

JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES

Muneeba Faizan Nazim¹, Sohail Amjad², Anum Shahid³

¹Lecturer (Law), Edwardes College Peshawar, KPK, Pakistan.
Email: muneeba_shahzad@hotmail.com

²PhD Research Scholar (Law), International Islamic University Malaysia.
Email: sohailamjad09@yahoo.com

³Lecturer, Department of Law, University of Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: anamshahid.iiui@yahoo.com



HEC
"Y"



Category
HEC Journal
Recognition System

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History:

Received: January 02, 2024
Revised: January 30, 2024
Accepted: February 01, 2024
Available Online: February 07, 2024

Keywords:

Juvenile Justice
International Practices
Comparative Analysis
Rehabilitation
Restorative Justice

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Copyrights:



Copyright Muslim Intellectuals Research Center. All Rights Reserved © 2021. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

This article provides an examination of how different countries approach the reform of their justice systems. It analyses approach across continents, focusing on the historical roots, underlying philosophies and current implementations. The goal is to identify strategies, address challenges and suggest areas for improvement. By exploring Europe, North America and Asia, the article examines differences between adversarial systems, variations in the age of responsibility and how cultural factors impact juvenile justice. It critically evaluates concerns related to rights disparities in accessing justice and the lack of standards. Drawing from practices and innovative rehabilitation models, the article concludes with recommendations to promote rehabilitation efforts, expand justice approaches, and foster international collaboration for stronger juvenile justice systems worldwide.

Corresponding Author's Email: anamshahid.iiui@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Through the years, popular sentiment, conventions, and legal concepts have all slowly shifted—along with those juvenile disciplinary practices. Different countries have established various juvenile justice systems and thus given rise to a delicate balance between severe punishment and restorative methods. The comprehensive study provides an in-depth account of worldwide reform movements in the juvenile justice arena. This research project will serve as a global picture of juvenile justice systems: the changing legal forms, historical bases, and modern programs. While the initial focus of juvenile justice was punishment,

laws now generally emphasise reform in light of the special problems that children and young people face. In the long history of that idea, immigrants to America encountered in recent years have brought it from Europe. The philosophical traditions of this history include the first American juvenile court and the nationalist movement in Europe. These historical foundations help us to better understand modern developments and variances in juvenile justice systems (Cauffman, Fine, Mahler, & Simmons, 2018).

In this study, we undertake a comparison and contrast of three major regions. Cultural factors, methods of rehabilitation, and in their legal systems are many and varied for juvenile justice. We must look closer at each region's juvenile justice, which, in all its complexity, is unique. This calls for a comparison of inquisitorial and adversarial systems, differences in the age of criminal liability, and cultural factors' role in shaping them. More than an academic exercise, this inquiry provides a thorough look over boundary disputes and controversies in the form of challenges to the rule of law. Serious challenges to the promotion of juvenile justice systems that can be used worldwide include human rights violations, discrepancies in access to justice, and an absence of international norms. The study's purpose is to provide answers by pioneering realistic solutions to these problems on a global scale (Ehrhard-Dietzel, Barton, & Hickey, 2017). The complete growth and reintegration of juvenile offenders into society is a priority in this article. The paper will also discuss rehabilitation methods and success stories you haven't heard before. It will also explore international cooperation and restorative justice strategies, with an eye to suggesting principles that could have global implications for the development of juvenile criminal law reform. This focused study--more than mere academic research--comprehensive overview of juvenile justice reform issues, is also a call to action. If we want to build juvenile justice systems that are efficient and just, then we must draw lessons from the widest possible range of experiences abroad. These systems will stand in testimony to the worldwide trend of supporting our youth and bringing them back into society (Sherman, F., & Balck, 2015).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This qualitative study explores juvenile justice reform, addressing the need to take different cultural contexts into account in order to solve international problems. By employing a "grounded theory" approach, the writer seeks all the angles on foreign juvenile criminal justice systems at great length in Europe, North America, and Asia, regardless of nationality. Locating rehabilitation experts, legislators as well and legal practitioners, we can also interview them in semi-structured form, thus deepening familiarity at each place Of juvenile justice to make our understanding more complete than mere general categories. By its very nature, thematic content evaluation is based on the ability to recognise patterns. This article is not about identifying individual human trainable subjects but instead looks more at the broader picture that lives and forms like. It may be more difficult for some people than others because of this well-established methodology's limitations in a sound qualitative study design, which must accept our own unavoidable subjectivity while trying as hard as possible to control it. In an interpretative framework which draws upon qualitative research methods, the author brings out the tangled past of juvenile justice reform by specifying cultural influences and human rights issues in international comparison.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The philosophical origin of European *jurisquibenevolutiae* is the origins of juvenile justice can be traced to the *parens patriae* philosophy in Europe, reflecting a conceptual shift in the treatment of young offenders. Rooted in the belief that the state serves as the ultimate parent for those without proper guardianship, this philosophy attempted to take up the possible preservation and love in children who were *nuravectioners* for *wiling* by criminals or abandoned. This early approach laid the foundation for recognising the state's responsibility to ensure the welfare of vulnerable youth, marking the beginning of a distinct juvenile justice ideology (Cate, 2016).

System of laws in the early age and religious influence: Juvenile offenders during the time of the Middle Ages were often placed in ecclesiastical courts where defendants faced similar punishment as adult criminals. Typically, the penalties were severe and punitive, failing to distinguish among people on the basis of age. However, the attitude of society gradually underwent a change in the Age of Enlightenment, and that made it possible to recognise the special needs of young people in the prospects for reform or self-improvement. This period laid the foundation for juvenile justice in the modern sense.

America's First Juvenile Court: One of the pivotal moments in the evolution of juvenile justice took place in Chicago at the end of the 19th century when the first juvenile court was established there in 1899. Following the goals of the Progressive Era, this judge set up was intended to steer young offenders away from the tough-minded ways of adult criminal justice. Rehabilitation and guidance were emphasised, countering the traditional approach of simply rendering punishment (Zimring, 2018).

Progressive Era Reforms and the Juvenile Court Model: Progressivism brought a broad spectrum of changes in response to the insufferable conditions of juvenile offenders. The core principles, including the best interests of the child and individualised treatment, became an integral part of the juvenile court model. During this time, juveniles were given separate legal systems (Dowd, 2015), a sign that society was turning towards a more humane penal form in which humane treatment and rehabilitation would be made central issues to address the special needs of those in conflict with the law.

International Influences and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: In the middle of the 20th century, greater international cooperation on juvenile justice issues formed, which culminated in 1989 with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This historic document set international standards for the consideration of juvenile offenders, stressing their rights, protection, and rehabilitation. The Convention was a significant milestone on the road to a broader consensus on the principles underlying all juvenile justice systems. This was the start of an international movement towards greater unity and rights in juvenile justice (Weber, Umpierre, & Bilchik, 2018).

Shifts in Legal Philosophy and Contemporary Reforms: In recent decades, there has been a global tendency towards more rights-focused, child-sensitive approaches to juvenile justice. Many countries are moving away from punitive approaches, turning to rehabilitative models and implementing community-based alternatives to incarceration. This present-day transformation represents a continuing commitment to improving juvenile justice systems worldwide, making certain they correspond with social change, incorporating the well-being and rehabilitation of young offenders into the question of national destiny in every society (Henning, 2018).

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Comparative Analysis: Juvenile Justice Systems in Europe

a. Inquisitorial vs. Adversarial Systems

The Continental European Inquisitorial System: The inquisitorial system in continental Europe is deeply rooted in civil law traditions. It was known to involve the active engagement of judges in the prosecution process, including the establishment of guilt or innocence. In juvenile justice proceedings, this means judges play a more active role, making greater efforts to ascertain the truth. In essence, it is a matter of determining facts rather than resolving disputes between opposing litigants. This approach is often considered to be more accommodating and less adversarial--striving for an all-around understanding of the juvenile's situation and needs (Rap, 2013).

From the Common Law Adversarial System: When one turns to Europe--judicial systems in common law countries, such as the United Kingdom--it is found that adversarial. In these jurisdictions, there is a struggle between prosecution and defence in juvenile justice proceedings, watched over by an impartial judge. Opposing parties present evidence to the judge who plays a neutral role. While this adversarial model is based on notions like justice, it leads to a probing examination of evidence. Unfortunately, it can create a more combative atmosphere. This could affect juvenile defendants differently (Abrams, Jordan, & Montero, 2018).

Comments on Juvenile Proceedings: The choice of inquisitorial versus adversarial systems for juvenile justice proceedings has profound implications. The inquisitorial system approach may produce a more cooperative environment and a deeper sense of juvenile violations. According to this argument, such an approach also minimises procedural protections. Adversarial systems, conversely, provide strong safeguards but may create a more adversarial dynamic--affecting the treatment of juveniles within the legal process (Goldson, 2018).

b. Inquisitorial vs. Adversarial Systems

Variations in the Age of Criminal Responsibility: Among European countries, certain countries have very different ages at which people are considered legal adults. One jurisdiction established the threshold at a relatively young age, and it would be possible to prosecute juveniles for violations, but others have set the bar much higher to take into account young people's very immaturity. These disparities are rooted in differing cultural, legal, and psychological views. When are individuals deemed capable of understanding both the cognitive and moral issues involved in their actions?

The Impact on Juvenile Justice Policies: Juvenile justice policies are greatly influenced by the age of criminal responsibility. Perhaps those with lower thresholds for age might intervene in young offenders through rehabilitation rather than punishment. Nevertheless, in jurisdictions where the age at which it becomes possible to go to trial is higher, it may emphasise diversionary programs and educational measures instead of punitive actions altogether. To develop policies that meted out to the special needs--and capacities--of juvenile delinquents was seeing these differences. It's only in this way that there can be a harmonious and effective system for juvenile justice.

Facing distinct laws and approaches toward juvenile offenders, European countries wrestle with how to unify procedural methods in dealing with juvenile crime in a fair and truly rehabilitative way. As to their comparison, the analysis of all these legal systems and age-related considerations interact intricately. They furnish insight into the complex nature of juvenile justice practices on the European continent (Winterdyk, 2002).

Comparative Analysis: Juvenile Justice Systems in North America

a. Juvenile Waiver to Adult Court

Standard for the transfer of juveniles to adult court: The method is North American practice; waiving juveniles to adult court is a legal mechanism under which a juvenile is tried and sentenced as an adult. Transferring criteria differ from one location to another, but they generally include factors such as the severity of the offence, the age and maturity level of the juvenile, and the juvenile's criminal history. Some states have a statutory exclusion policy. This automatically shifts a certain type of offence down from juvenile to adult court, while other judges make such determinations on a case-by-case basis (Janeksela, 1992).

Critique and Success of the Transfer System: The waiver system in North America has been praised as well as criticised. Advocates argue that such types of things secure punishment for serious offences and prevent dangerous juveniles from being lodged in the juvenile justice system. However, critics charge that it goes against the rehabilitative philosophy of the juvenile justice system, punishes kids like adults and is deeply unfair to underprivileged communities. The system is better able to keep juvenile crime in check, but the challenges lie in addressing concerns of fairness and proportionality while also considering whether serious damage will be done to rehabilitation efforts through side effects.

b. Restorative Justice Programs

Restoring Restorative Justice in Youth Cases: Restorative justice programs in North America revolve around reparations for juvenile defendants rather than just punishment. For better, the most promising initiatives involve facilitating dialogues involving the victims and the offenders in an attempt to generate empathy, understanding, and a sense of responsibility. The procedures vary. Some locales incorporate restorative justice practices into the legislative process; others see them as alternatives to the traditional courtroom (Katz, J., & Bonham Jr, 2006).

Assessing the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice: In the case of juvenile justice, evaluating the effectiveness of restorative justice involves measuring recidivism rates and satisfaction among victims or how well-off the community is overall. Proponents argue that restorative justice leads to better rehabilitation programs for first-time offenders and lower recidivism than traditional approaches. Victims should be empowered by its participatory nature and the fact that it makes them a part of finding the solution. However, the challenges are to have voluntary participation, work out power imbalances, and integrate restorative justice principles into the existing legal framework. The effectiveness of RJ depends on several factors, the most vital of which include stakeholders' commitment, community support, and proper implementation.

In terms of North America, there is tension between the severe measures and the guiding ideals in its juvenile justice systems. Waivers for transferring juveniles to adult court raise questions about achieving a proper balance of responsibility and development when it comes to youth. At the same time, whether or not it's successful in theory, the implementation and evaluation of restorative justice initiatives can be seen as attempts to move towards a health/healing rather than a punitive approach, emphasising repair and reintegration. Understanding these dynamics contributes to a nuanced analysis of North American juvenile justice practices (Zimring, Langer, & Tanenhaus, 2017).

Comparative Analysis: Juvenile Justice Systems in Asia

a. Cultural Influences on Juvenile Justice

Collectivism or Individualism: The cultural background has a crucial effect on sentencing norms for juveniles in Asia. There's a sharp dichotomy between individualism as opposed to collectivism that significantly affects the public attitude toward juvenile delinquency. To illustrate, an intervention in collectivist societies, where the value of the group takes precedence over individual worth, could be family-oriented- involving parents or neighbours rather than youth detention centres, which might serve individualism and so on. Conversely, individualists might concentrate more on civil rights standards so that there could be an emphasis placed on personal responsibility for crime and matching rehabilitative programs to the special needs of juvenile offenders.

Shame or Rehabilitation: Asian countries each display different cultural attitudes towards shame and rehabilitation. Public punishment for misdemeanours is a traditional part of some cultures, and there is a public emphasis on shame. On the other hand, rehabilitation is emphasised in other societies where young offenders (Travers, 2013) are seen not collectively but rather as people to be helped. Achieving a middle ground between cultural norms and universally accepted principles of juvenile justice is not easily done. We must come up with new techniques which are respectful of cultural diversities yet keep to the human rights standards that are common to every nation and territory. (Travers, 2013).

b. Cultural Influences on Juvenile Justice

Progressive Rehabilitation Approaches: In response to changing societal attitudes and global trends, several Asian countries are taking on progressive rehabilitation approaches. T's choices may include therapeutic interventions, educational plans, vocational training, and community-based programs. These important factors contribute to reducing crime among young people. So, governments want to help shape the growth of a new kind of order. The rehabilitative measures that these nations are striving towards, instead of imposing rigid restraints, strive to adopt measures that consider the individual circumstances of each person who is placed under them: their very own growth and integration (Kim, Lin, & Lambert, 2015).

The study of successful rehabilitation programs may be made by examining case studies in Asia. There are programs in countries that embrace innovative models which also aim to prevent juvenile delinquency through education and mental health support. Case studies are an excellent way to get ideas for how to design and carry out rehabilitation programs. Programs are quite complicated often involving a range of

government agencies collaborating with non-governmental organisations, along with the local communities. In this way, they adapt social norms and values to fit individual needs. Further research in efforts to describe the causes of juvenile crime is necessary.

The examination of Asia's juvenile justice systems highlights how vital it is to the cultural milieu that one practices law. The interplay between collectivism and individualism, as well as the delicate balance between shaming and rehabilitation, reflects the complex dynamics at play. The kinds of interventions and successes they have show the potential there is for Asian countries to change their juvenile justice systems. This reflects a mindfulness of maximising the welfare of juvenile offenders in these tailored treatment programs (Shahidullah & Das, 2017).

CHALLENGES AND CONTROVERSIES

Human Rights Concerns in Juvenile Justice Systems

Challenges to Detention Conditions: Worldwide, the plight of minors placed in detention is still a significant human rights problem. Such obstacles are mostly overcrowding, inadequate health care, and shortages of educational or recreational facilities. Minors confined to detention are prone to mental ailments, exploitation, and violence. This raises very serious questions of ethics and human rights. The importance of detention conditions to the rehabilitative purposes of juvenile justice also stresses the need for concerted efforts to promote the welfare and growth of minors.

The Legal Safeguards and Due Process: The human rights implications of the treatment and legal rights of juvenile detainees are also issues of concern. In fact, in some districts, minors have no access to legal representation at all. Others get shoddy legal advice, and still others are kept waiting in pre-trial detention indefinitely. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) stipulates that juvenile offenders must receive special care, including the right to legal representation. It bars them from any mistreatment that exceeds the standard for torture or other cruel treatment (Shoemaker & Wolfe, 2016).

Alternative Accident Measures and Restorative Justice: Instead of detaining children, make a paradigm shift toward alternative measures and restorative justice approaches that address these concerns in detention. Community-based programs, counselling, and rehabilitation offer more humane and effective means of making sure young people account for their crimes by nontraditional forms of punishment that respect their human rights in the process. Such a change involves a commitment to balancing public safety with the principles of rehabilitation and reintegration (Usman, M., Khan, A., & Amjad, S. 2021).

Capital Punishment for Juvenile Offenders: The practice of executing young people brings great human rights problems with it. International standards, as exemplified by the CRC and numerous human rights treaties, moreover, indisputably condemn the execution of individuals who were juveniles at the time of their crimes. Worldwide movements to abolish capital punishment for youth recognise the cruelty inherent in such an act and its violation of foundational human rights principles (Pienaar, 1993).

The Evolving Legal Landscape: The sort of legal landscape has evolved over time, with an increasing number of countries abolishing the death penalty for juveniles. International pressure and human rights activism contribute to this upward trend. The struggle is by no means over, though. There are still areas

where local law and politica, or cultural factors, prevent the complete abolition of juvenile capital punishment. However, these challenges can be overcome through compliance with international standards and advocating for the human rights of juveniles as well as almost juveniles to death.

Rehabilitation and Reintegration: Rather than resorting to the extreme and irreversible measure of capital punishment, let's focus on rehabilitation and reintegration. Emphasising the potential for rehabilitation takes into account the developmental immaturity of juveniles. It also is an indication of respect for their capacity to change. The principles of human rights point to the importance of giving reform and reintegration opportunities to juveniles. The system should not only be fair, but it must also uphold the dignity of each person, no matter what they have done in the past.

Human rights front and center is a juvenile justice system that must be addressed. One task is to prioritise the safety concentration; it derives from basic standards of equity, justice, and human rights. Juveniles must be guaranteed that their treatment is in accord with the norms of the juvenile court. Fairness should also be required.

We thus need reforms that help young people return to society. Instead of removing human rights from the crisis apparatus of poverty, therefore, we ought to transition young people back into a society that values growth and one that is symbiotic. (Chambliss, 2011).

Disparities in Access to Justice

Financial impediments and legal representation: Unequal access to legal justice is borne out of social and economic factors, among which are financial barriers. It is not uncommon for economically challenged people to find themselves unable to afford litigation costs -- and thus deprived of a fair or competent defence. The inability to retain counsel can reduce legal representation's quality, therefore decreasing the overall fairness of juvenile justice proceedings.

Barriers to Education, Legal Truancy: Educational discrepancies are responsible for keeping some people out of the law, and poor schooling means that many people have no inkling of what "the law" is. For youth to be effective participants in juvenile justice, they need to understand their rights and responsibilities. We must address educational inequality if we are to build a more fair, open juvenile justice system (Usman, M., Kanwel, S., Khan, M. I., & Khan, A. 2021).

Overrepresentation and Implicit Bias: Certain groups are over-represented in the various stages of the juvenile justice system, keeping racial and ethnic disparities alive. There is evidence that racial, ethnic and religious minorities are disproportionately involved in juvenile justice because of implicit biases exhibited by law enforcement, legal professionals and judges. This problem has aroused attention and concern because it suggests system-wide discrimination, calling for measures to root out biases.

Differential Treatment and Sentencing: Racial and ethnic divisions manifest themselves in different treatments and punishments. Juveniles from out-castes have sometimes been given harsher sentences for the same offences than children from more normal circumstances. A comprehensive review of the policies, practices and training programs designed to produce people sensitive to diversity in every situation of decision-making for juveniles is the only way to resolve these disparities (Sheffer, 1995).

Lack of International Standards

The Need for a Universal Framework: The lack of a universal framework in juvenile justice poses challenges due to the diversity of legal systems worldwide. Compliance with different principles in different countries makes uniformity an ideal which is difficult to attain. For juvenile justice to be established through the consensus of common rights and well-being vested in all documents-given impetus by a shared commitment to justice and fairness, a universal framework is essential (Khan, A., Iqbal, N., & Ahmad, 2022).

United Nations Efforts and the CRC: United Nations efforts, particularly through the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), provide a foundational basis for international standards in juvenile justice. However, challenges persist in achieving global adherence to these standards. The establishment of a juvenile justice framework that is more uniform along the lines of human rights standards will depend, to a significant extent, on strengthening international cooperation and getting countries to ratify and implement the CRC.

Cultural Sensitivity vs. Standardization: Balancing diverse legal systems requires both respecting cultural sensitivities as well as standardising. To find a framework that properly fits, different legal traditions, norms and practices must be taken into account. The successful implementation of any harmonisation effort demands a delicate balance between cultural sensitivity and the establishment of fundamental rights and procedural fairness (Hussain, N., Khan, A., & Chandio, 2023).

Enforcement and Compliance Challenges: Although international standards have been established, there are challenges in implementing and ensuring compliance according to them. Political or logistical constraints prevent national laws from aligning with global norms in many instances. Overcoming these problems will require continued dialogue between various countries and an unflagging commitment to cooperation, as seen through acceptance of the international juvenile justice standards.

In addressing disparities in access to justice and setting international editorial standards in juvenile justice, a multidimensional approach is needed. By removing barriers of income and ethnic disparities and by advocating for a universal model, the world community can move toward one that is equitable, sensitive to differences in culture, and defends the rights of each young individual involved (Mallicoat, 2018).

BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

Emphasising Rehabilitation:

Rehabilitation Models: Advocating rehabilitation as a fundamental consideration in the criminal justice system means finding examples of sound practices that help guide young people toward adulthood in a positive direction. To get new ideas for things to copy, education-themed interventions and mentorship plans also have their good functions. Through advancing evidence-based practices, personalised treatment plans, and comprehensive support systems, areas that do this can create an atmosphere conducive to young offenders' positive change.

Rehabilitation Measures and Public Safety: To build an effective juvenile justice system, finding a consensus between protecting public safety and promoting reformation is essential. There are suggestions

of how to achieve this balance. Risk assessment tools would help the government in this respect, telling us which people are dangerous to the public. It also means introducing tailored rehabilitation programs and support services matched to particular risks and needs. Applying restorative justice principles and community involvement can create a network of support, creating a safer environment for juveniles (Phillippi Jr, Coccozza, & DePrato, 2013).

Restorative Justice Approaches

To expand Restorative Justice Programs: Encouraging the expansion of restorative justice programs within juvenile justice systems is critical. This proposal involves integrating restorative justice at several points in the legal process, from pre-trial to post-conviction. Healing, accountability, and understanding can be facilitated through expanding restorative justice circles, conferencing, and victim-offender dialogue. Jurisdictions can gain from a broadened approach to restorative justice that also embeds it in policy frameworks, making it more accessible and effective for a wider group of juvenile offenders (Asif Khan, Nagina Riaz, & Muhammad Usman, 2024).

Victim-Offender Mediation Made Lasting in Juvenile Justice Systems: One vital recommendation is to incorporate victim-offender mediation into juvenile justice systems so as to increase accountability and provide restitution. Mediation by trained professionals allows victims to express their experiences and gives offenders an idea of how they have hurt others. By incorporating this approach into sentencing and rehab plans, juvenile justice systems can attend to victims' needs and also empower them in decision-making processes, thereby contributing to the restoration of harm inflicted.

International Collaboration

Sharing Best Practices: If we're going to promote international collaboration then we need to have a means of exchanging best practices among nations. Indigenous models for successful rehabilitation, restorative justice programs, and newfangled policies can be very effective.

Not only are all these things becoming the norm, but they are deeply ingrained in countries which are home to them. Every place has its own story. To let you learn from my past, each country will have its own tale. This will be how we can operate today, or at least in the next ten years or so. I call on all of us as difference makers to make a positive change in our sphere, creating international territories full of life and seeking the truth with every advance.

Establishing a Framework for Cooperation: Establishing a framework for international cooperation requires the formalisation of agreements and protocols that promote collaboration. Examples of measures include bilateral or multilateral partnerships between states, international organisations and NGOs. Together, they can tackle research initiatives, launch joint training schemes and people's cooperation, and build model standards for juvenile justice across the board.

Such a framework encourages people to carry on a continuous project, sharing knowledge, resources and a shared commitment to treating juvenile offenders humanely. (National Research Council, 2013)

CONCLUSION

In short, juvenile justice reform has a varied map on the international stage. Still shaped by historical, cultural, and legal differences. Europe's inquisitorial systems were compared to North America's adversarial ones, and the different cultural strands in Asia make each region unique in juvenile justice. Without human rights concerns, disparities in access to justice or universal standards to capture it all, a comprehensive approach is necessary. This study, based on qualitative research methods, analysed global juvenile justice systems extensively. Even as we work at reforming our impressions of youth and youthfulness, which underpin many legal injustices, certain guidelines emerge to channel them. Balancing public safety as well as rehabilitation Through such success stories, promoting restorative justice on a broader scale--these are key steps for developing kind, efficient facilities for juvenile criminals. What is more, establishing best practices and an international standard for cooperation could promote cross-border collaboration across borders in dealing with common problems. Clearly, those who advocate reform seek more humane treatment for juvenile offenders. We don't always achieve what we want in life. Those in charge of juvenile rehabilitation should take something from global experience, be innovative in practice, and reach toward international collaboration. We must not abuse them. A juvenile justice system that is humane and efficient can be created. In looking forward, let us continue to follow these insights and recommendations to guide juvenile justice reform towards a fairer or kinder outlook on children--the seeds of tomorrow's human society.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, L. S., Jordan, S. P., & Montero, L. A. (2018). What is a juvenile? A cross-national comparison of youth justice systems. *Youth justice, 18*(2), 111-130.
- Asif khan, Nagina Riaz, & Muhammad Usman. (2024). Blasphemy Laws in Contemporary Legal Systems. *International Journal of Human And Society, 4*(1), 164-171.
- Cate, S. (2016). Devolution, not decarceration: The limits of juvenile justice reform in Texas. *Punishment & Society, 18*(5), 578-609.
- Cauffman, E., Fine, A., Mahler, A., & Simmons, C. (2018). How developmental science influences juvenile justice reform. *UC Irvine L. Rev.*, 8, 21.
- Chambliss, W. J. (Ed.). (2011). *Juvenile crime and justice* (Vol. 5). Sage.
- Dowd, N. E. (Ed.). (2015). *A new juvenile justice system: Total reform for a broken system* (Vol. 6). NYU Press.
- Ehrhard-Dietzel, S., Barton, M. S., & Hickey, D. A. (2017). Implementation and outcomes of an innovative front end juvenile justice reform initiative. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 34*, 223-234.
- Goldson, B. (Ed.). (2018). *Juvenile justice in Europe: past, present and future*. Routledge.
- Henning, K. (2018). The challenge of race and crime in a free society: The racial divide in fifty years of juvenile justice reform. *Geo. Wash. L. Rev.*, 86, 1604.
- Hussain, N., Khan, A., & Chandio, L. A. (2023). Legal Safeguards against Mob Justice: An Analysis of Blasphemy Laws in Pakistan and International Human Rights Norms. *Al-Qamar*, 13-26.
- Janeksela, G. M. (1992). The significance of comparative analysis of juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 16*(1-2), 137-150.

- Katz, J., & Bonham Jr, G. (2006). Restorative justice in Canada and the United States: A comparative analysis. *JIJIS*, 6, 187.
- Khan, A., Iqbal, N., & Ahmad, I. (2022). Human Trafficking in Pakistan: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 2(3), 257-268.
- Kim, B., Lin, W. C. A., & Lambert, E. G. (2015). Comparative/international research on juvenile justice issues: a review of juvenile justice specialty journals. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 26(4), 545-562.
- Mallicoat, S. L. (2018). *Crime and criminal justice: Concepts and controversies*.
- National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming juvenile justice: A developmental approach*. National Academies Press.
- Phillippi Jr, S. W., Coccozza, J., & DePrato, D. K. (2013). Advancing evidence-based practices for juvenile justice reform through community development. *Journal of Community Practice*, 21(4), 434-450.
- Pienaar, P. J. J. (1993). *Juvenile courts: problems and dilemmas* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Zululand).
- Rap, S. E. (2013). *The participation of juvenile defendants in the youth court. A comparative study of juvenile justice procedures in Europe* (Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University).
- Shahidullah, S. M., & Das, S. (2017). Globalization and Reforms in Juvenile Justice in South Asia: A Comparative Study of Law and Legal Advances in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. *Crime, Criminal Justice, and the Evolving Science of Criminology in South Asia: India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh*, 173-218.
- Sheffer, J. P. (1995). Serious and habitual juvenile offender statutes: Reconciling punishment and rehabilitation within the juvenile justice system. *Vand. L. Rev.*, 48, 479.
- Sherman, F., & Balck, A. (2015). *Gender injustice: System-level juvenile justice reforms for girls*.
- Shoemaker, D. J., & Wolfe, T. W. (2016). *Juvenile justice: A reference handbook*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Travers, M. (2013). Comparing juvenile justice systems: Towards a qualitative research project in East Asia. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 8, 115-128.
- Usman, M., Kanwel, S., Khan, M. I., & Khan, A. (2021). Advancing Gender Equality within the Legal Framework of Pakistan: Navigating Progress and Overcoming Persistent Challenges. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 9(5), 310-316.
- Usman, M., Khan, A., & Amjad, S. (2021). *State Responsibility and International Law: Bridging the Gap*.
- Weber, J., Umpierre, M., & Bilchik, S. (2018). *Transforming Juvenile Justice Systems*.
- Winterdyk, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Juvenile justice systems: International perspectives*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Zimring, F. E. (2018). *American juvenile justice*. Oxford University Press.
- Zimring, F. E., Langer, M., & Tanenhaus, D. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Juvenile justice in global perspective* (Vol. 1). NYU Press.