

Determinants Of Juvenile Delinquency: A Multi-Systemic Integration Of Psychological Risk Factors, Cognitive Processes, And Developmental Pathways

Taara Shah

Pope High School, Marietta, Georgia, United States

Abstract

Juvenile delinquency establishes a critical social and public well-being issue on a global scale, reproduced in approximately 900,000 annual youth arrests in the United States alone. Historical methods mainly focused on separate risk factors, whereas modern research has highlighted the worth of multi-systemic perspectives that bring together psychological, cognitive, developmental, and contextual effects. This thematic review produces current literature from psychology and criminology to clarify the multifaceted trails leading to juvenile felonious, with specific attention to the interaction among psychological risk profiles, cognitive processes, developmental contexts, gender-differentiated pathways, and adverse experiences.

The examination separates three central theoretical mechanisms concerned in youth delinquency: (1) Psychopathy and externalizing disorders, such as Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), which are marked by impulsivity, emotional dysregulation, and behavioural disinhibition; (2) Cognitive constructs like criminal identity and deviant thought patterns, which bear antisocial attitudes; and (3) Developmental and ecological contexts, including ancestral relationships, peer networks, community resources and adversities, together with adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). Notably, while ACEs signify potent risk factors, their role must be understood within a gathering of consistent determinants rather than as isolated causal agents.

Interferences that address these multidimensional causes—such as cognitive-behavioural therapies, identity-focused strategies, trauma-informed clinical practice, and systemic supports—have established a reduction in recidivism by 15–30% in empirical evaluations. Furthermore, gender-sensitive and developmentally geared methods are highlighted for their critical importance, given the different risk routes and action needs among male and female youth populations. The review eventually asserts that vigorous juvenile justice policies must include comprehensive multi-domain risk assessments, targeted interference modalities tailored to specific needs, addition of evidence-based practices, and simultaneous efforts to reduce risk factors while stimulating protective resources. These references carry practical implications for forward policy and practice within the spheres of juvenile justice, mental health, educational systems, and community outreach.

Keywords: *Juvenile delinquency, multi-systemic risk factors, psychopathy and ADHD, criminal identity and cognition, evidence-based intervention*

Date of Submission: 24-10-2025

Date of Acceptance: 04-11-2025

I. Introduction

Juvenile delinquency remains a determined apprehension within social, psychological, and public health areas worldwide, with important consequences for individuals involved, as well as for victims, their families, and broader communities. In the United States, annual arrests of adolescents aged 10 to 17 approach 900,000, with considerable extents attributable to both violent and property offenses. Comparable designs are observed globally, where youths establish approximately 15–20% of total crime in advanced nations. A nuanced understanding of the multifactorial backgrounds of youth antisocial activity is vital for designing effective inhibition and interference approaches. Traditional models that assign crime to remote individual features or singular ecological variables have shown incomplete explanatory power, as they fail to account for contrasting outcomes among similarly exposed youths. Consequently, current study prioritizes integrated multi-systemic frameworks that examine the complex interplay of psychological propensities, developmental contexts, environmental settings, and social dynamics manipulating adolescent offending.

Central to the forecast and understanding of juvenile delinquency are psychological and personality theories linked to expressing pathology. Traits related with psychopathy—including scheming interpersonal styles, emotional instability, impulsivity, and antisocial tendencies—have been strongly connected to early onset offending, diversity of criminal activity, sharp risk-taking, and raised recidivism. In addition, the presence of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), particularly when comorbid with oppositional defiant or

conduct disorder, significantly elevates the likelihood of delinquency; individuals diagnosed with ADHD and comorbid conduct disorder before age 18 are at particularly high risk for subsequent offending. Longitudinal studies reveal that approximately 20–30% of those diagnosed with ADHD during childhood later engage with the criminal justice system, compared to 3–5% of their general population peers. These psychological vulnerabilities are neither static nor isolated but operate within broader developmental, ecological, and social contexts. The transformation of dispositional risk into criminal behavior is moderated by cognitive variables—such as criminal identity, deviant thought structures, and criminal self-efficacy—as well as social environments, including family functioning, peer association, educational climates, and community resources.

Modern theoretical and empirical work recognizes that youth offending emerges not primarily from individual pathology, but from dynamic interactions among a constellation of risk and protective factors operating at multiple ecological levels. This acknowledgment underpins the development of integrated models including the General Personality and Cognitive Social Learning (GPCSL) framework, the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) approach, and developmental taxonomy models, each of which aims to capture the complexity of juvenile delinquency. Furthermore, emerging scholarship has highlighted distinct gender-based pathways, demonstrating that risk exposure, developmental trajectories, and protective factors often diverge significantly between male and female juvenile offenders, thus requiring gender-responsive theoretical and therapeutic interventions. For instance, while males account for about 75–80% of juvenile arrests, the presence of females within the justice system is increasing, accompanied by specific risk profiles marked by heightened trauma exposure and self-injurious behaviors.

The juvenile justice system represents a critical juncture where psychological assessment, developmental sensitivity, and evidence-informed intervention can substantially redirect youth trajectories toward desistance or, conversely, perpetuate criminal involvement. Early detection of risk factors, trauma-sensitive screening, and delivery of developmentally tailored therapies—particularly cognitive-behavioral intervention—have been shown to decrease recidivism rates, with meta-analytic data indicating a 15–30% reduction relative to conventional approaches. In contrast, punitive, developmentally insensitive strategies risk exacerbating criminal involvement and contribute to phenomena such as the “school-to-prison pipeline”. Identifying modifiable intervention targets and optimizing their delivery remains a central concern for policy leaders, practitioners, and researchers alike.

This review adopts an interdisciplinary stance, integrating insights from psychology (cognitive dynamics, personality theory), criminology (identity development, risk management), education (school factors, peer relations), and public policy (evidence-based practices, prevention implementation) in order to form a comprehensive approach to juvenile delinquency. By blending these perspectives, the analysis emphasizes the importance of coordinated, cross-sectoral responses, advocating for collaborative strategies among psychology, criminology, educational systems, and policy frameworks rather than isolated efforts by individual disciplines.

In sum, this integrative model underscores that addressing juvenile delinquency demands coordinated interventions spanning mental health evaluation, school-oriented prevention programs, family support services, and rehabilitation approaches responsive to developmental stages.

This thematic review tries to address the following research question:

RQ: How do psychological risk factors (including psychopathy and ADHD), cognitive processes (criminal identity and thinking styles), developmental contexts, and gender-specific pathways interact to shape juvenile delinquency trajectories, and what evidence-based intervention strategies effectively target these multifaceted pathways to reduce reoffending and promote youth desistance?

II. Research Methodology

This thematic review of the literature integrates up-to-date psychological and criminological studies that analyse the multi-determinant causes of juvenile delinquency. Systematic online searches were conducted across peer-reviewed databases such as PubMed, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar using search terms such as "juvenile delinquency," "offending in adolescence," "adverse childhood experiences," "psychopathy," "ADHD," "criminal identity," and related concepts. Inclusion criteria included empirical research, meta-analyses, and theoretical articles from 2005 to 2025 with a focus on recent studies (2023–2025) that indicate current knowledge. The review favoured peer-reviewed materials and excluded opinion pieces and non-English language publications. Literature was thematically arranged under major determinants: personality and psychological factors (notably psychopathy and ADHD), cognitive processes involved in criminality (criminal identity and thinking styles), ecological and developmental contexts, gender-specific pathways, and evidence-based intervention styles. The each theme was analysed critically to determine convergent findings, theoretical mechanisms, and research gaps.

Theoretical Mechanisms: Psychopathy, ADHD, and Criminal Identity

Understanding juvenile delinquency involves consideration of the psychological and cognitive processes by which individual tendencies are converted into antisocial behavior. Three related theoretical concepts—psychopathy, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), and criminal identity—give critical insight into such pathways.

Psychopathy and Externalizing Personality Traits

Psychopathy is understood to be a dimensional personality disorder made up of features across interpersonal (e.g., egotism, manipulation), affective (e.g., callousness, emotion dysregulation), lifestyle (e.g., impulsivity), and behavioural (e.g., antisociality) spectrums (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 14).

The triarchic model develops this theoretical framework into three symptomatic structures: disinhibition (impulsivity, emotional instability), meanness (callousness, predatory aggression), and boldness (dominance, low fear), all supposed to underlie different pathways to antisocial behaviour (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 15). Empirical data strongly confirm the link between psychopathic tendencies and criminal behaviour; psychopathic subjects are often found to exhibit earlier criminal initiation, more offense diversity, riskier behaviour, and greater recidivism (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 14). Importantly, psychopathy does not exist as a solo typology.

The moderated-expression theory of psychopathy indicates that resilience social factors like solid interpersonal connections or superior intelligence might help to cushion the translation of psychopathic characteristics into offense behaviour (Hart et al., 2024, p. 2). This psychological disposition and environmental interaction demonstrate a key principle: risk factors of individuals are moderated by developmental as well as social conditions, including adversarial contexts. Though negative childhood experiences (ACEs) like abuse, neglect, and family dysfunction can further heighten the expression of psychopathic tendencies, effective social support and healthy interpersonal relationships can impede their expression in offending behavior (Hart et al., 2024, p. 2).

ADHD, Comorbidity, and Externalizing Pathways

The same developmental trajectories leading to offending are found in people with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, especially if they have comorbidities of oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), conduct disorder (CD), and substance use disorders (SUDs).

These comorbidities substantially raise the risk of antisocial behavior (Modesti et al., 2025, p. 2). Oppositional defiant disorder, in fact, has been recognized as an antecedent to conduct disorder and a valid predictor of criminal behavior (Modesti et al., 2025, p. 2). Evidence shows that adult men with ADHD and comorbid ODD or alcohol use disorder have significantly increased offending risk, with diagnosis at age 18 or younger further increasing the risk (Modesti et al., 2025, pp. 2, 5). Statistical analyses verify that both ODD and alcohol use disorder are highly correlated with offending behavior, highlighting the necessity for early assessment and intervention for co-occurring disorders (Modesti et al., 2025, p. 6). The processes that connect ADHD with delinquency work through compromised executive functioning, emotion dysregulation, and behavioral disinhibition.

Youth with ADHD have impairments in impulse control, planning, and delayed gratification—processes instrumental in inhibiting antisocial impulses and thinking ahead to consequences. When combined with adversity—such as ACEs—these neurobiological risks produce increased risk to criminal pathways (Modesti et al., 2025, p. 6). Early intervention in emotion regulation and control of impulses, combined with support for addressing environmental sources of stress, can minimize offending risk in populations of ADHD (Modesti et al., 2025, p. 8).

Criminal Identity and Cognitive Mechanisms

In addition to personality and psychiatric disorders, cognitive structures serve an essential function in perpetuating antisocial conduct.

Criminal identity—the way that people imagine their roles, abilities, and position in a criminal ideology—is posited as a leading cause of chronic criminal engagement and a key site for desistance-focused intervention (Veysey & Rivera, 2017, p. 1249). Criminal identity has two separate dimensions: explicit criminal identity (ECI), which is intentional social-cognitive self-conceptualization as a criminal, and implicit criminal identity (ICI), which arises out of nonconscious associations formed as a result of criminal encounters (Veysey & Rivera, 2017, p. 1251). Notably, ECI and ICI frequently are uncorrelated, in the sense that people may actively disavow a criminal identity but retain entrenched nonconscious criminal self-associations—a pattern that makes intervention and prediction of desistance difficult (Veysey & Rivera, 2017, p. 1252). Criminal thinking style—the typical thought content and cognitive processes that support habitual antisocial behavior—is another vital mechanism.

Offending behavior is maintained by criminal thinking styles that contain attitudes of minimizing personal responsibility, justifying deviance, and ignoring societal norms if not targeted (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 23). Criminal self-efficacy—the conviction that one is able to effectively carry out criminal activities—also serves as an antecedent to procriminal attitudes and increased offending risk (Boduszek et al., 2013, p. 15). Early detection of maladaptive cognitive profiles in high-risk youth, especially for those with high psychopathy or ADHD dimensions, can guide secondary and tertiary prevention efforts (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 23).

Integration: From Disposition to Behavior

Together, these theoretical processes show a similar thread: psychopathic or externalizing individuals are typically less able—either by way of personality organization, neurobiological limitation, or cognitive structure—to internalize moral codes and suppress antisocial behaviors (Hart et al., 2024, p. 2). This does not mean determinism. Multi-systemic strategies that integrate individual-level intervention (managing personality characteristics, cognitive distortions, and skill deficits) with social-contextual support (building relationships, mitigating environmental stressors, and offering prosocial opportunities) are critical in interrupting criminal pathways and fostering long-term behavior modification. The literature emphasizes the importance of early detection, focused treatment, and preventative programming that are addressed to psychological disposition as well as developmental context, acknowledging that even those with high levels of personality or neurobiological risk can desist when supported by protective social mechanisms.

Developmental, Ecological, and Moral Contexts

Criminal activity is also fully explained through a developmental and environmental framework, considering participation as a changeable process instead of an unchangeable personal state (Taylor & Horgan, 2006, p. 586). Criminal paths are dynamic, characterized by developmental sequences and sequences of transitions (Taylor & Horgan, 2006, p. 588). Youth delinquency results from complex interactions between environmental factors (e.g., peer groups, parent factors) and personal factors (e.g., genetics, temperament) (Cicerali & Cicerali, 2018, p. 138). Parental factors are influential mediators but not direct causes of juvenile delinquency (Cicerali & Cicerali, 2018, p. 138). Developmental theories imply that the connection between age and criminality is mediated by genetic predisposition and negative environmental influences, including early maltreatment (Cicerali & Cicerali, 2018, p. 140). Moffitt's Developmental Taxonomic Theory also differentiates between life-course-persistent (LCP) antisocial behavior, which is regarded as a neurodevelopmental disorder, and adolescence-limited (AL) behavior, which tends to occur in the presence of antisocial peers (Cicerali & Cicerali, 2018, p. 140).

This ecologically grounded approach calls for an overt integration of psychological considerations within their larger political and social settings (Taylor & Horgan, 2006, p. 586). Problem behavior theory, for instance, sees problematic behaviors as embedded within an intricate system including the individual's emotions, values, contexts, and person–environment interactions encountered during young adulthood and youth (Bates et al., 2022, p. 138; p. 145). The effectiveness of the Theory of Self-Control is illustrated by research indicating that those who partake in dangerous driving behaviors, including drink driving or high-range speeding, are, overall, more likely to have a complex offending history, as would be expected when viewing individuals with low self-control as being involved in multifaceted antisocial behavior (Bates et al., 2022, p. 137; p. 145). In addition, encouraging positive behavior, i.e., school violence prevention, necessitates a positive and supportive social climate setting up norms and explicit expectations for conflict resolution (Stilwell et al., 2024, p. 848).

Moral philosophy is one perspective that comes in contrast with unrealistically simple economic models based on cost-benefit calculations and models based on the normative nature of criminal law on "morally imperfect persons" (White, 2012, p. 67). Kantian moral psychology, which considers character, strength, and willpower, posits that motivational factors like affect (rapid, transitory emotional influence) and passion (a stable inclination) directly affect criminal decisions and culpability through the doctrine of *mens rea* (White, 2012, p. 67; p. 68; p. 71). Moral constructs also function as possible protective factors; for those scoring high in psychopathic traits, greater integrity (loyal commitment to a strict moral code) greatly disempowers the expression of these traits into criminality (Hart et al., 2024, p. 112736; p. 112736).

Lastly, criminal behavior research should take into consideration the pathological and stigma environments confronted by justice-involved individuals. Chronic victimization and childhood trauma, including sexual and physical abuse, are prevalent in prison populations (Goff et al., 2007, p. 153). The rate of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in sentenced prisoners is considerably higher than in the general population, with disproportionately more women being affected (Goff et al., 2007, p. 152; p. 153). Inadequate treatment of PTSD in this group contributes to heightened risk for recidivism, self-injury, and suicide (Goff et al., 2007, p. 153). Such criminal history places a pervasive and disparate negative stigma on individuals, making reintegration successful—obtaining employment, for example—challenging due to lack of legal safeguard and dealing with intricacies of the system such as transportation and housing instability (Jones Young & Ryan, 2019, p. 497; p. 496).

Gender Differences and Predictors of Offending

Examination of gender differences and predictors of offending evidences not just overall trends, but also essential differences that require gender-specific theoretical and methodological orientation. es (Gover et al., 2008; Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). The more general conceptual models in criminal psychology recognize gender as an important factor; for example, the General Personality and Cognitive Social Learning (GPCSL)

model encompasses gender—along with age, ethnicity, and crime support at the neighborhood level—in its general assessment of risk factors (Fortune & Heffernan, 2019). In addition, models forecasting individual offending frequency (λ) admit that it can be a function of time-stable factors, such as gender (Farrington et al., 2016).

Gender as a Moderator and a Target of Criminogenic Research

Gender also serves as a key moderator variable in forecasting institutional outcomes (Walters, 2023). Sex, for instance, together with age, race, and follow-up length, needs to be controlled when examining variables that are associated with disciplinary misconduct among correctional populations (Walters, 2023). Meta-analytic data indicate higher correlations among Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS) and institutional misconduct outcomes for females than males (Walters, 2023). This suggests that sex has a moderating influence and deserves more consideration in future studies regarding criminal thinking assessment and prison conduct (Walters, 2023). Previous research has used PICTS specifically to examine disciplinary outcomes in terms of female data (Walters & Elliott, 1999) and investigated previous literature on gender variations in institutional misconduct (Gover et al., 2008). Outside of institutions, there is a strong need to make the scope of root criminal justice models larger in order to allow for generalizability across genders (Boduszek et al., 2013). For example, the need to have theoretical models, for instance, criminal social identity models, empirically tested in a wider scope of offender groups, including female offenders (Boduszek et al., 2013), has been established. Additionally, particular offense types reveal gender disparity, for example, Driving Under the Influence (DUI), where the highest percentage of offenders were male (90%) (Spolander, 1997). Research seeking to forecast recidivism with indicators such as criminal self-efficacy often involves female samples (e.g., 25.3% in a sample) (Ung & Lloyd, 2024). In targeted research on psychological protectors of criminality, some research draws on predominantly female samples (e.g., 81.2% female) to evaluate the protective function of variables such as integrity (Hart et al., 2024). Researchers also commonly control for gender as a participant variable when examining if intervention effectiveness, like cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), differ between subgroups (Smith et al., 2024).

Theoretical advancement has traditionally examined the intersection of gender, crime, and desistance, with a specific focus on cognitive change mechanisms (Giordano et al., 2002). In addition, studies have been committed to examining the role of criminal justice system participation and gender stereotypes on women's explicit and implicit criminal identities (Rivera & Veysey, 2016).

Distinct Female Offender Pathways: Trauma, Dual Harm, and Extreme Violence

Women and girls in the criminal justice system have also experienced a significant rise in population, with women contributing to more than 50% of self-injury cases reported in some correctional facilities (Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). This group is a distinct segment marked by high levels of complex needs, such as difficulties with emotion regulation, mental health issues, and long histories of victimization and trauma (De Vogel & Nicholls, 2016; De Vogel et al., 2016; Huitema et al., 2021; Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). In light of such an increase, it is more critical to discuss the theoretical knowledge deficit concerning dual harm—co-occurrence of aggression and self-harm—amongst women offenders (Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). Although dual harm is confined to a small female subgroup, making direct comparisons with male peers challenging through methodological heterogeneity between studies (Huitema et al., 2021; Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). Interestingly, covertly observed aggression within institutions indicates that women are more likely to target staff members with serious aggressive behavior than other women offenders (Nicholls et al., 2009; Selenius et al., 2016; Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024).

In the case of high-impact violence, women's participation in acts of terrorism and mass shootings is a relatively unexamined phenomenon (Jacques & Taylor, 2009; Turner, 2016; Wickham et al., 2020; Nicholson & Allely, 2021). The literature heavily relies on case discussion, which impedes direct comparison between male and female groups in terms of precipitating, motivating, and environmental factors (Nicholson & Allely, 2021). Therefore, empirical research to define contributory factors and warning behaviors by gender is important to risk minimization (Gonzalez et al., 2014; Nicholson & Allely, 2021).

Unique differences that have been found for women who belong to terror groups are a younger age of radicalisation, higher education levels than might be speculated, and lower religious ideology and extremism levels (Nicholson & Allely, 2021). Incentivization for membership in far-right groups was also dissimilar; the women were recruited by relational affiliation (e.g., friends or family) or relative deprivation, while men were incentivized by extreme Christian ideology (Gonzalez et al., 2014; Nicholson & Allely, 2021). In addition, information about female mass shooters is limited (Katsavdakakis et al., 2011; Nicholson & Allely, 2021). Nevertheless, the one developing trend indicates that female mass shooters show a tendency to attack their current or former sites of work (Nicholson & Allely, 2021). Even though there is no formal psychological evaluation data available, family members evaluating female bombers have reported symptoms that are similar to those of

Borderline Personality Disorder as well as Dissociative Disorder (Felthous et al., 2019; Nicholson & Allely, 2021).

Juvenile Processing and Adult System Impacts

Children's entry into the criminal justice system tends to result from early-onset psychological and behavioral disorders. Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), most commonly diagnosed before the age of 12, often endures into adulthood and has been associated with increased offending risks, especially when combined with disorders like oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) and substance abuse disorders (Modesti et al., 2025, pp. 95, 152). Early detection of these comorbidities seems to be important, since offenders were more likely than non-offenders to be diagnosed before the age of 18 (Modesti et al., 2025, pp. 119, 145). These results highlight the need for early intervention measures that consider psychiatric complexity and precursors of behavior.

The school setting is an essential context for prevention and early detection. Adolescent violence and peer victimization not only detract from academic achievement but also hinder social and emotional development (Stilwell et al., 2024, p. 284). Studies indicate that creating safe and prosocial school environments makes a significant contribution to positive developmental outcomes (Stilwell et al., 2024, pp. 284, 292). Approaches like the Positive Youth Development (PYD) model provide ecologically based models of school safety, focusing on the place of local community partnerships and culturally responsive policies (Stilwell et al., 2024, p. 301). However, typical approaches—like zero-tolerance mandates—can oversimplify the problem and feed into the school-to-prison pipeline (Stilwell et al., 2024, p. 301).

An analogous paradigm shift resonates in school shooting research as well, with a focus shifting toward a more comprehensive understanding of prevention at the systemic level and away from the individuation of risk (Grøndahl & Bjørkly, 2016, pp. 395–396). This reconceptualization necessitates investment in examining general indicators of school violence rather than narrowly targeting end cases.

The shift between juvenile and adult criminal justice systems also brings more into relief. While a few risk factors—such as a background of antisocial behavior—are unchanging, others fluctuate by developmental stage and population (Fortune & Heffernan, 2019, p. 545). Young offenders tend to have distinct psychosocial patterns, requiring individualized interventions (Smith et al., 2024, p. 447). Static and dynamic risk constructs like the Central Eight and Big Four might operate uniquely based on whether the target is a youth, an offender with mental health issues, or someone who has been involved in substance-related crimes (Fortune & Heffernan, 2019, p. 545).

Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) has emerged as a staple of both juvenile and adult correctional programs. It was introduced in the United States in the 1980s and embraced in the U.K. by the 1990s, evidence-based practices such as Reasoning and Rehabilitation, Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT), and Aggression Replacement Training (ART) are the foundation of behavioral treatment (Szifris et al., 2025, p. 13). These treatments tend to be organized based on the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model, focusing on matching treatment intensity with levels of individual risk and criminogenic needs (Fortune & Heffernan, 2019, pp. 547–548).

Together, the literature calls for early intervention, trauma-sensitive care, and developmental sensitivity in the treatment of juvenile offenders. The integration of mental health screening, school-based prevention, and evidence-based rehabilitation methods can help to minimize the prospect of system entrenchment and long-term recidivism.

Prevention and Intervention: Multi-Pathway Approaches to Reducing Juvenile Delinquency

Successfully tackling youth delinquency calls for intervention strategies that address the various determinants outlined in this review—cognitive styles, psychological risk factors, developmental settings, and gender-sensitive needs. Though there is no one intervention capable of tackling the complexity of youth crime, evidence-based interventions rooted in multi-systemic models have proved significant in reducing reoffending and facilitating youth desistance journeys.

Early Intervention and Risk Stratification

Early recognition and intervention are key points of leverage in the prevention of criminal careers. The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model is the overarching framework for this model, which suggests that intervention level needs to be consistent with offense risk level, address criminogenic needs (changeable risk factors), and be responsive to the individual learning styles and characteristics (Andrews & Bonta, 2023). In this context, differentiation of static risk factors (e.g., previous offense history, age of first offense) from dynamic risk factors (DRF) allows practitioners to target resources toward modifiable areas most responsive to intervention (Fortune & Heffernan, 2019, p. 664).

Early identification of co-occurring psychiatric and personality risk factors is especially crucial. Youth with ADHD diagnosis before the age of 18, and most notably youth with comorbid oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) or conduct disorder (CD), are a high-priority group for intervention (Modesti et al., 2025, pp. 2, 5). Identification of psychopathic features at an early stage—assessed by reliable measures like the Psychopathy Checklist-Youth Version—may guide secondary and tertiary prevention strategies based on the individual personality profiles (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2023, p. 23). In addition, screening for adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), such as abuse, neglect, witnessing domestic violence, and parental incarceration, is important contextual information for understanding youth risk and guiding ACE-informed intervention strategies. But ACE screening must be conceptualized not as a function to predict delinquency risk by itself, but instead as recognizing one category of developmental stressors that combine with psychological, cognitive, and social variables to influence offending pathways.

Cognitive and Identity-Focused Interventions

Cognitive-behavioral treatment (CBT) is one of the most empirically validated and most commonly used intervention strategies in juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. Meta-analytic findings show that evidence-based cognitive-behavioral programs decrease recidivism by 15–30% relative to control (Smith et al., 2024). The theoretic model of CBT within correctional settings borrows from the Risk-Need-Responsivity model, which focuses on correction of erroneous or malfunctioning cognitions that maintain criminal behavior. Criminal thinking styles—assessed via measures like the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS)—can be categorized into proactive dimensions (cold, calculating cognition) and reactive dimensions (impulsive, affectively dysregulated cognition) (Walters, 2023, pp. 101–106). By intervening in these pathological thinking patterns, CBT targets a central criminogenic need.

Even so, CBT has faced legitimate criticism concerning its application within criminal justice systems. Scholars observe that CBT, in contemporary corrections usage, has moved away from individualized therapeutic origins towards standardized, group-based administration focusing on scalability rather than treatment fidelity (Szifris et al., 2025, pp. 5, 28). In addition, successful interventions for the treatment of depression or anxiety are not necessarily likely to target criminogenic thought patterns, calling for increased theoretical unity and specificity in CBT protocols (Smith et al., 2024, p. 523).

Augmenting classic CBT, newer models place greater emphasis on identity work and narrative models. Criminal identity, and specifically the implicit criminal identity (ICI) developed through repeated offense exposure, is a robust predictor of chronic offending. Intervention directly targeting identity reconstruction, leading youth away from criminal towards prosocial identities, has been found to be effective in facilitating desistance (Paternoster & Bushway, 2009; Stevens, 2012). The Criminal Narrative Experience (CNE) model, for example, argues that the way in which people think about and tell their offending stories constructs cognitive distortions and change readiness (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2024, p. 280). From knowing a person's narrative theme and the thinking patterns underpinning it, practitioners can adapt interventions to meet an individual's stage of change and psychological readiness (DeBlasio & Mojtahedi, 2024, pp. 282, 353–354).

ACE-Informed Approaches Within Broader Intervention

ACE-informed care principles—defined by an awareness of the prevalence of trauma, a knowledge of how trauma influences behavior and development, and a blending of trauma-responsive practices—are an essential element in the wider intervention context but not an independent approach. ACE-informed principles embrace trauma screening, knowledge of trauma responses, incorporating trauma into treatment planning, and building physically and emotionally safe environments (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2014). These values are especially timely with the finding that large percentages of delinquents report high ACE exposure, and studies suggest that ACEs might combine with biological risk factors (e.g., ADHD or psychopathic features) to heighten offending risk.

ACE-informed practices must still be coupled with other evidence-supported interventions that address specific criminogenic deficits, not replaced. For instance, an adolescent with both high ACE exposure and high psychopathic traits needs to be treated for both trauma response and the particular emotional dysregulation and behavioural disinhibition of psychopathy. Likewise, adolescents with ADHD and ACE backgrounds are helped by treatments targeting both executive function deficits and emotional dysregulation related to trauma. Therefore, intensive intervention models tend to stack up several evidence-based elements—trauma-informed care, cognitive-behavioural methods, emotion regulation skills, and prosocial skill building—into combined treatment packages (Smith et al., 2024, p. 447).

Gender-Responsive and Developmentally Sensitive Approaches

Successful intervention needs to address gendered needs and developmental sensitivity. Female juvenile offenders most often exhibit risk profiles that differ from those of males, with greater frequencies of trauma

exposure, self-injury, and relational aggression (Khalil & Da Silva Guerreiro, 2024). Gender-responsive strategies acknowledge that women's patterns to offending tend to include victimization of trauma, and the interventions should deliberately address trauma processing, building healthy relationships, and femininity and prosocial role reconstruction of identity (Gover et al., 2008). Interventions for boys may need to more directly deal with peer influence and focus on masculine identity development around prosocial vs. antisocial roles.

Developmentally sensitive interventions acknowledge that adolescent brain development, especially in areas responsible for impulse control, future thinking, and social awareness, extends into the teenage period and early adulthood. This neurobiology fact explains why young people are likely more amenable to intervention compared to their adult counterparts and justifies rehabilitation-oriented juvenile justice strategies (Steinberg, 2008). Interventions must be matched to the capacities of adolescent development, with specific focus on scaffolding abstract thought, perspective, and planning ahead.

Systemic and Environmental Supports

In addition to individual-focused interventions, evidence increasingly favors multi-systemic interventions addressing family, school, peer, and community levels. Family interventions that enhance parenting skills, strengthen family bonds, and diminish household conflict yield strong effects in reducing delinquency (Aos et al., 2006). School-based prevention programs developing prosocial relationships, coping with bullying and peer victimization, and delivering academic support contribute to protective factors against offending (Grøndahl et al., 2017). Community-based supports such as mentorship schemes, employment opportunities for youth, and organized leisure activities engender healthy peer affiliations and prosocial identity formation—essential protective factors that buffer the expression of psychological risk factors for behavioral delinquency.

In addition, targeting acute environmental risk factors such as housing instability, food insecurity, and exposure to community violence decreases offending risk regardless of individual-level interventions (Weiman, 2007). Therefore, effective prevention and intervention efforts must couple individual assessment and treatment with systemic interventions that respond to the ecological environments in which youth grow up.

III. Conclusion

This detailed literature review has brought together the modern psychological and criminal research on the multi-model determinants of juvenile crimes. It demonstrates that young offences develop through crucial interactions between certain psychosocial traits such as ADHD, Cognitive processes such as criminal identity, developmental influence such as family, friends and community, gender differences and experience of adversity including childhood trauma. Instead of seeing delinquency as caused by one key factor, the review explains it as the consequence of mutual and cooperating influences from biological, psychological, cognitive, and social systems.

There are many notable contributions of this study that can be used in policy making. First traits such ADHD and psychopathy aren't the only reasons for qualifying for an offence. It actually depends on social connections, opportunities and environmental stress. This leads to show that youths that are at higher risk of crimes may change owing to effective interventions. Next, there are various cognitive factors such as criminal identity and distorted thinkings help maintain offerings and are extremely importance for change. Thirdly, trauma and adverse childhood experiences play a major role must be addressed alongside other many risks using integrated, trauma-informed, evidence-based approaches. Next, it was noted that girls and boys both have been noted to adapt different routes. This means that interventions must be gender sensitive that reflects their experiences and needs accordingly. Finally, reoffending could be reduced in youth by using effective programs that combined integrating cognitive restructuring, identity work, trauma-informed principles, and systemic supports.

The findings of this study can be used in multiple sectors. Juvenile justice systems should use assessments that compromise of psychological, cognitive, developmental, and contextual factors in addition to the category/type of offense.

Early intervention programs should target adaptable risk factors identified through multi-domain assessment, with specific attention to ADHD screening and cognitive distortion identification. Schools, mental health services, and community organizations should collaborate to create trauma-informed, developmentally responsive environments that simultaneously address psychiatric and behavioral risk while building prosocial identity and legitimate opportunities. Intervention protocols should be flexible enough to layer multiple evidence-based components—cognitive-behavioral techniques, narrative approaches, family engagement, and community support—into individualized treatment packages matching each youth's specific risk profile and developmental stage.

However, this review must acknowledge important limitations. First, this thematic review, while comprehensive, was not conducted as a formal systematic review with predetermined search protocols and quality rating criteria; thus, publication bias and selective reporting may influence the synthesized findings. Second, the

review privileges recent literature (2023–2025) and may underrepresent foundational theoretical work that remains empirically valid. Third, much of the reviewed research originates from developed Western nations, limiting generalizability to diverse cultural and economic contexts. Fourth, the review primarily addresses individual and family-level determinants; macro-level factors including criminal justice policy, socioeconomic inequality, and systemic racism warrant greater integration in future work. Finally, research on juvenile female offenders, though included here, remains less abundant than literature on males, potentially limiting understanding of gendered pathways.

Future research should prioritize several directions. Longitudinal studies tracking interactions among psychological traits, cognitive processes, developmental contexts, and intervention exposure would elucidate causal mechanisms more definitively. Research examining racial and ethnic disparities in both delinquency pathways and intervention access is critically needed. Investigation of protective factors and resilience mechanisms—particularly how youth with significant risk exposure achieve desistance—remains underdeveloped. Development and testing of integrated intervention protocols combining multiple evidence-based components, as proposed in this review, would strengthen the empirical foundation for comprehensive practice. Finally, research examining how systemic factors including educational inequity, economic opportunity, and criminal justice policies shape delinquency trajectories would advance macro-level understanding. Through continued interdisciplinary research and translation of findings into practice, juvenile justice systems can move toward approaches that recognize psychological complexity, honor developmental potential, and create meaningful pathways toward youth desistance and community reintegration.

References

- [1]. Anderson, S.W., Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Tranel, D. And Damasio, A.R. (1999), "Impairment Of Social And Moral Behavior Related To Early Damage In Human Prefrontal Cortex", *Nature Neuroscience*, Vol. 2 No. 11, Pp. 1032-1037.
- [2]. Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (2023) *The Psychology Of Criminal Conduct*, 7th Edn. New York: Routledge.
- [3]. Barra, S., Turner, D., Müller, M., Hertz, P. G., Retz-Junginger, P., Tüscher, O., ... Retz, W. (2022). ADHD Symptom Profiles, Intermittent Explosive Disorder, Adverse Childhood Experiences, And Internalizing/Externalizing Problems In Young Offenders. *European Archives Of Psychiatry And Clinical Neuroscience*, 272(2), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00406-020-01181-4>
- [4]. Bates, L., Alexander, M., & Webster, J. (2022). The Link Between Dangerous Driving And Other Criminal Behaviour: A Scoping Review. *Safer Communities*, 21(2), 137–156.
- [5]. Boduszek, D., Adamson, G., Shevlin, M., Hyland, P., & Bourke, A. (2013). The Role Of Criminal Social Identity In The Relationship Between Criminal Friends And Criminal Thinking Style Within A Sample Of Recidivistic Prisoners. *Journal Of Human Behavior In The Social Environment*, 23(1), 14–28.
- [6]. Boduszek, D., Debowska, A. And Willmott, D. (2017), "Latent Profile Analysis Of Psychopathic Traits Among Homicide, General Violent, Property, And White-Collar Offenders", *Journal Of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 51, Pp. 17-23.
- [7]. Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2017). *The Psychology Of Criminal Conduct* (6th Ed). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [8]. Brezina, T., & Topalli, V. (2012). Criminal Self-Efficacy: Exploring The Correlates And Consequences Of A "Successful Criminal" Identity. *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, 39(8), 1042–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812438345>
- [9]. Burt, C.H., Simons, R.L. And Gibbons, F.X. (2012), "Racial Discrimination, Ethnic-Racial Socialization, And Crime: A Micro-Sociological Model Of Risk And Resilience", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 77 No. 4, Pp. 648-77.
- [10]. Christian, J., Veysey, B. M., Herrschaft, B., & Tubman-Carbone, H. (2009). Moments Of Transformation: Formerly Incarcerated Individuals' Narratives Of Change. In B. M. Veysey, J. Christian, & D. J. Martinez (Eds.), *How Offenders Transform Their Lives* (Pp. 12-29). London, England: Willan.
- [11]. Cicerali, L. K., & Cicerali, E. E. (2018). Parental Influences On Youth Delinquency. *Journal Of Criminal Psychology*, 8(2), 138–149.
- [12]. Cima, M., Tonnaer, F., & Hauser, M. D. (2010). Psychopaths Know Right From Wrong But Don't Care. *Social Cognitive And Affective Neuroscience*, 5(1), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.1093/Scan/Nsp051>
- [13]. Deblasio, S., & Mojtahedi, D. (2023). Exploring The Relationship Between Psychopathy And Criminal Thinking: Utilising The TriPM Within A Forensic Sample. *Journal Of Criminological Research, Policy And Practice*, 9(1), 14–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRPP-05-2022-0021>
- [14]. Deblasio, S., Ioannou, M. And Synnott, J. (2022), "Sexual Offending: The Intrepid Professional-Adventurer And The Dejected Revenger-Victim", *International Journal Of Offender Therapy And Comparative Criminology*, Vol. 68 No. 12, Pp. 1-17, [Doi: 10.1177/0306624X221124836](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221124836).
- [15]. Deblasio, S., Mojtahedi, D. (2024). Exploring The Relationship Between Criminal Narrative Experience (CNE) And Criminal Thinking, Among Sexual Offenders. *Journal Of Criminological Research, Policy And Practice*.
- [16]. Dhingra, K. And Boduszek, D. (2013), "Psychopathy And Criminal Behaviour – A Psychosocial Research Perspective", *Journal Of Criminal Psychology*, Vol. 3 No. 2, Pp. 83-107, [Doi: 10.1108/JCP-06-2013-0014](https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-06-2013-0014).
- [17]. Douglas, K. S., & Skeem, J. L. (2005). Violence Risk Assessment: Getting Specific About Being Dynamic. *Psychology, Public Policy, And Law*, 11(3), 347–383. [Doi:10.1037/1076-8971.11.3.347](https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.11.3.347)
- [18]. Farrall, S., & Calverley, A. (2005). *Understanding Desistance From Crime*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- [19]. Farrington, D. P., Macleod, J. F., & Grove, P. G. (2016). Mathematical Models Of Criminal Careers. *Journal Of Research In Crime And Delinquency*, 53(3), 336–355.
- [20]. Filkin, S., Mojtahedi, D. And Willmott, D. (2022), "Motivations For Adolescent Offending And Truancy From School: Retrospective Interviews With Adults Recently Released From A Custodial Prison Sentence In England", *Heliyon*, Vol. 8 No. 6, P. E09762.
- [21]. Fortune, C. A., & Heffernan, R. (2019). *The Psychology Of Criminal Conduct: A Consideration Of Strengths, Weaknesses And Future Directions*. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 25(6), 659–674.
- [22]. Frick, P. J., Kimonis, E. R., Dandreaux, D. M., & Farrell, J. M. (2003). The 4 Year Stability Of Psychopathic Traits In Non-Referred Youth. *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*, 21(6), 713–736. <https://doi.org/10.1002/Bsl.568>
- [23]. Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A Meta-Analysis Of The Predictors Of Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works! *Criminology*, 34(4), 575–607.

- [24]. Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, Crime, And Desistance: Toward A Theory Of Cognitive Transformation. *American Journal Of Sociology*, 107, 990-1064.
- [25]. Goff, A., Rose, E., Rose, S., & Purves, D. (2007). Does PTSD Occur In Sentenced Prison Populations? A Systematic Literature Review. *Criminal Behaviour And Mental Health*, 17(3), 152-162.
- [26]. Gover, A. R., Pérez, D. M., & Jennings, W. G. (2008). Gender Differences In Factors Contributing To Institutional Misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 378-403.
- [27]. Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, And Stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.
- [28]. Grøndahl, P., & Bjørkly, S. (2016). Research Quality And Psychological Theory In Publications On School Shooters With Multiple Victims - A Systematic Review Of The Literature. *Cogent Psychology*, 3(1), 1152759.
- [29]. Hall, J. R., & Benning, S. D. (2006). The "Successful" Psychopath: Adaptive And Subclinical Manifestations Of Psychopathy In The General Population. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook Of Psychopathy* (Pp. 459-478). The Guilford Press.
- [30]. Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. J. R. (2001). A Structured Approach To Evaluating Change Among Sexual Offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal Of Research And Treatment*, 13, 105-122.
- [31]. Hart, W., Wahlers, D. E., Lambert, J. T., & Hall, B. T. (2024). Psychopathic But Less Criminal: The Buffering Effects Of Integrity. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 229, 112736. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2024.112736>
- [32]. Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization And Infrhumanization. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 65, 399-423. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115045>
- [33]. Hough, M. (2010) Gold Standard Or Fool's Gold?: The Pursuit Of Certainty In Experimental Criminology. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 10, 11-22.
- [34]. Jessor, R. (1992), "Risk Behavior In Adolescence: A Psychosocial Framework For Understanding And Action", *Developmental Review*, Vol. 12 No. 4, Pp. 374-390.
- [35]. Jones Young, N. C., & Ryan, A. M. (2019). Criminal History And The Workplace: A Pathway Forward. *Equality, Diversity And Inclusion: An International Journal*, 38(5), 494-504.
- [36]. Kendall, K. (2004) Dangerous Thinking: A Critical History Of Correctional Cognitive Behaviouralism. In: Mair, G. (Ed.) *What Matters In Probation*. Cullompton: Willan.
- [37]. Khalil, L., & Da Silva Guerreiro, J. (2024). Self-Harm And Aggression In Women Who Committed A Criminal Offence: A Scoping Review. *The Journal Of Forensic Practice*, 26(2), 114-128.
- [38]. Lenkens, M., Van Lenthe, F. J., Schenk, L., Sentse, M., Severiens, S., Engbersen, G., & Nagelhout, G. E. (2024). Experiential Peer Support And Desistance From Crime: A Systematic Realist Literature Review. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 30(10), 1421-1451.
- [39]. Lipsey, M.W. & Landenberger, N.A. (2007) PROTOCOL: Cognitive-Behavioral Programs For Juvenile And Adult Offenders: A Meta-Analysis Of Controlled Intervention Studies. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 3(1), 1-21.
- [40]. Lipsey, M.W., Landenberger, N.A. & Wilson, S.J. (2007) Effects Of Cognitive-Behavioral Programs For Criminal Offenders. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 3(1), 1-27.
- [41]. Little, M. (1990). *Young Men In Prison: The Criminal Identity Explored Through The Rules Of Behaviour*. Hants, UK: Dartmouth.
- [42]. Lun, J., Sinclair, S., & Cogburn, C. (2009). Cultural Stereotypes And The Self: A Closer Examination Of Implicit Self-Stereotyping. *Basic And Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 117-127.
- [43]. Maher, B. S., Bitsko, R. H., Claussen, A. H., O'Masta, B., Cerles, A., Holbrook, J. R., ... Rush, M. (2024). Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis Of The Relationship Between Exposure To Parental Substance Use And Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder In Children. *Prevention Science: The Official Journal Of The Society For Prevention Research*, 25(Suppl. 2), 291-315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11121-023-01605-2>
- [44]. Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform And Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- [45]. McGuire, J. & Clark, D. (2004) A National Dissemination Program. In: Goldstein, A.P., Nensén, R., Daleflod, B. & Kalt, M. (Eds.) *New Perspectives On Aggression Replacement Training: Practice, Research And Application*. Oxford: Wiley.
- [46]. McGuire, J. (2004). *Understanding Psychology And Crime: Perspectives On Theory And Action*, Open University Press, Berkshire.
- [47]. Modesti, M. N., Gubbini, S., De Rossi, P., Manzi, A., Nicolò, G., Adriani, B., Pallottino, S., Parmigiani, G., Del Casale, A., Guariglia, C., & Ferracuti, S. (2025). ADHD In Adults And Criminal Behavior: The Role Of Psychiatric Comorbidities And Clinical And Sociodemographic Factors In A Clinical Sample. *International Journal Of Law And Psychiatry*, 101, 102088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Ijlp.2025.102088>
- [48]. Moffitt, T.E. (1993), "Adolescent-Limited And Life-Course Persistent Antisocial Behavior: A Developmental Taxonomy", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 100 No. 4, Pp. 674-701.
- [49]. Nicholson, D., & Allely, C. S. (2021). Exploring Female Involvement In Acts Of Terrorism And Mass Shootings: A Systematic Review. *Journal Of Criminal Psychology*, 11(4), 335-356.
- [50]. Nourredine, M., Gering, A., Fournier, P., Rolland, B., Falissard, B., Cucherat, M., ... Jurek, L. (2021). Association Of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder In Childhood And Adolescence With The Risk Of Subsequent Psychotic Disorder: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 78(5), 519-529. <https://doi.org/10.1001/Jamapsychiatry.2020.4799>
- [51]. Paternoster, R., & Bushway, S. (2009). Desistance And The "Feared Self": Toward An Identity Theory Of Criminal Desistance. *The Journal Of Criminal Law And Criminology*, 99, 1103-1056.
- [52]. Patrick, C. J. (2022). Psychopathy: Current Knowledge And Future Directions. *Annual Review Of Clinical Psychology*, 18, 387-415. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-072720-012851>
- [53]. Patrick, C.J., Fowles, D.C. And Krueger, R.F. (2009), "Triarchic Conceptualization Of Psychopathy: Developmental Origins Of Disinhibition, Boldness, And Meanness", *Development And Psychopathology*, Vol. 21 No. 3, Pp. 913-938, [Doi: 10.1017/S0954579409000492](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579409000492).
- [54]. Redondo, S., Martínez Catena, A. And Andres Pueyo, A. (2012), "Therapeutic Effects Of A Cognitive- Behavioural Treatment With Juvenile Offenders", *European Journal Of Psychology Applied To Legal Context*, Vol. 4 No. 2, Pp. 159-178.
- [55]. Rivera, L. M., & Veysey, B. M. (2016). Criminal Justice System Involvement And Gender Stereotypes: Consequences And Implications For Women's Implicit And Explicit Criminal Identities. *Albany Law Review*, 78, 101-120.
- [56]. Salekin, R. T., & Lochman, J. E. (2008). Child And Adolescent Psychopathy: The Search For Protective Factors. *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, 35(2), 159-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854807311330>
- [57]. Schiweck, C., Arteaga-Henriquez, G., Aichholzer, M., Edwin Thanarajah, S., Vargas-Cáceres, S., Matura, S., ... Reif, A. (2021). Comorbidity Of ADHD And Adult Bipolar Disorder: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. *Neuroscience And Biobehavioral Reviews*, 124, 100-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Neubiorev.2021.01.017>

- [58]. Schlenker, B. R. (2008). Integrity And Character: Implications Of Principled Expedient Ethical Ideologies. *Journal Of Social And Clinical Psychology*, 27(10), 1078–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1521/Jscp.2008.27.10.1078>
- [59]. Shover, N. (1996). *Great Pretenders: Pursuits And Careers Of Persistent Thieves*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- [60]. Simourd, D.J. And Hoge, R.D. (2000), "Criminal Psychopathy A Risk-And-Need Perspective", *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 2, Pp. 256-272.
- [61]. Skeem, J. L., & Cooke, D. J. (2010). Is Criminal Behavior A Central Component Of Psychopathy? Conceptual Directions For Resolving The Debate. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(2), 433–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0008512>
- [62]. Smith, A., Roberts, A., Krzemieniewska-Nandwani, K., Eggins, E., Cook, W., Fox, C., Maruna, S., Wallace, S., & Szifris, K. (2024). Revisiting The Effectiveness Of Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy For Reducing Reoffending In The Criminal Justice System: A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 20(3), E1425.
- [63]. Sommers, I., Baskin, D. R., & Fagan, J. (1994). Getting Out Of The Life: Crime Desistance By Female Street Offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, 15, 125-149.
- [64]. Stevens, A. (2012). "I Am The Person Now I Was Always Meant To Be": Identity Reconstruction And Narrative Reframing In Therapeutic Community Prisons. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 12, 527-547.
- [65]. Stilwell, S. M., Heinze, J. E., Hsieh, H. F., Torres, E., Grodzinski, A., & Zimmerman, M. (2024). Positive Youth Development Approach To School Safety: A Comprehensive Conceptual Framework. *Journal Of School Health*, 94(9), 848–859.
- [66]. Sykes, G.M. And Matza, D. (1970), "Techniques Of Delinquency", Wolfgang, M.E., Savitz, L. And Johnston, N. (Eds), *The Sociology Of Crime And Delinquency*, 2nd Ed., Wiley, New York, Pp. 292-299.
- [67]. Szifris, K., Roberts, A., Maruna, S., & Fox, C. (2025). Exploring The Theoretical Foundations Of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy In The Criminal Justice System. *The Howard Journal Of Crime And Justice*.
- [68]. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An Integrative Theory Of Intergroup Conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology Of Intergroup Relations* (Pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- [69]. Taylor, M., & Horgan, J. (2006). A Conceptual Framework For Addressing Psychological Process In The Development Of The Terrorist. *Terrorism And Political Violence*, 18(4), 585–601.
- [70]. Ung, J., & Lloyd, C. D. (2024). Exploring The Relationships Between Criminal Self-Efficacy Factors And Recidivism. *Legal And Criminological Psychology*, 29(2), 195–211.
- [71]. Veysey, B. M., & Rivera, L. M. (2017). Implicit Criminal Identity And Age: Implications For Criminal Persistence And Desistance. *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, 44(10), 1249–1261.
- [72]. Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory Of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part I. Reliability And Preliminary Validity. *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, 22(3), 307–325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854895022003008>
- [73]. Walters, G. D. (2023). Predicting Prison Misconduct With The Psychological Inventory Of Criminal Thinking Styles: A Meta-Analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 103(4), 470–488.
- [74]. Walters, G. D., & Elliott, W. N. (1999). Predicting Release And Disciplinary Outcome With The Psychological Inventory Of Criminal Thinking Styles: Female Data. *Legal And Criminological Psychology*, 4(1), 15–21.
- [75]. Walters, G.D. (1990), *The Criminal Lifestyle: Patterns Of Serious Criminal Conduct*, SAGE, Newbury Park, CA.
- [76]. Walters, G.D. And Geyer, M.D. (2007), "The PICTS Fear-Of-Change Scale: Construct And Predictive Validity", *The Prison Journal*, Vol. 87 No. 2, Pp. 211-226, Doi: 10.1177/0032885507303749.
- [77]. Weeks R, Widom C (1998) Self-Reports Of Early Childhood Victimization Among Incarcerated Adult Male Felons. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence* 13(3): 346–361.
- [78]. Weiman, D.F. (2007), "Barriers To Prisoners' Reentry Into The Labor Market And The Social Costs Of Recidivism", *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, Vol. 74 No. 2, Pp. 575-611.
- [79]. White, M. D. (2012). Kantian Moral Psychology And Criminal Behavior. *Journal Of Criminal Psychology*, 2(1), 67–76.
- [80]. Wike, T. L., & Fraser, M. W. (2009). School Shootings: Making Sense Of The Senseless. *Aggression And Violent Behavior*, 14, 162–169. Doi:10.1016/J.Avb.2009.01.005
- [81]. Yochelson, S. And Samenow, S.E. (1976), *The Criminal Personality, Vol. I: A Profile For Change*, Vol. 1, Jason Aronson, New York, NY.
- [82]. Young, S., & Cocallis, K. (2021). ADHD And Offending. *Journal Of Neural Transmission* (Vienna, Austria: 1996), 128(7), 1009–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00702-021-02308-0>