
The author if this article is a neuroscientist, she uses her knowledge and studies on the adolescent and adult brain to explore the differences in the brain and how it affects crime and culpability. In the fall of 2004, the Supreme Court was reviewing whether capital crimes done by minors under 18 should get the death sentence, the case for leniency was based part on these brain studies. Beckman includes many examples in her article for Science; teen’s brains are much less capable of impulse control, decision-making, and reasoning- the brain is capable of this until early 20’s. Beckman argues that “The very part of the brain that is judged by the legal system process comes on board late.”. Teens do not have the are in the cerebellum that is important for timing and learning and brain regions that prepare for the task at hand. Beckman concludes that death penalty is not a logical option, she advocates for the abilities of youth rehabilitation.


This article is proving how rehabilitative approach to juvenile delinquents is beneficial for everyone. The article is focused on the Texas court system as it includes several examples on how the Texas system has many faults in the direction it is going. Also, gives several more accounts on how implementing new more logical approaches has worked in lowering the gang violence and juvenile delinquents in Texas. The article enforces the importance of keeping juveniles out of adult courts and giving them rehabilitative services. Most important facts included are; the biggest percentage of offenders in adult jails with mental illnesses have been in adult jails as juvenile offenders, the fact that placing juvenile offenders increases their risks of
becoming drug addicts if they are placed in adult jails. Darnell advocates for “improving professional judgments of risk and amenability in juvenile justice”. Darnell also advocates for several alternative choices of rehabilitation for juvenile offenders as opposed to ending up in adult jails.


Feixa discusses in defense of juvenile delinquents that being a teen is the stage stage in individual life stuck between physiological puberty “a natural condition” and the status of the adult position “a cultural construction”. The article explains that adolescence is considered a universal condition, a developing stage in human development. Feixa states that adolescence can be grouped into five big models of, which fall under different societies: "puber", "ephebe" "boy and girl", "teenager", and "youngsters". In each society and time, teens have different characteristics each type has features that are different and features that are permanent to this day. By describing the features of these five models of youth, Feixa gives a larger panoramic understanding of teens today in this society, the way they function and why. The article gives several ethnographical examples to prove plasticity of adolescence now a days and adolescents in the past. Feixa takes the perspective as the psycho-social and cultural environment for the teens brain development.


This article explains that transferring juveniles into adult courts are disadvantaged at the sentencing stage. The article explores a Juvenile waiver law that allow youthful defendants who have not reached the age of adulthood to be transferred out juvenile courts and into adult
criminal courts where they are subject to prosecution as if they were adults. The data examined in the article compares the outcomes of juveniles in adult jails to those in juvenile systems. Steiner advocates for justice to be done for the teens as he gives several accounts of young children being given the wrong sentencing for their crimes. Steiner believes that for the better of the community as a whole, juveniles should be given the right tools such as school and proper rehabilitation in order to lower the percentage of juvenile delinquents as well as creating law abiding citizens when they finish their sentencing. Steiner enforces the notion that even if juveniles aren’t trialed as adults they are still paying for the crimes committed- in a way that improves the community as well as the delinquents themselves.


The article uses the recent issue on the Supreme Court's decision on the case of J.D.B. v. North Carolina; concerning the right an adult has to remain silent, which is stated by the Fifth Amendment in the Constitution. Gottesman advocates for juvenile delinquents' rights by enforcing the notion that juveniles need to be sentenced differently in the manner that will protect their rights from the Constitution and stop them from giving false confessions and unlawful convictions. The article informs the reader that the Fifth Amendment is enforced to give a person the privilege against self-incrimination as a protection from police questioning and interrogation. The second important Court case discussed is the case of Berghuis v. Thompkins; this example gives reason as to why the Thompkins rule should not be applied to juveniles that are younger than 18.

This article writes about the assertion of sanctuary for juvenile offenders that committed crimes in Texas that have been given the death penalty for their punishment. Long uses the case of Napoleon Beazley, to support his argument. Beazley, an African-American minor delinquent is a very important account given in the article; gives insight on human rights principles concerning execution of minors under 18 years of age as well as the Religious, moral and social meanings of sanctuary.


This article is useful because it notes exactly the influences of incarceration of juvenile delinquents. Levin presents several alternatives to incarcerating juvenile delinquents. The fact that in the U.S. as of 2012, several states have been trying to change the ongoing pattern of continually increasing the percentage of juvenile delinquents in jail. Levin also includes the information of the fact that imprisonment of juvenile delinquents far too expensive for what it does and very often is counterproductive, compared to alternative options for incarceration. The author discusses with great importance, a study by the Annie E. Casey Foundation titled "No Place for Kids: The Case for Reducing Juvenile Incarceration" written in 2011.


Most juvenile justice reforms brought out in recent years have created progressively difficult and criminal-like methods to sanctioning youths. While research to date has not inspected wide amount of new sentencing options. Research also hasn’t thoroughly thought on theories of adult sentencing. This study presents these issues and develops opposing hypotheses that show the effects of legal, extra-legal and processing factors, also several newly enforced sentencing options in the criminalized juvenile court in Texas. The hypothesis presented in this study are tested by using qualitative and quantitative data. The results of this study are consistent with
the resulting expectations, they do not support opinions that with increased criminalization in the juvenile courts it will eliminate contemplation of age, gender, or race/ethnicity in the final sentencing decisions.