

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Educational pathways to prevention: An interdisciplinary framework for understanding and addressing student delinquency in school environments

Nurshahira Ibrahim^{1*}, Najibah Zakariya^{2*}, Tengku Intan Suzila Tengku Sharif³, Maziah Mahmud¹,
Koray Çetinceli⁴, Seher Yastioğlu⁵, Tuğrul Yılmaz⁶

¹ Academy of Contemporary Islamic Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Pahang Campus, Bandar Tun Razak, Pahang, 26400, Malaysia

² Academy of Contemporary Islamic Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam Branch, 40450, Selangor, Malaysia

³ Academy of Language Studies (APB), Universiti Teknologi MARA, Pahang Branch, Bandar Tun Razak, Pahang, 26400, Malaysia

⁴ Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Trade and Logistics, Süleyman Demirel University, Merkez/Isparta, 32260, Türkiye

⁵ Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, 15200, Türkiye

⁶ Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business, Süleyman Demirel University, Merkez/Isparta, 32260, Türkiye

* **Corresponding author:** Nurshahira Ibrahim, shahiraibrahim@uitm.edu.my; Najibah Zakariya, najibahzakariya@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Student delinquency remains a pervasive and multifaceted challenge within educational institutions, necessitating a comprehensive exploration of its underlying causes and potential interventions. This concept paper aims to elucidate the complex interplay of factors contributing to delinquent behavior among students, drawing upon a diverse array of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence. By adopting an interdisciplinary approach, this research synthesizes insights from psychology, neuroscience, sociology, and education to develop a nuanced understanding of student delinquency. The paper examines individual, familial, peer, school, and community-level risk factors, while also considering the neurobiological underpinnings of adolescent decision-making and impulse control. Furthermore, it critically evaluates existing intervention strategies, explores the school-to-prison pipeline phenomenon, and investigates the role of school climate and technology in shaping student behavior. Through a rigorous analysis of these multifaceted dimensions, this concept paper aims to contribute to the development of more effective, evidence-based strategies for preventing and addressing student delinquency. By implementing these strategies, educators and policymakers can foster positive educational environments and promote long-term societal well-being.

Keywords: delinquency; students, education; prevention strategies; school interventions

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 14 July 2025 | Accepted: 13 August 2025 | Available online: 23 August 2025

CITATION

Ibrahim N, Zakariya N, Sharif TIST, et al. Educational pathways to prevention: An interdisciplinary framework for understanding and addressing student delinquency in school environments. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2025; 10(8): 3902. doi: 10.59429/esp.v10i8.3902

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by author(s). *Environment and Social Psychology* is published by Arts and Science Press Pte. Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

1. Introduction

The ongoing challenge of student delinquency continues to confound educators, policymakers, and researchers, requiring a comprehensive exploration of its underlying causes. Delinquent behavior among students, characterized by persistent misbehavior, truancy, and actions that violate school rules or community norms, has profound effects on academic achievement, school climate, and long-term community outcomes^[1]. The multifaceted nature of this phenomenon requires an interdisciplinary approach that synthesizes insights from multiple fields, including psychology, neuroscience, sociology, and education. By adopting this holistic perspective, a broader understanding of the multiple influences that shape delinquent student behavior can be uncovered. Recent research has identified a variety of factors that contribute to student delinquency, including individual characteristics, family dynamics, peer influences, the school environment, and community context. For example, adverse childhood experiences and a lack of family affection can significantly predict delinquency, moderated by neighborhood factors, and mediated by delinquent peer associations^[2]. Individual characteristics, social environment, and physical environment have also been shown to influence school attendance and delinquency^[3]. In addition, substance use, trauma, delinquent peers, and neighborhood characteristics are consistently associated with increased delinquent behavior, with genetic factors moderating this risk^[4]. The social environment also plays an important role in shaping personal development and delinquent behavior, highlighting the complex interaction between genetic and environmental factors^[5]. Although factors have been generally identified, Kennedy et. al argue that protective factors against delinquency, including family and neighborhood elements, need to be taken seriously, although research on this subject remains relatively limited^[4]. Understanding the influence of these various aspects is important to effectively address juvenile delinquency and prevent its escalation into more severe issues within the community.

Research on student delinquency is important for understanding and addressing problematic behavior among youth. Studies have shown that delinquency tends to peak during the early years of secondary school, with males being more prone to such behavior than females^[6,7]. School well-being also plays an important role, as a negative school environment is associated with increased delinquent behavior, such as truancy and vandalism^[8]. Teachers play a key role in managing student delinquency through education, guidance, and disciplinary measures^[9]. When teachers fail to engage effectively with these students, research suggests they will be less likely to participate in school activities and may develop negative attitudes toward education^[9,10]. Preventing juvenile delinquency is important not only to safeguard the physical and mental health of minors but also to promote social stability and economic development. Early intervention and education can effectively reduce future crime rates and the associated societal costs. Multidimensional prevention strategies involving family, school, and social interventions are recommended to comprehensively address this issue^[11].

Juvenile delinquency is a complex issue that carries significant consequences for individuals and society. Failure to address delinquency can lead to an increased risk of death, imprisonment, school dropout, and violation of social norms and laws^[12]. Socioeconomic factors, family dysfunction, peer influence, substance abuse, and mental health issues all contribute to delinquent behavior^[13]. The consequences extend beyond the individual, affecting community safety and overall societal well-being^[13]. A lack of proper family control, conflicts at home, residential environment, and media influence are key factors in juvenile delinquency^[14]. Many juveniles engage in criminal activities to fulfill basic needs and seek recreation due to inadequate family support^[14]. Addressing juvenile delinquency requires a holistic approach that combines preventive measures, tailored interventions, and collaborative efforts among stakeholders to create a nurturing environment for youth and break the cycle of delinquency^[15].

By synthesizing current knowledge and identifying gaps in recent research, this concept paper aims to lay the foundation for more effective prevention and intervention strategies. The objectives of this research are threefold: (1) to identify and analyze key risk factors that contribute to student delinquency, (2) to examine psychological and neurological perspectives on delinquent behavior, and (3) to evaluate the effectiveness of current intervention strategies and propose evidence-based recommendations for policy and practice.

2. Risk factors associated with student delinquency

The etiology of student delinquency is inherently complex, involving a multifaceted interplay of risk factors that span individual, familial, peer, school, and community domains. A thorough understanding of these risk factors is crucial for developing targeted and effective interventions.

2.1. Individual factors

At the individual level, a diverse range of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral characteristics has been associated with an increased propensity for delinquent behavior. Cognitive abilities, particularly executive functioning skills such as impulse control, planning, and decision-making, play a crucial role in regulating behavior and resisting antisocial impulses^[16]. Students with deficits in these areas may struggle to navigate social situations and adhere to school rules, potentially leading to disciplinary infractions and academic disengagement.

Emotional regulation, another critical individual factor, encompasses the ability to recognize, understand, and manage one's emotions effectively^[17]. Adolescents with poor emotional regulation skills may exhibit heightened reactivity to stress and frustration, increasing the likelihood of aggressive or disruptive behavior^[18]. Moreover, the presence of mental health disorders, such as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), conduct disorder, or depression, can significantly increase the risk of delinquent behavior^[19].

Certain personality traits, particularly those associated with antisocial tendencies, have been linked to an increased likelihood of delinquent behavior^[20]. These traits, which may include callousness, manipulative tendencies, and disregard for social norms, may predispose individuals to engage in delinquent acts without fully considering the consequences or impact on others.

2.2. Family dynamics

The family environment serves as a crucial context for child development, exerting a profound influence on behavioral outcomes. Parental involvement, characterized by consistent monitoring, emotional support, and effective discipline practices, has been consistently associated with lower rates of delinquent behavior^[21,22]. Conversely, neglectful or harsh parenting styles, marked by inconsistent discipline, low warmth, and poor supervision, may increase the risk of antisocial behavior and academic disengagement^[23].

Socioeconomic status (SES) is another critical familial factor, with lower SES consistently associated with higher rates of delinquency^[24,25]. This relationship is likely mediated by a complex interplay of factors, including greater exposure to stress, limited access to resources and opportunities, and parental absence due to work demands. Furthermore, family structure, particularly single-parent households or frequent transitions in caregivers, has been associated with an elevated risk of delinquent behavior^[26,27].

Intergenerational transmission of antisocial behavior represents another salient familial risk factor. Children of parents with a history of criminal behavior or substance abuse are at increased risk of engaging in similar behaviors, potentially due to a combination of genetic predisposition and environmental

influences^[28,29]. This underscores the importance of considering family history and dynamics when assessing risk and developing interventions.

2.3. Peer influences and social networks

During adolescence, peer relationships take on heightened importance, often exerting a powerful influence on individual behavior and decision-making. Association with delinquent peers has been consistently identified as a robust predictor of antisocial behavior, with social learning theory positing that individuals acquire and reinforce deviant attitudes and behaviors through peer interactions^[30,31].

The phenomenon of peer pressure, particularly in the context of risk-taking behaviors, plays a significant role in shaping adolescent decision-making. Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that the presence of peers activates reward-related brain regions, potentially increasing the salience of immediate rewards and diminishing the perceived risks associated with certain behaviors^[32,33].

Social network analysis has provided valuable insights into the dynamics of peer influence and delinquency. Research has shown that adolescents tend to form homophilous relationships, gravitating toward peers with similar behavioral tendencies^[34,35]. This clustering effect can create pockets of delinquent behavior within schools, potentially amplifying and reinforcing antisocial norms within certain peer groups.

2.4. School environment and academic performance

The school environment plays a pivotal role in shaping student behavior, with various aspects of school climate and structure influencing the likelihood of delinquent acts. School connectedness, characterized by a sense of belonging and positive relationships with teachers and peers, has been consistently associated with lower rates of problem behavior and improved academic outcomes^[36,37].

Academic performance and engagement represent critical factors in determining the trajectory of student behavior. Poor academic achievement and disengagement from school have been linked to an increased risk of delinquency, potentially creating a self-reinforcing cycle of academic failure and behavioral problems^[38,39]. This underscores the importance of early academic intervention and support in preventing the onset of delinquent behavior.

School policies and disciplinary practices also exert a significant influence on student behavior and outcomes. Punitive disciplinary approaches, such as zero-tolerance policies and exclusionary practices (e.g., suspension and expulsion), have been criticized for their potential to exacerbate behavioral problems and contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline^[40,41]. This highlights the need for more nuanced and restorative approaches to school discipline that address underlying issues and promote positive behavioral change.

2.5. Community-level factors

The broader community context in which students are embedded plays a crucial role in shaping behavioral outcomes. Neighborhood characteristics, such as poverty, crime rates, and social disorganization, have been consistently associated with higher rates of delinquent behavior among youth^[42,43]. These community-level factors may influence student behavior through various mechanisms, including increased exposure to violence, limited access to positive role models, and reduced social control.

Access to resources and opportunities within the community can also significantly impact student outcomes. Communities with limited recreational facilities, after-school programs, and employment opportunities may provide fewer prosocial alternatives for youth, potentially increasing the likelihood of engagement in delinquent activities^[44,45].

Furthermore, the presence of collective efficacy within a community, characterized by social cohesion and informal social control, has been associated with lower rates of youth violence and delinquency^[46,47]. This underscores the importance of community-level interventions that foster social connections and promote a shared sense of responsibility for youth well-being.

In conclusion, the complex interplay of individual, familial, peer, school, and community-level factors underscores the multifaceted nature of student delinquency. Effective prevention and intervention strategies must address this complexity, targeting multiple levels of influence to create comprehensive and sustainable change. By understanding the diverse array of risk factors associated with delinquent behavior, educators, policymakers, and researchers can develop more nuanced and targeted approaches to supporting at-risk youth and fostering positive educational environments.

3. Psychological and neurological perspectives on delinquent behavior

To develop a comprehensive understanding of student delinquency, it is crucial to examine the psychological and neurological underpinnings of adolescent behavior. This section explores the cognitive and emotional development characteristic of adolescence, the role of mental health disorders in delinquent behavior, and the neurobiological factors influencing decision-making and impulse control.

3.1. Cognitive and emotional development in adolescence

Adolescence represents a period of significant cognitive and emotional development, characterized by both opportunities and vulnerabilities. From a cognitive perspective, adolescents experience substantial improvements in executive functioning, including enhanced working memory, cognitive flexibility, and abstract reasoning^[48,49]. However, these cognitive advancements occur asynchronously with socioemotional development, potentially contributing to the heightened risk-taking and impulsivity often observed during this period.

The dual systems model of adolescent brain development suggests that the differing maturation rates of reward-seeking and cognitive control systems contribute to increased risk-taking behavior^[50]. According to this model, the rapid development of the socioemotional system, which responds strongly to rewards and social stimuli, outpaces the maturation of the cognitive control system responsible for impulse inhibition and long-term planning. This developmental mismatch may create a period of vulnerability to peer influence and engagement in risky behaviors.

Emotional development during adolescence is marked by increased emotional reactivity and a growing capacity for emotion regulation^[51,52]. However, the ability to effectively regulate emotions in challenging situations often develops more slowly than the intensity of emotional experiences, which may contribute to impulsive or maladaptive behaviors when adolescents encounter stress. Understanding these developmental processes is crucial for designing interventions that are sensitive to the unique cognitive and emotional landscapes of adolescence.

3.2. The role of mental health disorders in delinquent behavior

The prevalence of mental health disorders among youth in the juvenile justice system is significantly higher than in the general population, underscoring the complex relationship between mental health and delinquent behavior^[53]. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, and substance use disorders are particularly overrepresented among delinquent youth.

ADHD, characterized by difficulties with attention, hyperactivity, and impulse control, has been consistently associated with an increased risk of delinquent behavior^[54,55]. The core symptoms of ADHD

may contribute to academic difficulties, social problems, and impulsive decision-making, potentially leading to disciplinary infractions and academic disengagement.

Conduct disorder and oppositional defiant disorder involve persistent patterns of rule-violating and aggressive behavior, where it represents significant risk factors for more severe and persistent delinquency^[56]. These disorders often involve deficits in empathy, emotion regulation, and social problem-solving skills, which may impair an individual's ability to navigate social relationships effectively and adhere to societal norms^[57].

Substance use disorders, which often co-occur with other mental health conditions, can exacerbate the risk of delinquent behavior through various mechanisms. Substance use may impair judgment and decision-making, increase impulsivity, and expose individuals to high-risk social environments^[58]. Moreover, the need to obtain substances may lead to engagement in illegal activities, perpetuating a cycle of substance use and delinquency.

3.3. Neurobiological factors influencing decision-making and impulse control

Advances in neuroimaging techniques have provided valuable insights into the neurobiological substrates of adolescent behavior and decision-making. The prefrontal cortex, a region critical for executive functions such as impulse control, planning, and decision-making, undergoes significant structural and functional changes during adolescence^[59,60]. This protracted development may contribute to the heightened impulsivity and risk-taking observed during this period.

The limbic system, particularly the amygdala and nucleus accumbens, plays a crucial role in emotional processing and reward-seeking behavior. During adolescence, these regions exhibit heightened reactivity to emotional and rewarding stimuli, potentially contributing to increased sensation-seeking and susceptibility to peer influence^[61].

Neurotransmitter systems, particularly dopamine and serotonin, also undergo significant changes during adolescence, influencing reward processing, mood regulation, and impulse control^[62]. Alterations in these systems have been linked to various psychopathologies associated with delinquent behavior, including ADHD and substance use disorders^[55].

Stress and trauma can significantly impact brain development and function, potentially increasing vulnerability to delinquent behavior. Chronic stress exposure during childhood and adolescence has been associated with alterations in brain structure and function, particularly in regions responsible for emotion regulation and executive functioning^[63,64]. These neurobiological changes may impair impulse control, emotional regulation, and decision-making, potentially increasing the risk of antisocial behaviors. Understanding these neurobiological factors is crucial for designing interventions that address the unique developmental needs of adolescents. For example, interventions that focus on strengthening impulse control and decision-making skills may be particularly effective during this period of heightened neuroplasticity. Additionally, recognizing the impact of stress and trauma on brain development underscores the importance of trauma-informed approaches in addressing delinquent behavior.

In conclusion, the psychological and neurological perspectives on delinquent behavior provide a nuanced understanding of the complex factors influencing adolescent decision-making and behavior. By integrating insights from cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and developmental psychopathology, researchers and practitioners can develop more targeted and effective interventions to address student delinquency. This interdisciplinary approach holds promise for creating prevention and intervention

strategies that are sensitive to the unique developmental needs of adolescents, ultimately fostering positive behavioral outcomes and academic success.

4. Intervention strategies

Based on our comprehensive analysis of risk factors and neurological perspectives, we propose organizing interventions into three main categories: Individual and Relational Interventions, School-Wide and Systemic Approaches, and Alternative Engagement Models. This framework allows for a more coherent basis for evaluating the effectiveness of these interventions.

4.1. Individual and relational interventions

4.1.1. Mentoring and counseling programs

Mentoring programs have emerged as a promising intervention strategy for at-risk youth, providing supportive relationships and positive role models. These programs typically pair students with adult mentors who offer guidance, support, and encouragement. Research has demonstrated that well-implemented mentoring programs can lead to improvements in academic performance, behavioral outcomes, and social-emotional development^[65,66].

One of the most well-known and extensively studied mentoring programs is Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBSA). This community-based program matches youth with adult mentors who provide one-on-one guidance and support through regular meetings and activities. A randomized controlled trial of BBBSA found that participating youth were less likely to initiate drug and alcohol use, engage in violent behavior, and skip school compared to a control group^[67,68]. The success of BBBSA and similar programs underscores the potential of mentoring as an effective intervention strategy for at-risk youth.

Counseling interventions, particularly those based on cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) principles, have shown promise in addressing delinquent behavior. CBT-based interventions help students identify and modify maladaptive thought patterns and behaviors, develop problem-solving skills, and improve emotional regulation^[69]. A meta-analysis of CBT interventions for juvenile offenders found significant reductions in recidivism rates compared to control groups^[70,71].

4.1.2. Family-Based interventions

Recognizing the crucial role of family dynamics in shaping student behavior, family-based interventions aim to address delinquency by improving family functioning, communication, and parenting practices. These interventions often combine parent training, family therapy, and home-based support services.

Multisystemic Therapy (MST) is a well-established family-based intervention that has demonstrated effectiveness in reducing delinquent behavior and improving family functioning. MST is an intensive, home-based intervention that addresses multiple factors contributing to antisocial behavior, including family dynamics, peer relationships, and school performance^[72]. A meta-analysis of MST studies reported significant reductions in recidivism rates and out-of-home placements for juvenile offenders^[73].

Functional Family Therapy (FFT) is another evidence-based, family-centered intervention that has shown promise in addressing delinquent behavior^[74]. FFT focuses on improving family communication, problem-solving skills, and parenting practices. Research has demonstrated that FFT can lead to significant reductions in recidivism rates and improvements in family functioning^[75,76].

4.1.3. Impact of teacher-student relationships on behavior

The quality of teacher-student relationships has been consistently identified as a crucial factor in shaping student behavior and academic engagement. Positive, supportive relationships between teachers and students can serve as a protective factor against delinquent behavior and promote prosocial development^[77,78].

Research has demonstrated that students who perceive their teachers as caring, supportive, and fair are more likely to exhibit positive behaviors, engage in academic tasks, and adhere to school rules^[79,80]. Conversely, negative or conflictual teacher-student relationships have been associated with increased behavioral problems and poorer academic outcomes^[81].

Interventions aimed at improving teacher-student relationships have shown promise in reducing disciplinary incidents and improving school climate. For example, the My Teaching Partner (MTP) program, when combined with other interventions, has demonstrated positive effects on student behavior and academic skills^[82]. Teachers who received MTP coaching displayed higher levels of instructional support, leading to increased student engagement^[83]. The implementation of coaching programs can be influenced by teachers' perceptions of program feasibility and occupational health factors^[84]. Specific coaching actions, such as providing practice opportunities and feedback, have been associated with improved teacher implementation fidelity, use of evidence-based strategies, and student achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics^[85]. These findings highlight the importance of structured, evidence-based coaching approaches in supporting teachers' professional development and enhancing classroom outcomes, although combining multiple interventions may not always yield additional benefits^[83].

4.2. School-Wide and systemic approaches

4.2.1. Restorative justice practices in school settings

Restorative justice practices in schools aim to address student misconduct by focusing on repairing harm, restoring relationships, and promoting accountability, rather than relying solely on punitive measures. These approaches typically involve facilitated dialogues between offenders and those affected by their actions, with the goal of developing mutually agreed-upon solutions.

A growing body of research supports the effectiveness of restorative justice practices in reducing disciplinary incidents and improving school climate. For example, a study of restorative justice implementation in Minnesota schools found significant reductions in suspension rates and improvements in student-teacher relationships^[86]. Another study in Oakland, California, demonstrated that schools implementing restorative justice practices experienced a 56% reduction in suspensions for African American students, helping to address racial disparities in disciplinary outcomes^[87]. Another study of 485 middle schools reported decreased suspension rates, improved academic achievement, and reduced schoolwide misbehavior following the increased use of restorative practices^[88]. An integrative review of 11 studies further confirmed the association between restorative practices and reduced suspension rates^[89].

4.2.2. School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS)

School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) is a comprehensive, multi-tiered framework for promoting positive behavior and reducing disciplinary incidents across entire school communities. SWPBIS emphasizes the establishment of clear behavioral expectations, the teaching of prosocial skills, and the use of data-driven decision-making to guide interventions^[90].

Research has consistently demonstrated the effectiveness of SWPBIS in reducing disciplinary referrals, suspensions, and expulsions while also improving academic outcomes and school climate^[90,91]. A randomized controlled trial of SWPBIS implementation in elementary schools found significant reductions

in office disciplinary referrals and suspensions, as well as improvements in academic performance and organizational health^[125,126]. Another study revealed that implementing multiple SWPBIS tiers with fidelity significantly decreased out-of-school suspensions and law enforcement referrals for students with disabilities^[127]. A long-term examination of Missouri's SWPBIS initiative showed statistically significant lower rates of exclusionary discipline practices across primary, middle, and high school levels^[91]. Additionally, an equity-focused SWPBIS approach demonstrated effectiveness in reducing office discipline referrals for Black students, with consistent results across teacher demographics and pre-existing attitudes^[92]. These findings collectively support the positive impact of SWPBIS on both school discipline and student outcomes.

4.2.3. Influence of school policies and leadership on student engagement

School policies and leadership practices play a crucial role in shaping the overall school climate and, by extension, student behavior and engagement. Effective school leaders establish a shared vision for a positive school culture, implement supportive policies, and foster collaborative relationships among staff, students, and families^[93,94].

Research has demonstrated that schools with clear, consistently enforced behavioral expectations and fair disciplinary practices tend to have lower rates of student misconduct and higher levels of student engagement^[10,95]. Moreover, schools that prioritize student voice and participation in decision-making processes have been associated with improved school climate and reduced disciplinary incidents^[96,124].

Leadership approaches that emphasize distributed leadership and collective efficacy among staff have also been linked to improvements in school climate and student outcomes. When teachers feel empowered and supported in addressing student behavior, they are more likely to implement proactive strategies and maintain positive relationships with students^[97,98].

4.2.4. Creating a positive school climate: comprehensive approaches

Recognizing the interconnected nature of school climate factors, many schools have adopted comprehensive approaches to fostering positive educational environments. These approaches often integrate multiple evidence-based strategies to address various aspects of school climate simultaneously.

The Positive Action program is one such comprehensive approach that has proven effectiveness in improving school climate and reducing problem behaviors. This school-wide intervention focuses on promoting positive thoughts, actions, and feelings through a combination of classroom curriculum, school-wide activities, and family involvement. Research has shown that schools implementing Positive Action report significant reductions in disciplinary referrals, substance use, and violent behavior, as well as improvements in academic performance^[99]. Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), particularly at Tier 2, have been associated with lower rates of self-reported substance misuse and substance-related disciplinary referrals in secondary schools^[100]. Studies on school climate measurement have identified important factors and scales that work together to assess overall school climate^[101]. Additionally, the implementation of positive discipline practices based on Dreikurs' model has shown significant positive effects on students' emotional well-being, academic performance, and intrinsic motivation, particularly in mathematics and language learning^[102]. These findings collectively support the effectiveness of positive behavioral approaches in creating healthier learning environments and improving various student outcomes.

The Caring School Community (CSC) program is another comprehensive approach that aims to foster a sense of community and belonging within schools. CSC emphasizes on developing supportive relationships among students, staff, and families through class meetings, cross-age buddy systems, and family

involvement activities. Research has demonstrated that schools implementing CSC experience improvements in school climate, reductions in problem behaviors, and enhanced academic outcomes^[91,103,104].

4.3. Alternative engagement models

4.3.1. Alternative education models

Alternative education programs aim to provide tailored educational experiences for students who may struggle in traditional school settings. These programs often feature smaller class sizes, individualized instruction, and a focus on social-emotional learning alongside academic content. Research has shown that well-designed alternative education programs can lead to improvements in academic performance, attendance, and behavioral outcomes among at-risk students^[105-107].

One promising model is the Twilight Academy, an alternative education program that operates during non-traditional school hours and provides intensive academic and social support to students at risk of dropping out. A study of Twilight Academies in Georgia found that participating students experienced significant improvements in attendance, course completion rates, and graduation rates compared to similar students in traditional school settings^[108].

Career and technical education (CTE) programs represent another alternative approach that has shown promise in engaging at-risk students and reducing delinquent behavior. By providing hands-on, career-focused learning experiences, CTE programs can increase student engagement, improve academic performance, and enhance post-secondary outcomes^[109]. Research has demonstrated that participation in high-quality CTE programs is associated with reduced dropout rates and better employment prospects^[109,110].

4.3.2. Role of extracurricular activities in preventing delinquency

Participation in extracurricular activities has been consistently associated with positive outcomes for students, including reduced rates of delinquent behavior and improved academic performance^[111,128]. These activities provide opportunities for skill development, positive peer interactions, and connections with caring adults outside the classroom setting.

Research has demonstrated that involvement in structured after-school programs can lead to reductions in problem behaviors and improvements in academic achievement, particularly among at-risk youth^[112,113]. These programs often combine academic support, enrichment activities, and opportunities for social-emotional skill development.

Sports participation, in particular, has been associated with numerous positive outcomes, including reduced rates of delinquent behavior, improved academic performance, and enhanced social skills^[114-116]. The structured nature of sports activities, together with opportunities for teamwork and positive adult mentorship, may contribute to these benefits.

Arts-based programs, including music, theater, and visual arts, have also shown potential in promoting positive youth development and reducing risk-taking behaviors. Participation in arts activities has been associated with improvements in self-esteem, social skills, and academic engagement^[117,118].

4.3.3. Technology-based interventions

Advancements in technology have opened up new avenues for delivering interventions to at-risk youth. Computer-based cognitive training programs, mobile applications for behavior tracking and skill-building, and online counseling platforms represent promising approaches for engaging students and providing accessible support.

For example, a study on a computerized cognitive training program for juvenile offenders found significant improvements in impulse control and reductions in recidivism rates compared to a control group^[119]. Similarly, mobile applications designed to promote emotional regulation and coping skills have shown promise in reducing aggressive behavior and improving mental health outcomes among at-risk youth^[120]. Another study proposed a framework incorporating modern technologies such as AI, virtual reality, and wearable devices to address individual risk factors and promote holistic well-being in juvenile rehabilitation^[121]. In the medical field, a feasibility study demonstrated that personalized cognitive training could enhance executive functions, particularly inhibitory control, in children and adolescents with epilepsy^[122]. Similarly, the RehaCom program showed clinical usefulness in rehabilitating brain injury patients, with all participants exhibiting improved performance in trained functions^[123]. These findings collectively suggest that computerized cognitive training programs can be effective tools for rehabilitation across various populations, including juvenile offenders and individuals with neurological conditions.

5. Conclusion and future directions

This comprehensive exploration of student delinquency has highlighted the complex interplay of factors contributing to problematic behavior in educational settings. By adopting a multifaceted approach that considers individual, familial, peer, school, and community-level influences, we have developed a nuanced understanding of the roots of delinquent behavior and potential avenues for intervention.

Several key themes have emerged from this analysis:

1. Early intervention and prevention strategies are essential and should address risk factors across multiple domains of influence, from individual cognitive development to community support systems.
2. There is a clear need to move away from purely punitive disciplinary approaches toward more restorative and supportive practices that maintain student engagement in the educational process.
3. A positive school climate and supportive relationships play a critical role in fostering prosocial behavior and academic success, highlighting the importance of relationship-building in educational environments.
4. Technology offers both challenges and opportunities—it can exacerbate behavioral issues but also provide innovative solutions for intervention and support through personalized digital tools.
5. Addressing systemic inequities and biases that contribute to disproportionate disciplinary outcomes for marginalized students is necessary for creating truly effective prevention strategies.

Moving forward, several areas warrant further research and development:

1. Longitudinal studies examining the long-term impacts of various intervention strategies on student outcomes and life trajectories are needed to better understand what works over time.
2. Investigating culturally responsive approaches to addressing delinquent behavior that account for diverse student populations and community contexts could improve intervention effectiveness across different groups.
3. Further exploration of innovative technology-based interventions that leverage artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and other emerging technologies to support positive behavior change represents a promising frontier.

4. Examining the intersections between student delinquency and broader societal issues, such as poverty, systemic racism, and access to mental health resources, is essential for developing comprehensive solutions.
5. Developing integrated, school-wide approaches that combine multiple evidence-based strategies to create sustained improvements in school climate and student behavior should be a priority.

By continuing to advance our understanding of student delinquency and refining our approaches to intervention, we can work toward creating educational environments that support the positive development and success of all students. This multifaceted approach holds promise for disrupting the school-to-prison pipeline, reducing racial and socioeconomic disparities in disciplinary outcomes, and fostering more equitable and effective educational systems.

Acknowledgements

Authors acknowledge the Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi (KPT) for funding under the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme for Early Career Researchers (FRGS-EC) (Grant No: FRGS-EC/1/2024/SS09/UITM/02/6).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2011). Bullying as a predictor of offending, violence and later life outcomes. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 90-98.
2. Khan, M. B. U., & Tang, Y. (2023). Influence of Childhood Adversity on Students' Delinquent Activities: Interplay with Neighborhood Context and Delinquent Peer Association. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 6677530, 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6677530>.
3. Boabeng, J. E., Yao, D. W. J., Addo, A. O., & Odum, J. K. (2022). A Review On Juvenile Delinquency and Academic performance of Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies and Innovative Research*, Volume 08, pp. 988-1002. DOI: 10.53075/Ijmsirq4364654764753
4. Kennedy, T.D., Detullio, D., Millen, D.H. (2020). Risk and Protective Factors for Delinquency. In: *Juvenile Delinquency*. Springer Briefs in Psychology (). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38250-6_3
5. Lu, X., & Lai, M. (2024). Exploring the Association Between Juvenile Delinquency and Its Influence Factor Within the Online Learning Contexts. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Interdisciplinary Humanities and Communication Studies*, 175-179. DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/48/20231649
6. Carroll, A., Green, S., Houghton, S., & Wood, R. (2003). Reputation Enhancement and Involvement in Delinquency Among High School Students. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 50(3), 253–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912032000120444>
7. Cui, K., Fong, T.C. & Yip, P.S.F. Latent heterogeneity of deviant behaviors and associated factors among ethnic minority adolescents: a latent class analysis. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 18, 93 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-024-00771-7>
8. Laure, S., Damayanti, Y., Benu, J., & Ruliati, L. (2020). Kesejahteraan Sekolah dan Kenakalan Remaja Siswa Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan. *Journal of Health and Behavioral Science*, 2(2), 88-104. <https://doi.org/10.35508/jhbs.v2i2.2192>
9. Famela Ayuni, & Febrina Dafit. (2023). Peran guru dalam mengatasi kenakalan siswa sdn 83 pekanbaru. *Didaktik: Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang*, 9(3), 1250 - 1257. <https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v9i3.1586>
10. Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59-68.
11. Zhuoma, L. (2024). The Importance of Preventing Juvenile Delinquency. *Economics, Law and Policy*, 7 (3), 162-170. <https://doi.org/10.22158/elp.v7n3p162>
12. Damião, D. B. (2020). Conduta Delinquente: Um Estudo Sobre As Consequências Da Delinquência. *Psicologia: Um Olhar Do Mundo Real*, Volume 1, 68-73. DOI: 10.37885/200500271.
13. Sarker, I. (2023). A Study on Juvenile Delinquency in Bangladesh its Causes and Consequences. *East African Scholars Multidiscip Bull*, 6(4), 30-36. DOI: 10.36349/easjmb.2023.v06i04.001.

14. Haveripet, P. (2013). Causes and consequences of juvenile delinquency in India. *Recent Research in Science and Technology*, 5, 29-31.
15. Zai, A. F., Akhter, S., & Rasheed, N. (2022). Collaborative Efforts for Breaking the Cycle of Juvenile Delinquency. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)*, Volume 2, Issue 9, 31-37. DOI: 10.48175/IJETIR-8074
16. Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 135-168.
17. Zheng, J. (2023). Analyzing the Developmental Processes and Influencing Factors of Children's Emotional Recognition, Expression, and Regulation Abilities: A Comprehensive Review. *Studies in Psychological Science*, 1(2), 1-16. doi:10.56397/SPS.2023.09.01.
18. Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(2), 217-237.
19. Loeber, R., Burke, J., & Pardini, D. A. (2009). Perspectives on oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, and psychopathic features. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50(1-2), 133-142.
20. Moreira, D., Azeredo, A.A., Ramião, E., Figueiredo, P., Barroso, R., & Barbosa, F. (2024). Systematic Exploration of Antisocial Behavior. *European Psychologist*. 29(2), 108-122. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000527>
21. Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37(6), 749-775.
22. Yan, S., & Augustine, B. (2023). Parental Monitoring, Exposure to Family Violence, and Delinquency: A Latent Class Analysis on Arizona Youth. *Victims & Offenders*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2023.2189192>
23. Sun, W., Wang, M., Zheng, F., & Wang, Y. (2024). From Nurture to Deviance: A Study on Parenting Style and Juvenile Delinquency. *Deviant Behavior*, 46(5), 639–655. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2024.2361051>
24. Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
25. Liu, X. (2024). The Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Criminal Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 42, 674-679. <https://doi.org/10.54097/cw3rfj72>
26. Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
27. Hoffmann, J. P. (2023). Family structure, unstructured socializing, and delinquent behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Volume 87, 102086. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2023.102086>.
28. Besemer, S., Ahmad, S. I., Hinshaw, S. P., & Farrington, D. P. (2017). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the intergenerational transmission of criminal behavior. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 37, 161-178.
29. Järvinen, A., Lichtenstein, P., D'Onofrio, B.M., Fazel, S., Kuja-Halkola, R. and Latvala, A. (2024), Health, behavior, and social outcomes among offspring of parents with criminal convictions: a register-based study from Sweden. *J Child Psychol Psychiatr*, 65: 1590-1600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.14003>
30. Akers, R. L., & Jennings, W. G. (2009). Social learning theory. In J. Miller (Ed.), *21st Century criminology: A reference handbook* (pp. 323-332). Sage Publications.
31. Jones, M.S., Pierce, H., & Shoaf, H. (2023). Early exposure to adverse childhood experiences and delinquent peer association among youth. *Family Relations*, 72(5), 2991-3009. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12856>
32. Albert, D., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2013). The teenage brain: Peer influences on adolescent decision making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(2), 114-120.
33. Koele, I. J., Hoorn, J. V., Ellen R. A. Bruijn, D., Güroğlu, B. (2023). Neural processing of observed performance-based errors and rewards in the context of friends and unfamiliar peers across adolescence, *Neuropsychologia*, Volume 188, 108619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2023.108619>.
34. Haynie, D. L. (2001). Delinquent peers revisited: Does network structure matter? *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(4), 1013-1057.
35. Murray, J.M., Sánchez-Franco, S.C., Sarmiento, O.L. et al. Selection homophily and peer influence for adolescents' smoking and vaping norms and outcomes in high and middle-income settings. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 10, 615 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02124-9>
36. Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C. B., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). The importance of bonding to school for healthy development: Findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 252-261.
37. Wilkins NJ, Krause KH, Verlenden JV, et al. School Connectedness and Risk Behaviors and Experiences Among High School Students — Youth Risk Behavior Survey, United States, 2021. *MMWR Suppl* 2023;72(Suppl-1):13–21. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.su7201a2>
38. Maguin, E., & Loeber, R. (1996). Academic performance and delinquency. *Crime and Justice*, 20, 145-264.

39. Motti-Stefanidi, F., Pavlopoulos, V., & Asendorpf, J. (2023). Cascades linking school achievement and engagement to the acculturation of immigrant-origin youth. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 20(6), 1021–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2023.2184338>
40. Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Williams, N. T. (2014). More than a metaphor: The contribution of exclusionary discipline to a school-to-prison pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 546-564.
41. Battjes, K., & Zane Kaplan, L. (2023). Zero Tolerance vs Restorative Justice in the United States. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 13(4), 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1414>
42. Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing “neighborhood effects”: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28(1), 443-478.
43. Brundidge, T. F., & Leban, L. (2024). The conditioning role of perceptions of collective efficacy in the relationship between adverse childhood experiences and delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Volume 90, 102143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2023.102143>.
44. Hawkins, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Farrington, D. P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R. F., Harachi, T. W., & Cothorn, L. (2000). Predictors of youth violence. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 1-11.
45. Brown et al., (2025). Associations Between Neighborhood Resources and Youths’ Response to Reward Omission in a Task Modeling Negatively Biased Environments. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, Volume 64, Issue 4, 463 – 474.
46. Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.
47. Gearhart M. C. (2024). The Multilevel Factor Structure of Social Cohesion, Mutual Efficacy, and Informal Social Control: A Case for Practice-Informed Research. *Social work*, 69(2), 167–175. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swae002>
48. Blakemore, S. J., & Choudhury, S. (2006). Development of the adolescent brain: Implications for executive function and social cognition. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(3-4), 296-312.
49. Parr, A.C., Sydnor, V.J., Calabro, F.J., & Luna, B. (2024). Adolescent-to-adult gains in cognitive flexibility are adaptively supported by reward sensitivity, exploration, and neural variability. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 101399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2024.101399>.
50. Marquez-Ramos, F., Alarcon, D., Amian, J. G., Fernandez-Portero, C., Arenilla-Villalba, M. J., & Sanchez-Medina, J. (2023). Risk Decision Making and Executive Function among Adolescents and Young Adults. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 142. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020142>
51. Silvers, J. A., McRae, K., Gabrieli, J. D., Gross, J. J., Remy, K. A., & Ochsner, K. N. (2012). Age-related differences in emotional reactivity, regulation, and rejection sensitivity in adolescence. *Emotion*, 12(6), 1235-1247.
52. Fombouchet, Y., Pineau, S., Perchee, C., Lucenet, J., & Lannegrand, L. (2023). The development of emotion regulation in adolescence: What do we know and where to go next? *Social Development*, 32(4), 1227-1242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12684>
53. Teplin, L. A., Abram, K. M., McClelland, G. M., Dulcan, M. K., & Mericle, A. A. (2002). Psychiatric disorders in youth in juvenile detention. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 59(12), 1133-1143.
54. Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L., & Unnever, J. D. (2002). The relationship of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder to crime and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 4(4), 344-360.
55. Barbuti, M., Maiello, M., Spera, V., Pallucchini, A., Brancati, G. E., Maremmanni, A. G. I., Perugi, G., & Maremmanni, I. (2023). Challenges of Treating ADHD with Comorbid Substance Use Disorder: Considerations for the Clinician. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 12(9), 3096. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12093096>
56. Loeber, R., Burke, J. D., Lahey, B. B., Winters, A., & Zera, M. (2000). Oppositional defiant and conduct disorder: A review of the past 10 years, part I. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 39(12), 1468-1484.
57. Eisenberg, N., Zuffianò, A., Spinrad, T. L. (2024). Are prosocial tendencies relevant for developmental psychopathology? The relations of prosocial behavior and empathy-related responding to externalizing problems, internalizing problems, and autism spectrum disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, 36(5):2207-2217. doi:10.1017/S0954579424000063
58. Chassin, L., Sher, K. J., Hussong, A., & Curran, P. (2013). The developmental psychopathology of alcohol use and alcohol disorders: Research achievements and future directions. *Development and Psychopathology*, 25(4pt2), 1567-1584.
59. Casey, B. J., Jones, R. M., & Hare, T. A. (2008). The adolescent brain. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124(1), 111-126.
60. Juraska, J.M. (2024). The last stage of development: The restructuring and plasticity of the cortex during adolescence especially at puberty. *Developmental psychobiology*, 66(2), e22468. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.22468>

61. Galvan, A., Hare, T. A., Parra, C. E., Penn, J., Voss, H., Glover, G., & Casey, B. J. (2006). Earlier development of the accumbens relative to orbitofrontal cortex might underlie risk-taking behavior in adolescents. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(25), 6885-6892.
62. Wahlstrom, D., White, T., & Luciana, M. (2010). Neurobehavioral evidence for changes in dopamine system activity during adolescence. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34(5), 631-648.
63. McEwen, B. S., & Morrison, J. H. (2013). The brain on stress: Vulnerability and plasticity of the prefrontal cortex over the life course. *Neuron*, 79(1), 16-29.
64. Sheppard, M., Rasgado-Toledo, J., Duncan, N.W., Elliott, R., Garza-Villarreal, E.A., & Muhlert, N. (2024). Noradrenergic alterations associated with early life stress. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 164, 105832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2024.105832>.
65. DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57-91.
66. Alonso, M. A., González-Ortiz-de-Zárate, A., Gómez-Flechoso, M. Á., and Castrillón, M. (2024). Effectiveness of a Peer Mentoring on University Dropout and Academic Performance. *Psicología Educativa*, 30(1), 29 - 37. <https://doi.org/10.5093/psed2024a5>
67. Grossman, J. B., & Tierney, J. P. (1998). Does mentoring work? An impact study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program. *Evaluation Review*, 22(3), 403-426.
68. Herrera, C., DuBois, D., Heubach, J., & Grossman, J.B. (2023). Effects of the Big Brothers Big Sisters of America Community-Based Mentoring Program on social-emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes of participating youth: A randomized controlled trial. *Children and Youth Services Review*, Volume 144,106742. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106742>.
69. Shin, E. J., & Kim, J. M. (2024). Development and Effectiveness of Character Education Program Based on Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: A Study on University Students. *The Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 24(10), 1-24. 10.22251/jlcci.2024.24.10.1
70. Landenberger, N. A., & Lipsey, M. W. (2005). The positive effects of cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders: A meta-analysis of factors associated with effective treatment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(4), 451-476.
71. Cuijpers, P., Miguel, C., Harrer, M., Plessen, C. Y., Ciharova, M., Ebert, D., & Karyotaki, E. (2023). Cognitive behavior therapy vs. control conditions, other psychotherapies, pharmacotherapies and combined treatment for depression: a comprehensive meta-analysis including 409 trials with 52,702 patients. *World Psychiatry*, 22(1), 105-115.
72. Satodiya, R.M., Bied, A., Shah, K., Parikh, T., & Ash, P. (2024). A Systematic Review of Multisystemic Therapy in Adolescent Sex Offenders. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 52, 51 - 60. DOI:10.29158/JAAPL.230117-23
73. Curtis, N. M., Ronan, K. R., & Borduin, C. M. (2004). Multisystemic treatment: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(3), 411-419.
74. Littell, J., H., Pigott, T. D., Nilsen, K. H., Roberts, J., Labrum, T. K. (2023). Functional Family Therapy for families of youth (age 11–18) with behaviour problems: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 19(3), e1324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1324>.
75. Alexander, J. F., & Robbins, M. S. (2011). Functional family therapy. In R. J. R. Levesque (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Adolescence* (pp. 1080-1088). Springer.
76. Firdasannah, A., Borualogo, I.S., & Kusdiyati, S. (2024). Functional Family Therapy to Address Teenage Behavior Problems in Theft Cases in LPKA Bandung. *Psikostudia : Jurnal Psikologi*. 13(1), 76-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v13i1>
77. Sabol, T. J., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Recent trends in research on teacher–child relationships. *Attachment & Human Development*, 14(3), 213-231.
78. Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Marsh, H. W. (2023). Autonomy-Supportive Teaching Enhances Prosocial and Reduces Antisocial Behavior via Classroom Climate and Psychological Needs: A Multilevel Randomized Control Intervention. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 45(1), 26-40. Retrieved May 2, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2021-0337>
79. Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students’ school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 493-529.
80. Howard, J. L., Slep, G. R., & Wang, X. (2024). Need Support and Need Thwarting: A Meta-Analysis of Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness Supportive and Thwarting Behaviors in Student Populations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231225364>
81. Steenberghs, N., Lavrijsen, J., & Verschueren, K. (2023). Teacher-student relationships and engagement of high-ability students: An exploration from the perspective of the academic risk hypothesis. *High Ability Studies*, 34(2), 249–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2023.2189573>

82. Doyle, N.B., Gomez Varon, J.A., Downer, J.T., & Brown, J.L. (2023). Testing the integration of a teacher coaching model and a social-emotional learning and literacy intervention in urban elementary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Volume 132, 104232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104232>.
83. Downer, J. T., Doyle, N. B., Pianta, R. C., Burchinal, M., Field, S., Hamre, B. K., ... Scott-Little, C. (2024). Coaching and Coursework Focused on Teacher–Child Interactions During Language/Literacy Instruction: Effects on Teacher Outcomes and Children’s Classroom Engagement. *Early Education and Development*, 35(5), 1032–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2024.2303604>
84. Braun SS, Bradshaw CP, Beahm LA, Budavari AC, Downer J, Ialongo NS and Tolan PH (2023) Predicting implementation of the PAX Good Behavior Game + MyTeachingPartner interventions. *Front. Psychol.* 14:1059138. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1059138
85. Glover, T.A., Reddy, L.A., & Crouse, K. (2023). Instructional coaching actions that predict teacher classroom practices and student achievement. *Journal of school psychology*, 96, 1-11 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.10.006>.
86. Stinchcomb, J. B., Bazemore, G., & Riestenberg, N. (2006). Beyond zero tolerance: Restoring justice in secondary schools. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 123-147.
87. Jain, S., Bassey, H., Brown, M. A., & Kalra, P. (2014). Restorative justice in Oakland schools: Implementation and impacts. *Oakland Unified School District*.
88. Darling-Hammond, S. (2023). Fostering belonging, transforming schools: The impact of restorative practices. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.54300/169.703>
89. Samimi, C., Han, T. M., Navvab, A., Sedivy, J. A., & Anyon, Y. (2023). Restorative practices and exclusionary school discipline: an integrative review. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 26(1), 28–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2023.2204884>
90. Kubiszewski, V., Carrizales, A., & Lheureux, F. (2023). Can School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) improve adolescents’ perceptions of school climate?. *Journal of School Psychology*, 2023, 99, pp.101223. Doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2023.101223.
91. Gage, N. A., Lewis, T. J., Johnson, N. L., & Way, G. T. (2024). The Impact of the Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS) on Disciplinary Exclusions. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 27(2), 82-93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007241275691> (Original work published 2025)
92. Austin, S.C., McIntosh, K., Smolkowski, K., Santiago-Rosario, M.R., Arbuckle, S.L., & Barney, N.E. (2024). Examining differential effects of an equity-focused schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports approach on teachers' equity in school discipline. *Journal of school psychology*, 104, 101284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2024.101284>.
93. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.
94. Wilson Heenan, I., De Paor, D., Lafferty, N., & Mannix McNamara, P. (2023). The Impact of Transformational School Leadership on School Staff and School Culture in Primary Schools—A Systematic Review of International Literature. *Societies*, 13(6), 133. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13060133>
95. Nese, R. N. T., Nese, J. F. T., Santiago-Rosario, M. R., Izzard, S., Newson, A., Pimentel-Mannan, I., Lissman, D. C., Daza, T., Triplett, D., & Malose, S. (2024). Improving Classroom Engagement and Reducing Exclusionary Discipline: A Quasi-Experimental Study of the Inclusive Skill-Building Learning Approach During COVID-19. *Journal of Education*, 205(2), 114-129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574241309893> (Original work published 2025)
96. Mitra, D. L. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing “student voice” in schools lead to gains in youth development? *Teachers College Record*, 106(4), 651-688.
97. Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 3-13.
98. Brandisauskiene, A., Buksnyte-Marmiene, L., Cesnaviciene, J., & Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva, G. (2023). The Relationship Between Teacher’s Autonomy-Supportive Behavior and Learning Strategies Applied by Students: The Role of Teacher Support and Equity. *SAGE Open*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181384> (Original work published 2023)
99. Flay, B. R., Allred, C. G., & Ordway, N. (2001). Effects of the Positive Action program on achievement and discipline: Two matched-control comparisons. *Prevention Science*, 2(2), 71-89.
100. Austin, S. C., Hammond, M. A., & Seeley, J. R. (2024). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and Substance Misuse in Secondary Schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 27(2), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007241276528> (Original work published 2025)
101. Siebert, C. F., Holloway, S. D., DuBois, D. L., Bavarian, N., Lewis, K. M., & Flay, B. (2024). Identification of Important Factors When Measuring School Climate: Latent Construct Validation and Exploration. *The Journal of school health*, 94(1), 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13394>

102. Jiménez, F., Calle, M., Quishpe, N., Cueva, J., y Torres, B., (2024) El rol de la disciplina en el rendimiento académico: un enfoque desde el comportamiento positivo. *Reincisol*, 3(6), pp. 6312-6324. [https://doi.org/10.59282/reincisol.V3\(6\)6312-6324](https://doi.org/10.59282/reincisol.V3(6)6312-6324)
103. Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Wilson, N. (2004). Effects of an elementary school intervention on students' "connectedness" to school and social adjustment during middle school. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 24(3), 243-262.
104. Teesson, M., Birrell, L., Slade, T., Rewton, L. R., Olsen, N., Hides, L. et al.. (2024). Effectiveness of a universal, school-based, online programme for the prevention of anxiety, depression, and substance misuse among adolescents in Australia: 72-month outcomes from a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Digital Health*, Volume 6, Issue 5, e334 - e344.
105. Lange, C. M., & Sletten, S. J. (2002). Alternative education: A brief history and research synthesis. Project FORUM, National Association of State Directors of Special Education.
106. Olarte, D. A., Tsai, M. M., Chapman, L., Hager, E. R., & Cohen, J. F. W. (2023). Alternative School Breakfast Service Models and Associations with Breakfast Participation, Diet Quality, Body Mass Index, Attendance, Behavior, and Academic Performance: A Systematic Review. *Nutrients*, 15(13), 2951. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu15132951>
107. Guerrero, S., Valcárcel, J. V., Rodríguez, A. (2024). Unveiling alternative schools: A systematic review of cognitive and social-emotional development in different educational approaches. *Children and Youth Services Review*, Volume 158, 107480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2024.107480>.
108. Vick, R. M., & Packard, B. W. L. (2008). Academic success strategy use among community-active urban Hispanic adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 30(4), 463-480.
109. Dougherty, S. M. (2023). Putting evidence on CTE to work. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 104(6), 6-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217231161520> (Original work published 2023)
110. Plank, S. B., DeLuca, S., & Estacion, A. (2008). High school dropout and the role of career and technical education: A survival analysis of surviving high school. *Sociology of Education*, 81(4), 345-370.
111. Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(1), 10-43.
112. Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
113. Yao, J., Yao, J., Li, P., Xu, Y., & Wei, L. (2023). Effects of after school programs on student cognitive and non-cognitive abilities: A meta analysis based on 37 experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *Science Insights Education Frontiers*, 17(1):2627-2649. Doi: 10.15354/sief.23.re228.
114. Mahoney, J. L., & Stattin, H. (2000). Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: The role of structure and social context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 113-127.
115. Owen, K. B., Foley, B. C., Smith, B. J., Manera, K. E., Corbett, L., Lim, M., Phongsavan, P., Qualter, P., Ding, D., & Clare, P. J. (2024). Sport Participation for Academic Success: Evidence From the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 21(3), 238-246. Retrieved Jun 18, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2023-0506>
116. Nguri, M. (2024). Effects of Sports Participation on Academic Performance in Adolescents. *American Journal of Recreation and Sports*, 3(1), 12-23. <https://doi.org/10.47672/ajrs.2048>
117. Catterall, J. S., Dumais, S. A., & Hampden-Thompson, G. (2012). The arts and achievement in at-risk youth: Findings from four longitudinal studies. National Endowment for the Arts.
118. Lewis, D. (2024). Impact of Theater Arts Participation on High School Students. *American Journal of Arts, Social and Humanity Studies*, 4(2), 12-22. <https://doi.org/10.47672/ajashs.2353>
119. Syngelaki, E. M., Moore, S. C., Savage, J. C., Fairchild, G., & Van Goozen, S. H. (2013). Executive functioning and risky decision making in young male offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(3), 274-293.
120. Whittaker, R., Merry, S., Stasiak, K., McDowell, H., Doherty, I., Shepherd, M., ... & Rodgers, A. (2012). MEMO—A mobile phone depression prevention intervention for adolescents: Development process and postprogram findings on acceptability from a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 14(1), e13.
121. TJ, S., & Kumar, R. (2024). Role of Modern Technology for Rehabilitation in Mitigation of Juvenile Recidivism: A Critical Appraisal. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2):11012-11018.
122. Tapia, J. L., Aras, L. M., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2024). Enhancing Executive Functions in Pediatric Epilepsy: Feasibility and Efficacy of a Computerized Cognitive Training Program. *Children*, 11(4), 484. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children11040484>
123. Sarpourian, F., Bahaadinbeigy, K., Fatemi Aghda, S.A., Fatehi, F., Ebrahimi, S., & Fallahnezhad, M. (2024). Effectiveness of computer-based telerehabilitation software (RehaCom) compared to other treatments for patients with cognitive impairments: A systematic review. *Digital Health*, 10.

124. Berti, S., Grazia, V. & Molinari, L. Active Student Participation in Whole-School Interventions in Secondary School. A Systematic Literature Review. *Educ Psychol Rev* 35, 52 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09773-x>
125. Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), 133-148.
126. Zhang, Y., Fallon, L., Larson, M., Browning Wright, D., Cook, C. R., & Lyon, A. R. (2024). Associations among educators' beliefs, intervention fidelity, and student outcomes in school-wide positive behavior interventions, and supports: A school-level moderated mediation analysis. *School Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq000061>
127. Fleming, J. I., Grasley-Boy, N. M., Gage, N. A., Lombardo, M., & Anderson, L. (2023). Effects of Tiered SWPBIS Fidelity on Exclusionary Discipline Outcomes for Students With Disabilities: A Conceptual Replication. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 26(1), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007231193173> (Original work published 2024)
128. Pharaswal, L., Latif A. (2023). The benefits of participating in extracurricular activities. *GfNPSS-International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(9), 2384-2388.