Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Property Law and Blockchain Applications in International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

The Economic Case for Reform: Rethinking Juvenile Incarceration in the United States

Laner Zhu

Trinity College School, Port Hope, Canada
mlaner26@tcs.on.ca

Abstract. This paper presents a comprehensive economic analysis challenging the fiscal efficacy of punitive juvenile justice models in the United States (U.S.). While late twentieth century incarceration policies coincided with declining youth crime rates, this correlation obscures underlying structural determinants - macroeconomic expansion, immigration reform, and strengthened community networks - that drove crime reduction. Through integrating theoretical frameworks from economics, developmental neuroscience, and criminology, this study exposes the empirical shortcomings of deterrence-based models, particularly when applied to juvenile populations. The analysis reveals that punitive incarceration triggers cascading losses in human capital, including lower educational attainment, diminished lifetime earning potential, and the deepening of multigenerational poverty. In sharp contrast, rehabilitative interventions grounded in therapeutic education, psychological support, and structured reintegration consistently yield significantly superior cost-benefit outcomes across both public safety and macroeconomic dimensions. These empirical findings underscore the urgent need for systemic reform toward evidence-based models that prioritize human capital development, advancing both societal well-being and fiscal sustainability through targeted youth investment rather than punitive, custodial confinement.

Keywords: economic reform, juvenile incarceration, recidivism, rehabilitative justice, United States

1. Introduction

The United States (U.S.) has experienced an unprecedented escalation in incarceration rates over the past several decades. As evidenced by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the incarceration rate has grown by nearly 350% since 1980, placing approximately 2.2 million individuals behind bars [1]. This escalation has positioned the U.S. with the highest incarceration rate globally, exceeding the global average by more than four times, as noted by criminal justice policy expert Professor Tonry of the University of Minnesota Law School [2]. Amidst this broader phenomenon, juvenile offenders represent a complex dynamic. Despite significant declines in youth crime rates, persistently high recidivism raises concerns about the long-term economic effectiveness of harsher incarceration. For the purpose of this report, recidivism is defined as the tendency to engage in repeated criminal behavior after punishment or intervention for a prior offense [3]. A well-

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

functioning criminal justice system must balance public safety with economic efficiency - that is, optimizing resource allocation to maximize societal benefits while minimizing costs [4]. Yet the persistent cycle of juvenile recidivism imposes hidden burdens that extend well beyond the walls of detention facilities, including reduced lifetime earnings, diminished employment opportunities, and substantial public expenditures [5]. This stark disparity prompts a critical question: can a strictly punitive juvenile justice model sustain economic value over the long term, or does it ultimately undermine both human capital - the productive potential individuals contribute - and broader fiscal stability?

2. Thesis & paper overview

This report evaluates 21st century U.S. juvenile incarceration practices through an economic lens, examining their impact on recidivism, human-capital development and public budgets. It juxtaposes immediate fiscal gains - such as reduced crime rates and lower up-front correctional expenses - with mounting long-term liabilities, including workforce erosion, cyclical reoffending, and escalating social-support outlays. Although punitive measures may yield short-term fiscal relief, their persistent economic burdens - lost human capital, repeated incarceration cycles, and rising welfare expenditures - underscore the superior sustainability and effectiveness of rehabilitative and restorative strategies. By prioritizing education, mental-health services, and community integration, these approaches promise lasting benefits to individuals and society alike.

3. Declining juvenile crime and short-term economic gains

The decline in juvenile crime over recent decades is often attributed to stricter incarceration policies that provided immediate economic benefits by curbing costly offences. This trend is rooted in the "Tough-on-Crime" era of the 1990s - a period marked by harsh sentencing laws, expansive prison construction, and policies aimed at reducing crime through punitive measures. A key driver to this shift in criminal justice strategy was the 1994 Crime Bill, spearheaded by President Bill Clinton, which introduced mandatory minimum sentences and expanded juvenile-to-adult transfer waivers, substantially increasing the number of minors eligible for trial as adults [6].

Concurrently, federal and state legislatures made substantial investments in prison construction and extended the average duration of felony sentences - from 17.9 months in 1988 to 27.5 months by 2012 [7]. Proponents of these reforms, such as Harvard criminologist James Q. Wilson posited that the expansion of incarceration played a critical role in reducing crime. Reinforcing this view with quantitative evidence, University of Chicago economist Levitt estimated that increased incarceration accounted for approximately one-third of the 1990s crime drop [6]. Specifically, the number of juveniles incarcerated in adult prisons fell from a peak of 10,420 in the early 21st century to a low of 2,250 in 2021 [8]. Likewise, youth residential placements have declined by 65% since 1997 [9]. These reductions correspond with findings from the National Center for Victims of Crime, which estimated annual victimization to impose over $450 billion annually - encompassing medical expenses and productivity losses [10]. From this vantage point, the removal of high-risk juveniles through harshened incarceration can be construed as fiscally justifiable, delivering short-term relief by curbing high-cost criminal activity. However, this rationale - though seemingly pragmatic - relies on an overly narrow interpretation of causality. Attributing the decline in juvenile crime solely through incarceration oversimplifies a deeply interconnected issue - one that also involves a range of social and economic factors, which will be explored in the following section.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

4. Neurodevelopmental realities and the fallacy of deterrence

A central justification underpinning juvenile incarceration is its presumed efficacy in reducing the direct costs of crime - namely healthcare spending, property damage, and law enforcement interventions - through the mechanisms of deterrence and incapacitation. Deterrence theory posits that the threat or imposition of punishment dissuades individuals from engaging in unlawful conduct. While this principle may carry some merit in the context of adult offenders, its application to juveniles is fundamentally flawed. It fails to account for well-established distinctions in neurodevelopment, particularly the underdevelopment of the prefrontal cortex - the region of the brain responsible for impulse control, risk assessment, and long-term planning. Given that this region remains underdeveloped during adolescence, juveniles are more prone to impulsive behavior, heightened emotional reactivity, and increased vulnerability to peer influence [11]. Consequently, they possess a substantially diminished capacity to evaluate long-term consequences and are consequently less responsive to the deterrent effect of punitive sanctions.

These biological and behavioral realities cast doubt on the efficacy of punitive strategies within the juvenile justice system. An expanding body of empirical research suggests that not only do such approaches fail to deter delinquent behavior, but they may also exacerbate it. Assistant Professor of Medical Social Sciences at Northwestern University Peticlerc found that court involvement was associated with increased rates of both violent and nonviolent offenses among youth. Further studies demonstrate that incarcerated juveniles are significantly more likely to reoffend - and to do so more frequently, more rapidly, and with greater severity - than those who avoid custodial sanctions [12]. A key factor contributing to these adverse outcomes is the harsh and often dehumanizing environment many incarcerated youth are exposed to. Solitary confinement, physical restraints, and various forms of psychological degradation remain routine practices in juvenile facilities across the United States [13]. These methods are widely denounced as cruel and inhumane, as they violate the United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juvenile Deprived of Their Liberty. Beyond in flicting immediate psychological harm, these practices deprive adolescents of critical developmental supports - including social interaction, emotional support, and consistent access to education - all of which are essential for effective rehabilitation [13]. The carceral environment further limits personal freedoms and stifles self-expression, often placing youth in rigid institutional settings that resemble adult prisons [14].

In contrast, Mental Health America stresses that children require nurturing, secure, and stable environments to maintain good mental health. The punitive conditions within the juvenile justice systems (JJS) directly contradict these needs, impeding mental and emotional development and weakening the likelihood of successful reintegration into society. Studies have shown that more rigorous incarceration systems do not lower crime rates, while less punitive, more rehabilitative approaches are associated with significantly lower recidivism [15]. In other words, “juvenile correctional facilities represent the larger of two evils” [12], not because they fail to punish, but because they prioritize punishment at the expense of reform.

5. Structural drivers of crime reduction

Importantly, claims that incarceration directly reduces juvenile crime are not only overstated but also confounded by major structural factors. During the 1990s, the United States experienced a period of substantial economic expansion. Real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita grew by nearly 30%, while unemployment fell from 6.8% in 1991 to 4.8% in 2001 [6]. Strengthened labor markets expanded access to lawful employment, particularly for low-income populations, thereby furnishing

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

a more viable alternative to criminal enterprise. Concurrently, the United States reformed its immigration policy through the Immigration Act of 1990, which introduced the Diversity Visa Lottery - a mechanism intended to foster legal immigration from underrepresented countries. Although the probability of individual selection remained modest, the policy nonetheless facilitated a steady rise in legal immigration throughout the decade. This influx of immigrants exerted a stabilizing influence on many communities. Cross-sectional time-series data published in Social Science Quarterly reveal that jurisdictions experiencing the largest influx of immigrants between 1990 and 2000 simultaneously registered the most significant declines in homicide and robbery rates [16]. These reductions are attributed to the strong cultural and familial networks established by immigrant populations. Such networks provide social cohesion, economic support, and access to legal employment - factors that improve living standards and reduce incentives for criminal behavior. These community-rooted mechanisms contributed far more to crime reduction than incarceration-based interventions. This is especially relevant for adolescents, who are uniquely susceptible to external influences. Physical and social environments exert a disproportionate impact on youth behavior, shaping the likelihood of criminal involvement more than punitive deterrents. Despite these insights, incarceration remains a dominant response. In 2020 alone, 424,300 American juveniles were arrested [17], with many still subject to confinement. This continued reliance on punitive justice not only disregards what the data reveal about the roots of youth crime but also diverts resources away from community-based approaches that have proven more effective. Ultimately, the so-called “economic logic” of juvenile incarceration is not only unfounded - it is counterproductive, obscuring the real social and economic reforms that drive lasting reductions in crime.

6. Institutional harm and policy-driven recidivism

While incarceration aims to deter crime, its long-term impact on juvenile offenders is often counterproductive. Research shows that many youth naturally “age out” of criminal behaviour - a trend especially prevalent in drug-related offences, where incarcerated sellers are quickly replaced in illicit markets [7]. The term “age out” refers to a developmental process in which youth, upon reaching maturity, cease delinquent activities and begin to internalize prosocial norms. Rather than supporting this natural desistance, punitive incarceration often delays or derail it. Instead of deterring crime, harsh incarceration environments transform correctional facilities into criminal learning environments, where juveniles forge illicit networks and refine illicit skills [18]. These environments often lack rehabilitation and instead foster criminal learning. Without adequate reintegration support, such as education or counseling, incarceration reinforces deviant identities rather than correcting them [19]. One of the clearest manifestations of this harm is the placement of juveniles in adult prisons. While adult correctional facilities may appear more controlled - equipped with armed guards, barbed wire, and strict routines - they are psychologically destabilizing for youth. Adolescents in these environments experience disproportionately high rates of mental illness and PTSD due to constant fear and the absence of developmental support. Even within the juvenile justice system itself, conditions vary widely. Some facilities resemble therapeutic boarding schools, while others mimic adult prisons in their rigidity and control [14]. Despite the rehabilitative mandate of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (J.D.A.), many juvenile institutions fall short. Rather than focusing on development, they resort to punitive strategies such as solitary confinement, restrictions on self-expression, adult-style incarceration, and extreme behavioral controls. These practices strip youth of autonomy and emotional safety, hardening their identities

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

instead of guiding them toward reform. As such, incarceration too often undermines its purpose, exacerbating the very behaviors it seeks to prevent.

The shortcomings of the juvenile justice system are deeply rooted in broader systemic structures. One of the most consequential policy shifts has been the growing use of transfer laws, which permit juveniles to be tried and sentenced in adult courts [20]. Enacted largely in response to public and political pressure, this shift has undermined the rehabilitative capacity of the juvenile system. This politicization amplifies public fear, thereby paving the way for increasingly punitive legislation. By prioritizing efficiency in punishment over individualized assessment, and by relying on charge severity as a proxy for dangerousness, current frameworks entrench cycles of system involvement and heighten the risk of reoffending.

Such legal frameworks disregard the well-established principle that juveniles are less culpable than adults and significantly more amenable to rehabilitation. Reinforcing the ineffectiveness of punitive models, Wong, Professor of Criminology at the University of British Columbia, and colleagues, conducted a comprehensive review of aftercare programs. They found that systems emphasizing punishment consistently fail to produce lasting reform, with recidivism rates ranging from 41% to 83% of youth reoffending after release [21]. These figures underscore a troubling disconnect between the intentions of punitive policies and their real-world consequences. Structural deficiencies within juvenile detention facilities further exacerbate these failures. According to the Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 18% of facilities reported overcrowding, while 15% of juveniles were housed in environments lacking rehabilitative support [22]. These conditions are not anomalies, but symptoms of a system shaped by economic inequality and political neglect, placing youth in settings that reinforce rather than mitigate criminogenic behaviors. Economic policies exacerbate these systemic shortcomings. Court-imposed fines and fees disproportionately burden low-income families, often leading to deeper legal entanglement. As the Emory Law Journal observes, such financial penalties function less as corrective tools than as punitive traps, with nonpayment frequently resulting in extended supervision, additional sanctions, or reincarceration [23]. In effect, poverty itself becomes a pipeline back into the juvenile system. Addressing these interwoven issues requires policy reforms that emphasize youth development and equitable economic support over punishment.

7. Long-term economic toll of recidivism and lost human capital

The long-term economic consequences of juvenile incarceration are profound, driven by persistently high recidivism rates, diminished human capital, and structural inefficiencies in reintegration support [19]. Over 70% of the 600,000 inmates released annually are rearrested within five years of release [1], highlighting the systemic failure of current correctional practices. This persistent cycle recidivism imposes staggering societal costs. Scholars at Washington University estimate that while direct correctional expenditures surpass $80 billion annually, the broader indirect societal costs - including diminished tax revenue and decreased workforce productivity - escalate the total economic burden to nearly $1 trillion, or roughly 6% of GDP [24]. Based on research conducted by Brown and MIT economists of 35,000 juvenile court cases, juvenile detention costs an average of $88,000 per youth annually. Beyond the direct impacts, incarceration reduces high school completion by 13% and increases adult incarceration by 23% [25] This erosion of educational attainment carries macroeconomic consequences, as even halving the national dropout rate for a single graduating class could generate $7.6 billion in earnings, boost GDP by $5.6 billion annually, and gain $713 million in federal tax revenues [26]. Furthermore, the stigma of a criminal record can depress job prospects and wages by up to 50%, amounting to $230 billion in aggregate losses [27]. These economic

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

setbacks extend beyond individuals, creating ripple effects across families and communities. As household income decline, children face diminished access to quality education, further entrenching the intergenerational cycle of disadvantage and impeding economic growth.

8. Rehabilitation over retribution: the economic efficiency of human-centered interventions

Recognizing the immense financial and social costs associated with punitive juvenile incarceration, policymakers increasingly advocate for rehabilitation methods as more financially prudent approaches. Access to education, vocational training, and substance abuse treatment has been shown to reduce recidivism by 15-20%, while stable full-time employment can halve re-offence rates [27]. In addition, strengthening human capital through education and wage growth supports crime reduction, as a 10% rise in high school graduation rates corresponds to a 9% decline in arrests, and a 10% wage increase causes a 10-20% drop in crime [28]. In stark contrast, each additional year of sanctioning raises future offending by 4-7%, a trend linked to skill erosion and long-term labour market exclusion [5]. Thereby, these methods focus on strengthening human capital and equipping juveniles with the tools to reintegrate into society productively.

From a fiscal standpoint, the benefits of rehabilitation are substantial. Education policy experts from Old Dominion University further highlight this inefficiency, noting that juvenile detention requires $148,767 annually per youth, compared to just $11,011 for public education [29]. Redirecting funds to rehabilitative programs could therefore yield crime reduction and foster economic stability by reducing recidivism rates. Even modest improvements in high school completion rates can generate billions in GDP and tax revenue. These figures suggest that investing in education and rehabilitation not only improves public safety but also maximizes economic efficiency over time.

9. Limitations & conclusion

This study underscores the profound limitations of punitive juvenile justice policies but also acknowledges the constraints of existing research. Significant gaps in data, particularly on the dependent variable of juvenile incarceration rates, complicate the ability to fully measure the long-term economic and social impacts of current policies. These omissions limit the precision of policy evaluation and highlight the urgent need for more rigorous, comprehensive data collection to support evidence-based reforms.

Even with these constraints, the findings demonstrate that punitive incarceration produces, at best, short-term reductions in crime while failing to address the structural causes of youth offending. Its long-term consequences - high recidivism, the erosion of human capital, and the perpetuation of intergenerational poverty - render it an unsustainable approach. Attributing public safety gains solely to incarceration further neglects broader socioeconomic influences, including labor market conditions and immigration trends. By contrast, rehabilitative strategies - education, vocational training, and structured reintegration programs - consistently achieve superior outcomes. They reduce reoffending, enhance community safety, and generate long-term fiscal benefits by improving graduation and employment rates while decreasing public expenditures.

The case for reform is therefore both moral and fiscal. As Joan Petersilia, co-director of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center, cautions, “ignoring those willing to reform would be shortsighted” [27]. Shifting toward a rehabilitative juvenile justice model is not only a compassionate choice but also an economically rational one. By reallocating resources toward programs that build human capital, disrupt cycles of incarceration, and address systemic inequities, policymakers can foster

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

safer communities, stronger economies, and brighter futures for vulnerable youth. Realizing these outcomes will require sustained political will, targeted investment, and an unwavering commitment to aligning juvenile justice policy with empirical evidence.

References

[1] Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

[2] Tonry, M. (2014). Legal and Ethical Issues in the Prediction of Recidivism. Federal Sentencing Reporter, 26(3), 167–176.

[3] National Institute of Justice. (n.d.). Recidivism. U.S. Department of Justice. https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism

[4] Owens, E., & Ba, B. (2021). The economics of policing and public safety. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 35(4), 3-28.

[5] Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. A. (2006). Perceived Criminality, Criminal Background Checks, and the Racial Hiring Practices of Employers. The Journal of Law & Economics, 49(2), 451–480. https://doi.org/10.1086/501089

[6] Levitt, S. D. (2004). Understanding why crime fell in the 1990s: Four factors that explain the decline and six that do not. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 18(1), 163–190.

[7] Mauer, M. (2018). The impact of prison length on recidivism. The Prison Journal, 98(4), 456-475.

[8] Zeng, Z., Carson, E. A., Kluckow, R., & BJS Statisticians. (2023). Juveniles Incarcerated in U.S. Adult Jails and Prisons, 2002–2021. The Bureau of Justice Statistics.

[9] Puzzanchera, C., Hockenberry, S., & Sickmund, M. (2022, December). Youth and the Juvenile Justice System 2022 National Report. National Center for Juvenile Justice.

[10] National Center for Victims of Crime. (2011) Economic Costs of Victimization. Retrieved from https://www.victimsofcrime.org/resources/annual-costs-of-crime

[11] Tyler, M. (2015, August 1). Understanding the Adolescent Brain and Legal Culpability. American Bar Association. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_interest/child_law/resources/child_law_practiceonline/child_law_practice/vol-34/august-2015/understanding-the-adolescent-brain-and-legal-culpability/

[12] Fagan, J., & Kupchik, A. (2011). Juvenile incarceration and the pains of imprisonment. Duke Forum for Law and Social Change, 3(29), 29-60.

[13] Gagnon, J. C., Kern, L., & Mathur, S. R. (2022). The council for exceptional children, division of emotional and behavioral health's position statement on solitary confinement. Behavioral Disorders, 47(4), 282-291.

[14] Fagan, J. (2010). The contradictions of juvenile crime & punishment. Daedalus, 139(3), 43-61.

[15] Latimer, J. (2001). A meta-analytic examination of youth and delinquency, family treatment, and recidivism. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 43(2), 237-253.

[16] Wadsworth, T. (2010). Is Immigration Responsible for the Crime Drop? An Assessment of the Influence of Immigration on Changes in Violent Crime between 1990 and 2000. Social Science Quarterly, 91, 531-553.

[17] Estimated number of youth arrests | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2020). Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[18] Bayer, R. (2003). Crime and punishment: An analysis of juvenile incarceration effects. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 93(2), 345–369.

[19] Schnepel, K. T. (2017). Good jobs and recidivism. The Economic Journal, 128(608), 447-469.

[20] Collins, A. M., & Cooper, M. (2024). Juvenile waivers as a mechanism in the erosion of the juvenile justice system. Social Sciences, 13(7), 367.

[21] Wong, J. S., Lee, C., & Beck, N. (2024). The effects of aftercare/resettlement services on crime and violence in children and youth: A systematic review. Campbell systematic reviews, 20(2), e1404.

[22] Hockenberry, S., Sickmund, M., & Sladky, A. (2013, September). Juvenile residential facility census, 2010: Selected findings (National Report Series Bulletin). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[23] Shapiro, L. R. (2020). The Crippling Costs of the Juvenile Justice System: A Legal and Policy Argument for Eliminating Fines and Fees for Youth Offenders. Emory Law Journal, 69(6), 1305–1349.

[24] McLaughlin, M., Pettus-Davis, C., Brown, D., Veeh, C., & Renn, T. (2016). The Economic Burden of Incarceration in the United States [Working paper]. Institute of Justice Research and Development, Florida State University

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28038

College of Social Work.
[25] Aizer, A., & Doyle Jr., J. (2015). Juvenile Incarceration, Human Capital, and Future Crime: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 130(2), 759-804.
[26] Alliance For Excellent Education. (2011). The High Cost of High School Dropouts: What the Nation Pays for Inadequate High Schools. Issue Brief, 1-5.
[27] Petersilia, J. (2011). Beyond the Prison Bubble. The Wilson Quarterly (1976-), 35(1), 50–55. http: //www.jstor.org/stable/41001069
[28] Council of Economic Advisers. (2016, April). Economic Perspective on Incarceration and the Criminal Justice System (Council of Economic Advisers, Author). Government Publishing Office.
[29] Ellison, J., Owings, W., & Kaplan, L. (2017). State Fiscal Effort and Juvenile Incarceration Rates: Are We Misdirecting our Investment in Human Capital? Journal of Education Finance, 43(1), 45-64.