

## Inadequacy of Referral-Only Methods: A Broad Civic Framework for Adolescent Custody Substitutes and Reconciliation-Oriented Interventions

**Aleksandr Ivanovich Petrov**

Department of Sociology and Social Policy

Lomonosov Moscow State University

Moscow, Russia

### ABSTRACT

Contemporary juvenile justice systems have increasingly adopted referral-based diversion strategies as an alternative to formal detention. However, emerging empirical evidence suggests that referral-only mechanisms remain insufficient in addressing the multidimensional needs of justice-involved adolescents. This study critically examines the structural limitations of referral-centric approaches and proposes a comprehensive civic framework integrating community-based custody substitutes with reconciliation-oriented interventions.

Drawing upon longitudinal developmental research and intervention studies, this paper synthesizes findings demonstrating that isolated referral mechanisms often fail to disrupt entrenched pathways of delinquency, particularly among high-risk youth populations (Cauffman et al., 2023; Evans-Chase & Zhou, 2014). Referral-based systems tend to operate within fragmented institutional architectures, lacking continuity of care, relational depth, and contextual adaptability. Consequently, these approaches inadequately address underlying determinants such as socio-economic marginalization, trauma exposure, and systemic exclusion (Edelman, 2019; Dierkhising et al., 2023).

This research develops a multi-layered civic intervention model grounded in restorative justice theory, developmental psychology, and community systems integration. The proposed framework emphasizes relational accountability, socio-emotional skill development, and structural reintegration through coordinated services including mentorship, family therapy, educational reentry, and employment programming (DeWit et al., 2016; Development Services Group, 2014; Davis & Heller, 2020). The model is designed to replace episodic referral pathways with sustained, community-embedded engagement.

Analytical findings indicate that integrated civic frameworks yield significantly improved outcomes in recidivism reduction, psychosocial development, and long-term societal reintegration compared to referral-only strategies. Moreover, reconciliation-oriented interventions demonstrate enhanced effectiveness in addressing harm, rebuilding community trust, and fostering youth agency (González, 2020).

The study concludes that systemic transformation of juvenile justice requires a paradigmatic shift from procedural diversion to relational, community-driven ecosystems of care. Policy implications include the reallocation of resources toward integrated service networks and the institutionalization of restorative practices. Limitations and future research directions are also discussed, particularly regarding scalability and cross-context applicability.

**Keywords:** Juvenile justice, diversion limitations, restorative justice, community-based interventions, adolescent development, recidivism reduction, civic framework, youth rehabilitation

## **INTRODUCTION**

The evolution of juvenile justice systems reflects a persistent tension between punitive control and rehabilitative intent. Historically, early juvenile courts emerged with a reformative mandate, emphasizing individualized treatment and moral guidance rather than strict legal adjudication (Fox, 1998; Feld, 2007). However, over time, institutional practices increasingly adopted punitive characteristics, particularly during periods of heightened concern over youth crime. In response, diversion strategies—primarily referral-based mechanisms—were introduced to redirect adolescents away from formal judicial processing and detention facilities.

Referral-based diversion systems typically involve directing youth offenders to external services such as counseling programs, educational interventions, or community supervision initiatives. While conceptually aligned with rehabilitative goals, these approaches often function as procedural alternatives rather than transformative interventions. Evidence suggests that referral-only models frequently lack the structural coherence necessary to produce sustained behavioral change (Evans-Chase & Zhou, 2014). Instead, they operate as fragmented pathways disconnected from broader social and developmental contexts.

The limitations of referral-centric systems are particularly evident when examined through a developmental lens. Adolescence is characterized by significant neurobiological, psychological, and social transitions, requiring interventions that are both context-sensitive and relationally grounded (Cavanagh, 2022). Referral mechanisms, however, tend to prioritize administrative efficiency over developmental appropriateness. This mismatch results in interventions that fail to engage youth meaningfully or address the root causes of delinquent behavior.

Moreover, systemic inequities further exacerbate these limitations. Research indicates that marginalized populations—including racial minorities, economically disadvantaged youth, and those involved in dual welfare systems—experience disproportionate contact with the juvenile justice system (Gardner et al., 2022; Dierkhising et al., 2023). Referral-based approaches, when implemented without structural sensitivity, risk perpetuating these disparities rather than mitigating them. Edelman (2019) highlights how broader processes of poverty criminalization intersect with justice system practices, reinforcing cycles of disadvantage.

Another critical shortcoming of referral-only methods lies in their insufficient attention to relational dynamics. Effective intervention for high-risk youth often depends on the quality of relationships established with mentors, caregivers, and community actors (Cavell et al., 2009; DeWit et al., 2016). Referral systems, however, frequently lack mechanisms for fostering sustained relational engagement. As a result, youth may cycle through multiple disconnected services without forming meaningful attachments that support behavioral transformation.

Additionally, the institutional design of referral systems often neglects continuity of care. Youth may be referred to programs with limited follow-up, resulting in inconsistent engagement and high attrition rates. This issue is compounded by the absence of integrated service coordination, leading to duplication of efforts or gaps in service provision (Development Services Group, 2024). Consequently, the potential benefits of diversion are undermined by systemic inefficiencies.

The need for a comprehensive alternative framework is therefore evident. Such a framework must move beyond isolated referral pathways toward integrated, community-based systems capable of addressing the multifaceted needs of justice-involved youth. This includes incorporating restorative justice principles, which emphasize

---

accountability, harm repair, and community participation (González, 2020). Unlike traditional diversion models, restorative approaches seek to rebuild relationships and foster collective responsibility.

Furthermore, effective frameworks must integrate evidence-based interventions targeting key developmental domains. These include family-based therapies, which address systemic dynamics within households (Development Services Group, 2014); mentorship programs that enhance socio-emotional competencies (DeWit et al., 2016); and employment initiatives that provide structured opportunities for skill development and economic inclusion (Davis & Heller, 2020; Modestino, 2019).

The present study aims to critically analyze the inadequacy of referral-only methods and to propose a comprehensive civic framework for adolescent custody substitutes. Specifically, the research addresses the following objectives: (1) to identify structural and functional limitations of referral-based diversion systems; (2) to synthesize empirical evidence on effective community-based interventions; and (3) to develop an integrated model that aligns restorative justice principles with developmental and socio-economic considerations.

By situating juvenile justice within a broader civic context, this study contributes to ongoing debates regarding system reform and youth rehabilitation. The proposed framework emphasizes not only the reduction of recidivism but also the promotion of long-term developmental outcomes and social inclusion. In doing so, it challenges prevailing assumptions about the sufficiency of referral-based diversion and advocates for a more holistic, systems-oriented approach.

## **Literature Review**

The existing body of literature on juvenile justice interventions reveals a complex interplay between developmental theory, institutional design, and socio-structural factors. Referral-based diversion strategies have been widely studied as alternatives to formal detention; however, their effectiveness remains contested. A critical synthesis of the provided references highlights both the contributions and limitations of these approaches, while also identifying key pathways for reform.

Longitudinal developmental research provides foundational insights into the long-term consequences of juvenile justice involvement. Cauffman et al. (2023) demonstrate that early system contact can produce enduring negative effects on psychological development, educational attainment, and social integration. These findings underscore the importance of minimizing formal system involvement, thereby supporting the rationale for diversion strategies. However, the study also indicates that diversion alone is insufficient without addressing underlying developmental risks.

Cavanagh (2022) further emphasizes the necessity of aligning juvenile justice interventions with principles of healthy adolescent development. The author argues that effective systems must account for cognitive immaturity, susceptibility to peer influence, and ongoing identity formation. Referral-based models often fail in this regard, as they are not designed to provide sustained developmental support. Instead, they function as episodic interventions lacking continuity and depth.

Systematic reviews of intervention literature reveal additional limitations. Evans-Chase and Zhou (2014) conclude that while many diversion programs show short-term benefits, their long-term effectiveness is inconsistent. The

---

variability in outcomes is attributed to differences in program design, implementation fidelity, and participant characteristics. Importantly, the review highlights that interventions focusing solely on behavioral redirection—without addressing relational and environmental factors—tend to produce limited impact.

Relational dynamics emerge as a critical factor in effective youth intervention. Cavell et al. (2009) demonstrate that high-quality mentoring relationships significantly improve behavioral outcomes among aggressive youth. Similarly, DeWit et al. (2016) find that program-supported mentoring contributes to improved mental health and developmental trajectories. These findings challenge the adequacy of referral-only systems, which often lack mechanisms for fostering sustained relational engagement.

Family-based interventions also play a pivotal role. The Development Services Group (2014) identifies family therapy as one of the most effective approaches for addressing delinquent behavior. By targeting systemic dynamics within households, these interventions address root causes rather than symptoms. However, referral systems frequently fail to ensure consistent participation in such programs, limiting their effectiveness.

Socio-economic interventions represent another critical dimension. Davis and Heller (2020) and Modestino (2019) provide evidence that youth employment programs can significantly reduce criminal involvement. These programs offer structured environments, skill development opportunities, and financial incentives that promote prosocial behavior. Yet, referral-based systems often treat employment programs as optional add-ons rather than integral components of intervention frameworks.

Structural inequalities further complicate intervention outcomes. Gardner et al. (2022) document how racialized exclusion within educational and justice systems contributes to persistent disparities. Dierkhising et al. (2023) highlight the unique challenges faced by youth involved in both juvenile justice and child welfare systems. These populations require coordinated, multi-system interventions that referral-only models are ill-equipped to provide.

Restorative justice emerges as a promising alternative framework. González (2020) provides empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of restorative practices in reducing recidivism and improving victim satisfaction. Unlike traditional diversion models, restorative approaches emphasize accountability, dialogue, and community engagement. This aligns with broader calls for systemic reform that prioritize relational and contextual factors.

Historical analyses further contextualize these findings. Feld (2007) and Fox (1998) trace the evolution of juvenile justice systems, highlighting the shift from rehabilitative ideals to punitive practices. This historical trajectory underscores the need for renewed emphasis on community-based, developmentally informed interventions.

Recent literature also explores emerging challenges, including stigma and identity-based disparities. Moore et al. (2024) identify stigma as a significant barrier to reintegration, while Hancock (2023) examines the intersection of gender and race in shaping delinquency outcomes. These studies highlight the importance of culturally responsive and inclusive intervention frameworks.

Despite the breadth of existing research, significant gaps remain. First, there is limited integration across intervention domains, with most studies focusing on isolated programs rather than comprehensive systems. Second, there is insufficient attention to implementation challenges, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Third, existing frameworks often lack scalability, limiting their applicability across diverse contexts.

This study addresses these gaps by proposing an integrated civic framework that synthesizes insights from multiple domains. By combining restorative justice principles with evidence-based interventions and community engagement, the proposed model seeks to overcome the limitations of referral-only systems and provide a more holistic approach to youth rehabilitation.

### **Structural Limitations of Referral-Only Systems**

Referral-based diversion systems operate on a procedural logic that prioritizes case redirection rather than systemic transformation. While these systems reduce immediate detention rates, they fail to establish sustained intervention pathways. One core limitation is fragmentation. Youth are often referred to isolated service providers without integrated coordination, leading to discontinuity in care (Development Services Group, 2024). This fragmentation produces inconsistent engagement and weakens intervention efficacy.

Additionally, referral-only approaches lack accountability structures. Once a referral is made, oversight mechanisms are minimal, resulting in variability in service quality and completion rates. This undermines both individual outcomes and system-level effectiveness. Evans-Chase and Zhou (2014) highlight that such inconsistencies significantly reduce long-term impact.

Another critical issue is the absence of contextual responsiveness. Referral systems typically operate with standardized procedures that fail to account for socio-economic, cultural, and developmental variability. As a result, interventions are often misaligned with individual needs, particularly among marginalized populations (Edelman, 2019).

### **Developmental Mismatch and Psychosocial Gaps**

Adolescence is a period characterized by neurodevelopmental sensitivity and identity formation. Effective interventions must therefore be developmentally attuned. However, referral-only models rarely incorporate developmental science into program design. Cavanagh (2022) emphasizes that adolescents require structured environments that support cognitive maturation and emotional regulation.

Referral systems often neglect psychosocial determinants such as trauma, peer influence, and family dynamics. Dira and Subardjo (2025) demonstrate that peer relationships significantly influence delinquency intensity, yet referral mechanisms rarely address peer network restructuring. Similarly, Dierkhising et al. (2023) show that youth with dual system involvement face compounded vulnerabilities that require integrated interventions.

The lack of relational depth further exacerbates these issues. Cavell et al. (2009) and DeWit et al. (2016) establish that sustained mentoring relationships are critical for behavioral change. Referral-only approaches, however, fail to ensure continuity of relational engagement.

### **Socio-Structural Inequalities and Systemic Bias**

Juvenile justice systems are embedded within broader socio-economic structures that shape access, outcomes, and disparities. Referral-only models often replicate these inequalities rather than mitigating them. Gardner et al. (2022)

identify systemic exclusion within educational and justice institutions, while Hancock (2023) highlights intersectional disparities across gender and race.

Economic marginalization further intensifies these dynamics. Edelman (2019) argues that poverty is frequently criminalized, leading to disproportionate system involvement among disadvantaged youth. Referral systems that do not address structural conditions—such as housing instability, unemployment, and educational exclusion—are inherently limited.

Moreover, stigma plays a critical role in shaping reintegration outcomes. Moore et al. (2024) demonstrate that justice-involved individuals face persistent stigmatization, which hinders access to opportunities and reinforces recidivism cycles. Referral-only systems lack mechanisms to counteract these stigmatizing processes.

### **Integrated Civic Framework for Custody Substitutes**

To address these limitations, this study proposes a multi-layered civic framework that replaces referral-only approaches with integrated, community-based systems. The framework consists of four interdependent components:

First, relational infrastructure emphasizes sustained mentorship and community engagement. Drawing on evidence from mentoring research, this component ensures that youth establish stable, supportive relationships that facilitate behavioral transformation (DeWit et al., 2016).

Second, family-centered interventions address systemic dynamics within households. Family therapy models provide mechanisms for resolving conflict, improving communication, and strengthening support networks (Development Services Group, 2014).

Third, socio-economic integration focuses on education and employment pathways. Programs such as summer employment initiatives have demonstrated measurable reductions in criminal behavior and improvements in long-term outcomes (Davis & Heller, 2020; Modestino, 2019).

Fourth, restorative justice mechanisms facilitate reconciliation and accountability. González (2020) demonstrates that restorative practices enhance victim satisfaction and reduce recidivism by fostering dialogue and community participation.

These components are interconnected through coordinated service delivery systems, ensuring continuity of care and holistic intervention.

### **Operational Model and Implementation Mechanisms**

The operationalization of the proposed framework requires institutional restructuring and resource reallocation. Central to this process is the establishment of integrated service hubs that coordinate interventions across sectors, including education, health, and community organizations.

Case management systems must be redesigned to ensure continuity and accountability. Rather than episodic referrals, youth should be enrolled in structured intervention pathways with clearly defined milestones and

---

evaluation metrics. Jalbert et al. (2010) demonstrate that reduced caseload sizes and intensive supervision improve outcomes, highlighting the importance of individualized attention.

Technology can also play a role in enhancing coordination. Data-sharing platforms enable real-time monitoring of program participation and outcomes, reducing fragmentation and improving efficiency.

Finally, community participation is essential for sustainability. Civic organizations, local stakeholders, and youth themselves must be actively involved in program design and implementation. This participatory approach enhances legitimacy and responsiveness.

### **Comparative Effectiveness Analysis**

Comparative analysis indicates that integrated civic frameworks outperform referral-only systems across multiple dimensions. Greenwood (2008) emphasizes that comprehensive prevention and intervention programs yield higher returns in reducing delinquency compared to isolated approaches.

Similarly, Malvaso et al. (2023) highlight that early and sustained intervention reduces long-term system involvement. Referral-only systems, which often operate reactively, fail to capitalize on these opportunities.

The integration of multiple intervention domains—relational, familial, economic, and restorative—creates synergistic effects that amplify outcomes. This contrasts with the limited impact of single-domain interventions.

### **Results**

The analytical synthesis of the literature reveals consistent patterns regarding the limitations of referral-only methods and the effectiveness of integrated civic frameworks. First, referral-based systems demonstrate limited long-term impact on recidivism reduction. While short-term diversion outcomes may appear positive, longitudinal evidence indicates that youth often re-enter the justice system due to unresolved underlying issues (Cauffman et al., 2023; Evans-Chase & Zhou, 2014).

Second, developmental outcomes are significantly influenced by the presence or absence of relational support. Youth engaged in mentoring and family-based interventions exhibit improved behavioral regulation, mental health, and social integration (DeWit et al., 2016; Development Services Group, 2014). In contrast, referral-only approaches fail to provide sustained relational engagement, resulting in weaker outcomes.

Third, socio-economic interventions emerge as critical determinants of success. Employment programs and educational reintegration initiatives are associated with reduced criminal activity and improved life trajectories (Davis & Heller, 2020; Modestino, 2019). These findings underscore the importance of addressing structural factors rather than focusing solely on behavioral redirection.

Fourth, restorative justice practices demonstrate measurable benefits in terms of accountability and community reintegration. González (2020) provides evidence that restorative approaches reduce recidivism while enhancing victim satisfaction. This contrasts with traditional diversion methods, which often lack mechanisms for addressing harm and rebuilding relationships.

Fifth, systemic inequalities significantly influence intervention outcomes. Marginalized populations experience higher rates of system involvement and lower access to effective interventions (Gardner et al., 2022; Dierkhising et al., 2023). Referral-only systems, which do not address these disparities, fail to achieve equitable outcomes.

Finally, integrated frameworks that combine multiple intervention domains produce the most favorable results. These frameworks ensure continuity of care, address diverse needs, and create synergistic effects that enhance overall effectiveness (Greenwood, 2008; Malvaso et al., 2023).

Overall, the findings indicate that referral-only methods are insufficient for achieving sustained behavioral change and social reintegration. Comprehensive, community-based frameworks provide a more effective alternative by addressing the multifaceted nature of youth delinquency.

## **Discussion**

The findings of this study highlight a fundamental mismatch between the complexity of youth delinquency and the simplicity of referral-only intervention models. Referral systems operate within a narrow procedural paradigm that prioritizes diversion from formal detention but fails to engage with the broader socio-developmental context.

From a theoretical perspective, the inadequacy of referral-only methods can be understood through ecological systems theory, which emphasizes the interaction between individuals and their environments. Effective interventions must therefore operate across multiple levels, including family, community, and institutional contexts. Referral systems, by contrast, function at a single level, limiting their impact.

The integration of restorative justice principles represents a significant advancement in addressing these limitations. By focusing on relational accountability and community engagement, restorative approaches align with developmental and sociological theories of behavior change. González (2020) demonstrates that such approaches not only reduce recidivism but also enhance social cohesion.

However, the implementation of integrated civic frameworks presents several challenges. Resource constraints, institutional resistance, and coordination difficulties may hinder adoption. Jalbert et al. (2010) emphasize the importance of manageable caseloads and structured supervision, which require substantial investment.

Additionally, scalability remains a critical concern. While integrated models show promise in localized contexts, their effectiveness across diverse settings requires further investigation. Differences in cultural, economic, and institutional conditions may influence outcomes.

Another limitation relates to measurement and evaluation. Comprehensive frameworks involve multiple components, making it difficult to isolate the effects of individual interventions. Future research should focus on developing robust evaluation methodologies that capture the complexity of integrated systems.

Despite these challenges, the implications of this study are clear. Policymakers must move beyond referral-based diversion toward holistic, community-centered approaches. This requires not only programmatic changes but also a shift in institutional philosophy—from control-oriented systems to care-oriented ecosystems.

## **Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that referral-only methods are fundamentally inadequate for addressing the complex needs of justice-involved adolescents. While such approaches reduce immediate detention rates, they fail to produce sustained behavioral change or social reintegration.

The proposed civic framework offers a comprehensive alternative that integrates relational, familial, socio-economic, and restorative components. By addressing the root causes of delinquency and fostering community engagement, this model provides a more effective pathway for youth rehabilitation.

The research contributes to ongoing debates on juvenile justice reform by emphasizing the need for systemic transformation. Future efforts should focus on scaling integrated frameworks, improving evaluation methods, and ensuring equitable access to interventions.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Cauffman, Elizabeth, Marie L. Gillespie, Jordan Beardslee, Frank Davis, Maria Hernandez, and Tamika Williams. 2023. Adolescent contact, lasting impact? Lessons learned from two longitudinal studies spanning 20 years of developmental science research with justice-system-involved youths. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 24: 133–61.
2. Cavanagh, Caitlin. 2022. Healthy adolescent development and the juvenile justice system: Challenges and solutions. *Child Development Perspectives* 16: 141–47.
3. Cavell, Timothy A., L. C. Elledge, Kenya T. Malcolm, Melissa A. Faith, and Jan N. Hughes. 2009. Relationship quality and the mentoring of aggressive, high-risk children. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* 38: 185–98.
4. Cole, Heather, and Rebecca Cohen. 2013. Breaking down barriers: A case study of juvenile justice personnel perspectives on school reentry. *Journal of Correctional Education* 64: 13–35. Available online: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26507528> (accessed on 1 December 2025).
5. Crime Solutions. 2021. Practice Profile: Skill-Building Interventions for Delinquent Behaviors of Youth; Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available online: <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedpractices/skill-building-interventions-delinquent-behaviors-youth> (accessed on 15 September 2025).
6. Davis, Jonathan M., and Sara B. Heller. 2020. Rethinking the benefits of youth employment programs: The heterogeneous effects of summer jobs. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 102: 664–77.
7. Development Services Group. 2014. Family Therapy. Literature Review; Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available online: [https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family\\_Therapy.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family_Therapy.pdf) (accessed on 10 September 2025).
8. Development Services Group. 2024. Alternatives to Detention Confinement Model Programs Guide Literature Review; Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available online: <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/model-programs-guide/literature-reviews/alternatives-to-detention-and-confinement> (accessed on 8 September 2025).

9. DeWit, David J., David DuBois, Gizem Erdem, Simon Larose, and Ellen L. Lipman. 2016. The role of program-supported mentoring relationships in promoting youth mental health, behavioral, and developmental outcomes. *Prevention Science* 17: 646–57.
10. Dierkhising, Carly B., Andrea L. Eastman, and Kristine Chan. 2023. Juvenile justice and child welfare dual system involvement among females with and without histories of commercial sexual exploitation. *Children and Youth Services Review* 150: 106989.
11. Dira, Hayyu, and Ratna Y. S. Subardjo. 2025. Peer relationships and their impact on juvenile delinquency intensity: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Health Sciences and Medical Development* 4: 116–26.
12. Edelman, Peter. 2019. *Not a Crime to Be Poor: The Criminalization of Poverty in America*. New York: The New Press.
13. Evans-Chase, Michelle, and Huiquan Zhou. 2014. A systematic review of the juvenile justice intervention literature: What it can (and cannot) tell us about what works with delinquent youth. *Crime & Delinquency* 60: 451–70.
14. Fagan, Abigail A., and Andrea M. Lindsey. 2014. Gender Differences in the effectiveness of delinquency prevention programs: What can be learned from experimental research? *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 41: 1057–78.
15. Feld, Barry C. 2007. *A Century of Juvenile Justice: A Work in Progress or a Revolution That Failed?* Minnesota Legal Studies Research Paper No. 99-6. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Law School. Available online: [https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/faculty\\_articles/301/](https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/faculty_articles/301/) (accessed on 1 December 2025).
16. Fields, Diane, and Laura S. Abrams. 2010. Gender differences in the perceived needs and barriers of youth offenders preparing for community reentry. *Child & Youth Care Forum* 39: 253–69.
17. Fox, Sanford J. 1998. A contribution to the history of the American juvenile court. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 49: 7–16.
18. Gardner, Joby, Amanda Klonsky, Ishujon Clemens, Selena Gallardo, Rakeisha Harris, Natali Rosario, Ashley Suarez, Bridget Torres, and Maria E. Torre. 2022. Back in on the outside: Racialized exclusion at Chicago's school/prison nexus and the promise of student voice. *Urban Education* 59: 1078–105.
19. González, Thalia. 2020. The legalization of restorative justice: A fifty-state empirical analysis. *Utah Law Review* 2019: 3. Available online: <https://dc.law.utah.edu/ulr/vol2019/iss5/3> (accessed on 1 December 2025).
20. Greenwood, Peter. 2008. Prevention and intervention programs for juvenile offenders. *The Future of Children* 18: 185–210.
21. Hancock, Katy. 2023. Wellness and delinquency at the intersection of gender and race. *Crime & Delinquency* 69: 1534–64.
22. Hereth, Jane. 2022. Overrepresentation of People Who Identify as LGBTQ+ in the Criminal Legal System. Chicago: Safety & Justice Challenge. Available online: <https://www.pro-memoria.info/wp/wp-content/uploads/Overrepresentation-Of-People-Who-Identify-As-LGBTQ-In-The-Criminal-Legal-System-Report-Safety-and-Justice-Challenge.pdf> (accessed on 7 September 2025).
23. Hockenberry, Sarah, and Charles Puzanchera. 2015. *Juvenile Court Statistics 2013 (National Report Series Bulletin)*; Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
24. Jalbert, Sarah K., William Rhodes, Christopher Flygare, and Michael Kane. 2010. Testing probation outcomes in an evidence-based practice setting: Reduced caseload size and intensive supervision effectiveness. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 49: 233–53.

25. Javdani, Shabnam. 2019. Critical issues for youth involved in the juvenile justice system: Innovations in prevention, intervention, and policy. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community* 47: 67–75.
26. Jolliffe, Darrick, and David P. Farrington. 2007. *A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Impact of Mentoring on Re-Offending: A Summary*. London: Home Office.
27. Jones, Denise, and Dennis Jones. 2020. Transcend the summer slump: How summer programs can attract and retain low-income high school students. *Afterschool Matters* 31: 60–67.
28. Jones, Denise, Paul Feigenbaum, and Denise F. Jones. 2021. Motivation (constructs) made simpler: Adapting self-determination theory for community-based youth development programs. *Journal of Youth Development* 16: 7–28.
29. Jones, Denise, Zaida Pearson, Deanna C. Sinex, Jeremiah Nash, Aiwen Chen, and Dennis F. Jones. 2024. Making summer count: Youths' perceptions of meaningfulness and future orientation in summer youth employment contexts. *Afterschool Matters* 38: 57–71.
30. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). 2017. Available online: <https://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai> (accessed on 1 December 2025).
31. Lee, JoAnna S., Mark E. Courtney, Tracy W. Harachi, and Emiko A. Tajima. 2015. Labeling and the effect of adolescent legal system involvement on adult outcomes for foster youth aging out of care. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 85: 441.
32. Leonard, Latrice. 2018. *Civic Engagement and Mentorship as Preventative Measures to Deter Adolescent Delinquency*. Doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX, USA.
33. Lewis, Consuella, and Rachel M. Cohen. 2016. *Diversion & Extended Diversion Evaluation Report*. West Islip: Youth Enrichment Services.
34. Malvaso, Catia, Michaela Magann, Pedro H. Ribeiro Santiago, Alicia Montgomerie, Rhiannon Pilkinton, Paul Delfabbro, and John Lynch. 2023. Early versus late contact with the youth justice system: Opportunities for prevention and diversion. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* 36: 16–41.
35. Modestino, Alicia S. 2019. How do summer youth employment programs improve criminal justice outcomes, and for whom? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 38: 600–28.
36. Moore, Kelly E., Sarah Phillips, Rachelle Kromash, Shania Siebert, Walter Roberts, MacKenzie Peltier, Madison D. Smith, Terril Verplaetse, Phillip Marotta, Catherine Burke, and et al. 2024. The causes and consequences of stigma among individuals involved in the criminal legal system: A systematic review. *Stigma and Health* 9: 224.