

# Juvenile justice and the missouri model literature reviews example

[Technology](#), [Development](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Introduction](#) \n \t
2. [Historical development of Juvenile Justice](#) \n \t
3. [Multiple causes of delinquencies](#) \n \t
4. [Conclusion](#) \n \t
5. [Works Cited](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

## **Introduction**

America has the potential of reducing further the detrimental Juvenile crimes that are rampant in the US today if the Juvenile Justice will consider the Missouri model. United States have been one of the countries that have high cases of juvenile court cases. Statistics show that in every four Americans arraigned in court one of them has the capability of being a juvenile delinquent. California records high number of such incidences according to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The rising number of crimes includes the Juvenile of Ex-offenders. This is somehow unnecessary since the US Juvenile System provides for confinement correcting services.

The older Juvenile System training school is incomparable with the Missouri confinement correction school. Even if earlier training schools meet the standards of correcting juvenile offenders, the result on incarceration is disappointment in terms of both future youth success and recidivism.

Although correction facilities are in various states, records have shown that

70 to 80 percent of the juveniles released from youth correction facilities are re-arrested with new offenses within an estimate of two to three years. A small number of juvenile ex-offenders show back to high school but their job performance and the overall future success is under jeopardy. This is so much unacceptable because the abusive conditions that compromise the safety of public and the development of youth are bad enough in addition to the price tagged to correction of youth offenders estimated at \$6 billion per annum.

Missouri approach offers promising approach for juvenile offenders' correction. Missouri agencies have produced promising results without breaking the national budget, in addition to this, Missouri juvenile offenders have proved successful in their life after prison. The results of this model are positive youth outcomes, impressive safety records and lower recidivism for Missouri State as compared to other States of the US. Home-based intervention of youth correction serves better correcting than the routine incarceration.

## **Historical development of Juvenile Justice**

The critical most development of the Juvenile system that has affected the correction and training youth on how to avoid confinements is the inherent tension of the system in meeting punishment for law violation. The conflict of interest between punishing juvenile law offenders and the role of the system to bring about constructive behavior changes to the juvenile law offenders has been a challenge to the full implementation of correction measures. The intertwined and overarching roles of the Juvenile Judicial System of

protecting the public from further harm caused by Juvenile in addition to ensuring that this group of criminals not only change in terms of committing crimes but also prosper as productive Citizens. Balancing the interest of the community, offender and that of the client have posed problems in having the whole of US courts achieving like Missouri. The effectiveness of the System to reduce recidivism and to bring about positive outcomes to the offenders have been failing due to ignorance of the government to ensure accountability by ensuring that the performance of the system is result based.

Policy pendulums show a promising future for the US juvenile groups as they are geared towards reforms and rehabilitation. Various bills have been on the front line in facilitating development and competence determination of youths. The various bills also serve to make the information about youth offenders is made confidential though information about their delinquent acts need to be brought to light among youth serving agencies. Though the various developments have been in strong support of policy makers, the aim for majority of the policy was on serious crimes like murder, that fall out of the Juvenile court realm. This has been challenging as it has given the Juvenile court a hard time to shape youth offenders of serious crimes.

Lack of systematic analysis of Juvenile provisions across states possesses a big problem in the quest to address issues of correcting youthful law offenders effectively. Generally, the Juvenile Justice has exhibited profound change in the past two decades. State governments have been in the lead in enacting laws that have changed the Juvenile Justice landscape in the US.

The result has been reduction in sentencing discretion, greater public access

to juvenile records to facilitate research for a better understanding on effective ways of dealing with Juvenile offenders, and sharing of information between the Juvenile and the adults' court systems, this has brought about investigation on the possibility of crime perpetration in regards to family set up.

### **Multiple causes of delinquencies**

Researches provide grounds that there are no single cause accounts for all delinquency and that there exists no single pathway leading to criminal perpetration. However, the most risky factors that affect the youth offenders correction programs are; Birth trauma which are not easily correctable, residence in high crime neighborhoods the offenders are more likely to continue involving themselves in criminal activities. Limited employment and lack of housing are other two concerns that have posed challenges to complete reforming of juvenile law offenders. Offenders find no option of living other than involving on criminal acts to earn a living.

### **Conclusion**

The Missouri approach holds the future in curbing juvenile crimes as its emphasis is moving beyond symptoms to the root causes of juvenile delinquency. This ensures that changes made to the young offenders are long lasting if not permanent. This involves preparation of offenders to contribute positively to their home, school and community.

## Works Cited

- Bernard, Thomas J. *Serious Delinquency: An Anthology*. Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Pub, 2006. Print.
- Butts, Jeffrey A. *Teen Courts in the United States: A Profile of Current Programs*. Washington, DC: U. S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. Print.
- Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Probation Practice*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2002. Print.
- Guidance Manual for Monitoring Facilities Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002*. N. p., 2010. Print.
- Hess, Kären M, and Christine M. H. Orthmann. *Juvenile Justice*. Australia: Cengage Learning/Wadsworth, 2010. Print.
- Howell, James C. *Preventing & Reducing Juvenile Delinquency: A Comprehensive Framework*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2003. Print.
- Kastner, Jessica Jean. " Beyond the Bench: Solutions to Reduce the Disproportionate Number of Minority Youth in the Family and Criminal Court Systems." *JL & Pol'y* 15 (2007): 941.
- Lundman, Richard J. *Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Scott, Elizabeth S, and Laurence D. Steinberg. *Rethinking Juvenile Justice*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2008. Print.
- Sims, Barbara, and Pamela Preston. *Handbook of Juvenile Justice: Theory and Practice*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC/Taylor & Francis, 2006. Print.