Journal of Professional & Applied Psychology *Original Article*

Mental Health and Criminological Profile of Juvenile Recidivists: An Indigenous Exploration of Juvenile Recidivism in Punjab Prisons

Almas Irfan[1], Rafia Rafique[2]

Abstract

One of the significant goals of criminology is to identify the difference between offenders who re-offend and those who do not and related risk factors for re-offending. In this context, it was hypothesised that there would likely to be an association in criminological and mental health profiles of recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab Prisons. The sample comprised of recidivist (*n* = 158) and non-recidivist (*n* = 321) juvenile offenders incarcerated in different Prisons and Borstal Institutes of Punjab, Pakistan. A literature-based demographic sheet was developed to collect data. Findings showed that type of crime and gang affiliation were significantly associated with recidivism (offend, re-offend). Recidivist juvenile offenders started their criminal career significantly earlier, had more average number of charges/cases, and spent more time in custody than non-recidivist juvenile offenders. Moreover, history of the psychological issues, occasional/chronic use of drugs, history of self-harm, aggressive tendencies, and gambling addiction were significantly associated with recidivism (offend, re-offend) in juvenile offenders. The study provided the basis for the researchers and policymakers to devise and suggest a need-based corrective plan for juvenile recidivists to reduce re-offending. Moreover, this study provided baseline data for future researchers to plan further studies with this subgroup (recidivists).

Keywords: Borstal Institute, Criminological Profiles, Incarcerated, Juvenile Offender, Non-Recidivist, Recidivist, Reoffending

Received: 12 April 2022; Revised Received: 10 June 2022; Accepted: 26 June 2022

[1]PhD Scholar, Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
[2]Professor/Director, Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Corresponding Author Email:
almasirfan02@gmail.com

Introduction

Recidivism is on the rise all across the world. Yukhnenko et al. (2019) stated that global re-arrest rates range from 26 percent to 60 percent, reconviction rates from 20 percent to 63 percent, and re-incarceration rates from 14 to 45 percent. Juvenile recidivists account for a disproportionate quantity of crime compared to the general population of juvenile offenders and are more likely to continue criminal behavior as adults (Moffitt & Caspi 2001). One of the significant goals of criminology is to uncover disparities between offenders who re-offend and those who do not and related risk factors for re-offending. Very little research has been undertaken to understand better the dynamics of the subgroup of young offenders in Pakistan (Anwar et al., 2015; Ishfaq & Kamal, 2019).

Understanding the criminological characteristics of adolescent repeat offenders might assist in reevaluating correctional services. Researchers have sought to comprehend the criminal characteristics of primary and repeat offenders. Compared to their counterparts (non-recidivists), repeat offenders begin their criminal careers earlier; the majority commit property crimes, have more delinquent companions, are affiliated with gangs, spend more time in jail, and commit disproportionately more crimes (Pyle et al.,

2020). Ward et al. (2010) discovered two high-rate groups, one with a peak in late adolescence and the other in early adulthood. The adolescent peaked category was the smallest cohort with the most significant average offending rates from early adolescence to adulthood. Previously, the subgroup characteristic (recidivist) has not been investigated. Most indigenous literature on delinquency did not divide the sample according to the risk and offending characteristics.

Furthermore, it has been noted that the subgroup's (repeat offending) mental health and criminological characteristics have been overlooked. Young offenders have frequently been studied from the perspective of protection and risk factors rather than considering more criminogenic variables and mental health profiles (Russell, 2017). If such a link existed, it could be used to guide the development of intervention programs customised to the needs of young offenders at high risk of re-offending (Development Services Group Inc, 2017). It is unclear whether this link is causal, but mental health problems and illnesses have been connected to youth offending behaviors and delinquent adjudication (Moffitt & Scott, 2008). Studies have consistently demonstrated that children and adolescents with mental health care histories have a much-increased chance of becoming involved in the juvenile justice system (Underwood & Washington, 2016). An examination of indigenous research in this area reveals few studies and that a more comprehensive research program is required to address various aspects of delinquency. Previous studies have offered helpful information on planning more thorough and in-depth research (Ishfaq & Kamal, 2019). However, there is no information on the prevalence of re-offending based on various demographic, mental health, and criminological features. Most studies' approaches are not rigorous, the theoretical underpinning is not present, and the analyses are simplistic. As a result, the topic of re-offending must be examined in depth from many perspectives. The current study focused on this subgroup (recidivists) to conduct a thorough investigation.

Rationale

Under Pakistan's Juvenile Justice System Act (JJSA), passed in 2018 (Ijaz et al., 2021), people under 18 are entitled to special protection. JJSA-2018 has been introduced, and it strongly recommends that remedial actions be considered and executed for young offenders to assist them in abstaining from further crime and facilitating their safe reintegration into society. To intervene and create prevention efforts for juvenile offenders, we must first understand the characteristics of this group and the factors that contribute to recurring offences. However, the approaches most commonly employed in our context to predict, prevent, and manage juvenile delinquency are based on stereotyped notions, often providing low accuracy levels due to a lack of empirical research. As per the researcher's knowledge, no baseline data is available in an indigenous context to study juvenile recidivists incarcerated in Punjab prisons. Results of the study enabled researchers and policymakers to devise and suggest a corrective plan for juvenile recidivists to reduce re-offending and provide baseline data for future researchers to study this subgroup (recidivists).

Objectives

- To find an association between criminological profiles and recidivism (offend, re-offend) in juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab prisons.
- To determine the differences between recidivism and non-recidivist juvenile offenders in terms of age at committing the first offence, the number of offences/ cases, and total time in custody.
- To find an association between mental health profiles and recidivism (offend, re-offend) in juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab prisons.

Hypotheses

- There is likely to be a significant association between criminological profiles and recidivism (offend, re-offend) in juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab prisons.
- There are likely differences between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders in terms of age at committing the first offence, number of offences/ cases, and total time.
- There is likely to be a significant association between mental health profiles and recidivism (offend, re-offend)in juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab prisons.

Method

Research Design and Sample

A cross-sectional research design was used in the current study. The population of the study was juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab Prisons. Sample comprised of recidivist (n = 159) and non-recidivist (n = 321) juvenile offenders. The current study used a non-probability (convenient) sampling technique for maximum sample representation. The participants included those who were 18 years or less than 18 years. Most of the participants were uneducated or had primary level education. Data was collected from different central and district jails (where juveniles were confined) and Punjab's Borstal Institutes (Faisalabad & Bahawalpur). The data sources included official records from the Prisons Management and Information System (PMIS), file records, and participants' self-reports.

Measures

Screening Checklist Form

After reviewing previous literature on recidivism, a screening checklist is formed to screen repeat offenders. The domains include information about previous offending, incarceration, re-arrest, and violation of conditional release. Additional domain comprised questions to extract data self-reportedly (i.e., did you commit any offence without being arrested?) to screen-out maximum repeat offenders.

Demographic Information Form

A range of questions in two domains (such as criminological, mental health, educational/ occupational, familial, and institutional) was added to the information sheet to extract data on juvenile offenders' criminological and mental health profiles. Offence profile included age at committing past and current offense/s, legal status, current and historical offence-related factors, offence classification, sentence length, number of (current) offences, recidivism, breach history, number of times sentenced, acceptance of crime commission, and factors related to the current offence. The mental health domain included questions related to psychological issues (internalising/externalising), history of self-harm and substance abuse, aggressive tendencies, and gambling addiction.

Procedure

Permission was sought from the prison administration to collect data and review the relevant records of the juvenile offenders incarcerated in different prisons and the Borstal institutes of Punjab. After issuing a formal permission letter, a pilot study was conducted to ensure the accuracy and feasibility of collecting information via a developed data collection form. The demographic information form was developed after reviewing relevant literature. After the pilot study, some questions were modified and removed from the final version. Two prison psychologists in the field reviewed the final protocol for their feedback. Before collecting data, the consent of the participants was sought out for administering the demographic form and reviewing their prisons files. The researcher administered the demographic information forms orally with the assistance of prison mental health professionals and read them aloud to some participants who needed further assistance in understating the statement. Some of the information was also collected from the files/ record of the young offenders.

Results

The current study assessed an association between the criminological and mental health profiles of recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders incarcerated in Punjab Prisons. A Chi-square and an independent sample *t*-test were employed to analyse study variables. The results are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1

Criminological Profile of Juveniles Recidivist (n = 159) and non-Recidivists (n = 321)

Variables	Recidivist			
	Yes *f* (%)	No *f* (%)	χ^2	Effect size
Legal-status	-	-	25.66***	.23***
Under-Trial	135(85.4)	209(65.1)	-	-
Unconfirmed condemned	22(13.9)	105(32.7)	-	-
Confirmed condemned	1(.6)	7(2.2)	-	-
Acceptance of criminal Responsibility	-	-	8.59*	.13*
Yes	78(49.4)	120(37.4)	-	-
No	79(50.0)	201(62.6)		
Self-reported reason for offending	-	-	19.85**	.20**
Harassment/blackmailing	12(7.6)	17(5.3)	-	-
Anger	20(12.7)	74(23.1)	-	-
Peer Pressure	10(6.3)	18 (5.6)	-	-
land dispute	-	12(3.7)	-	-
Falsely Allegations	17(10.8)	14 (4.4)	-	-
Others	99(62.7)	186(57.9)		
Violence in the commission of the crime	-	-	19.71***	.20***
With violence	37(23.4)	134(41.7)	-	-
Without violence	108(68.4)	180(56.1)	-	-
Both	8(5.1)	7 (2.2)		
Type of Offense	-	-	112.08***	.48***
Homicide	23(14.6)	63(19.6)	-	-
Serious Injury	7(4.4)	30(9.3)	-	-
Sexual Assault	11(7.0)	135(42.1)	-	-
Abduction	2(1.3)	3(.9)	-	-
Theft	74(44.9)	55(17.1)	-	-
Decoity	22(13.9)	12(3.7)	-	-
Illicit Drug	11(7.0)	7(2.2)	-	-
Weapon	8(5.1)	6(1.9)	-	-
Property Damage	-	2(.6)	-	-
Public Order Offense	3(1.9)	1(.3)	-	-
Miscellaneous	-	4(1.2)	-	-
Accompanied during offence	-	-	15.39**	.17**
Committed Alone	63(39.9)	155(48.3)	-	-
With Friend	74(46.8)	110(34.3)	-	-
With family member	13(8.2)	49(15.3)	-	-
Any gang affiliation (Past/Present):	-	-	12.07**	.16***
Yes	35(22.2)	32(10.0)	-	-
No	123(77.8)	289(90.0)		
Friend's usage of drugs	-	-	55.31***	.34***
Yes	77(48.7)	52(16.2)	-	-
No	81(51.3)	269(83.8)	-	-

Stay out late at night with friends	-	-	40.90***	.29***
Yes	80(50.6)	70(21.8)	-	-
No	78(49.4)	251(78.2)	-	-

**p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001*

Table 1 showed that chi-square test of independence indicated significance association between legal status and recidivism with χ^2 (2, *N*= 379) = 25.66, *p*=.000, φ = .23. The value of the phi coefficient was .23 (< .50), which indicated a moderate effect size. The finding showed that most of the juvenile recidivists (repeat offenders) are under trial (84.4%), and non-recidivists are mostly convicted (32.7%). An association between accepting criminal responsibility and recidivism was found with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 8.59, *p*=.000, φ = .13. The value of the phi coefficient was .13 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size. The finding showed that juvenile recidivists accept criminal responsibility more frequently (49.4%) than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (37.4%). There was a significant association between self-reported reasons for crime and recidivism with χ^2 (5, *N*= 379) = 19.85, *p*=.000, φ = .23, and the value of the phi coefficient was .23 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size that showed a significant difference in the self-reported motive reason of committing crime between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders.

A significant association was found between violence in the commission of crime and recidivism with χ^2 (5, *N*= 379) = 19.85, *p*=.000, φ =.20, and the value of the phi coefficient was .20 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size. It can be interpreted as non- recidivists using more violence in the commission of the crime (41.5 %) than recidivists (23.4 %). In terms of the type of crime, a significant association was found between the type of offence and recidivism with χ^2 (10, *N*= 379) = 11.08, *p*=.000, φ = .48. The value of the phi coefficient was. 48 (< .50) indicated a moderate effect size and showed that most juvenile recidivists committed crimes against property, i.e., 44.9% committed theft, and 13.9% committed robbery. However, non-recidivists committed more crimes against the person, such as 19.6% committing homicide, 9.3% for serious injury, and 42.1% committing sexual offences. A significant association between the accompanied during offence and recidivism was found with χ^2 (2, *N*= 379) = 15.39, *p*=.000, φ = .17. The value of the phi coefficient was .17 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size and showed that most of the juvenile recidivists committed offences with friends (46.2%), and non-recidivists committed crimes with the accompaniment of family members.

A significant association between gang association and recidivism were found with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 12.07, *p*=.000, φ = .16. The value of the phi coefficient was .16 (< .50), which indicated a moderate effect size and showed in terms of gang affiliation, as recidivist juvenile offenders were more often members of gangs (22.2%) than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (10.0%). Moreover, results indicated an association between friends' usage of drugs and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 55.31, *p*=.000, φ = .34. The value of the phi coefficient was .34 (< .50), which indicated a medium effect size and showed that most friends of recidivist juvenile offenders (48.7 %) use drugs as compared to non-juvenile offenders (16.2 %). Additionally, an association between being out late at night with friends and recidivism was found with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 40.90, *p*=.000, φ = .29. The value of the phi coefficient was .29 (< .50), which indicated a moderate effect size, and showed that 50% of the recidivist juvenile offenders stayed out late with their peers at night, and 21.8% of the non-juvenile offenders stayed out late at night with their peers.

Table 2

Mean Differences in Age at Committing First Offense, Total Number of Offense/ Cases, and Time in Custody between Recidivist (n = 159) and Non-Recidivist Juveniles Offenders (n = 321)

Variables	Recidivist (n=158)		Non-recidivist (n=321)				95% CI		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t (298)*	*p<*	*LL*	*UL*	*Cohen's d*
Age (at current offense (Years))	13.94	2.18	15.15	2.11	5.77	001	-1.33	-.45	0.56
Offense (Total charges/cases)	3.46	4.60	1.48	1.08	-5.325	001	-2.70	-1.24	0.59
Time in custody (for current charges (Years))	2.54	.86	1.37	1.97	9.024	.001	.917	1.42	0.76

*$p < .05$

Note. *M*= Mean; *SD*= Standard Deviation; CI=Confidence Interval; *LL*= Lower Limit; *UL*= Upper Limit.

An independent sample *t*-test was utilised to compare the mean difference between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders. Results revealed that the age of recidivist juvenile offenders was significantly lower (*M* = 13.94, *SD* = 2.18) when committing their first offence than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (*M* = 15.15, *SD* = 2.11). Further, recidivist juvenile offenders significantly had more average number of charges/cases (*M* = 3.46, *SD* = 4.60) in their current arrest than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (*M* = 1.48, *SD* = 1.08) in their previous arrest. Furthermore, recidivist juvenile offenders spent more time in custody (*M* = 2.54, *SD* =.86) than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (*M* = 1.37, *SD* = 1.97) with medium effect size.

Table 3

Psychological and Behavioural Profile of Juveniles Recidivist (n = 159) and Non-Recidivists (n = 321)

Variables	Recidivist			
	Yes *f* (%)	No *f* (%)	χ^2	*Effect size*
History of any Psychological Issues	-	-	7.72**	.137**
Yes	16(10.1)	11(3.4)	-	-
No	142(89.9)	310(96.6)	-	-
Occasional Usage of Drugs	-	-	31.89**	.26**
Yes	49(31.0)	32(10.0)	-	
No	109(69.0)	289(90.0)	-	
Chronic Usage of Drugs	-	-	46.51***	.31***
Yes	45(28.5)	18(5.6)	-	-

No	113(71.5)	303(94.4)	-	-
History of Self-Harm	-		35.06***	27***
Yes	62(39.2)	47(14.6)	-	-
No	96(60.8)	274(85.4)	-	-
Aggressive Tendencies	-	-	12.56**	.16**
Yes	64(40.5)	78(24.3)	-	-
No	94(59.5)	243(75.7)	-	-
Gambling addiction	-	-	40.10**	.29**
Yes	48(30.4)	25(7.8)	-	-
No	110(69.6)	296(92.2)	-	-

**p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001*

Table 3 showed that the chi-square test of independence indicates a significant association between a history of the psychological issue and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 7.72, *p*=.000, φ = .13. The value of the phi coefficient was .13 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size and revealed that 10.1% of juvenile recidivists and 3.4 % of non-recidivist juvenile offenders had a history of mental health issues. A significant association was found between occasional use of drugs and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 31.89, *p*=.000, φ = .26. The value of the phi coefficient was .26 (< .50), which indicated a small effect size and revealed and indicated that most juvenile recidivists (31%) use drugs occasionally, as compared to non-recidivist juvenile offenders (10%). Furthermore, a significant association was found between chronic use of drugs and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 46.51, *p*=.000, φ = .31. The value of the phi coefficient was .31 (< .50), which indicated a moderate size and revealed and indicated 28.5 % of juvenile recidivist offenders had a history of chronic drug usage, which was significantly lesser than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (5.6%). A significant association was found between the history of self-harm and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 35.06, *p*=.000, φ =27. The value of the phi coefficient was .27 (< .50), which showed a small effect size. It revealed a significant difference in self-harm history between recidivists and non-recidivist juvenile offenders (39.2 % and 14.6%, respectively). Furthermore, a significant association was found between aggressive tendencies and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 12.56, *p*=.000, φ = .16. The value of the phi coefficient was .16 (< .50), which showed a small effect size. It suggested more aggressive tendencies (40.5%) than non-recidivist juvenile offenders (24.3%). In addition, a significant association was found between gambling addiction and recidivism with χ^2 (1, *N*= 379) = 40.10, *p*=.000, φ =.29 The value of the phi coefficient was .29 (< .50), which showed juvenile recidivists had more addiction to gambling (40.5%) as compared to non-recidivist juvenile offenders (7.8%).

Discussion

The current study was designed to determine whether the criminological and mental health profiles of juvenile recidivists and non-recidivist offenders differ according to different juvenile risk indicators. In this context, some characteristics (criminological and mental health) associated with first-time and repeat offenders were found and discussed.

According to the findings, most juvenile recidivists (repeat offenders) are on trial, while non-recidivists are mostly convicted. As of 2018, 1209 of the 1343 juvenile detainees in Pakistan's 112 facilities were still awaiting trial. Juvenile trials must be completed within 6 months, according to the Juvenile Justice System Act of 2018, and if the period exceeds 6 months, the juvenile must be given bail (Shah et al., 2020). On the other hand, juveniles are

detained for years. It has significant mental health repercussions and establishes a relationship with hardened criminals. The extended confinement of under-trials is one of the most heinous features of our judicial and legal systems (Jabbar, 2021).

The majority of recidivist juveniles committed property offences. Non-recidivists, on the other hand, committed a more significant number of crimes against persons (Cuervo et al., 2015). One probable explanation is that the court severely punishes children who commit heinous crimes, and their trial could be more lengthy and extensive. When a juvenile crime is involved in a minor crime, such as a crime against property, the court system is more tolerant and flexible. Previously, our nation found that the most prevalent crime was stealing, followed by assault/injuring someone (Kurtuluş et al., 2009; Zeren et el., 2013). However, research shows that if a juvenile offender is reintegrated into society without any intervention, their risks of re-offending may increase (Carpentier & Proulx, 2021).

According to current data, most criminal offences committed by repeat offenders are perpetrated without the use of violence. Most crimes perpetrated by juvenile repeat offenders are against the property; committing robbery demonstrates this. Furthermore, repeat criminals were frequently joined by companions when committing crimes. According to Rokven et al. (2017), delinquent friend associations elevate youth's risk of offending, but only when they reside close to these friends. This geographic proximity also explains why youth with frequent contact with and strong ties to delinquent peers are likelier to become offenders.

Non-repeat offenders, on the other hand, committed crimes more frequently, either with family members or alone. According to our findings, non-repeat offenders are jailed for violent offences. This allegation may be justified because most such crimes are perpetrated in Punjab's agricultural districts, where the majority of such crimes are committed over land and family issues. According to the JJSA 2018, the court does not impose severe sanctions on juvenile offenders under 18, who are used by adult family members, including their young children, to escape severe punishment if the adult family member commits the same crime (Ijaz et al., 2021).

Furthermore, it was hypothesised that the age at committing the first offence differs significantly between repeat and non-repeat offenders. As expected, repeat offenders started their criminal careers younger than non-repeat offenders. According to the Life-Course persistent offending theory provided by Moffitt and Caspi (2001), many juveniles begin offending throughout childhood and continue their careers after reaching adulthood, the nature of their behavior becoming life-course-persistent. The onset of problem behavior in this group of children occurs early, generally due to a complex combination of biological, individual, and environmental variables (Mbuba, 2004). In addition, it was hypothesised that repeat offenders had been involved in multiple charges/cases in their current arrest compared to their counterparts (non-repeat offenders). The results confirmed that repeat juvenile offenders had a disproportionately high number of charges against them in their current arrest. The results are supported by Moffitt and Caspi's (2001) life-course-persistent framework, which shows that recidivists account for between 5% and 10% of the population and are responsible for more than half of all crimes. It was also hypothesised that repeat offenders spent significantly more time in prisons than non-recidivist delinquents. According to McCollister et al. (2010), if a juvenile offender repeats a crime and spends additional time in jail, recidivism has substantial costs connected with the courts, community, and custodial services.

Psychological and Behavioural Profile of Recidivist and Non-recidivist Juvenile Offenders

Compared to non-repeat offenders, repeat offenders had a higher prevalence of mental health difficulties. Furthermore, repeat

offenders used drugs regularly and had chronic drug problems. It was also evident that repeat offenders had a high prevalence of self-harm history, violent tendencies, and gambling addiction. Literature suggests that externalising disorders were strongly connected to recidivism in a recent study by Wibbelink et al. (2017), but internalising disorders were not (and in some cases, internalising behaviors disorders had a buffering effect on recidivism). This relationship between mental health issues and delinquency has also been investigated in some subpopulations of youths (Rosenberg et al., 2014). A mental health illness was strongly related to juvenile justice system involvement among maltreated youths residing in out-of-home care, with conduct disorder being just the most robust predictor (Yampolskaya & Chuang 2012). Chu et al. (2012) found that gang-affiliated offenders scored higher on recidivism risk measures (SAVRY and YLS/CMI) and engaged in violent and other criminal behaviour more frequently during follow-up. These discrepancies suggest gang membership and criminal recidivism among juvenile offenders. Furthermore, even after controlling for the effect of having delinquent acquaintances, adolescent gang involvement is linked to a greater risk of crime. Furthermore, adolescents involved with gangs but are not full members report higher delinquency than youth who are not involved with gangs but minor delinquency than full-fledged gang members (Curry et al., 2002).

Conclusion

The current study was designed to determine whether the criminological and mental health profiles of juvenile recidivists and non-recidivist offenders differ enough to justify need-based rehabilitation policies and intervention. The results showed significant differences in the criminological and mental health profiles of recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders (such as type of crime, age at committing the first offence, and history of mental health issues). The study results provide a basis for the researchers and policymakers to devise and suggest a need-based corrective plan for juvenile recidivists to reduce re-offending. Moreover, the study provides baseline data for future researchers to plan further studies.

Limitations

Although the findings of this study help develop prevention and intervention programs, the following limitations must be considered. For example, the data is from a single province; thus, it cannot be applied to the entire population of juveniles from multiple regions. Only incarcerated offenders were included in the study; it omitted adolescents who were not imprisoned since their charges were minor and were released from the police station. Researchers have to rely on official records collected by law enforcement agencies (i.e. police) during data collection, which may be prone to error. Information on mental health was extracted from official records that the prison base mental health professionals maintained, and it could not be verified due to time constraints. Despite using the collateral source of data collection, some information could not be cross-examined due to missing records. Moreover, researchers have to rely on the decisions of the Justice System, which may also distort collected data.

Implications

Data was collected from collateral sources using the demographic form and official record review that can help to minimise the chance of error and desirability effects. Psycho-legal profiles of recidivists were developed to identify juvenile recidivists in high need of intervention to desist from further crime after targeted interventions. This profile may also help in critical decision-making for the juvenile justice system. The study may provide an initial snapshot for developing a complex correctional model for the prison department to implement evidence-based practice. Moreover, a comprehensive understanding of the profiles of juvenile recidivists in the juvenile offender population provides baseline data for this

subgroup that can be used for subsequent studies.

Contribution of Authors

Almas Irfan: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original draft

Rafia Rafique: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Reviewing & Editing, Supervision

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest declared by authors.

Source of Funding

The authors declared no source of funding.

References

Anwar, S., Khan, S. E., Chaudhry, A. G., Khan, K. E., & Sultana, S. (2015). Exploring Socio-Cultural Factors of Recidivism in Juvenile Delinquents: An Anthropological Perspective. *Science. International (Lahore)*, *27*(1), 817-819.

Carpentier, J., & Proulx, J. (2021). Recidivism rates of treated, non-treated and dropout adolescent who have sexually offended: a non-randomised study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. 99-115.

Chu, C. M., Daffern, M., Thomas, S., & Lim, J. Y. (2012). Violence risk and gang affiliation in youth offenders: A recidivism study. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *18*(3), 299-315.

Cuervo, K., Villanueva, L., González, F., Carrión, C., & Busquets, P. (2015). Characteristics of young offenders depending on the type of crime. *Psychosocial Intervention*, *24*(1), 9-15.

Curry, G.D., Decker, S.H., & Egley, A. (2002). Gang involvement and delinquency in a middle school population. *Justice Quarterly, 19(3),* 275292

Development Services Group, Inc. (2017). *Intersection Between Mental Health and the Juvenile Justice System*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Ijaz, A., Madni, A., & Akhtar, N. (2021). Implementation of Juvenile Justice System Act 2018: Prospects and Challenges for Pakistan. *Review of Politics and Public Policy in Emerging Economies*, *3*(1), 79-85.

Ishfaq, N., & Kamal, A. (2019). Empirical Evidence of Multi-Facets of Delinquency in Pakistan: Revised Self-Reported Delinquency Scale. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, *34*(1), 115-137.

Jabbar, J. (2021, March 14). Society: A Childhood in Prison. Dawn.Com; www.dawn.com. https://www.dawn.com/news/1612403

Kurtuluş, A., Salman, N., Günbet, G., Bora, B., Cenger, C. D., & Kemalettin, A. (2009). Sociodemographic characteristics of children between the ages of 12 and 15 who are dragged into crime in Denizli. *Pamukkale Medical Journal*, *1*(1), 8-14.

Mbuba, J. M. (2004). *Juvenile recidivism: An analysis of race and other sociodemographic predictors within three intervention modalities in the state of Louisiana*. Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College.

McCollister, K. E., French, M. T., & Fang, H. (2010). The cost of crime to society: New crime-specific estimates for policy and program evaluation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 108*(1-2), 98-109.

Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2001) Childhood predictors differentiate life-course persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial pathways among males and females. *Developmental Psychopathology, 13*(2), 355–375

Moffitt, T., & Scott, S. (2008). Conduct disorders of childhood & adolescence. In M. Rutter (Ed.), *Child*

Psychiatry. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pyle, N., Flower, A., Williams, J., & Fall, A. M. (2020). Social risk factors of institutionalized juvenile offenders: A systematic review. *Adolescent Research Review, 5*(2), 173-186.

Rokven, J. J., de Boer, G., Tolsma, J., & Ruiter, S. (2017). How friends' involvement in crime affects the risk of offending and victimisation. *European Journal of Criminology, 14*(6), 697–719. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370816684150

Rosenberg, H. J., John E. Vance, Stanley D. Rosenberg, George L. Wolford, Susan W. Ashley, and Michael L. Howard (2014). "Trauma Exposure, Psychiatric Disorders, and Resiliency in Juvenile-Justice-Involved Youth." *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy 6* (4):430–37.

Russell, K. C. (2017). *Recidivism Rates Among Juveniles With Mental Illness* [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University, USA]. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5507&context=dissertations

Shah, S. A., Balasingam, U., Salman, N. W., Dhanapal, S., & Ansari, K. M. (2020). Restorative Juvenile Justice System in Pakistan: An Overview. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, *15*(2), 266-282.

Underwood, L. A., & Washington, A. (2016). Mental illness and juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(2), 228.

Ward, A. K., Day, D. M., Bevc, I., Ye, S., Rosenthal, J. S., & Duchesne, T. (2010). Criminal trajectories and risk factors in a Canadian sample of offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*, 1278-1300.

Wibbelink, C. J., Hoeve, M., Stams, G. J. J., & Oort, F. J. (2017). A meta-analysis of the association between mental disorders and juvenile recidivism. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 33*, 78-90.

Yampolskaya, S., & Chuang, E. (2012). Effects of mental health disorders on the risk of juvenile justice system involvement and recidivism among children placed in out-of-home care. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *82*(4), 585.

Yukhnenko, D., Sridhar, S., & Fazel, S. (2019). A systematic review of criminal recidivism rates worldwide: 3-year update. *Wellcome Open Research*, *4*, 28.

Zeren, C., Mustafa Arslan, M., Yengil, E., Karanfil, R., Akçan, R., & Oksuz, M. (2013). Sociodemographic characteristics of juvenile delinquents in Turkey. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *24*(6), 688-698.