

TRYING TEENAGERS AS ADULTS FOR HEINOUS CRIMES: EFFECTS ON REHABILITATION AND RECIDIVISM

Kamolxonova Dilbarxon Kamolxon qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature 3rd year
kamolhonovadilbar@gmail.com

Scientific supervisor: **Xamidova Madinabonu Abduboriy qizi**
head teacher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract. This study examines the impact of trying adolescents aged 13–16 as adults for heinous crimes, particularly murder, on their rehabilitation and future behavior. The research analyzes developmental psychological factors, the influence of social environments, and the characteristics of criminal justice systems. Findings suggest that prosecuting juveniles in adult courts often reduces their chances of successful rehabilitation and increases the likelihood of recidivism. In contrast, age-appropriate rehabilitation programs demonstrate more effective outcomes. The study highlights the need for reforms in juvenile justice systems and criminal policy to better address the developmental needs of young offenders.

Keywords: juvenile delinquency, murder, criminal justice system, rehabilitation, recidivism, adolescent psychology, criminal policy.

Аннотация. Данное исследование направлено на изучение влияния судебного преследования подростков в возрасте 13–16 лет как взрослых за тяжкие преступления, включая убийство, на их реабилитацию и дальнейшее поведение. В работе анализируются психологические особенности развития несовершеннолетних, влияние социальной среды и специфика уголовно-правовой системы. Результаты показывают, что привлечение подростков к ответственности в рамках взрослой системы правосудия часто снижает их шансы на успешную реабилитацию и увеличивает риск рецидива. В то же время установлено, что специализированные программы, ориентированные на возрастные особенности, оказываются более эффективными. Полученные выводы подчеркивают необходимость реформирования системы ювенальной юстиции и уголовной политики.

Ключевые слова: преступность несовершеннолетних, убийство, судебная система, реабилитация, рецидив, подростковая психология, уголовная политика

Annotatsiya. Ushbu tadqiqot 13–16 yoshdagi o'smirlarning og'ir jinoyatlar, xususan qotillik sodir etgan holatlarda ularni kattalar sifatida sud qilish amaliyotining ularning reabilitatsiyasi va kelajakdagi xulq-atvoriga ta'sirini o'rganishga qaratilgan. Tadqiqot davomida voyaga yetmaganlarning psixologik rivojlanish darajasi, ijtimoiy muhit ta'siri va jinoiy javobgarlik tizimining o'ziga xos xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, o'smirlarni kattalar tizimida sud qilish ko'pincha ularning qayta ijtimoiylashuv imkoniyatlarini kamaytiradi va takroriy jinoyatchilik xavfini oshiradi. Shu bilan birga, maxsus yoshga moslashtirilgan reabilitatsiya dasturlari samaraliroq natija berishi aniqlangan. Tadqiqot natijalari jinoyat siyosatini takomillashtirish va voyaga yetmaganlar adliya tizimini isloh qilish zarurligini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: voyaga yetmaganlar jinoyatchiligi, qotillik, sud tizimi, reabilitatsiya, takroriy jinoyatchilik, o'smirlar psixologiyasi, jinoyat siyosati

Introduction. Juvenile crime, particularly violent offenses such as murder, has become one of the most debated issues in modern criminal justice systems. Society often reacts strongly when individuals aged 13–16 commit serious crimes, raising immediate questions about moral responsibility, punishment, and justice. In many countries, these cases lead to calls for juveniles to be tried as adults, reflecting a belief that the severity of the crime should override age considerations. However, this perspective raises complex psychological, ethical, and legal concerns. Adolescence is a developmental stage characterized by emotional instability, impulsivity, and incomplete cognitive maturation. According to neuroscience research, the human brain—especially the prefrontal cortex responsible for judgment, impulse control, and long-term planning—continues developing until the mid-20s. This means that adolescents, while capable of understanding rules, may not fully grasp long-term consequences in high-pressure situations. At the same time, public perception is often shaped by media coverage of violent juvenile crimes, which tends to amplify fear and demand for harsher punishment. High-profile cases can influence policy decisions, sometimes resulting in juveniles being transferred to adult courts even when their psychological development suggests otherwise. This creates a fundamental tension between two goals of criminal justice systems: retribution (punishment for wrongdoing) and rehabilitation (reforming the offender). Adult sentencing of juveniles may satisfy immediate societal demands for justice, but it raises serious questions about long-term effectiveness in reducing crime and promoting reintegration.

Additionally, placing juveniles in adult correctional facilities exposes them to environments that are often violent and not designed for rehabilitation. Instead of receiving educational and psychological support, young offenders may be further influenced by hardened criminals, increasing their likelihood of reoffending. Therefore, the key issue is not only whether juveniles can be held responsible for serious crimes, but whether treating them as adults actually serves the long-term goals of justice and public safety.

Literature Review. Research in developmental psychology provides strong evidence that adolescents differ significantly from adults in terms of cognitive control and decision-making. Laurence Steinberg (2009) argues that adolescent brains are still developing, particularly in areas related to impulse control and risk evaluation, making them more vulnerable to emotional and peer influences. Thomas Grisso (2008) highlights that juveniles in adult correctional systems suffer higher levels of psychological distress and are more likely to develop antisocial behavior patterns. Elizabeth S. Scott (2013) emphasizes that adolescents have a greater capacity for behavioral change and rehabilitation compared to adults due to neuroplasticity. Donna Bishop (2000) found that transferring juveniles to adult courts significantly increases recidivism rates, in some cases by more than one-third compared to juvenile rehabilitation systems. Terrie Moffitt (1993) distinguishes between life-course-persistent offenders and adolescence-limited offenders, suggesting that most juvenile criminal behavior is temporary and situational. These studies collectively suggest that punitive approaches may be less effective than rehabilitative models for juvenile offenders.

Methodology. This study uses a qualitative research approach based on secondary data analysis. Academic journals, criminological reports, psychological studies, and legal case analyses were reviewed to compare outcomes between juvenile justice systems and adult criminal courts.

A comparative framework was used to evaluate:

- Recidivism rates
- Psychological impact

- Rehabilitation success
- Social reintegration outcomes

Discussion and Analysis. The analysis shows a clear pattern: juveniles tried as adults face significantly worse long-term outcomes compared to those processed in juvenile justice systems. One major issue is environmental exposure. Adult prisons are typically not designed for young offenders, exposing them to violence, trauma, and criminal subcultures. According to Grisso (2008), this environment often reinforces criminal identity rather than correcting behavior. Another key factor is stigmatization. Being labeled as an “adult criminal” at a young age reduces future opportunities in education and employment, increasing social exclusion. This lack of reintegration opportunities is strongly linked to higher recidivism. From a developmental perspective, Steinberg (2009) explains that adolescents are still forming identity and behavioral patterns. Harsh punishment during this stage may disrupt positive development and increase long-term antisocial tendencies. On the other hand, juvenile justice systems that focus on rehabilitation—such as counseling, education, and structured social programs—show significantly better outcomes. These systems treat crime as a developmental issue rather than purely moral failure. However, it is also important to acknowledge the opposing argument. Some legal scholars argue that extremely violent crimes require proportionate punishment regardless of age. This perspective is rooted in deterrence theory, which suggests that harsh punishment may prevent future crimes. Yet, empirical evidence does not consistently support this claim in the context of juvenile offenders.

Conclusion. The evidence suggests that trying teenagers aged 13–16 as adults for heinous crimes is generally counterproductive in terms of rehabilitation and long-term public safety. While such policies may satisfy immediate demands for justice, they often increase recidivism and reduce opportunities for successful reintegration. A more effective approach is a balanced juvenile justice system that combines accountability with rehabilitation, focusing on psychological development and social reintegration.

Recommendations

- Strengthen juvenile rehabilitation programs (education, therapy, mentoring)
- Limit transfer of minors to adult courts
- Use psychological assessments before sentencing decisions
- Develop restorative justice approaches for juvenile offenders
- Invest in early intervention programs to prevent youth crime

References

1. Steinberg, L. (2009). Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*.
2. Grisso, T. (2008). Adolescent Offenders in Adult Courts. *American Psychological Association*.
3. Scott, E. S. (2013). The Legal Construction of Adolescence. *Harvard Law Review*.
4. Bishop, D. M. (2000). Juvenile Offenders in the Adult Criminal Justice System. *Crime & Delinquency Journal*.
5. Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Antisocial Behavior. *Psychological Review*.
6. Feld, B. C. (1997). *Bad Kids: Race and the Transformation of the Juvenile Court*. Oxford University Press.
7. *Roper v. Simmons* (2005). United States Supreme Court decision on juvenile sentencing.