Huddersfield]. <https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/27932/>
- Shah, S. A., Balasingam, U., Salman, N. W., Dhanapal, S., & Ansari, K. M. (2020). Restorative juvenile justice system in Pakistan: An overview. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 15(2), 266–282.
- Shahab, S., Ali, A., & Altaf, H. (n.d.). Exploring the Impact of Poverty on Youth in Pakistani Society and Strategies for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 5(2), 281–295.
- Shahidullah, S. M., & Das, S. (2017). Globalization and Reforms in Juvenile Justice in South Asia: A Comparative Study of Law and Legal Advances in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. In *Crime, Criminal Justice, and the Evolving Science of Criminology in South Asia: India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh* (pp. 173–218). Springer.
- Shem-Tov, Y., Raphael, S., & Skog, A. (2024). Can Restorative Justice Conferencing Reduce Recidivism? Evidence From the Make-it-Right Program. *Econometrica*, 92(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA20996>
- Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. J., & Ariel, B. (2015). Are Restorative Justice Conferences Effective in Reducing Repeat Offending? Findings from a Campbell Systematic Review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 31(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-014-9222-9>
- Tabassam, A., & Shehzad, A. (2023). The Interaction of Innovation Networks, Frugal Innovations, And Organizational Readiness In The Circular Economy. *Resmilitaris*, 13(2), 3668–3680.
- Ullah, H. M. H., & Bakhsh, F. (2024). Socioeconomic and Cultural Factors and Juvenile Delinquency in Pakistan: A Critical Analysis of Structural Theories. *Current Trends in Law and Society*, 4(1), 101–109.
- Walker, S. C., & Herting, J. R. (2020). The Impact of Pretrial Juvenile Detention on 12-Month Recidivism: A Matched Comparison Study. *Crime & Delinquency*, 66(13–14), 1865–1887. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720926115>

- Winicov, N. (2019). A systematic review of behavioral health interventions for suicidal and self-harming individuals in prisons and jails. *Heliyon*, 5(9). [https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440\(19\)36039-6](https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(19)36039-6)
- Wong, A. H. L. (2024). Can lowering the minimum age of criminal responsibility be justified? A critical review of China's recent amendment. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 63(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12543>
- Wright, N., Walters, P., & Strang, J. (2016). Dual diagnosis in prisons: Management of co-existing substance use and mental health disorders. *Advances In Dual Diagnosis*, 9(1). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/add-12-2015-0025/full/html?ai=116&ui=7anx&af=H>
- Yoon, I. H. (2022). Multitiered pedagogies of pathologization. *Who Decides*, 247.
- Yousaf, M. N., Khan, A., Hayat, U., & Ahmad, A. (2025). Socioeconomic Perspective and Analysis of the Linkage of Education and Child Labor in Pakistan: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Religion and Society*, 3(02), 25–39.
- Zanolie, K., Ma, I., Bos, M. G., Schreuders, E., Vandenbroucke, A. R., van Hoorn, J., van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Wierenga, L., Crone, E. A., & Güroğlu, B. (2022). Understanding the dynamics of the developing adolescent brain through team science. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 16, 827097.
- Zulfiqar, D., Lak, T. A., Hussain, M., Mobeen, M., & Nadeem, M. A. (2025). A Phenomenological Exploration of Challenges Hindering the effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Post-Incarcerated Women in Pakistan. *Journal of Social Horizons*, 2(2), 110–119.