APPROVAL OF HONORS PROGRAM SENIOR PROJECT

Candidate

Lilly Peters

Project Title

Breaking the Cycle: Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Rehabilitation and Reform

This Senior Project is approved as acceptable

Project Director

Dr. Jay Fortenbery

Committee Member

Dr. Jay Quinan

Committee Member

Dr. Andrew Stern

Honors Program Co-Director

Dr. Bill Yankosky

Honors Program Co-Director

Dr. Fred Sanborn

November 20, 2025

Breaking the Cycle: Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Through Rehabilitation and Reform

Lily Peters

Taylor-Crocker Honors Program, North Carolina Wesleyan University

Dr. Jay Fortenbery

Dr. Jay Quinan

Dr. Andrew Stern

November 13th, 2025

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my project director, Dr. Fortenbery, and to my committee members, Dr. Quinan and Dr. Stern. I would not have been able to complete this project without their guidance, encouragement, and feedback throughout this entire process. Their support was very valuable to me throughout this process, and they were very helpful by providing information to refine my ideas and strengthen my focus areas for my thesis. I am incredibly grateful for the time, care, and effort that they dedicated to helping me succeed.

I would also like to thank the faculty of the Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Religious Studies departments here at Wesleyan. They have equipped me with critical thinking skills, knowledge, and a passion for research that has helped shape both my professional and academic goals. Without their support, I would not have been able to complete this project. A special thank you goes to my colleagues at High Point Family Justice Center, whose dedication to advocacy and justice helped inspire my work and deepened my understanding of the importance of both rehabilitation and reform.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unending support, encouragement, and understanding throughout my academic career here at Wesleyan. Their patience and belief in me made this milestone possible, and for that, I am forever grateful. I would also like to thank my academic advisor, Dr. Thierauf, for all her support and encouragement throughout my time at Wesleyan. She has believed in me since I started at Wesleyan, and her constant encouragement has left an impact on me.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....5
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....7

Introduction to Juvenile Recidivism.....7

Psychological and Behavioral Factors Contributing to Recidivism.....8

Family and Environmental Influences Contributing to Recidivism.....11

Societal Factors Influencing Juvenile Recidivism.....15

Intervention and Prevention Programs.....18

Educational and Vocational Programs and Therapeutic Interventions.....21

Restorative Justice Approaches and Reentry Programs.....24

Conclusion.....29

Chapter 3: Results and Discussion.....31

Introduction.....31

Educational and Vocational Programs.....31

Therapeutic Interventions.....32

Restorative Justice Approaches.....33

Reentry and Community Support Programs.....34

Chapter 4: Conclusion and References.....38-41

Abstract

Juvenile recidivism is a persistent challenge within today's criminal justice system and is influenced by individual, familial, and societal factors. This thesis synthesizes existing research to examine predictors of reoffending among justice-involved youth and to evaluate the effectiveness of various intervention strategies. Family dynamics, influence of peers, socioeconomic conditions, and systemic inequities are all significant predictors of recidivism. Programs designed to mitigate reoffending include educational and vocational initiatives, therapeutic interventions, restorative justice approaches, and reentry services. These programs demonstrate how comprehensive, evidence-based strategies can support youth development and reduce future offending. This thesis also considers the different existing research to examine predictors of reoffending among justice-involved youth and to evaluate perspectives on intervention strategies, contrasting liberal reform-oriented approaches that prioritize rehabilitation and reintegration with conservative and deterrence-informed frameworks that emphasize accountability and structured supervision. The findings suggest that hybrid strategies integrating both rehabilitation and accountability measures offer the most promising approach towards reducing juvenile recidivism. This research highlights the importance of multifaceted, evidence-based interventions as well as informing policy and practice aimed at improving outcomes for justice-involved youth.

Keywords: Juvenile recidivism, restorative justice, rehabilitation, deterrence, reentry programs, intervention strategies, juvenile justice policy

Introduction

Nearly two-thirds of juvenile offenders reoffend within three years of release, with studies indicating that 70-80% of youth leaving correctional facilities are rearrested within that timeframe (The Sentencing Project, 2023; CSG Justice Center, 2024). This reveals a persistent challenge for not only the criminal justice system but also the communities that the juveniles are returning to. Not only do these repeat offenses impact the youth who are involved, but they also affect their families, the neighborhoods that they live in, and the community at large. It is incredibly important that we examine the factors that cause juvenile recidivism to identify and implement effective strategies to reduce both short-term and long-term risks of reoffense. Currently, some of the most effective approaches have been family-based interventions, cognitive-behavioral therapy, multisystemic therapy, and intensive supervision of juveniles (NIJ, 2022).

Though there are numerous current programs aimed at rehabilitating juvenile offenders, current recidivism rates remain high. This suggests that the current approaches we have to reducing juvenile recidivism rates are not 100% effective for all juveniles. There are complex factors that need to be considered when discussing the causes of repeat offending among juveniles. Some important factors include mental health issues, family dynamics, peer influences, and community environments (Clarke, 2017; Roberson et al., 2020).

Although no interventions are 100% effective, there are some recidivism interventions that seem to show promise, and there is limited agreement on which programs have consistently reduced recidivism rates, making this an important topic of discussion. It is imperative that we examine the factors that cause juvenile recidivism in order to identify and implement effective strategies to reduce both short-term and long-term risks of reoffense.

This thesis will address these issues by examining the underlying causes of juvenile recidivism and evaluating the effectiveness of the current intervention programs. The questions guiding my research on this topic are:

1. What individual, family, and societal factors influence juvenile offending and recidivism?
2. How do educational programs and achievement impact recidivism among juvenile offenders?
3. To what extent can juveniles who commit serious crimes be rehabilitated?
4. How should the juvenile justice system respond to serious offenses: rehabilitation versus adult prosecution?

Not only do these repeat offenses impact the youth who are involved, but they also affect their families, the neighborhoods that they live in, and the community at large. It investigates individual, familial, and societal influences and identifies the programs that are most effective in reducing recidivism. By examining and analyzing these factors and strategies, this study aims not only to clarify why some juveniles recidivate but also to highlight ways in which at-risk youth can be supported more effectively. To build a solid foundation for this analysis, the following literature review will explore existing research on juvenile offending, associated risk factors, and the effectiveness of current prevention programs, highlighting gaps in the literature and identifying opportunities for more targeted interventions.

Literature Review

Introduction to Juvenile Recidivism

Juvenile recidivism is one of the biggest challenges within the criminal justice system today. Recidivism can be defined as "the tendency for an offender to engage in repeated criminal behavior often after serving a sentence for a previous crime" (Recidivism, 2023). National statistics reveal that almost two-thirds of youth released from juvenile corrections facilities are rearrested within three years, while some studies have suggested this figure is close to 70-80% percent. (The Sentencing Project, 2023; CSG Justice Center, 2014). These statistics show the importance of examining the factors that contribute to persistent offending and identifying effective interventions to reduce reoffending.

Recidivism is not only based upon individual behavior, but it is also the result of personal, family, and societal influences. Research shows that risk factors such as childhood neglect, poor educational attainment, exposure to violence, and family instability significantly increase the likelihood of reoffending (Cottle, Lee, & Helibrun, 2001; Farrington, 2005). However, interventions such as restorative justice practices, correctional education, and reentry services have demonstrated a potential in lowering recidivism rates, although their effectiveness has varied across populations (Wilson, Gallagher & MacKenzie, 2000; The Sentencing Project, 2023). The way that their effectiveness varies across populations is that not every juvenile population responds to these types of programs in the same way. Communities deal with the economic and social costs of repeated offending, while young people face disrupted educational and vocational opportunities, mental health effects, and ongoing cycles of system involvement, all of which contribute to current recidivism rates. (USA Facts, 2022).

This literature review examines the existing research on juvenile recidivism with three main goals. First, to examine the individual risk factors that increase the likelihood of reoffending, disadvantage, and the barriers to successful reentry into society. Finally, this review evaluates the existing evidence on interventions and programs designed to reduce recidivism that can range from educational and vocational training to both restorative justice and approaches that are family-focused. By examining this body of research, this review aims to not only highlight the multiple causes of recidivism but also the strategies most effective in supporting juvenile rehabilitation and reducing long-term system involvement.

Psychological and Behavioral Risks Contributing to Recidivism

One of the strongest predictors of recidivism among juveniles is the presence of early antisocial behavior and psychological risk factors. Cottle, Lee, and Heilbrun (2001) conducted a meta-analysis and found that individual-level characteristics such as prior offenses, age at first offense, and conduct problems were consistently associated with higher rates of reoffending. This review also found that mental health disorders, including depression, anxiety, conduct disorder, and ADHD, were overly prevalent among youth who are justice-involved and can predict recidivism risk. (Cottle, Lee, & Heilbrun, 2001; Robertson et. al., 2020).

Farrington (2005) highlights the childhood origins of antisocial behavior, noting that impulsivity, aggression, and poor self-control in early childhood development significantly increase the likelihood of persistent delinquency (Farrington, 2005). Traumatic experiences alongside adverse childhood experiences can increase these risks. Baglivo et al. (2014) found that multiple adverse childhood events could significantly predict the onset as well as the persistence of delinquent behavior. Wolff and Baglivo (2017) also found that trauma histories serve as strong predictors of repeat offending, which highlights the recurrent relationship

between trauma and recidivism. These findings suggest that addressing individual behavioral and psychological traits early on can be crucial in reducing recidivism.

Substance use also influences recidivism. Early onset drug or alcohol use is strongly linked to continued delinquency, and continuous substance/drug abuse following justice system involvement can predict higher rates of rearrest (Mulvey et al., 2010). Also, behavioral traits such as aggression, impulsivity, and emotionlessness increase the likelihood of repeat offending (Cauffman et al., 2005). Addressing these psychological and behavioral vulnerabilities through specific interventions is essential for reducing recidivism.

Extending beyond behavioral traits, educational and cognitive factors also play critical roles when it comes to recidivism. Juveniles who struggle academically are more likely to stay involved in the justice system than juveniles who do not struggle academically. The "Juvenile Justice Contact, Educational Trajectories, and Recidivism" study (Bond and Davidson, 2025) demonstrated that educational disruptions caused by system involvement can create cycles of academic failure that then make delinquent behavior worse. (Bond and Davidson, 2025). However, interventions that provide both educational and vocational support have been shown to reduce these risks. Wilson, Gallagher, and MacKenzie (2000) found that juveniles engaged in structured or work programs while incarcerated showed lower rates of reoffending compared to their peers who did not engage in these types of programs. (Wilson et al., 2000).

The existing research shows that antisocial tendencies, low self-control, impulsivity, and aggression are all strong predictors of reoffending among youth (Farrington, 2005). Farrington studied the childhood origins of antisocial behavior and found that the early-emerging antisocial behaviors, like aggression and impulsivity, can persist into adolescence as well as adulthood, making the chances of recidivism higher. These specific findings indicate the need for

interventions that target early behavioral development in order to help prevent long-term offending. In addition to these antisocial personality factors, trauma and adverse childhood experiences are important predictors of delinquent behavior and recidivism. Baglivio et. al (2014) found that repeated adverse childhood experiences, such as exposure to abuse, neglect, or even household dysfunction, all significantly increase the risk of initial delinquency as well as persistent reoffending.

The Pathways to Desistance Study, a longitudinal project that follows serious adolescent offenders, revealed that psychiatric disorders, substance use, and comorbid conditions were strongly associated with persistent offending trajectories (Mulvey and Slowikowski, 2011). Youth who have untreated or undertreated mental health needs are much more likely to reoffend, highlighting the importance of bringing psychological assessments and treatments into correctional programming. Beyond only clinical diagnoses, deficits in decision making as well as cognitive immaturity both heighten the risk of recidivism. Developmental psychologists have argued that adolescents are more prone to risk-taking and are less competent at weighing the long-term benefits of decisions compared to adults (Cottle et al., 2001). These specific developmental factors mean that interventions that have been designed for adults might not sufficiently address the cognitive and behavioral needs of the juvenile population.

This research indicates that effective interventions targeting psychological and behavioral risks can reduce recidivism. A meta-analysis done by Wilson, Gallagher, and MacKenzie (2000) found that educational and vocational programs in correctional settings contributed to reductions in reoffending, partially by improving self-control and fostering positive behavior. Also, interventions that combine therapeutic services with educational opportunities have been found to reduce risk factors and improve post-release outcomes (Lipsey, 2009; Scott et al., 2022).

These findings illustrate that while psychological and behavioral risks are significant contributors to juvenile recidivism, they also represent the areas where well-designed interventions can make a difference.

Together, these studies all emphasize the importance of focusing on individual-level interventions that target behavioral, psychological, and educational challenges. By designing programs that address these specific risk factors, juvenile justice systems can be better equipped to interrupt the cycle of reoffending before it becomes established.

Family and Environmental Influences Contributing to Recidivism

Family and environmental contexts can significantly shape whether or not youth who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system are going to reoffend. Research has consistently demonstrated that early family experiences, such as parental supervision, stability, and exposure to neglect, all serve as important predictors of long-term behavioral outcomes. Farrington (2005) emphasizes that antisocial behavior often starts in childhood, with family-related risk factors like inconsistent discipline, parental criminal involvement and history, as well as a lack of emotional support, increasing the likelihood of persistent offending. These early influences can create a pattern that leads juveniles to internalize these negative behaviors and carry them with them into their adolescence and even into adulthood.

Parental criminal history is one of the biggest factors when it comes to the risk of recidivism. A study examining life-course perspectives found that juveniles whose parents had prior criminal history and involvement were significantly more likely to become reoffenders. (Wojciechowski, 2025). This relationship reflects environmental exposure as well as generational transmission of behaviors, as youth and juveniles tend to mirror the behaviors that were modeled within their households. Juveniles in these environments might face disadvantages

such as limited economic opportunities, as well as the stigma that surrounds family incarceration. If a juvenile lives in poverty, then they are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviors. An example of a social system disadvantage that a juvenile may have is unequal access to education. If a juvenile grows up in an area with a high poverty rate, the schools that they go to are likely to also be affected by this. The "Prediction of Criminal Recidivism in Juveniles" (Cottle, Lee, & Helibrun, 2001) study further reinforced that family context is one of the most powerful risk factors in predicting future offending, with poor family functioning, lack of supervision, and conflict-filled environments being consistent predictors of recidivism across different studies.

Childhood neglect is another important factor to consider that influences recidivism. Research has shown that adolescents who have experienced neglect have a higher risk of becoming involved in the system and are more likely to persist in offending behaviors (Courtney, Ryan, & Williams, 2013). Unlike abuse, neglect often presents itself as absence; absence of care, absence of guidance, and absence of supervision, which then, in turn, presents itself as weakened attachments to institutions like school and community organizations. These weakened bonds reduce the protective factors that could otherwise lessen the risks of reoffending. Similarly, the Sentencing Project (2023) highlights how environmental instability, which can include housing insecurities as well as family disruption, can aggravate cycles of incarceration by failing to provide the structure that is necessary for successful rehabilitation.

When it comes to reentry, family support is crucial. Studies on juvenile reentry services demonstrate that family-focused interventions have significantly reduced recidivism by addressing relational dynamics during the transition of juveniles back into the community. (Early, Chapman & Hand, 2013). Programs that include families in case planning, therapy, and skill-building help to rebuild trust as well as provide youth with stable support systems.

Likewise, “Special Considerations for Reentry of At-Risk Youth From Juvenile Justice Facilities” (Hester and Jolivette, 2024) highlights how youth who return to supportive and structured households have better outcomes than those who reenter environments that have been marked by instability and a continued exposure to crime. Reentry can be defined as the reentrance of an individual into society after having been incarcerated.

Extending beyond the family, community, and environmental factors also have a strong influence on recidivism. Economic disadvantage, neighborhood crime, as well as limited access to resources are all contributors to cycles of delinquency. According to the Council of State Governments Justice Center (2024), youth returning to communities with concentrated poverty and limited educational and employment opportunities face higher risks of reoffending. Similarly, the Illinois Criminal Justice Authority (2019) reports that structural inequalities in housing, schooling, and healthcare contribute to persistently high recidivism rates among juveniles, suggesting that environmental context has to be addressed alongside the individual-level interventions.

School environments can also reflect and reinforce these specific broader influences. The “Juvenile Justice Contact, Educational Trajectories, and Recidivism” study (Bond and Davidson, 2025) highlights how disruptions in education, which include truancy and disciplinary suspension, both increase the likelihood of recidivism. When these factors are combined with family instability, these educational setbacks reduce opportunities for social development and make reintegration into society after system development that much more challenging. This aligns with the findings from the Pathways to Desistance Study, which revealed that consistent engagement in school and work can significantly reduce the likelihood of reoffending, and disconnection from these institutions can amplify these environmental risk factors.

The influence of peers, which is closely tied to both family and community environments, makes these risks even more difficult. The “Effect of Risk Factors on Recidivism Among Juveniles From the Perspectives of Juvenile Justice Professionals” (Clarke, 2017) reports that association with delinquent peers was consistently cited by juvenile justice practitioners as one of the leading causes of recidivism. Youth who lack stable support from their families often turn to their peer groups for a sense of belonging, which then reinforces antisocial behavior when those peers themselves have been involved and engaged in delinquent activities. These specific environmental dynamics outline how recidivism is affected not only by individual choice but also by the interactions between family instability and peer influence.

When taken together, the research indicates that addressing juvenile recidivism requires interventions that include both family and environmental factors. Programs that support parenting, address neglect, and also engage families in reentry planning have demonstrated their effectiveness in reducing reoffending. However, at the same time, systemic reforms that target disadvantaged communities, improve access to education, and ,reduce exposure to delinquent peer groups are essential to breaking the cycles of incarceration. As The Sentencing Project (2023) and CSG Justice Center (2024) have both emphasized, interventions must extend beyond the justice system in order to address the structural factors that shape youth development. Without targeting these specific factors, efforts to reduce juvenile recidivism are unlikely to produce sustainable change.

Societal Factors Influencing Juvenile Recidivism

Family and community dynamics play important roles in shaping delinquent behavior; however, broader factors establish the contexts in which juvenile offending and recidivism occur. Juveniles do not only interact with the justice system; their outcomes are strongly tied to social

institutions, public policy, and systemic inequalities. Research consistently demonstrates that incarceration policies, access to education, socioeconomic inequality, as well as systemic bias are all contributors to the high rates of juvenile recidivism within the United States.

One of the most important societal factors influencing recidivism is the heavy reliance on incarceration as the main response to juvenile offending. The Sentencing Project (2023) emphasizes that incarceration frequently fails to address the underlying causes of delinquency and often makes the problem worse. Youth who are incarcerated are removed from their social environments, such as school, employment, and the community, and are instead placed in facilities where they might be exposed to peers who are antisocial and could be exposed to institutional trauma. The result of this is a cycle where detention interrupts healthy developments and increases the likelihood of reoffending after being released. This concern has been reinforced by the Council of State Governments Justice Center (2024), which notes that youth incarceration is costly, not very effective, and often fails at preparing juveniles for successful reintegration into society.

Disruption to education is another critical societal factor. Involvement within juvenile justice often coincides with inconsistent as well as negative school experiences, including suspension, expulsion, and even academic failure. The “Juvenile Justice Contact, Educational Trajectories, and Recidivism" study (Bond and Davidson, 2025) highlights how involvement in the system interrupts educational attainment, which is one of the strongest protective factors against recidivism. This disruption contributes to what is known as the “school-to-prison pipeline,” where correctional school policies disproportionately push at-risk youth out of educational opportunities and into the hands of the justice system. In turn, juveniles with limited

educational opportunities face greater challenges in attaining employment and stability, all of which increase their likelihood of reoffending (Pathways to Desistance, OJJDP).

Socioeconomic inequality can also underline the patterns of recidivism. Youth who are from disadvantaged backgrounds often face limited access to stable housing, healthcare, and employment opportunities. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (2019) reports that structural inequalities, which can include poverty and racial disparities, create environments where recidivism is more common and even becomes more difficult to prevent. imilarly, the USAFacts report (2022) highlights that systemic disadvantages disproportionately impact marginalized groups, amplifying the cycles of incarceration as well as reoffending. These inequities reveal that we cannot understand recidivism without considering what specific social structures shape opportunity and drive rehabilitation.

The systemic bias within the justice system further highlights these disadvantages. Sentencing disparities, detention practices, and access to rehabilitative resources contribute to higher recidivism rates among certain demographic groups, particularly youth of color. The report Comparing Official Measures of Recidivism in Juvenile Justice (Caudill and Trulson, 2023) illustrates how inconsistent measurement of recidivism can obscure these disparities; however, the data consistently reflect disproportionate outcomes amongst both racial and socioeconomic lines. These specific inequities point to the broader societal challenges that extend beyond just individual or familial behavior, emphasizing the need for structural reform in juvenile justice policies.

Societal attitudes toward rehabilitation over punishment also influence juvenile outcomes. Cottle, Lee, & Heilbrun (2001) identified society's reliance on punitive models of justice as a factor that limits the effectiveness of interventions, noting that risk factors are often

addressed only after system involvement rather than through proactive and preventative measures. Similarly, the 40-year meta-review on interventions for juvenile offenders (Dent and Pappas, 2021) found that programs that emphasize education, vocational training, and rehabilitation had better long-term outcomes than the punitive models. However, society's investment in such programs has historically been inconsistent, resulting in many jurisdictions prioritizing short-term punishment over long-term rehabilitation.

Reentry challenges further illustrate the role of societal factors. Youth who leave correctional facilities frequently return to environments that have very few resources for reintegrating them into society. The study "Let's Move Forward From Here: Partner Snapshots of Youth Transition from Juvenile Corrections" (Hester et al., 2024) highlights how societal systems, such as schools, employers, and community organizations, often fail at providing adequate opportunities for reentry into society. Without this structural support, youth face barriers to education, employment, and even housing, all of which increase the likelihood of reoffending. This is consistent with the findings from Special Considerations for Reentry of At-Risk Youth From Juvenile Justice Facilities (Hester and Jolivette, 2024).

When taken together, this research suggests that juvenile recidivism is not simply the result of individual or familial shortcomings, but it is deeply embedded within societal structures and policies. Justice models that are centered around incarceration, educational disruption, systemic inequality, and insufficient reentry support all contribute to the cycles of reoffending. Addressing these issues requires reform within the juvenile justice system, broader societal changes- such as educational investments, equal resource distribution, and systemic reforms that reduce bias and increase opportunity for rehabilitation. As The Sentencing Project (2023) and CSG Justice Center (2021) both emphasize, reducing recidivism is dependent on moving beyond

only punitive approaches and addressing the societal factors that maintain the cycles of incarceration.

Intervention and Prevention Programs

Both intervention and prevention programs are central to reducing juvenile recidivism, as they provide strategies that are structured to address the underlying causes of delinquent behavior while also promoting rehabilitation. Scholars have emphasized that the punitive sanctions alone have failed to create lasting behavioral change and that they often only make the cycle of reoffending worse. Instead, evidence-based programs that focus on rehabilitation, family involvement, and community support are consistently associated with lower recidivism rates and more positive long-term outcomes (Lipsey, 2009).

One of the most effective as well as one of the most widely implemented interventions is cognitive-behavioral therapy, which is also known as CBT. CBT works by reshaping our thought patterns and decision-making processes that underlie delinquent behavior, equipping youth with the skills that they need for problem-solving, emotional regulation, and impulse control. Meta-analyses have found that CBT programs significantly reduce recidivism, particularly when they are structured, goal-oriented, and delivered consistently (Lipsey, 2009). Programs like Aggression Replacement Training (ART) use CBT principles to help adolescents develop social skills, anger management strategies, as well as moral reasoning, all of which directly address the behavioral deficits that are associated with delinquency (Schubert et. al., 2010).

Another intervention approach that is becoming more well-known is restorative justice, which focuses on repairing the harm that was done, rather than punishing the offenders. Restorative justice programs involve dialogue that is monitored between offenders, victims, and community members, and this fosters accountability and empathy. These programs have been

shown to reduce reoffending by encouraging youth to take responsibility for their actions while also maintaining their ties to the community (Schubert et al., 2010). Beyond just reducing recidivism, restorative justice programs also strengthen community trust in the juvenile justice system and allow victims to have their voice included in the process, which addresses both rehabilitative and societal needs.

Diversion programs represent yet another critical intervention strategy. Rather than sending juveniles deeper into the justice system, diversion programs provide access to community-based alternatives such as counseling, educational workshops, or even community service. By keeping youth out of correctional facilities, diversion initiatives reduce exposure to delinquent peers and avoid the stigmatizing effects of incarceration (Lipsey, 2009). Research has consistently demonstrated that diversion programs can be particularly effective for first-time or low-risk offenders, offering them opportunities to address their behavioral issues without enduring the negative consequences of formal adjudication (Farrington, 2005).

Multisystemic Therapy (MST) is another type of intervention that is intensive and family-focused and addresses multiple areas of a youth's life: home, school, and relationships with their peers. MST is rooted in the understanding that delinquency doesn't occur in isolation, but that it is the product of interconnected systems. By equipping parents with better disciplinary strategies, improving school performance, and reducing association with delinquent peers, MST has been shown to lower recidivism rates significantly (Schubert et al., 2010). It is also important to know that MST can strengthen family functioning, creating a more stable environment that helps to reduce the likelihood of future offending.

Educational and vocational programs can further enhance the prevention of reoffending by providing youth with pathways that lead them to success outside of the justice system. Low

academic performance as well as disengagement from school are both strong predictors of delinquency, which makes educational interventions critical. Programs that focus on tutoring, GED completion, and vocational training not only reduce recidivism but also improve long-term employment prospects (Farrington, 2005). Employment readiness programs, especially, can help youth envision a productive future, breaking the cycle of crime by equipping them with marketable skills and a sense of self-efficacy.

Early intervention programs that target at-risk youth before they commit their first offense can also be promising for long-term prevention of reoffending. Farrington (2005) highlights that programs that address early childhood risk factors such as impulsivity, aggression, and poor self-control can all reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior later in adolescence. Examples of this can include after-school activities with structured supervision, as well as family-centered interventions that are designed to strengthen parenting skills. These measures are proactive and can prevent youth from even entering the justice system in the first place, therefore reducing future levels of recidivism.

Something that is common across successful interventions is their grounding in evidence-based practice, individualization, and community collaboration. Lipsey (2009) emphasizes that the “one-size-fits-all” approaches are less effective because they fail to meet the diverse needs of juvenile offenders. Instead, programs that tailor their services, whether that is through CBT, MST, or restorative justice, all tend to have better outcomes. What is equally important is the role of collaboration among schools, families, social services, and justice agencies, which ensures continuity of care and maximizes the effectiveness of these interventions. (Schubert et al., 2010).

Overall, both intervention and prevention programs represent the strategies that are the most promising for addressing juvenile recidivism. They place their focus on equipping youth with the skills, support, and opportunities that are needed to successfully transition into adulthood, while also promoting public safety at the same time. The current evidence demonstrates that rehabilitative, community-based approaches not only reduce reoffending but they also create stronger families as well as healthier communities. By making these programs the priority over punitive sanctions, the juvenile justice system will be better able to fulfill its rehabilitative mission as well as be able to reduce the long-term costs of crime on society.

Educational and Vocational Programs and Therapeutic Interventions

Educational and vocational programming, along with therapeutic interventions, represent two of the most promising avenues when it comes to reducing juvenile recidivism. Punitive sanctions often leave youth with little to no opportunities for rehabilitation, while evidence suggests that programs that emphasize education, employment readiness, and psychological support directly address both structural and behavioral factors that contribute to delinquency. By equipping these young offenders with skills, stability, and resilience, these interventions help to disrupt the cycle of reoffending and improve the reintegration of youth into society.

Academic failure as well as disengagement from school are among the most consistent predictors of juvenile delinquency. Youth who struggle academically or with their schoolwork are more likely to engage in criminal behavior, and incarceration often worsens these outcomes by interrupting schooling as well as reducing opportunities for educational attainment (Farrington, 2005). Because of this, educational and vocational programs have become a cornerstone for recidivism prevention efforts.

Research indicates that incarcerated youth who participate in structured education programs demonstrate improved literacy, numeracy, and academic persistence, all of which are associated with lower recidivism rates (Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie, 2000). Vocational training, in particular, can provide adolescents with practical skills that can translate into employment opportunities upon being released. By increasing the likelihood of stable employment, vocational programs can reduce the economic pressures as well as the social disconnection that frequently pushes youth back toward offending (Cottle, Lee, & Heilbrun, 2001).

Longitudinal studies, such as the Pathways to Desistance project, further highlight how important educational trajectories are in shaping outcomes for justice-involved youth. The findings from this study indicate that adolescents who reengage with school or with vocational programs both during and after incarceration are less likely to return to their criminal activity compared to those who remain disengaged (Mulvey & Slowikowski, 2011). These results emphasize why education plays a protective role in fostering long-term desistance.

Finally, community-based educational interventions like GED preparation, tutoring, and career-readiness workshops can create smoother transitions for youth who are reentering society. Family-focused reentry services often integrate educational support with broader case management, highlighting that academic progress cannot occur in isolation because it requires both family and community reinforcement. Programs that link education with job placement can be especially effective because they provide tangible incentives for youth to remain crime-free while cultivating ways to be self-sufficient.

While educational and vocational programs address structural barriers, therapeutic interventions target the behavioral and emotional challenges that contribute to juvenile

offending. Juvenile offenders disproportionately present with mental health issues, histories of trauma, and difficulties with emotional regulation, and if this is left unaddressed, it can increase the risk of recidivism (Farrington, 2005). Therefore, therapeutic approaches play a critical role in fostering long-term behavioral change.

Family-centered therapeutic interventions can be particularly important during reentry. Research on juvenile transitions from correctional facilities highlights that youth with strong family support are less likely to reoffend. Programs that incorporate family therapy, mentoring, and community-based care management create a continuity of care that addresses the specific stressors of reentry. For example, family-focused reentry services have been shown to reduce recidivism by strengthening communication, improving household stability, and reducing exposure to criminal environments.

Education and therapy are usually handled separately, but the most effective interventions integrate the two. Studies have consistently shown that therapeutic progress highly supports academic engagement, while educational success reinforces both self-esteem and psychological resilience. For example, adolescents who participate in therapeutic interventions that address self-regulation are better equipped to succeed in school, while educational accomplishments motivate them to stay engaged in therapy (Wilson et al., 2000).

Finally, interventions that blend vocational training with therapeutic support are able to create comprehensive models for reentry. Programs that teach job skills, provide counseling on decision-making, as well as stress management, prepare youth for the realities of adulthood, all while reducing the risk of recidivism. By targeting both the internal and external risk factors, these hybrid approaches are able to maximize the likelihood of desistance.

Restorative Justice Approaches and Reentry Programs

Restorative justice and reentry initiatives represent two important approaches in reducing juvenile recidivism, with both emphasizing rehabilitation and long-term reintegration over punitive confinement. Traditional punitive practices like incarceration can exacerbate barriers for youth and then fail to address the core issues that drive delinquent behavior. According to The Sentencing Project (2023), youth incarceration is not only ineffective at reducing recidivism, but it also increases the likelihood of future offending by disrupting developmental pathways, educational progress, and family stability. This has led juvenile justice policymakers and practitioners to explore more constructive alternatives, such as restorative justice practices and structured reentry programs that are supportive of youths' return to their communities.

Restorative justice places an emphasis on repairing the harm that was done by engaging the offender, the victim, and the community in the justice process. Instead of isolating youth, restorative justice programs focus on accountability, empathy, and relationship-building. Research highlights that these restorative models can help reduce recidivism and can also improve youth outcomes by addressing the social and emotional needs that underlie offending behavior. For example, Challenges and Successes of Restorative Justice in the Juvenile Justice System (Leavy-Skinner, 2019) notes that restorative justice practices encourage juveniles to accept responsibility and also provide them with opportunities to make amends, which often leads to improved community perceptions of both fairness and justice.

Restorative justice approaches work to shift the narrative around juvenile delinquency by promoting skill-building and positive identity development. By involving families, schools, and community members, restorative frameworks help to create support systems that can mitigate the risks of reoffense. The CSG Justice Center (2024) further stresses that these specific approaches allow for collaborative case planning as well as individualized responses that better align with

the developmental science. Restorative justice programs do face challenges with consistent implementation and community participation; however, evidence suggests that it remains a promising strategy for addressing accountability as well as rehabilitation within the juvenile justice system.

Reentry programs address the significant challenges that juveniles face when they are transitioning from being in correctional facilities to being back in their communities. After leaving confinement, youth can be faced with educational disruptions, strained relationships with their families, limited access to stable housing, and a lack of employment opportunities. These barriers can significantly increase the risk of recidivism if they are not adequately addressed (ICJIA, 2020). Reentry programs have been designed to provide structured support during this critical period, and this often happens through coordinated case management, family engagement, and access to educational and vocational services.

Several studies highlight the importance of targeted reentry support. For example, Special Considerations for Reentry of At-Risk Youth From Juvenile Justice Facilities: Voices From the Field (Hester and Jolivette, 2024) highlights that juvenile justice practitioners stress the need for culturally responsive, individualized reentry planning that incorporates support from both families and the community. Likewise, Family-Focused Juvenile Reentry Services (Hester et al., 2024) demonstrates that programs engaging families in the reintegration process are associated with lower recidivism rates because they help stabilize the youth's home environment and promote continuation of care.

Reentry success is also very dependent upon collaboration across systems. "Let's Move Forward From Here: Partner Snapshots of Youth Transitions from Juvenile Corrections (Hester et al., 2024) has found that partnerships between juvenile justice agencies, schools, and

community organizations are essential in ensuring continuity in services such as education, mental health care, and mentoring. If these connections did not exist, youth would often experience service gaps that hinder their ability to successfully reintegrate into society. The CSG Justice Center (2024) further highlights that programs emphasizing education, employment, and behavioral health during reentry play a pivotal role in reducing recidivism and setting youth on a path towards long-term stability.

While organizations such as The Sentencing Project tend to emphasize rehabilitation and restorative justice, which are approaches more aligned with the more liberal perspectives regarding juvenile justice, it is equally important to consider how both researchers and policymakers on the other side of the political spectrum view juvenile recidivism. Conservative viewpoints tend to place their focus on accountability, structured sanctions, and the perceived deterrent effect of punishment. Examining these perspectives will provide a more balanced understanding of both the ideological and policy debates that surround juvenile recidivism.

Conservative approaches as well as deterrence-based approaches to juvenile recidivism often focus on promoting accountability and making sure that juvenile offenders understand the consequences of their actions. Right on Crime (2022) emphasizes cost-effective and evidence-based practices that balance rehabilitation and personal responsibility, arguing that interventions should hold juveniles accountable while also providing pathways for reform. Likewise, the R Street Institute highlights “deflection” and “diversion” programs that redirect low-risk juveniles away from incarceration towards structured community supervision, aligning with conservative priorities such as public safety and financial efficacy. Research conducted by Brame et al. (2015) highlights the deterrence framework, suggesting that the perceived certainty of punishment or sanctions can influence juvenile behavior, even if the punishment itself is not a reliable deterrent.

Although these approaches are different from reform-oriented and restorative models, they both share the underlying goal of reducing reoffending, though they place a stronger emphasis on structure, consequences, and accountability.

Conservative and deterrence-informed approaches demonstrate their understanding of juvenile recidivism by emphasizing accountability and structured interventions alongside community reintegration. Research has indicated that programs incorporating clear expectations, consistent supervision, and effective consequences can complement rehabilitative efforts, especially for juveniles who are higher-risk (Brame et al., 2015). Deflection and Diversion strategies that have been promoted by the R Street Institute aim to prevent initial as well as repeated incarceration by maintaining their accountability through the use of monitored community programs. Likewise, Right on Crime (2025) highlights that evidence-based policies that balance cost-efficiency, public safety, and rehabilitation prove that structured supervision can reduce recidivism without solely relying on punitive measures. By integrating these insights with restorative and reentry programs, juvenile justice policymakers and practitioners can design hybrid interventions that not only address behavioral accountability but also address the social and emotional needs of juveniles, therefore producing more comprehensive and sustainable outcomes.

When both liberal and conservative perspectives are considered, they provide valuable insights into reducing juvenile recidivism. Both liberal and conservative perspectives offer complementary approaches to reducing juvenile recidivism; comparing both of these perspectives reveals both points of convergence as well as divergence. Liberal and reform-oriented approaches, such as The Sentencing Project, prioritize rehabilitation, restorative justice, and the social reintegration of youth, while focusing on addressing the underlying behavioral,

familial, and environmental factors that contribute to reoffending. When being contrasted, conservative and deterrence-oriented approaches emphasize accountability, structured supervision, and the role of clear consequences. Despite these differences, both conservative and liberal perspectives share the same goal of reducing juvenile reoffending. Rehabilitation programs and restorative justice initiatives aim to prevent future offending by addressing the root causes, and accountability-focused interventions seek to achieve the same outcomes through the use of behavioral incentives and consequences. When analyzing the strengths and limitations of each approach, it is clear that a hybrid strategy integrating rehabilitative support alongside structured accountability could offer the most effective framework for reducing juvenile recidivism.

In conclusion, restorative justice programs highlight shifts away from punitive correctional models and towards developmental and community-based approaches. Restorative justice addresses the harm caused by delinquency while also fostering accountability and social bonds, while reentry programs focus on building support systems that are necessary for successful reintegration into the community. Together, these approaches demonstrate that effective juvenile justice strategies have to extend beyond confinement to address the complex personal, familial, and societal challenges that youth face.

Conclusion

The body of research being reviewed demonstrates that juvenile recidivism is not driven by a single factor, but it is shaped by different influences. Family and environmental contexts provide a foundation for youth behavior where neglect, instability, and parent criminality all serve as significant predictors of reoffending. Environmental factors such as poverty, community crime, and lack of access to supportive services further increase vulnerability to continued

involvement in the justice system. These findings underscore the nature of risk factors that usually begin in childhood and persist throughout adolescence.

Beyond the family and community, societal structures as well as systemic practices also play an important role in recidivism outcomes. Evidence has shown that punitive approaches, specifically incarceration, fail to produce meaningful reductions in reoffending and may instead create barriers to successful reintegration (The Sentencing Project, 2023). These challenges highlight the necessity of considering broader structural issues to evaluate pathways out of delinquency.

The literature being reviewed also revealed that intervention and prevention programs hold substantial promise when they work together to address multiple domains at the same time. Educational and vocational programs work to equip youth with the necessary skills to succeed in adulthood, while therapeutic interventions work to target the underlying psychological and emotional challenges that can fuel delinquent behavior. Restorative justice approaches and reentry programs further support positive outcomes by focusing on accountability, repairing harm, and supporting successful transitions back into the community. Together, these interventions illustrate the value of comprehensive strategies that extend beyond punishment and instead make rehabilitation, personal development, and social reintegration all priorities.

When taken as a whole, the literature suggests that juvenile recidivism can be best understood as the product of overlapping risk factors as well as systemic challenges that require equally multifaceted solutions. The theme consistent across the research is that meaningful reductions in reoffending are dependent upon approaches that account for family, environmental, societal, and individual needs. While this evidence highlights effective strategies, it also points to

the gaps in implementation of these strategies and the ongoing challenges in ensuring consistency across the juvenile justice system.

Results/Discussion

One of the central questions guiding this thesis is how different interventions influence juvenile recidivism and what strategies show the most promise for reducing reoffending. The purpose of this section is to present the main findings from the existing research and to interpret their broader meaning within the juvenile justice context. To provide clarity, this literature is organized into four main themes: educational and vocational programs, therapeutic interventions, restorative justice approaches, and reentry-based support services. By synthesizing the evidence across these categories, this section highlights not only the interventions that demonstrate the strongest outcomes but also the challenges and limitations that affect their long-term effectiveness.

Educational/Vocational Programs

Educational and vocational programs have been consistently identified in the literature as effective interventions for reducing juvenile recidivism. Several studies have demonstrated that providing youth with educational opportunities and employment skills enhances their long-term outcomes by increasing their employability and promoting positive behaviors (Wilson, Gallagher, & Mackenzie, 2000). A study done by Wilson et. al (2000) found that participation in corrections-based education and in vocational programs significantly reduced recidivism rates among both youth and adult offenders, while programs that included structured work programs further enhanced these outcomes.

Also, evaluations of educational interventions for incarcerated youth reported improvements not only in skill acquisition but also in self-efficacy and motivation, both of which are critical for successful reintegration into the community (Juvenile Justice Contact, Educational Trajectories, and Recidivism, AJCJ 2025). These findings suggest that education and vocational

training provide both practical and psychological resources that contribute to reduced reoffending.

Though there are overall positive effects, this literature also highlights the limitations that may constrain the long-term impact of educational and vocational programs. Access and program quality vary widely across juvenile justice facilities, which can influence outcomes (Webb, Wang, and Ho, 2024). Also, broader social and structural barriers, such as stigma associated with juvenile justice involvement, limited post-release employment opportunities, and insufficient community support, can make the benefits of these interventions nonexistent (Hester and Jolivette, 2024; Early and Hand, 2013).

The evidence also suggests that educational and vocational programs are the most effective when they are paired with complementary services, such as mentoring, counseling, or family support, emphasizing the importance of integrated approaches. When taken together, these findings indicate that while educational and vocational programs are promising tools for reducing recidivism, their success is contingent on both program quality and the availability of supportive resources both during and after incarceration.

Therapeutic Interventions

Certain therapeutic interventions, including cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), family-based counseling, and psychosocial programs, are frequently cited as effective in reducing juvenile recidivism by addressing underlying behavior and emotional risk factors. Research indicates that structured therapeutic programs help youth develop coping strategies, improve their decision-making skills, and manage their antisocial behaviors (Cottle, Lee, & Heilbrun, 2001; Farrington, 2005). Additionally, family-focused interventions can strengthen communication, increase parental involvement, and reduce environmental stressors that

contribute to delinquency (Early, Chapman, and Hand, 2013). Evidence from longitudinal studies suggests that youth who engage in consistent therapeutic programming demonstrate lower rates of reoffending compared to those who do not participate in these types of interventions (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2011).

Despite these positive outcomes, therapeutic interventions face several limitations that can affect their overall impact. Program effectiveness is heavily dependent upon youth engagement, consistency, and program fidelity, with less structured or poorly implemented programs showing weaker results (Ryan, Williams, & Courtney, 2013). Also, many therapeutic interventions are limited in their durations, with follow-up support after release frequently lacking, which can reduce their long-term benefits (Hester & Jolivette, 2024). Disparities in access also exist, with some facilities being unable to offer evidence-based therapy to all youth because of resource shortages. Overall, this literature suggests that while therapeutic interventions are effective, their success is dependent on quality, engagement, and sustained post-release support.

Restorative Justice Approaches

Restorative justice approaches are increasingly recognized as effective strategies for reducing juvenile recidivism by emphasizing accountability, empathy, and repairing harm rather than relying only on punitive measures. Studies indicate that programs such as victim-offender mediation, conferencing, and community circles encourage youth to reflect on the consequences of their actions and foster positive behavior (Leavy-Skinner, 2019). Evidence from longitudinal and program evaluation studies suggests that youth who participate in restorative justice initiatives are less likely to reoffend compared to those processed through traditional adjudication (Hester et al., 2024). These findings highlight the potential of restorative justice to

not only reduce recidivism but also improve the relationships between offenders, victims, and the broader community.

Despite these positive outcomes, restorative justice programs face challenges that can limit their effectiveness. Access to these programs is often inconsistent, with availability depending on jurisdiction, offense type, and program resources (Leavy-Skinner, 2019). Further, program success heavily depends on proper facilitation, youth engagement, and victim participation, meaning that poorly implemented programs can yield minimal benefits (Hester et al., 2024). Additionally, restorative justice is most effective when integrated with other support, such as counseling or reentry services, emphasizing that it is not a stand-alone solution. Overall, this literature suggests that while restorative justice approaches can substantially reduce recidivism, consistent implementation, along with complementary support, is key.

Reentry and Community Support Programs

Reentry and community support programs are critical for reducing recidivism by addressing the barriers that youth face after being released from correctional facilities. Research done on this topic has consistently shown that programs emphasizing structural support, mentorship, and family involvement improve post-release outcomes. Family-focused reentry services have been linked to lower recidivism rates by strengthening home environments and providing consistent guidance (Early, Chapman, & Hand, 2013). Likewise, qualitative research highlights the importance of transitional planning and coordination with community partners, noting that youth who receive comprehensive reentry support are better able to access education, employment, and counseling services (Hester and Jolivette, 2024).

Despite these successes, reentry and community support programs are not without their challenges. Many youths experience gaps in service during their transition from secure

placement back into the community, which can limit the effectiveness of programs (Hester et al., 2024). Barriers such as limited program funding, staff shortages, and delayed services often undermine the sustainability of these supports, leaving youth vulnerable to relapse into criminal behavior. Also, the stigma that is associated with juvenile justice involvement makes it difficult for young people to secure employment or to reintegrate socially, even with program support (Hester and Jolivette, 2024). Overall, this literature suggests that reentry and community programs are most effective when they can provide consistent, long-term, and family-centered support; however, limitations can restrict their impact.

Conclusion

This thesis has explored the many factors that influence juvenile recidivism and the range of interventions that have been designed to reduce reoffending. Research has shown that individual, family, and societal factors all play a crucial role in shaping juvenile outcomes (Farrington, 2005). Programs that address these factors, from educational and vocational initiatives to therapeutic, restorative justice, and reentry services, all demonstrate that comprehensive and evidence-based approaches can effectively support juveniles and reduce recidivism.

Perspectives regarding intervention strategies can vary. For example, the conservative and liberal perspectives regarding intervention strategies are different; they are not the same. Reform-oriented approaches prioritize both rehabilitation and social reintegration, while the conservative and deterrence-based perspectives emphasize accountability, structured supervision, and consequences (Right on Crime, 2025). Despite their perspectives being different, both conservative and liberal approaches to juvenile recidivism aim to decrease reoffending, which highlights the value of hybrid strategies that integrate rehabilitation alongside accountability measures.

The limitations of this research include relying on secondary sources as well as the lack of longitudinal data, specifically for female juvenile offenders and youth of color. Regardless, these findings highlight that juvenile justice strategies have to address multiple levels of influence, combine evidence-based interventions, as well as consider diverse policy perspectives. Future research on juvenile recidivism should continue to evaluate program effectiveness and integrate different ideological perspectives.

Overall, addressing juvenile recidivism is more than just any single program or policy; it requires a comprehensive approach considering individual, familial, and societal influences while also balancing rehabilitation alongside accountability. By integration of restorative justice, educational and vocational supports, therapeutic interventions, and structured supervision, the juvenile justice system can more effectively reduce the risk of reoffending while also fostering positive development. Recognizing as well as analyzing differing perspectives from reform-oriented perspectives to deterrence-focused perspectives ensures that interventions are evidence-based and empirical. The path to juvenile recidivism is not in choosing between rehabilitation and accountability, but in designing a system that can do both, transforming the lives of juveniles while also protecting communities.

References

Bond, M., & Davidson, K. M. (2025). Juvenile justice contact, educational trajectories, and recidivism: A mixed- method evaluation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ*, *50*(3), 446–471.

Caudill, J. W., & Trulson, C. R. (2023). Comparing official measures of recidivism in juvenile justice. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ*, *48*(2), 319–344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-022-09672-x

Clarke, D. R. (2017). *The effect of risk factors on recidivism among juveniles from the perspectives of juvenile justice professionals* (Publication No. 10617809) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2014). *Core principles for reducing recidivism and improving other outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system* https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/reducing-juvenile-recidivism/

Cottle, C. C., Lee, R. J., & Heilbrun, K. (2001). The prediction of criminal recidivism in juveniles: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *28*(3), 367-394. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854801028003005

Cornell Law School Legal Information Institute. (n.d.). Recidivism. Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/recidivism

Early, K. W., Chapman, S. F., & Hand, G. A. (2013). Family-focused juvenile reentry services: A quasi-experimental design evaluation of recidivism outcomes. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, *2*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-025-09791-1

Ryan, J. P., Williams, A. B., & Courtney, M. E. (2013). Adolescent neglect, juvenile delinquency, and the risk of recidivism. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(3), 454–465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9906-8

Farrington, D. P. (2005). Childhood origins of antisocial behavior. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *12*(3), 177–190 . https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.448

Gleicher, L. (2019). *Examining the extent of recidivism in Illinois after juvenile incarceration*. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. https://icjia.illinois.gov/researchhub/articles/examining-the-extent-of-recidivism-in-illinois?utm

Hester, O. R., & Jolivette, K. (2024). Special considerations for reentry of at-risk youth from juvenile justice facilities: Voices from the field. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *75*(1), 4–11.

Hester, O. R., Jolivette, K., Sanders, S., Virgin, A. S., & Pitzel, A. (2024). "Let's Move Forward From Here": Partner snapshots of youth transition from juvenile corrections. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *75*(1), 12–36.

Hockenberry, S., Puzzanchera, C., & Sickmund, M. (2023). *Juvenile court statistics, 2020*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojp.gov/library/publications/juvenile-court-statistics-2020

Holloway, E. D., Irgens, M., McPhee, J., Folk, J. B., & Tolou-Shams, M. (2024). Youth recidivism: youth self-report matters. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1208317

Kijowski, M., Wilson, T., Kim, J., Lee, Y., & Jennings, W. G. (2025). Examining parent criminal history as a predictor of recidivism from a life-course perspective: Testing for age-differing salience in effects. *American Journal of Criminal Justice: AJCJ*, *50*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-024-09780-w

Kraus, J. (1976). Juvenile delinquency and the psychology of general deterrence. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, *22*(2), 112–119. https://doi.org/10.1177/002076407602200206

Leavy-Skinner, A. (2019). *Challenges and successes of restorative justice in the juvenile justice system* (Publication No. 27545983) [Doctoral dissertation, Capella University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Li, N., Hein, S., Quintana, D., Shelton, M., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2023). Racial/ethnic disparities of the Positive Achievement Change Tool in predicting recidivism and court dispositions for justice-involved youths. *Law and Human Behavior*, *47*(3), 422–435. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000533

Loughran, T. A., Brame, R., Fagan, J., Piquero, A. R., Mulvey, E. P., & Schubert, C. A. (2015, August). *Studying deterrence among high-risk adolescents* (OJJDP Pathways to

Desistance). Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojp.gov/library/publications/studying-deterrence-among-high-risk-adolescents

Mendel, R. (2023). *Why youth incarceration fails: An updated review of the evidence*. The Sentencing Project. https://www.sentencingproject.org/reports/why-youth-incarceration-fails-an-updated-review-of-the-evidence/

Mulvey, E. P. (2011). *Highlights from Pathways to Desistance: A longitudinal study of serious adolescent offenders*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh241/files/media/document/230971-factsheet.pdf

National Institute of Justice. (2022, March 22). *Five things about juvenile delinquency intervention and treatment*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/five-things-about-juvenile-delinquency-intervention-and-treatment

Number Analytics. (n.d.). *Socioeconomic status, juvenile delinquency, and rehabilitation*. Number Analytics.

Pappas, L. N., & Dent, A. L. (2023). The 40-year debate: A meta-review on what works for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *19*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-021-09472-z

Reynoso, E. (2008). *Juvenile justice: Recidivism among suitable placement youth: A gender comparison* (Publication No. 3339745) [Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, Fresno]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Right on Crime. (n.d.). *Juvenile justice*. Right on Crime. https://rightoncrime.com/initiatives/juvenile-justice/

Robertson, A. A., Fang, Z., Weiland, D., Joe, G., Gardner, S., Dembo, R., McReynolds, L., Dickson, M., Pankow, J., Dennis, M., & Elkington, K. (2020). Recidivism among justice-involved youth: Findings from JJ-TRIALS. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *47*(9), 1059–1078. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820922891

.Schneider, A. L. (1984). Sentencing guidelines and recidivism rates of juvenile offenders. *Justice Quarterly*, *1*(1), 107–124.

Scott, D. A., Beeson, S., Adams, S., Scott, M., & Taylor, G. S. (2022). A psychological and educational intervention program for incarcerated youth. *Safer Communities*, *21*(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-07-2021-0027

Seigle, E., Walsh, N., & Weber, J. (2014). *Reducing juvenile recidivism*. The Council of State Governments Justice Center. https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/reducing-juvenile-recidivism/

Shader, M. (2003). *Risk factors for delinquency: An overview*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/frd030127.pdf

The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2015, April 20). *Re-examining juvenile incarceration*. https://www.pew.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/04/reexamining-juvenile-incarceration

Tolou-Shams, M., Folk, J. B., Holloway, E. D., Ordorica, C. M., Dauria, E. F., Kemp, K., & Marshall, B. D. L. (2023). Psychiatric and substance-related problems predict recidivism for first-time justice-involved youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *51*(1), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.29158/JAAPL.220028-21

USAFacts Team. (2023, May 14). How common is it for released prisoners to re-offend? USAFacts. https://usafacts.org/articles/how-common-is-it-for-released-prisoners-to-re-offend/

Webb, B. C., Wang, X., & Ho, T. (2024). An empirical study on the effect of correctional college education on recidivism. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *75*(2), 148–168.

Wilson, D. B., Gallagher, C. A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *37*(4), 347–368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427800037004001