



Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice

Laurence Steinberg

Department of Psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122;
email: lds@temple.edu

Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol. 2009. 5:47–73

The *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* is online at clinpsy.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153603

Copyright © 2009 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

1548-5943/09/0427-0047\$20.00

Key Words

adolescence, crime, neuroscience, law, policy

Abstract

Although justice system policy and practice cannot, and should not, be dictated solely by studies of adolescent development, the ways in which we respond to juvenile offending should be informed by the lessons of developmental science. This review begins with a brief overview of the history, rationale, and workings of the American juvenile justice system. Following this, I summarize findings from studies of brain, cognitive, and psychosocial development in adolescence that have implications for the treatment of juveniles in the justice system. The utility of developmental science in this context is illustrated by the application of these research findings to three fundamental issues in contemporary justice policy: the criminal culpability of adolescents, adolescents' competence to stand trial, and the impact of punitive sanctions on adolescents' development and behavior. Taken together, the lessons of developmental science offer strong support for the maintenance of a separate juvenile justice system in which adolescents are judged, tried, and sanctioned in developmentally appropriate ways.

Contents

INTRODUCTION 48

JUVENILE JUSTICE IN AMERICA:
 AN OVERVIEW 49

 The Origins of the Juvenile
 Justice System 49

 Critical Decision Points Along
 the Juvenile Justice Pipeline 50

 The Relevance of Developmental
 Science to Decision Making
 in the Justice System 52

BRAIN, COGNITIVE, AND
 PSYCHOSOCIAL
 DEVELOPMENT IN
 ADOLESCENCE 53

 Adolescent Brain Development 53

 Adolescent Cognitive
 Development 55

 Adolescent Psychosocial
 Development 56

JUVENILE JUSTICE ISSUES
 INFORMED BY
 DEVELOPMENTAL
 SCIENCE 59

 Criminal Culpability of Youth 59

 Competence of Adolescents
 to Stand Trial 61

 Impact of Punitive Sanctions on
 Adolescent Development
 and Behavior 65

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING
 COMMENTS 68

INTRODUCTION

Few issues challenge a society’s ideas about both the nature of human development and the nature of justice as much as serious juvenile crime. Because we neither expect children to be criminals nor expect crimes to be committed by children, the unexpected intersection between childhood and criminality creates a dilemma that most people find difficult to resolve. Indeed, the only ways out of this problem are either to redefine the offense as something less serious than a crime or to

redefine the offender as someone who is not really a child (Zimring 1998).

For most of the twentieth century, American society has most often chosen the first approach—redefining the offense—and has treated most juvenile infractions as matters to be adjudicated as delinquent acts within a separate juvenile justice system designed, at least in theory, to recognize the special needs and immature status of young people and to therefore emphasize rehabilitation over punishment. Indeed, for much of the past century, states believed that the juvenile justice system was a vehicle to protect the public by providing a system that responds to children who are maturing into adulthood. States recognized that conduct alone—that is, the alleged criminal act—should not be dispositive in deciding when to invoke the heavy hand of the adult criminal justice system. They recognized that by providing for accountability, treatment, and supervision in the juvenile justice system—and in the community whenever possible—they promoted short-term and long-term public safety.

During the last two decades of the twentieth century, there was a dramatic shift in the way juvenile crime was viewed by policy makers and the public. Rather than choosing to define offenses committed by youth as delinquent, society increasingly opted to deal with young offenders more punitively in the juvenile justice system or to redefine them as adults and try them in adult criminal court. This trend was reflected in the growing number of juvenile offenses adjudicated in adult criminal court, where adolescents are exposed to a far more adversarial proceeding than in juvenile court; in the increasingly punitive response of the criminal justice system to juvenile offenders who are found guilty; and in what some observers have referred to as the “criminalization” of the juvenile justice system itself through increased use of punishment, rather than rehabilitation, as a legitimate juvenile justice goal (Feld 1993).

This transformation of juvenile justice policy and practice raises difficult, but important, questions for psychologists interested in the development and well-being of young people.

These questions are variations of the more general question of whether adolescents are fundamentally different from adults in ways that warrant the differential treatment of juveniles who break the law. In particular:

- Do adolescents have the psychological capabilities necessary to function as competent defendants in adult court?
- Should juveniles accused of crimes be held to the same standards of blameworthiness as adults and punished in the same ways as adult criminals who have committed similar crimes?
- How does exposing juveniles to especially punitive sanctions affect their behavior, development, and mental health?

These questions provide this review's focus. More broadly, the purpose of this review is to integrate developmental psychological considerations into moral, legal, political, and practical analyses of juvenile crime. Because addressing this issue necessitates at least a rudimentary understanding of the rationale and workings of the juvenile justice system, I begin not with a discussion of the science of adolescent development, but rather with a short history of juvenile justice in America and a brief overview of the process through which individuals are adjudicated within the system.

Following this brief introduction to American juvenile justice, I then summarize findings from recent studies of adolescent development that bear on whether adolescents differ from adults in ways that have implications for justice system policy and practice. Because not all aspects of adolescent development are pertinent to how young people are, or should be, treated in the justice system, I limit my discussion to studies that are especially relevant to these issues. Readers interested in a broader and more comprehensive treatment of adolescent development are encouraged to consult several recent reviews of this literature (Collins & Steinberg 2006, Smetana et al. 2006) as well as a recently updated handbook on adolescent psychology (Lerner & Steinberg 2009). I then look specifically at what we know about adolescents'

competence to stand trial, criminal culpability, and response to various types of sanctions and interventions.

JUVENILE JUSTICE IN AMERICA: AN OVERVIEW

The Origins of the Juvenile Justice System

Economic recessions in the early nineteenth century pushed children out of work in America's new factory system during the industrial revolution. Concerns about poor children on the street led to the creation of institutional care for children. In New York City, the Society for Prevention of Pauperism in 1824 became the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents, and in 1825 opened the nation's first House of Refuge. Boston followed a year later and Philadelphia in 1828. These Houses of Refuge were designed to maintain class status and prevent unrest (Krisberg & Austin 1993, Platt 1977).

In 1899, Jane Addams and her Hull House colleagues established what is generally accepted as the nation's first juvenile court. Juvenile court judges, in the early part of the twentieth century, were authorized to investigate the character and social background of both predelinquent and delinquent children. They examined personal motivation as well as criminal intent, seeking to identify the moral reputation of problematic children (Platt 1977). Ben Lindsey, of Denver, was the juvenile court judge whose practice most closely matched the rhetoric of the emerging juvenile court:

We should make it our business to study and know each particular case, because it will generally demand treatment in some little respect different from any other case. . . . (a) Is the child simply mischievous or criminal in its tendencies? (b) Is the case simply an exceptional or isolated instance in which a really good boy or girl has gone wrong for the first time because too weak to resist a strong temptation? (c) Is the child a victim of incompetent

Competence to stand trial: the ability of a defendant to understand the court proceeding, reason with relevant facts, and assist counsel

Criminal culpability: the extent to which an individual is judged to be responsible for a crime

Transfer: one mechanism through which juveniles' cases are referred to criminal (adult) court

Disposition: in the juvenile justice system, the outcome of an adjudication; comparable to a sentence in criminal court

parents? Does the home or parent need correction or assistance? (d) What of environment and association, which, of course, may embrace substantively all of the points of study? How can the environment be improved? Certainly by keeping the child out of the saloon and away from evil examples. (e) Is the child afflicted with what we call "the moving about fever" – that is, is he given to playing "hookey" from school, or "bumming" and running away, showing an entire lack of ambition or desire to work and settle down to regular habits? [Ben B. Lindsey, "The Boy and the Court," *Charities* 13 (January 1905):352; cited in Platt (1977)]

Julian Mack, Chicago's second juvenile court judge, similarly described the ideal juvenile court proceeding:

The problem for determination by the judge is not Has this boy or girl committed a specific wrong but What is he, how has he become what he is, and what had best be done in his interest and in the interest of the state to save him from a downward career. It is apparent at once that the ordinary legal evidence in a criminal court is not the sort of evidence to be heard in such a proceeding. (Mack 1909)

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the likely causes of the transformation of the juvenile justice system away from the rehabilitative ideal espoused by its founders and toward the more punitive regime that exists today (but see Scott & Steinberg 2008 for a discussion). However, it is worth noting that the early rhetoric on the rationale and purpose of the juvenile court is significant in two ways that bear on contemporary debates about justice system policy and practice. First, it is clear that the founders of the juvenile justice system began from the premise that adolescents are developmentally different from adults in ways that should affect our interpretation and assessment of their criminal acts. The questions raised by Judges Lindsey and Mack are relevant to the most vexing challenges that practition-

ers face today in determining (a) whether an adolescent's antisocial behavior is due to transient immaturity or contextual disadvantage, as opposed to deep-seated criminal character and (b) how best to construct a response to a juvenile's delinquent or criminal acts that will decrease the likelihood of recidivism. The difference between now and then, however, is that at the time of the court's founding, there was no science available to inform consideration of either issue. Owing to the dramatic increase in empirical research on normative and nonnormative adolescent development that began in the late 1970s, there has been a remarkable expansion of the scientific knowledge relevant to each of these matters.

Critical Decision Points Along the Juvenile Justice Pipeline

Juvenile justice is regulated mainly by state law, which makes it difficult to generalize about the system in ways that apply universally. Despite whatever differences exist across jurisdictions in policies and practices, however, the points of decision are essentially similar: referral, intake, detention, transfer, adjudication, disposition, and release (see Steinberg & Schwartz 2000).

Referral. Entrance into the pipeline begins with a referral to the juvenile justice system or a police arrest. Depending upon the state, a child may be too young or too old for the juvenile justice system. Children who are too young are most often diverted from the system or sent to the branch of juvenile court that has jurisdiction over neglected and abused children. Children who are too old are tried as adults. A juvenile may also be charged with an offense that results automatically in adult prosecution. If the juvenile is charged as an adult, most states allow for judges, after a hearing, to decide that the case should be transferred to juvenile court if the public interest requires it, or if the juvenile can prove that he or she is amenable to treatment in the juvenile justice system.

Intake. If the child enters the juvenile justice system after being arrested, referred by a private petitioner (such as a school or next-door neighbor), or transferred from criminal court, there will be an intake decision. Should the case proceed, or should the juvenile be diverted? If the latter, should it be an informal diversion, without further involvement by the juvenile court, or should the child be sent to a program, such as a community panel or teen court (and returned to juvenile court if he or she fails to obey a community-ordered disposition)? Some cases are diverted to other systems, such as the mental health system. Some cases are dropped entirely because intake officers decide that this particular combination of youth and offense does not belong in the juvenile justice system. Many factors thus enter into the decision to divert a case: The youth's age, prior history, the seriousness of the offense, and the youth's explanation or attitude will affect the intake decision.

Detention. If the intake officer decides that the case should proceed to a hearing, the officer must decide whether the child should be sent home (with or without supervision) or should be detained, either in a maximum-security detention center or in a detention alternative. Juveniles and their parents will need to explain to an intake officer how pretrial supervision will occur, and they will have to convince the officer that the juvenile will appear for trial. If the child is detained, there will be a court appearance within 24–72 hours. Most states call this first court appearance a detention hearing. Here a judge or referee will decide whether to continue the detention status. This is usually the first time that the child meets his or her attorney. Here the child must be able to discuss with counsel the circumstances of the arrest and out-of-court issues related to the detention decision (such as school attendance or the presence of an interested adult in the juvenile's life).

Transfer. Most persons under the age of 18 who are tried as adults are done so because of statutory exclusion of their case from the juvenile justice system. State law may exclude them

because of their age—in New York, for example, a 16-year-old will be tried as an adult for any offense. Every state excludes some offenses from juvenile court jurisdiction if a child is of a certain age (for example, a state can decide that 15-year-olds who are charged with armed robbery will have their cases begin in adult criminal court). Some states permit prosecutors to file the juvenile's case directly in the adult system, where the juvenile may or may not have an opportunity to have the case transferred to juvenile court. Every state also allows judges to transfer children of a certain age—usually 14, but in some instances, even younger—to criminal court if they are charged with an offense as serious as a felony. States usually must prove that the juvenile is “not amenable to treatment” in the juvenile justice system. At transfer hearings, it is important that the juvenile is able, for example, to discuss with counsel his or her recent placement history and its reason for failure. He or she should be able to understand options, such as proposed placements, counseling programs, or plea agreements.

Adjudication. If the child continues to be detained within the juvenile justice system, an adjudicatory hearing (comparable to the trial in criminal court) must be held within 10–30 days. (Although this is the general rule, in some states juveniles charged with high-profile crimes such as murder will have a longer time to wait until their trials.) Demands on juveniles at adjudicatory hearings are many. They will include the need to understand the nature of the charges against them and to consult with counsel. They will have to weigh the costs and benefits of entering an admission (guilty plea). They should be able to help counsel identify potential witnesses, know whether an alibi or other defenses are available, and consult with counsel during cross-examination of state witnesses.

Disposition. If the juvenile admits to the offense, or if the juvenile court finds by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the child has committed the offense, the court will proceed to disposition (sentence). Juveniles are

expected to assist counsel in presenting disposition options to the juvenile court. Assistance might include suggesting dispositions or helping the attorney and experts develop client-specific dispositions. Juvenile dispositions historically have been aimed at providing treatment, rehabilitation, or supervision in a way that best serves the needs of the juvenile, although in recent years some legislatures also have included incapacitation for public safety as a valid rationale. Under any of the models, the juvenile court will have a range of discretion. In some states, the juvenile court has wide latitude, from ordering that a child return home under supervision (probation) to placing a child in maximum-security institutions, known as training schools, reform schools, or youth development centers. In other states, which use a “youth authority” model, the court will either order probation or, if placement is warranted, transfer custody of the child to the youth authority, which will then determine the appropriate level of care.

Release. Most juvenile court dispositions are for indeterminate periods of time. However, dispositions cannot be for a longer period than an adult would serve for a similar crime in the criminal justice system. The court will usually review the juvenile’s case every six to nine months. Sometimes the reviews are formal hearings, whereas in other instances they are informal reviews of reports provided by probation officers or institutional staff. Many juveniles in placement, particularly those with mental health needs or who have been placed in inappropriate placements, end up being returned to juvenile court for a new disposition. Most often, those juveniles are placed in detention pending a new placement plan. When juveniles are released from institutions, they are placed on aftercare probation, which is analogous to parole. A juvenile who is on probation or on aftercare probation status can have that status revoked, or “violated,” for new offenses or for violating the terms of probation, such as associating with gang members, truancy, or missing curfew. A violation of probation may

lead to rearrest, detention, and another hearing, the outcome of which may be a new disposition.

The Relevance of Developmental Science to Decision Making in the Justice System

Although there are few decision points in the pipeline where the developmental status of the juvenile is taken into account explicitly, at each decision juncture, information about the juvenile’s stage of development should play an important role in the outcome of the decision. A juvenile’s developmental status is relevant with respect to the adjudication process because a just and fair hearing requires the competent participation of the individual in his or her defense. As noted earlier, at both the adjudication and transfer hearings, certain competencies are expected to be in place, including those that potentially affect the juvenile’s ability to understand the charges, assist counsel, and enter pleas (Scott & Grisso 2005). To the extent that these competencies are based on capabilities that develop over the course of childhood and adolescence, an accurate understanding of how and along what timetable these capabilities develop is crucial to deciding whether an individual possesses the skills necessary to participate in the process.

Under the law, characteristics of the offender and the circumstances of the offense can mitigate criminal responsibility and lessen the punishment that is ordered by the court. A crime that is committed impulsively is punished less severely than one that is premeditated, as is a crime that is committed under coercive pressure from others. Familiarity with the expected developmental timetables of phenomena such as self-control, foresight, and susceptibility to peer pressure is therefore important for making determinations of culpability. In theory at least, an offender who, by virtue of developmental immaturity, is impulsive, shortsighted, and easily influenced by peers should be punished less harshly than one who is better able to control himself, anticipate the future consequences of his behavior, and resist the

antisocial urgings of his friends (Steinberg & Scott 2003).

Finally, decision makers in the system often must assess the youngster's potential for change and risk for future offending when making transfer or disposition decisions (Mulvey & Leistico 2008). Such determinations of developmental plasticity are especially important at transfer hearings, because a youngster who is or seems hardened and unlikely to profit from rehabilitation is more likely to be charged as an adult than is one who is or is seen as malleable and amenable to intervention. Similarly, a juvenile who is deemed to be at high risk of recidivism, either because of a long prior record of offending or other characteristics associated with continued and/or dangerous criminal behavior (e.g., failure to respond to prior attempts at rehabilitation, a history of uncontrollable violence, or likelihood of inadequate adult supervision in the community) will be more likely to be sent to institutional placement.

In order to make well-informed decisions about the treatment of juveniles who have entered the juvenile justice pipeline, therefore, policy makers, practitioners, and mental health professionals need to be familiar with the developmental changes that occur during childhood and adolescence in the capabilities and characteristics that are relevant to competence, culpability, and likely response to treatment. Legislators need this information in order to create age-related laws and statutes that are developmentally appropriate and scientifically reasonable; if, for example, we know that the ability to understand charges or enter pleas does not generally develop until a certain age, it makes little sense to draw age boundaries that would subject developmentally incompetent individuals to court proceedings that necessitate their participation in order to satisfy ordinary due process requirements. Judges need this information in order to make wise and fair decisions in the courtroom; if we know that the capacity to regulate one's own behavior is unlikely to be present before a certain age, it is important that this information be taken into account at the time of sentencing or disposition. Men-

tal health professionals need this information in order to perform accurate assessments and make appropriate treatment recommendations; individuals at different stages of development may need very different sorts of interventions. And attorneys need this information in order to practice law more effectively; prosecutors may consider a juvenile's developmental status in deciding when it is appropriate to charge an individual as an adult, and defense attorneys need to know how best to interact with clients who may not fully understand their situation. Understanding the nature of psychological development during adolescence, therefore, will likely improve policymaking, judicial decision making, forensic evaluation, and legal practice.

BRAIN, COGNITIVE, AND PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENCE

When lawmakers focus on juvenile justice policy, the distinction between adolescence and adulthood, rather than that between childhood and adolescence, is of primary interest. However, most studies of adolescent development have compared adolescents with children, and only in recent years has scientific interest focused intensely on the psychological transition between adolescence and adulthood, largely in response to new research showing continued brain maturation through the end of the adolescent period. This work has provided support for the uniqueness of adolescence as a stage of life that is also distinct from adulthood with respect to several aspects of brain and psychosocial development.

Adolescent Brain Development

Although most of the developmental research on cognitive and psychosocial functioning during adolescence involves psychological studies, recent work in developmental neuroscience is beginning to shed light on the neural underpinnings of psychological development across adolescence and adulthood. In the past several years, a new perspective on risk taking

Socioemotional system: the brain system governing the processing of social and emotional information and the experience of reward and punishment

Cognitive control system: the brain system governing executive function, including deliberative thinking, impulse control, foresight, and the evaluation of risk and reward

(including antisocial risk taking) during adolescence has emerged, one that is informed by advances in developmental neuroscience (Casey et al. 2008, Steinberg 2008). According to this view, risky behavior in adolescence is the product of the interaction between changes in two distinct neurobiological systems: a socioemotional system, which is localized in limbic and paralimbic areas of the brain, including the amygdala, ventral striatum, orbitofrontal cortex, medial prefrontal cortex, and superior temporal sulcus; and a cognitive control system, which is mainly composed of the lateral prefrontal and parietal cortices and those parts of the anterior cingulate cortex to which they are interconnected (Steinberg 2007).

According to this dual-systems model, adolescent risk taking is hypothesized to be stimulated by a rapid and dramatic increase in dopaminergic activity within the socioemotional system around the time of puberty, which is presumed to lead to increases in reward seeking. However, this increase in reward seeking precedes the structural maturation of the cognitive control system and its connections to areas of the socioemotional system, a maturational process that is gradual, unfolds over the course of adolescence, and permits more advanced self-regulation and impulse control. The temporal gap between the arousal of the socioemotional system, which is an early adolescent development, and the full maturation of the cognitive control system, which occurs later, creates a period of heightened vulnerability to risk taking during middle adolescence (Steinberg 2008). As one writer has characterized it, the process may be akin to “starting the engines without a skilled driver behind the wheel” (Dahl 2001).

Neurobiological evidence in support of this dual-systems model is rapidly accumulating. A growing literature, derived primarily from rodent studies but with implications for human development, indicates that the remodeling of the dopaminergic system within the socioemotional network involves an initial postnatal rise and then, starting in preadolescence, a subsequent reduction of dopamine receptor density in the striatum and prefrontal cortex; this pat-

tern is more pronounced among males than females (Sisk & Foster 2004, Sisk & Zehr 2005, Teicher et al. 1995). As a result of this remodeling, dopaminergic activity in the prefrontal cortex increases significantly in early adolescence and is higher during this period than before or after. Because dopamine plays a critical role in the brain’s reward circuitry, the increase, reduction, and redistribution of dopamine receptor concentration around puberty, especially in projections from the limbic system to the prefrontal area, is likely to increase reward-seeking behavior and, accordingly, sensation seeking.

There is equally compelling neurobiological evidence for changes in brain structure and function during adolescence and early adulthood that facilitate improvements in self-regulation that permit individuals to modulate their inclinations to seek rewards, although this development is presumed to unfold along a different timetable and to be independent of puberty (see Paus 2005 for a summary). Because of synaptic pruning and the continued myelination of prefrontal brain regions, resulting in improved connectivity among cortical areas and between cortical and subcortical areas, there are improvements over the course of adolescence in many aspects of executive function, such as response inhibition, planning, weighing risks and rewards, and the simultaneous consideration of multiple sources of information. There is also improved coordination of affect and cognition, reflected in improved emotion regulation, which is facilitated by the increased connectivity between regions associated with the socioemotional and cognitive control systems.

The development of the cognitive control system, which is manifested chiefly in improved connectivity across brain regions, must be distinguished from the well-publicized maturation of the frontal lobes because of synaptic pruning. Although both processes result in improved thinking abilities, they occur at different times in adolescence and have different implications for cognitive development. Whereas increases in connectivity take place throughout adolescence and well into adulthood, the decline in gray matter density that reflects synaptic

pruning takes place in preadolescence and early adolescence and is more or less complete by age 16. Consequently, performance on tasks that activate the frontal lobes continues to improve through middle adolescence but not beyond age 16 on tasks of moderate difficulty (Conklin et al. 2007, Crone & van der Molen 2004, Hooper et al. 2004, Luna et al. 2001). In contrast, adult-like performance on more demanding cognitive tasks, especially those that require coordination between and among multiple cortical and subcortical brain regions, is not attained until later in development.

The upshot of this developmental neuroscience is that changes in the socioemotional system at puberty may promote reckless, sensation-seeking behavior in early and middle adolescence, while the regions of the prefrontal cortex that govern cognitive control continue to mature over the course of adolescence and into young adulthood. This temporal gap between the increase in sensation seeking around puberty and the later development of mature self-regulatory competence may combine to make adolescence a time of inherently immature judgment. Thus, despite the fact that in many ways adolescents may appear to be as intelligent as adults (at least as indexed by performance on tests of information processing and logical reasoning), their ability to regulate their behavior in accord with these advanced intellectual abilities is more limited. As the next section makes clear, research on adolescent cognitive and psychosocial development is consistent with this neurobiological profile.

Adolescent Cognitive Development

The application of information about normative adolescent development to policy and practice in the justice system necessitates differentiating between cognitive and psychosocial development, which appear to follow different developmental trajectories (Steinberg 2008). Briefly, on relatively less-demanding tasks that are mainly or exclusively cognitive in nature, and where improvement in adolescence is likely due to synaptic pruning of the frontal lobes,

adolescents evince adult levels of competence by age 16. In contrast, on more challenging tasks that involve the coordination of affect and cognition, and on many measures of psychosocial maturity, performance continues to improve well into young adulthood, most likely because this improvement is mediated by improved connectivity across brain regions, a relatively later development. As I discuss below, this temporal disjunction has created a great deal of confusion with regard to where we should draw the legal boundary between adolescence and adulthood, because different developmental literatures suggest different chronological ages.

The most important cognitive capacities involved in decision making are understanding (i.e., the ability to comprehend information relevant to the decision) and reasoning (i.e., the ability to use this information logically to make a choice). These capacities increase through childhood into adolescence. Between late childhood and middle adolescence (roughly between the ages of 11 and 16), individuals show marked improvements in reasoning (especially deductive reasoning) and in both the efficiency and capacity of information processing (Hale 1990, Kail 1997, Keating 2004, Overton 1990). Research has demonstrated conclusively that, as a result of gains in these areas, individuals become more capable of abstract, multidimensional, deliberative, and hypothetical thinking as they develop from late childhood into middle adolescence (Kuhn 2009). These abilities reach an asymptote sometime around 16, and by this age, teens' capacities for understanding and reasoning in making decisions, at least in controlled experiments, roughly approximate those of adults. This comparability between middle adolescents and adults is not limited to basic cognitive abilities such as memory or verbal fluency or to performance on tasks of logical reasoning. Studies of capacity to grant informed consent to receive medical treatment or participate as a research subject, for example, show little improvement beyond age 16 (Belter & Grisso 1984, Grisso & Vierling 1978, Gustafson & McNamara 1987, Weithorn & Campbell 1982).

The notion that adolescents and adults demonstrate comparable capacities for understanding and reasoning should not be taken to mean that they also demonstrate comparable levels of maturity of judgment, however. As my colleagues and I have argued elsewhere, maturity of judgment is affected both by cognitive capabilities as well as psychosocial ones, and although the former show adult levels of maturity by 16, the latter do not (Steinberg et al. 2008b). As a result, adolescents may be less able to deploy their cognitive capacities as effectively as adults in exercising judgment in their everyday lives when decisions are influenced by emotional and social variables. The development of these psychosocial factors is described in the next section.

Adolescent Psychosocial Development

New perspectives on adolescent “cognition-in-context” emphasize that adolescent thinking in everyday settings is a function of social and emotional, as well as cognitive, processes, and that a full account of youthful judgment must examine the interaction of all of these influences (Scott et al. 1995, Steinberg & Cauffman 1996). Even when adolescent cognitive capacities approximate those of adults, youthful decision making may still differ from that of adults due to psychosocial immaturity. Indeed, research indicates that psychosocial maturation proceeds more slowly than cognitive development, and that age differences in judgment may reflect social and emotional differences between adolescents and adults that continue well beyond mid-adolescence. Of particular relevance to the present discussion are age differences in susceptibility to peer influence, future orientation, reward sensitivity, and the capacity for self-regulation. Available research indicates that adolescents and adults differ significantly with respect to each of these attributes.

Peer influence. Substantial research evidence supports the conventional wisdom that teens are more oriented toward peers and responsive to peer influence than are adults (Steinberg &

Monahan 2007). Resistance to peer influence increases between adolescence and adulthood as individuals begin to form an independent sense of self and develop greater capacity for autonomous decision making. Studies of age differences and age changes in resistance to peer influence suggest somewhat different patterns vis-à-vis antisocial versus neutral or prosocial peer pressure prior to middle adolescence (with resistance to antisocial influence decreasing during this time, especially among boys, but resistance to other forms of peer influence increasing), but similar patterns after age 14 (with resistance to all forms of peer influence increasing). Because the main justice policy and practice questions concern differences between adolescents and adults, especially during the latter part of the adolescent period, it is this increase in resistance to peer influence from age 14 on that is of particular interest.

Recent studies of the neural underpinnings of resistance to peer influence in adolescence indicate that improvements in this capacity may be linked to the development of greater connectivity between cortical and subcortical regions, which likely facilitates the better coordination of affect and cognition (Grosbras et al. 2007, Paus et al. 2008), although it should be noted that this conclusion is based on studies of individual differences in brain morphology and function among same-aged adolescents who differ in their self-reported resistance to peer pressure and not to cross-sectional or longitudinal studies that link age differences in resistance to peer influence to age differences in brain structure or function. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to speculate that the social and arousal processes that may undermine logical decision making during adolescence, when connectivity is still maturing, do not have the same impact during adulthood. One recent behavioral study found, for instance, that adolescents, college undergraduates, and adults performed similarly on a risk-taking task when performing the task alone, but that the presence of same-aged friends doubled risk taking among adolescents and increased it 50% among the undergraduates, but had no

impact on the adults (Gardner & Steinberg 2005).

Peer influence affects adolescent judgment both directly and indirectly. In some contexts, adolescents might make choices in response to direct peer pressure, as when they are coerced to take risks that they might otherwise avoid. More indirectly, adolescents' desire for peer approval and consequent fear of rejection affects their choices even without direct coercion. The increased salience of peers in adolescence likely makes approval seeking especially important in group situations. Thus, it is not surprising, perhaps, that adolescents are far more likely than are adults to commit crimes in groups (Zimring 1998). Peers also may provide models for behavior that adolescents believe will assist them to accomplish their own ends. For example, there is some evidence that during early and middle adolescence, teens who engage in certain types of antisocial behavior, such as fighting or drinking, may enjoy higher status among their peers as a consequence. Accordingly, some adolescents may engage in antisocial conduct to impress their friends or to conform to peer expectations; indeed, in one of the most influential accounts of so-called adolescence-limited offenders (that is, individuals who commit crimes during adolescence but not before or after), imitation of higher-status peers is hypothesized to be a prime motivation for antisocial behavior (Moffitt 1993).

Future orientation. Future orientation, the capacity and inclination to project events into the future, may also influence judgment because it affects the extent to which individuals consider the long-term consequences of their actions in making choices. Over the course of adolescence and into young adulthood, individuals become more future oriented, with increases in their consideration of future consequences, in their concern about the future, and in their ability to plan ahead (Greene 1986, Nurmi 1991, Steinberg et al. 2008c).

There are several plausible explanations for this age gap in future orientation. In part, adolescents' weaker future orientation may reflect

their more limited life experience (Gardner 1993). To a young person, a short-term consequence may have far greater salience than one five years in the future. The latter may seem very remote simply because five years represents a substantial portion of her life. There is also evidence linking the differences between adolescents and adults in future orientation to age differences in brain structure and function, especially in the prefrontal cortex (Cauffman et al. 2005).

Reward sensitivity. Research evidence also suggests that, relative to adults, adolescents are more sensitive to rewards and, especially, to immediate rewards, a difference that may explain age differences in sensation seeking and risk taking (Galvan et al. 2007, Steinberg et al. 2008a). Although it had once been believed that adolescents and adults differ in risk perception, it now appears that age differences in risk taking are more likely mediated by age differences in reward sensitivity than by age differences in sensitivity to the potential adverse consequences of a risky decision (Cauffman et al. 2008, Millstein & Halpern-Felsher 2002). Thus, adolescents and adults may perceive risks similarly (both in the lab and in the real world) but evaluate rewards differently, especially when the benefits of the risky decision are weighed against the costs. So, for example, in deciding whether to speed while driving a car, adolescents and adults may estimate the risks of this behavior (e.g., being ticketed, getting into an accident) similarly, but adolescents may weigh the potential rewards (e.g., the thrill of driving fast, peer approval, getting to one's destination sooner) more heavily than adults, leading to lower risk ratios for teens—and a higher likelihood of engaging in the (rewarding) activity. Thus, what distinguishes adolescents from adults in this regard is not the fact that teens are less knowledgeable about risks, but rather that they attach greater value to the rewards that risk taking provides (Steinberg 2004).

The heightened salience of rewards to adolescents, relative to adults, is seen in age

Adolescence-limited offenders: antisocial individuals whose offending begins and ends during adolescence

differences in performance on the Iowa Gambling Task, in which subjects are given four decks of cards, face down, and are instructed to turn over cards, one at a time, from any deck. Each card has information about how much money the subject has won or lost by selecting that card. Two of the decks are “good,” in that drawing from them will lead to gains over time, and two of the decks are “bad”; drawing from them will produce net losses. Because a few cards in the “bad” decks offer very high rewards, though, a person who is especially sensitive to rewards will be drawn to the “bad” decks, even if he or she keeps losing money as a result. At the beginning of the task, people tend to draw randomly from all four decks, but as the task progresses, normal adults pick more frequently from the good decks. Children and younger adolescents (as well as adults with damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex) do poorly on this task (Crone et al. 2005, Crone & van der Molen 2004, Hooper et al. 2004). Performance improves with age, with the most dramatic improvement taking place during middle adolescence. This likely reflects a decrease in susceptibility to choosing based on the prospect of an immediate, attractive reward. Further evidence that adolescents tend to value immediate rewards more than adults do is seen in age differences in performance on tests of delay discounting, in which individuals are asked to choose between a smaller immediate reward (e.g., receiving \$600 tomorrow) and a larger delayed one (e.g., receiving \$1000 in one year) (Steinberg et al. 2008c). Heightened reward sensitivity, indexed by self-report or task performance, is especially pronounced during early and middle adolescence, when reward circuitry in the brain is undergoing extensive remodeling. There is some evidence from both human and animal studies that this may be linked to pubertal maturation (Dahl 2004).

Self-regulation. In addition to age differences in susceptibility to peer influence, future orientation, and reward sensitivity, adolescents and adults also differ with respect to their ability to control impulsive behavior and choices. Thus,

the widely held stereotype that adolescents are more reckless than adults is supported by research on developmental changes in impulsivity and self-management over the course of adolescence (Galvan et al. 2007, Leshem & Glicksohn 2007). In general, studies show gradual but steady increases in the capacity for self-direction through adolescence, with gains continuing through the high school years and into young adulthood. Similarly, impulsivity, as a general trait, declines linearly between adolescence and adulthood (Steinberg et al. 2008a).

An illustration of behavioral research that sheds light on age differences in impulse control is the study of performance on a task known as the Tower of London. In this test, the subject is presented with an arrangement of colored balls, stacked in a certain order, and several empty vertical rods onto which the balls can be moved. The subject is then presented with a picture of a different configuration of balls and asked to turn the original configuration into the new one by moving one ball at a time, using the fewest number of moves (Berg & Byrd 2002). This task requires thinking ahead, because extra moves must be used to undo a mistake. In several studies, our research group found that early and middle adolescents performed similarly to adults when the problem presented was an easy one (i.e., one that could be solved in two or three moves), but that they did not plan ahead as much as late adolescents and young adults on the harder problems; unlike the older subjects, the younger individuals spent no more time before making their first move on the complex problems than they did on the simple ones (Steinberg et al. 2008a). These findings are consistent with casual observations of teenagers in the real world, which also suggest that they are less likely than are adults to think ahead before acting.

Taken together, these findings from self-report and behavioral studies of psychosocial development indicate that individuals become more resistant to peer influence and oriented to the future, and less drawn to immediate rewards and impulsive, as they mature from adolescence to adulthood. Although the science of

adolescent brain development is still in its infancy, finding indicate that much of this maturation continues well beyond the age by which individuals evince adult levels of performance on tests of cognitive capacity. As I discuss in the next section, the continued maturation of cognitive competence through age 16 and the continued maturation of psychosocial competence into young adulthood have important implications for how we view and respond to the criminal behavior of juveniles.

JUVENILE JUSTICE ISSUES INFORMED BY DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE

Criminal Culpability of Youth

The adult justice system presumes that defendants who are found guilty are responsible for their own actions, should be held accountable, and should be punished accordingly. Because of the relative immaturity of minors, however, it may not be justified to hold them as accountable as one might hold adults. If, for example, adolescents below a certain age cannot grasp the long-term consequences of their actions or cannot control their impulses, one cannot hold them fully accountable for their actions. In other words, we cannot claim that adolescents “ought to know better” if, in fact, the evidence indicates that they do not know better, or more accurately, cannot know better, because they lack the abilities needed to exercise mature judgment. It is important to note that culpability cannot really be researched directly. Because an individual’s culpability is something that is judged by someone else, it is largely in the eye of the beholder. What can be studied, however, are the capabilities and characteristics of individuals that make them potentially blameworthy, such as their ability to behave intentionally or to know right from wrong.

I use the term “culpability” in this review as a shorthand for several interrelated phenomena, including responsibility, accountability, blameworthiness, and punishability. These notions are relevant to the adjudication of an individ-

ual’s guilt or innocence, because an individual who is not responsible for his or her actions by definition cannot be guilty, and to the determination of a disposition (in juvenile court) or sentence (in criminal court), in that individuals who are found guilty but less than completely blameworthy, owing to any number of mitigating circumstances, merit proportionately less punishment than do guilty individuals who are fully blameworthy.

The starting point in a discussion of criminal culpability is a principle known as penal proportionality. Simply put, penal proportionality holds that criminal punishment should be determined by two criteria: the harm a person causes and his blameworthiness in causing that harm. The law recognizes that different wrongful acts cause different levels of harm through a complex system of offense grading under which more serious crimes (rape, for example) are punished presumptively more severely than less serious crimes (shoplifting, for example). Beyond this, though, two people who engage in the same wrongful conduct may differ in their blameworthiness. A person may be less culpable than other criminals—or not culpable at all—because he inadvertently (rather than purposely) causes the harm, because he is subject to some endogenous deficiency or incapacity that impairs his decision making (such as mental illness), or because he acts in response to an extraordinary external pressure—a gun to the head is the classic example. Less-blameworthy offenders deserve less punishment, and some persons who cause criminal harm deserve no punishment at all (Scott & Steinberg 2008).

The concept of mitigation plays an important role in the law’s calculation of blame and punishment, although it gets little attention in the debate about youth crime. Mitigation applies to persons engaging in harmful conduct who are blameworthy enough to meet the minimum threshold of criminal responsibility but who deserve less punishment than a typical offender would receive. Through mitigation, the criminal law calculates culpability and punishment along a continuum and is not limited to the options of full responsibility or complete

Penal proportionality: the principle in American criminal law linking the severity of punishment for a crime to the criminal’s culpability

Mitigation: in criminal law, the lessening of criminal responsibility

excuse. Indeed, criminal law incorporates calibrated measures of culpability. For example, the law of homicide operates through a grading scheme under which punishment for killing another person varies dramatically depending on the actor's blameworthiness. Thus, the actor who kills intentionally is deemed less culpable if he does so without premeditation because his choice reveals less consideration of the harmful consequences of his act, and the actor who negligently causes another's death is guilty of a less serious crime than one who intends to kill. A person who kills in response to provocation or under extreme emotional disturbance may be guilty only of manslaughter and not of murder. Under standard homicide doctrine, mitigating circumstances and mental states are translated into lower-grade offenses that warrant less punishment.

What makes the conduct of one person less blameworthy than that of another person who causes the same harm? Generally, a person who causes criminal harm is a fully responsible moral agent (and deserves full punishment) if, in choosing to engage in the wrongful conduct, he has the capacity to make a rational decision and a "fair opportunity" to choose not to engage in the harmful conduct. Under this view, the actor whose thinking is substantially impaired or whose freedom is significantly constrained is less culpable than is the typical offender and deserves less punishment—how much less depends on the extent of the impairment or coercion. Under American criminal law, two very different kinds of persons can show that their criminal conduct was less culpable than that of the offender who deserves full punishment—those who are very different from ordinary persons due to impairments that contributed to their criminal choices and those who are ordinary persons whose offenses are responses to extraordinary circumstances or are otherwise aberrant conduct (Scott & Steinberg 2008).

Although it seems paradoxical, adolescents, in a real sense, belong to both groups. In the first group are individuals with endogenous traits or conditions that undermine their decision-making capacity, impairing their ability to un-

derstand the nature and consequences of their wrongful acts or to control their conduct. In modern times, this category has been reserved mostly for offenders who suffer from mental illness, mental disability, and other neurological impairments. The criminal law defenses of insanity, diminished capacity, extreme emotional disturbance, and involuntary act recognize that psychological and biological incapacities can undermine decision making in ways that reduce or negate the culpability of criminal choices.

Individuals in the second group are ordinary persons whose criminal conduct is less culpable because it is a response to extraordinary external circumstances: These cases arise when the actor faces a difficult choice, and his response of engaging in the criminal conduct is reasonable under the circumstances, as measured by the likely response of an ordinary law-abiding person in that situation. Thus, under standard self-defense doctrine, a person who kills a threatening assailant is excused from liability if a reasonable person in his place would have felt that his life was in danger. Similarly, the defenses of duress, necessity, and provocation are available to actors who can explain their criminal conduct in terms of unusual external pressures that constrained their ability to choose.

In the preceding section, I described aspects of psychological development in adolescence that are relevant to youthful choices to get involved in criminal activity and that may distinguish young offenders from their adult counterparts. Although youths in mid-adolescence have cognitive capacities for reasoning and understanding that approximate those of adults, even at age 18 adolescents are immature in their psychosocial and emotional development, and this likely affects their decisions about involvement in crime in ways that distinguish them from adults. Teenagers are more susceptible to peer influence than are adults and tend to focus more on rewards and less on risks in making choices. They also tend to focus on short-term rather than long-term consequences and are less capable of anticipating future consequences, and they are more impulsive and volatile in their emotional responses. When we consider these

developmental factors within the conventional criminal law framework for assessing blameworthiness, the unsurprising conclusion is that adolescent offenders are less culpable than are adults. The mitigating conditions generally recognized in the criminal law—diminished capacity and coercive circumstances—are relevant to criminal acts of adolescents and often characterize the actions of juvenile offenders. This does not excuse adolescents from criminal responsibility, but it renders them less blameworthy and less deserving of adult punishment.

Although in general lawmakers have paid minimal attention to the mitigating character of adolescents' diminished decision-making capacities, some legislatures and courts have recognized that immature judgment reduces culpability. Most notably, in its consideration of the constitutionality of the juvenile death penalty, the Supreme Court has focused on this rationale for mitigation. In *Roper v. Simmons*, the 2005 case that abolished the juvenile death penalty, the Court adopted the developmental argument for mitigation that follows from the research reviewed above. Justice Kennedy, writing for the majority, described three features of adolescence that distinguish young offenders from their adult counterparts in ways that mitigate culpability—features that are familiar to the reader at this point. The first is the diminished decision-making capacity of youths, which may contribute to a criminal choice that is “not as morally reprehensible as that of adults” because of its developmental nature. The Court pointed to the tendency of adolescents to engage in risky behavior and noted that immaturity and an “underdeveloped sense of responsibility” often result in “impetuous and ill-considered decisions” by youths. Second, the Court pointed to the increased vulnerability of youths to external coercion, including peer pressure. Finally, the Court emphasized that the unformed nature of adolescent identity made it “less supportable to conclude that even a heinous crime was evidence of irretrievably depraved character.” Adolescents are less blameworthy than are adults, the Court suggested, because the traits that contribute

to criminal conduct are transient, and because most adolescents will outgrow their tendency to get involved in crime as they mature. Although the Court did not elaborate, we have seen that each of these attributes of adolescence corresponds to a conventional source of mitigation in criminal law (*Roper v. Simmons* 2005).

Does this argument apply to the conduct of immature adults? Although most impulsive young risk takers mature into adults with different values, some adult criminals are impulsive, sensation-seeking risk takers who discount future consequences and focus on the here and now. Are these adolescent-like adults also less culpable than other adult offenders and deserving of reduced punishment? I think not. Unlike the typical adolescent, the predispositions, values, and preferences that motivate the adult offenders are not developmental but characterological, and they are unlikely to change merely with the passage of time. Adolescent traits that contribute to criminal conduct are normative of adolescence, but they are not typical in adulthood. In an adult, these traits are often part of the personal identity of an individual who does not respect the values of the criminal law and who deserves punishment when he or she violates its prohibitions (Scott & Steinberg 2008).

Competence of Adolescents to Stand Trial

Before discussing adolescents' competence to stand trial, it is worth underscoring the distinction between competence and culpability—two very different constructs that are often confused, even by those with expertise in criminal law. Competence to stand trial refers to the ability of an individual to function effectively as a defendant in a criminal or delinquency proceeding. In contrast, determinations of culpability focus on the defendant's blameworthiness in engaging in the criminal conduct and on whether and to what extent he will be held responsible. Although many of the same incapacities that excuse or mitigate criminal responsibility may also render a defendant incompetent, the two issues are analytically distinct and

Roper v. Simmons:
the U.S. Supreme
Court case that
abolished the juvenile
death penalty

Dusky v. United

States: the U.S. Supreme Court case that established criteria for competence to stand trial

In re Gault: the U.S. Supreme Court case that determined that juveniles adjudicated in juvenile court were entitled to many of the same procedural protections as adults adjudicated in criminal court

Developmental

incompetence: a lack of competence to stand trial due to normal cognitive or psychosocial immaturity, as opposed to mental illness or disability

separate legal inquiries, and they focus on the defendant's mental state at two different points in time (the time of the crime and the time of the court proceeding).

The reason that competence is required of defendants in criminal proceedings is simple: When the state asserts its power against an individual with the goal of taking away his liberty, the accused must be capable of participating in a meaningful way in the proceeding against him. If a defendant is so mentally ill or disabled that he cannot participate adequately, then the trial lacks fundamental fairness that is required as a part of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (Scott & Grisso 2005).

In 1960, the Supreme Court announced a legal standard for trial competence in *Dusky v. United States* that has since been adopted uniformly by American courts. According to *Dusky*, when the issue of a defendant's competence is raised in a criminal trial, the court's determination should focus on "whether the defendant has sufficient present ability to consult with his lawyer with a reasonable degree of rational understanding—and whether he has a rational, as well as factual, understanding of the proceedings against him." Thus, there are two parts to the competence requirement: The defendant must be able to consult with her attorney about planning and making decisions in her defense, and she must understand the charges, the meaning, and purpose of the proceedings and the consequences of conviction (Scott & Grisso 2005).

The requirement that criminal defendants be competent to stand trial had no place in delinquency proceedings in the traditional juvenile court. In a system in which the government's announced purpose was to rehabilitate and not to punish errant youths, the procedural protections accorded adult defendants—including the requirement of adjudicative competence—were thought to be unnecessary. This all changed with *In re Gault*, which led to an extensive restructuring of delinquency proceedings to conform to the requirements of constitutional due process. Today, it is generally

accepted that requirements of due process and fundamental fairness are satisfied only if youths facing charges in juvenile court are competent to stand trial.

Until the 1990s, the issue of juveniles' trial competence involved a straightforward incorporation into delinquency proceedings of a procedural protection that was relevant to a relatively small number of mentally impaired adult defendants, where it was assumed to apply similarly to a small number of mentally incapacitated youths. The regulatory reforms that began in the late 1980s changed the situation by increasing the punishment stakes facing many young offenders and by eroding the boundary between the adult and juvenile systems. The importance of this issue was not recognized immediately, however. As legislatures across the country began to enact laws that dramatically altered the landscape of juvenile crime policy, the procedural issue of whether developmentally immature youngsters charged with crimes might be less able to participate in criminal proceedings than are adult defendants—what is referred to in this article as developmental incompetence—was not central to the policy debates.

Given that developmental incompetence largely escaped the attention of courts and policy makers until recently, it is worth asking directly whether the constitutional prohibition against criminal adjudication of incompetent defendants must be applied to this form of incapacity. The answer is surely "yes." The competence requirement is functional at its core, speaking to questions about the impact of cognitive deficiencies on trial participation. Functionally it makes no difference if the defendant cannot understand the proceeding she faces or assist her attorney, whether due to mental illness or to immaturity (Scott & Grisso 2005). In either case, the fairness of the proceeding is undermined. In short, the same concerns that support the prohibition against trying criminal defendants who are incompetent due to mental impairment apply with equal force when immature youths are subject to criminal proceedings. In the context of the recent changes in juvenile

justice policy, it has become important to have a better understanding of how the capacities of children and adolescents to participate in criminal proceedings compare with those of adults. In pursuit of this end, I first examine the specific abilities that are required for adjudicative competence under the legal standard. I then turn to the research directly comparing the abilities of juveniles and adults.

Three broad types of abilities are implicated under the *Dusky* standard for competence to stand trial: (a) a factual understanding of the proceedings, (b) a rational understanding of the proceedings, and (c) the ability to assist counsel (Scott & Grisso 2005). Courts applying the standard are directed to weigh each factor, but otherwise they exercise substantial discretion in deciding how much competence is enough. Examining each component of competence under the *Dusky* standard and considering how the capacities of juvenile defendants are likely to compare with those of adults is instructive.

Factual understanding focuses on the defendant's knowledge and awareness of the charges and his understanding of available pleas, possible penalties, the general steps in the adjudication process, the roles of various participants in the pretrial and trial process, and his rights as a defendant. Intellectual immaturity in juveniles may undermine factual understanding, especially given that youths generally have less experience and more limited ability to grasp concepts such as rights. Juveniles also may be more likely than are adults to have extensive deficits in their basic knowledge of the trial process, such that more than brief instruction is needed to attain competence.

The rational understanding requirement of *Dusky* has been interpreted to mean that defendants must comprehend the implications, relevance, or significance of what they understand factually regarding the trial process. Deficits in rational understanding typically involve distorted or erroneous beliefs that nullify factual understanding. For example, an immature defendant may know that he has a right to remain silent, yet believe that the judge can take this "right" away at any time by demanding a

response to questions. (When asked what he thought the "right to remain silent" meant, my 12-year-old son said, "It means that you don't have to say anything until the police ask you a question.") Intellectual, emotional, and psychosocial immaturity may undermine the ability of some adolescents to grasp accurately the meaning and significance of matters that they seem to understand factually.

Finally, the requirement that the defendant in a criminal proceeding must have the capacity to assist counsel encompasses three types of abilities. The first is the ability to receive and communicate information adequately to allow counsel to prepare a defense. This ability may be compromised by impairments in attention, memory, and concentration, deficits that might undermine the defendant's ability to respond to instructions or to provide important information to his attorney, such as a coherent account of the events surrounding the offense. As I noted above, these capacities continue to improve through age 16, according to studies of cognitive development. Second, the ability to assist counsel requires a rational perspective regarding the attorney and her role, free of notions or attitudes that could impair the collaborative relationship. For example, some young defendants develop a belief that all adults involved in the proceeding are allied against him, perhaps after seeing defense attorneys and prosecutors chatting together outside the courtroom. Third, defendants must have the capacity to make decisions about pleading and the waiver or assertion of other constitutional rights. These decisions involve not only adequate factual and rational understanding, but also the ability to consider alternatives and make a choice in a decision-making process. Immature youths may lack capacities to process information and exercise reason adequately in making trial decisions, especially when the options are complex and their consequences far reaching.

As juveniles' competence to stand trial began to emerge as an important issue in the mid-1990s, the need for a comprehensive study comparing the abilities of adolescents

and adults in this realm became apparent. Before this time, a few small studies had looked at particular capacities in juveniles that were important at different stages in the justice process. However, no comprehensive research had compared the specific capacities of juveniles and adults that are directly implicated in assessments of adjudicative competence. In response to that need, the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice sponsored a large-scale study of individuals between the ages of 11 and 24—half of whom were in the custody of the justice system and half of whom had never been detained—designed to examine empirically the relationship between developmental immaturity and the abilities of young defendants to participate in their trials (Grisso et al. 2003). The study also probed age differences in psychosocial influences on decision making in the criminal process.

Based on participants' responses to a structured interview that had been used in previous studies of competence to stand trial among mentally ill adults, and for which norms had been established to define clinically significant "impairment," the researchers found that competence-related abilities improve significantly between the ages of 11 and 16. On average, youths aged 11 to 13 demonstrated significantly poorer understanding of trial matters, as well as poorer reasoning and recognition of the relevance of information for a legal defense, than did 14- and 15-year-olds, who in turn performed significantly more poorly than individuals aged 16 and older. There were no differences between the 16- and 17-year-olds and the young adults. The study produced similar results when adolescents and adults were categorized according to their scores above and below the cut-off scores indicating impairment. Nearly one-third of 11- to 13-year-olds and about one-fifth of 14- and 15-year-olds, but only 12% of individuals 16 and older, evidenced impairment at a level comparable to mentally ill adults who had been found incompetent to stand trial with respect to either their ability to reason with facts or understand the trial process.

Individual performance did not differ significantly by gender, ethnicity, or, in the detained groups, as a function of the extent of individuals' prior justice system experience. This last finding is important because it indicates that there are components of immaturity independent of a lack of relevant experience that may contribute to elevated rates of incompetence among juveniles.

A different structured interview was used to probe how psychosocial influences affect decision making by assessing participants' choices in three hypothetical legal situations involving a police interrogation, consultation with a defense attorney, and the evaluation of a proffered plea agreement. Significant age differences were found in responses to police interrogation and to the plea agreement. First, youths, including 16- to 17-year-olds, were much more likely to recommend waiving constitutional rights during an interrogation than were adults, with 55% of 11- to 13-year-olds, 40% of 14- to 15-year-olds, and 30% of 16- to 17-year-olds choosing to "talk and admit" involvement in an alleged offense (rather than "remaining silent"), but only 15% of the young adults making this choice. There were also significant age differences in response to the plea agreement. This vignette was styled so as not to clearly favor accepting or rejecting the state's offer, which probably accounted for the fact that young adults were evenly divided in their responses. In contrast, 75% of the 11- to 13-year-olds, 65% of the 14- to 15-year-olds, and 60% of the 16- to 17-year-olds recommended accepting the plea offer. Together, these results suggest a much stronger tendency for adolescents than for young adults to make choices in compliance with the perceived desires of authority figures (Grisso et al. 2003).

Analysis of participants' responses to the vignettes also indicated differences between the youngest age group and older subjects in risk perception and future orientation. Participants were asked to explain their choices, including their perceptions about positive and negative consequences of various options; questions probed the subjects' assessment of the

seriousness of risks (the perceived negative consequences) and the likelihood of risks materializing. Analyses indicated age differences for all of these dimensions of “risk perception,” with the 11- to 13-year-olds less able to see risks than 16- to 17-year-olds and young adults. Similarly, in comparison with older adolescents, fewer 11- to 13-year-olds mentioned the long-range consequences of their decisions, which suggests that future orientation differences exist that are consistent with those described above.

The study’s findings are consistent with those of earlier studies that examined various dimensions of youths’ functioning in the justice system. For example, an important study of youths’ and adults’ capacities to understand *Miranda* rights in the early 1980s found that, compared with adults in the criminal justice system, 14-year-olds in juvenile detention were less able to understand the meaning and importance of *Miranda* warnings (Grisso 1981). Other studies using smaller samples also have found age differences across the adolescent years with regard to knowledge of legal terms and the legal process in delinquency and criminal proceedings (e.g., Cooper 1997). Finally, a series of studies found significant age differences across the adolescent years in “strategic thinking” about pleas; older adolescents were more likely than younger subjects to make choices that reflected calculations of probabilities and costs based on information provided (e.g., Peterson-Badali & Abramovitch 1993).

In light of what is known about psychological maturation in early and mid-adolescence, these findings are not surprising. Indeed, given the abilities required of defendants in criminal proceedings, it would be puzzling if youths and adults performed similarly on competence-related measures. This research provides powerful and tangible evidence that some youths facing criminal charges may function less capably as criminal defendants than do their adult counterparts. This does not mean, of course, that all youths should be automatically deemed incompetent to stand trial any more than would a psychiatric diagnosis or low IQ score. It does mean, however, that the risk of incom-

petence is substantially elevated in early and mid-adolescence; it also means that policy makers and practitioners must address developmental incompetence as it affects the treatment of juveniles in court (Scott & Grisso 2005).

It is important to emphasize that the pattern of age differences in studies of legal decision making more closely resembles that seen in studies of cognitive development (where few age differences are apparent after 16) than in studies of psychosocial development (where age differences are observed in late adolescence and sometimes in young adulthood). This suggests that determinations of where to draw a legal boundary between adolescence and adulthood must be domain specific. In matters in which cognitive abilities predominate, and where psychosocial factors are of minimal importance (that is, in situations where the influence of adolescents’ impulsivity, susceptibility to peer pressure, reward sensitivity, and relatively weaker future orientation is mitigated), adolescents older than 15 should probably be treated like adults. In situations in which psychosocial factors are substantially more important, drawing the boundary at an older age is more appropriate. This is why my colleagues and I have argued that it is perfectly reasonable to have a lower boundary for adolescents’ autonomous access to abortion (a situation in which mandatory waiting periods limit the impact of impulsivity and shortsightedness and where consultation with adults likely counters immaturity of judgment) than for judgments of criminal responsibility (because adolescents’ crimes are often impulsive and influenced by peers) (Steinberg et al. 2008b).

Impact of Punitive Sanctions on Adolescent Development and Behavior

As noted above, the increasingly punitive orientation of the justice system toward juvenile offenders has resulted in an increase in the number of juveniles tried and sanctioned as adults and in the use of harsher sanctions in responding to the delinquent behavior of juveniles who have been retained in the juvenile justice

Life-course-persistent offenders: antisocial individuals whose offending begins before adolescence and persists into adulthood

Age-crime curve: in criminology, the relation between age and crime, showing that the prevalence of criminal activity increases between preadolescence and late adolescence, peaks around age 17, and declines thereafter

system. Research on the impact of adult prosecution and punishment and on the use of punitive sanctions more generally suggests, however, that these policies and practices may actually increase recidivism and jeopardize the development and mental health of juveniles (Fagan 2008). Consequently, there is a growing consensus among social scientists that policies and practices, such as setting the minimum age of criminal court jurisdiction below 18 (as about one-third of all states currently do), transferring juveniles to the adult system for a wide range of crimes, including nonviolent crimes, relying on incarceration as a primary means of crime control, and exposing juvenile offenders to punitive programs such as boot camps, likely do more harm than good, cost taxpayers much more than they need spend on crime prevention, and ultimately pose a threat to public safety (Greenwood 2006).

In order to understand why this is the case, it is important to begin with a distinction between adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent offenders (Moffitt 1993). Dozens of longitudinal studies have shown that the vast majority of adolescents who commit antisocial acts desist from such activity as they mature into adulthood and that only a small percentage—between five and ten percent, according to most studies—become chronic offenders. Thus, nearly all juvenile offenders are adolescent limited. This observation is borne out in inspection of what criminologists refer to as the age-crime curve, which shows that the incidence of criminal activity increases between preadolescence and late adolescence, peaks at about age 17 (slightly younger for nonviolent crimes and slightly older for violent ones), and declines thereafter. These findings, at both the individual and aggregate level, have emerged from many studies that have been conducted in different historical epochs and around the world (Piquero et al. 2003).

In view of the fact that most juvenile offenders mature out of crime (and that most will desist whether or not they are caught, arrested, prosecuted, or sanctioned), one must therefore ask how to best hold delinquent youth respon-

sible for their actions and deter future crime (both their own and that of others) without adversely affecting their mental health, psychological development, and successful transition into adult roles. If the sanctions to which juvenile offenders are exposed create psychological disturbance, stunt the development of cognitive growth and psychosocial maturity, and interfere with the completion of schooling and entrance into the labor force, these policies are likely to exacerbate rather than ameliorate many of the very factors that lead juveniles to commit crimes in the first place (mental illness, difficulties in school or work, and, as reviewed above, psychological immaturity).

It is clear that sanctioning adolescents as adults is counterproductive. One group of researchers examining this question compared a group of 2700 Florida youths transferred to criminal court, mostly based on prosecutors' discretionary authority under Florida's direct-file statute, with a matched group of youths retained in the juvenile system (Bishop & Frazier 2000). In another study, the researchers compared 15- and 16-year-olds charged with robbery and burglary in several counties in metropolitan New York and in demographically similar counties in New Jersey. The legal settings differed in that New York juveniles age 15 and older who are charged with robbery and burglary are automatically dealt with in the adult system under that state's legislative waiver statute, whereas in New Jersey, transfer is rarely used, and the juvenile court retains jurisdiction over almost all youths charged with these crimes (Fagan 1996).

The New York-New Jersey study found that youths convicted of robbery in criminal court were rearrested and incarcerated at a higher rate than those who were dealt with in the juvenile system, but that rates were comparable for burglary, a less serious crime. The study also examined the number of days until rearrest and found a similar pattern; the youths sentenced for robbery in criminal court reoffended sooner than did their juvenile court counterparts. Recidivism was not affected by sentence length; longer sentences were not more

effective at reducing recidivism than were shorter sentences. Results of the Florida study also support the conclusion that juvenile sanctions may reduce recidivism more effectively than criminal punishment. This study measured only rearrest rates and found lower rates for youths who were retained in juvenile court than for youths who were transferred. The follow-up period in this study was relatively brief—less than two years. During this period, transferred youth were more likely to be rearrested, committed more offenses per year, and reoffended sooner than did juveniles in the juvenile system. As in the New York-New Jersey study, longer sentences did not have a deterrent effect.

Within the juvenile system, of course, there is wide variation in the types and severity of sanctions to which offenders are exposed. Some youths are incarcerated in prison-like training schools, whereas others receive loosely supervised community probation—neither of which is effective at changing antisocial behavior. An important question therefore is, what can the juvenile system offer young offenders that will be effective at reducing recidivism? A detailed discussion of the enormous literature evaluating the effects of various sanctions and interventions is beyond the scope of this review, and this literature has been summarized many times (Greenwood 2006, Lipsey 1999). Here I highlight a few main points.

Until the 1990s, most researchers who study juvenile delinquency programs might well have answered that the system had little to offer in the way of effective therapeutic interventions; the dominant view held by social scientists in the 1970s and 1980s was that “nothing works” to reduce recidivism with young offenders. Today the picture is considerably brighter, in large part due to a substantial body of research produced over the past 15 years showing that many juvenile programs, in both community and institutional settings, have a substantial crime-reduction effect; for the most promising programs, that effect is in the range of 20% to 30%. An increased focus on research-based programs and on careful outcome evaluation al-

lows policy makers to assess accurately the impact on recidivism rates of particular programs to determine whether the economic costs are justified. In a real sense, these developments have revived rehabilitation as a realistic goal of juvenile justice interventions.

In general, successful programs are those that attend to the lessons of developmental psychology, seeking to provide young offenders with supportive social contexts and to assist them in acquiring the skills necessary to change problem behavior and to attain psychosocial maturity. In his comprehensive meta-analysis of 400 juvenile programs, Lipsey (1995) found that among the most effective programs in both community and institutional settings were those that focused on improving social development skills in the areas of interpersonal relations, self-control, academic performance, and job skills. Some effective programs focus directly on developing skills to avoid antisocial behavior, often through cognitive behavioral therapy. Other interventions that have been shown to have a positive effect on crime reduction focus on strengthening family support, including Multisystemic Therapy, Functional Family Therapy, and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care, all of which are both effective and cost effective (Greenwood 2006). It is also clear from these reviews that punitive sanctions administered within the juvenile system have iatrogenic effects similar to those seen in studies of juveniles tried as adults. Punishment-oriented approaches, such as “Scared Straight” or military-style boot camps, do not deter future crime and may even inadvertently promote reoffending. Nor do these programs appear to deter other adolescents from offending (Greenwood 2006).

The dearth of evidence supporting the effectiveness of tough sanctions in deterring youthful criminal activity becomes less puzzling when we consider the response of young offenders to harsh punishment in light of developmental knowledge about adolescence discussed earlier. Teenagers on the street deciding whether to hold up a convenience store may simply be less capable than adults, due to their

psychosocial immaturity, of considering the sanctions they will face. Thus, the developmental influences on decision making that mitigate culpability also may make adolescents less responsive to the threat of criminal sanctions (Scott & Steinberg 2008).

In addition, adolescence is a formative period of development. In mid and late adolescence, individuals normally make substantial progress in acquiring and coordinating skills that are essential to filling the conventional roles of adulthood. First, they begin to develop basic educational and vocational skills to enable them to function in the workplace as productive members of society. Second, they also acquire the social skills necessary to establish stable intimate relationships and to cooperate in groups. Finally, they must begin to learn to behave responsibly without external supervision and to set meaningful personal goals for themselves. For most individuals, the process of completing these developmental tasks extends into early adulthood, but making substantial progress during the formative stage of adolescence is important. This process of development toward psychosocial maturity is one of reciprocal interaction between the individual and her social context. Several environmental conditions are particularly important, such as the presence of an authoritative parent or guardian, association with prosocial peers, and participation in educational, extracurricular, or employment activities that facilitate the development of autonomous decision making and critical thinking. For the youth in the justice system, the correctional setting becomes the environment for social development and may affect whether he acquires the skills necessary to function successfully in conventional adult roles (Steinberg et al. 2004).

Normative teenagers who get involved in crime do so, in part, because their choices are driven by developmental influences typical of adolescence. In theory, they should desist from criminal behavior and mature into reasonably responsible adults as they attain psychosocial maturity—and most do, especially as they enter into adult work and family responsibilities.

Whether youths successfully make the transition to adulthood, however, depends in part on whether their social context provides opportunity structures for the completion of the developmental tasks described above. The correctional environment may influence the trajectories of normative adolescents in the justice system in important ways. Factors such as the availability (or lack) of good educational, skill building, and rehabilitative programs; the attitudes and roles of adult supervisors; and the identity and behavior of other offenders shape the social context of youths in both the adult and the juvenile systems. These factors may affect the inclination of young offenders to desist or persist in their criminal activities and may facilitate or impede their development into adults who can function adequately in society—in the workplace, in marriage or other intimate unions, and as citizens.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The overarching question I pose in this article is whether research on adolescent development indicates that adolescents and adults differ in ways that warrant their differential treatment when they violate the law. More specifically, I ask how this research informs debate about three fundamental questions that continue to challenge the justice system: (a) Should adolescents be held to adult standards of criminal culpability and, accordingly, exposed to the same punishment as adults; (b) Do adolescents possess the necessary capabilities to function as competent defendants in an adversarial court proceeding; and (c) How are juvenile offenders affected by the sorts of punitive sanctions that became increasingly popular during the past several decades?

It is now incontrovertible that psychological development continues throughout adolescence and into young adulthood in ways that are relevant to all three questions. Although basic cognitive competence matures by the time individuals reach age 16, many of the social and emotional capacities that influence adolescents'

judgment and decision making, especially outside the psychologist's laboratory, continue to mature into late adolescence and beyond. Compared to individuals in their mid to late twenties, adolescents even as old as 18 are more impulsive, less oriented to the future, and more susceptible to the influence of their peers. In addition, because adolescence is also period during which individuals are still acquiring the psychological capacities they will need to successfully transition into adult work and family roles, it is important that the sanctions to which juvenile offenders are exposed not adversely affect their development. Recent research on the neural underpinnings of these developments does not change the portrait of adolescent immaturity painted by behavioral research, but it does add detail and support to the argument that makes the story more compelling. It is one thing to say that adolescents don't control their impulses, stand up to peer pressure, or think through the consequences of their actions as well as adults; it is quite another to say that don't because they can't.

Because American criminal law clearly provides that diminished judgment mitigates criminal responsibility, it is reasonable to argue that adolescents are inherently less blameworthy than their elders in ways should affect decisions about criminal punishment; as a class, adolescents are inherently less blameworthy than adults. The picture that emerges from an analysis of the capacities necessary for competence to stand trial is not the same, however. Here the relevant research indicates that some adolescents (generally, those 16 and older) have adult-

like capabilities but that others (generally those 15 and younger) may not. Research on the impact of punitive sanctions on adolescent development and behavior, although not explicitly developmental in nature, indicates that trying adolescents as adults or exposing them to especially harsh sanctions does little to deter offending and may indeed have iatrogenic effects.

Although justice system policy and practice cannot, and should not, be dictated solely by studies of adolescent development, the ways in which we respond to juvenile offending should at the very least be informed by the lessons of developmental science. Taken together, the lessons of developmental science offer strong support for the maintenance of a separate juvenile justice system in which adolescents are judged, tried, and sanctioned in developmentally appropriate ways. Using developmental science to inform juvenile justice policy is not a panacea that will solve the problem of youth crime. Adolescents will always get in trouble, sometimes very serious trouble, and some will continue to offend, despite the state's best efforts to respond to their crimes in ways that will deter future offending. At the same time, the future prospects of some youths will be harmed by a system that holds them to adult levels of accountability for their crimes under our transfer rules. No one policy regime will yield good outcomes for all young offenders, but looking to developmental research to guide our decision making provides a solid framework for policies and practices that will enhance public safety in the long run by promoting healthy adolescent development.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. During the past two decades, policies and practices concerning the treatment of juvenile offenders in the United States became increasingly punitive, as evidenced by the increase in the number of juveniles tried as adults and the expanded use of harsh sanctions within both the juvenile and criminal justice systems. This was a break from the traditional model of juvenile justice, which emphasized rehabilitation rather than punishment as its core purpose, that had prevailed for most of the twentieth century.

2. In order to make well-informed decisions about the treatment of juveniles who have entered the juvenile justice pipeline, therefore, policymakers, practitioners, and mental health professionals need to be familiar with the developmental changes that occur during childhood and adolescence in the capabilities and characteristics that are relevant to their competence to stand trial, their criminal culpability, and their likely response to treatment.
3. Brain maturation continues well into young adulthood, and although individuals, on average, perform at adult levels on tests of basic cognitive ability by the time they are 16, most do not attain adult-like levels of social and emotional maturity until very late in adolescence or early in adulthood. Compared to adults, adolescents are more susceptible to peer influence, less oriented to the future, more sensitive to short-term rewards, and more impulsive.
4. This research on adolescent brain, cognitive, and psychosocial development supports the view that adolescents are fundamentally different from adults in ways that warrant their differential treatment in the justice system. An analysis of factors that mitigate criminal responsibility under the law indicates that adolescents are inherently less culpable than are adults and should therefore be punished less severely. In addition, studies of competence to stand trial indicate that those who are under 16 are more likely to be incompetent than are adults, raising questions about the appropriateness of trying younger adolescents in criminal court.
5. Studies of the impact of punitive sanctions on adolescent development and behavior, including prosecuting and sanctioning adolescents as adults, indicate that they do not deter adolescents from breaking the law and may in fact increase recidivism. In contrast, family-based interventions have been shown to be both effective and cost effective.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any biases that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Work on this review was supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. I am grateful to Elizabeth Cauffman, Thomas Grisso, Elizabeth Scott, and Robert Schwartz for their permission to draw on our collaborative work in the preparation of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- Belter R, Grisso T. 1984. Children's recognition of rights violations in counseling. *Prof. Psychol. Res. Pract.* 15:899-910
- Berg W, Byrd D. 2002. The Tower of London spatial problem solving task: enhancing clinical and research implementation. *J. Exp. Clin. Neuropsychol.* 25:586-604
- Bishop D, Frazier C. 2000. Consequences of transfer. In *The Changing Borders of Juvenile Justice*, ed. J Fagan, F Zimring, pp. 227-77. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Casey BJ, Getz S, Galvan A. 2008. The adolescent brain. *Dev. Rev.* 28:62-77

- Cauffman E, Shulman E, Claus E, Banich M, Steinberg L, et al. 2008. Responding to reward versus punishment: how adolescents differ from adults in performance on the Iowa Gambling Task. Dept. Psychol. Social Behav., Univ. Calif., Irvine. Manuscr. under review
- Cauffman E, Steinberg L, Piquero A. 2005. Psychological, neuropsychological, and psychophysiological correlates of serious antisocial behavior in adolescence: the role of self-control. *Criminology* 43:133–76
- Collins WA, Steinberg L. 2006. Adolescent development in interpersonal context. In *Social, Emotional, and Personality Development. Handbook of Child Psychology*, ed. W Damon, R Lerner, N Eisenberg, pp. 1003–67. New York: Wiley
- Conklin H, Luciana M, Hooper C, Yarger R. 2007. Working memory performance in typically developing children and adolescents: behavioral evidence of protracted frontal lobe development. *Dev. Neuropsychol.* 31:103–28
- Cooper D. 1997. Juveniles' understanding of trial-related information: Are they competent defendants? *Behav. Sci. Law* 15:167–80
- Crone EA, Bunge SA, Latenstein H, Van Der Molen MW. 2005. Characterization of children's decision making: sensitivity to punishment frequency, not task complexity. *Child Neuropsychol.* 11:245–63
- Crone EA, Van Der Molen MW. 2004. Developmental changes in real life decision making: performance on a gambling task previously shown to depend on the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *Dev. Neuropsychol.* 25:251–79
- Dahl R. 2001. Affect regulation, brain development, and behavioral/emotional health in adolescence. *CNS Spectr.* 6:1–12
- Dahl R. 2004. Adolescent brain development: a period of vulnerabilities and opportunities. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1021:1–22
- Fagan J. 1996. The comparative impacts of juvenile and criminal court sanctions on adolescent felony offenders. *Law Policy Rev.* 18:77–119
- Fagan J. 2008. Juvenile crime and criminal justice: resolving border disputes. *Fut. Child.* 18(2):81–118**
- Feld BC. 1993. Criminalizing the American juvenile court. *Crime Just.* 17:197–280
- Galvan A, Hare T, Voss H, Glover G, Casey BJ. 2007. Risk-taking and the adolescent brain: Who is at risk? *Dev. Sci.* 10:F8–14
- Gardner M, Steinberg L. 2005. Peer influence on risk-taking, risk preference, and risky decision-making in adolescence and adulthood: an experimental study. *Dev. Psychol.* 41:625–35
- Gardner W. 1993. A life-span rational choice theory of risk taking. In *Adolescent Risk Taking*, ed. N Bell, R Bell, pp. 66–83. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Greene A. 1986. Future time perspective in adolescence: the present of things future revisited. *J. Youth Adolesc.* 15:99–113
- Greenwood P. 2006. *Changing Lives: Delinquency Prevention as Crime Control Policy*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press**
- Grisso T. 1981. *Juveniles' Waiver of Rights: Legal and Psychological Competence*. New York: Plenum
- Grisso T, Vierling L. 1978. Minors' consent to treatment: a developmental perspective. *Prof. Psychol.* 9:412–26
- Grisso T, Steinberg L, Woolard J, Cauffman E, Scott E, et al. 2003. Juveniles' competence to stand trial: a comparison of adolescents' and adults' capacities as trial defendants. *Law Hum. Behav.* 27:333–63**
- Grosbras M, Jansen M, Leonard G, McIntosh A, Osswald K, et al. 2007. Neural mechanisms of resistance to peer influence in early adolescence. *J. Neurosci.* 27:8040–45
- Gustafson K, McNamara J. 1987. Confidentiality with minor clients: issues and guidelines for therapists. *Prof. Psychol. Res. Pract.* 18:503–8
- Hale S. 1990. A global developmental trend in cognitive processing speed. *Child Dev.* 61:653–63
- Hooper C, Luciana M, Conklin H, Yarger R. 2004. Adolescents' performance on the Iowa Gambling Task: implications for the development of decision making and ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *Dev. Psychol.* 40:1148–58
- Kail R. 1997. Processing time, imagery, and spatial memory. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* 64:67–78
- Keating D. 2004. Cognitive and brain development. In *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, ed. R Lerner, L Steinberg, pp. 45–84. New York: Wiley. 2nd ed.

Provides an excellent summary of research on the impact of trying juveniles as adults on adolescents' behavior, mental health, and recidivism.

Furnishes a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of various approaches to preventing and treating juvenile delinquency.

Landmark empirical study that demonstrates that in comparison to adults, individuals under 16 are more likely to be incompetent to stand trial.

Provides a legal analysis of how the justice system might best take the developmental incompetence of juveniles into account. Argues that a lower standard of competence should be used in juvenile than in criminal court.

Calls for juvenile justice reform based on the scientific study of adolescent development. Supplies useful summaries of literatures on adolescents' criminal culpability, competence to stand trial, and response to intervention.

Discusses how brain development in adolescence affects risk taking and reckless behavior, in which the heightened vulnerability of middle adolescence is highlighted.

- Krisberg B, Austin J. 1993. *Reinventing Juvenile Justice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Kuhn D. 2009. Adolescent thinking. See Lerner & Steinberg 2009. In press
- Lerner R, Steinberg L, eds. 2009. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. New York: Wiley. 3rd ed. In press
- Leshem R, Glicksohn J. 2007. The construct of impulsivity revisited. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 43:681–91
- Lipsey M. 1995. What do we learn from 400 research studies on the effectiveness of treatment with juvenile delinquents? In *What Works? Reducing Reoffending*, ed. J McGuire, pp. 63–78. New York: Wiley
- Lipsey M. 1999. Can rehabilitative programs reduce the recidivism of young offenders? An inquiry into the effectiveness of practical programs. *Va. J. Soc. Policy Law* 6:611–41
- Luna B, Thulborn K, Munoz D, Merriam E, Garver K, et al. 2001. Maturation of widely distributed brain function subserves cognitive development. *Neuroimage* 13:786–93
- Mack J. 1909. The juvenile court. *Harv. Law Rev.* 23:104–22
- Millstein S, Halpern-Felsher B. 2002. Perceptions of risk and vulnerability. *J. Adolesc. Health* 31S:10–27
- Moffitt T. 1993. Adolescence-limited and life-course persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychol. Rev.* 100:674–701
- Mulvey E, Leistico A. 2008. Improving professional judgments of risk and amenability in juvenile justice. *Fut. Child.* 18(2):35–58
- Nurmi J. 1991. How do adolescents see their future? A review of the development of future orientation and planning. *Dev. Rev.* 11:1–59
- Overton W. 1990. Competence and procedures: constraints on the development of logical reasoning. In *Reasoning, Necessity, and Logic: Developmental Perspectives*, ed. W Overton, pp. 1–32. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Paus T. 2005. Mapping brain maturation and cognitive development during adolescence. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 9:60–68
- Paus T, Toro R, Leonard G, Lerner J, Lerner R, et al. 2008. Morphological properties of the action-observation cortical network in adolescents with low and high resistance to peer influence. *Soc. Neurosci.* In press
- Peterson-Badali M, Abramovitch R. 1993. Grade related changes in young people's reasoning about plea decisions. *Law Hum. Behav.* 17:537–52
- Piquero A, Farrington D, Blumstein A. 2003. The criminal career paradigm: background and recent developments. *Crime Just.* 30:359–506
- Platt A. 1977. *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.
- Roper v. Simmons*, 541 U.S. 1040 2005
- Scott E, Grisso T. 2005. Developmental incompetence, due process, and juvenile justice policy. *N. C. Law Rev.* 83:793–846**
- Scott E, Reppucci N, Woolard J. 1995. Evaluating adolescent decision making in legal contexts. *Law Hum. Behav.* 19:221–44
- Scott E, Steinberg L. 2008. *Rethinking Juvenile Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press**
- Sisk C, Foster D. 2004. The neural basis of puberty and adolescence. *Nat. Neurosci.* 7:1040–47
- Sisk C, Zehr J. 2005. Pubertal hormones organize the adolescent brain and behavior. *Front. Neuroendocrinol.* 26:163–74
- Smetana J, Campione-Barr N, Metzger A. 2006. Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 57:255–84
- Steinberg L. 2004. Risk-taking in adolescence: What changes, and why? *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1021:51–58
- Steinberg L. 2007. Risk-taking in adolescence: new perspectives from brain and behavioral science. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 16:55–59
- Steinberg L. 2008. A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Dev. Rev.* 28:78–106**
- Steinberg L, Albert D, Cauffman E, Banich M, Graham S, Woolard J. 2008a. Age differences in sensation seeking and impulsivity as indexed by behavior and self-report: evidence for a dual systems model. *Dev. Psychol.* In press
- Steinberg L, Cauffman E. 1996. Maturity of judgment in adolescence: psychosocial factors in adolescent decisionmaking. *Law Hum. Behav.* 20:249–72
- Steinberg L, Cauffman E, Woolard J, Graham S, Banich M. 2008b. Are adolescents less mature than adults? Minors' access to abortion, the juvenile death penalty, and the alleged APA "flip-flop." Manuscript under review. Dept. Psychol., Temple Univ. In press

- Steinberg L, Chung H, Little M. 2004. Reentry of young offenders from the justice system: a developmental perspective. *Youth Violence Juv. Just.* 1:21–38
- Steinberg L, Graham S, O'Brien L, Woolard J, Cauffman E, Banich M. 2008c. Age differences in future orientation and delay discounting. *Child Dev.* In press
- Steinberg L, Monahan K. 2007. Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Dev. Psychol.* 43:1531–43
- Steinberg L, Schwartz R. 2000. Developmental psychology goes to court. In *Youth on Trial: A Developmental Perspective on Juvenile Justice*, ed. T Grisso, R Schwartz, pp. 9–31. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Steinberg L, Scott E. 2003. Less guilty by reason of adolescence: developmental immaturity, diminished responsibility, and the juvenile death penalty. *Am. Psychol.* 58:1009–18**
- Teicher M, Andersen S, Hostetter J. 1995. Evidence for dopamine receptor pruning between adolescence and adulthood in striatum but not nucleus accumbens. *Dev. Brain Res.* 89:167–72
- Weithorn L, Campbell S. 1982. The competency of children and adolescents to make informed treatment decisions. *Child Dev.* 53:1589–98
- Zimring F. 1998. *American Youth Violence*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Discusses why adolescents, by virtue of developmental immaturity, are inherently less culpable than adults. Cited multiple times by U.S. Supreme Court in its decision to abolish juvenile death penalty.
