

Juvenile And Effective Solutions to Prevent Juvenile Recidivism – Perspectives of Judicial Officers of Vietnam

Hoang Minh Tuan¹, Hoang Xuan Chau², Ha Do Ngoc³, Thang The Nguyen⁴

Abstract

Juvenile recidivism presents a significant challenge to the criminal justice system in Vietnam. This study examines the perspectives of judicial officers regarding effective solutions to mitigate juvenile reoffending. Through a series of structured interviews and surveys, the research explores judicial officers' insights into the root causes of juvenile delinquency, including socio-economic factors, family influences, and the impact of educational systems. The findings emphasize the importance of rehabilitation over punishment, suggesting that psychological counseling, vocational training, and educational support are pivotal in preventing recidivism. Furthermore, judicial officers advocate for the integration of community-based programs, early intervention strategies, and legislative reforms to address gaps in the juvenile justice system. The study concludes by highlighting the necessity for a multi-disciplinary approach, combining legal, social, and psychological interventions, to effectively curb juvenile recidivism in Vietnam.

Keywords: *Juvenile Recidivism, Judicial Officers, Community-Based Programs.*

Introduction

In recent years, the situation of law violations among adolescents has tended to increase in the number of cases and the number of adolescents violating the law, as well as the expansion of the scope of crimes and the scale, organization, nature, and level of danger of the behavior. What is worrying is that in terms of age, the situation of criminals tends to get younger. Criminals from 18 to 30 years old account for about 70%, under 18 years old account for 8%, this rate is also increasing. Only counting the subject of juvenile law violations, according to statistics from the Criminal Police Department of the Ministry of Public Security, in the three years from 2016 to 2018, 13,794 cases nationwide with 20,367 people under 18 years old committing crimes. From 2016 to June 2019, the entire Court System handled 8,129 cases with 10,923 defendants under 18 years old (2016 was 2,653 cases with 3,494 defendants; 2017 was 2,119 cases with 2,688 defendants; 2018 was 2,265 cases with 3,176 defendants and in the first 6 months of 2019 was 1,092 cases with 1,565 defendants). From this reality, it is necessary to research and find appropriate solutions in educating, preventing and managing juvenile offenders, contributing to reducing the current situation of juvenile offenders.

The managing, educating and reforming juvenile delinquents in the community is necessary and meaningful in the current context, when the conditions for organizing educational, preventive and reform activities in the community have revealed certain limitations such as: (1) Educational, rehabilitation and reintegration services in the community for juvenile delinquents are still limited in both quantity and quality, thus they cannot effectively support juvenile delinquents in resolving the causes and conditions of law violations; (2) In addition, the operating mechanism and necessary resources in the work of educating, preventing and reforming juvenile delinquents in the community are still lacking and have limitations, leading to the low effectiveness of this work; (3) Currently, there is no network of specialized, trained and paid staff to support the education and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents in the community. The activities of handling juvenile delinquents in the community have not been specialized; (4) There is a lack of specific provisions in the Law on Children, the Penal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, the Law on Handling of Administrative Violations and sub-law documents on the role, functions and tasks of social workers in

¹ Vietnam Youth Academy, N3 Chua Lang, street, Dong Da district, Hanoi, Vietnam, Email: Tuanhmtn@gmail.com.

² Northern College of Law, Email: chau1.hoang@gmail.com.

³ Vietnam Youth Academy, N3 Chua Lang, street, Dong Da district, Hanoi, Vietnam, Email: ngochayri@gmail.com.

⁴ VNU University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Hanoi, 336 Nguyen, Trai, street, Thanh Xuan district, Hanoi, Vietnam, Email: thangvcl@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3998-0099>.

preventing, handling, educating, rehabilitating and reintegrating juvenile offenders into the community; regulations assigning an agency to be responsible for developing and managing the team of social workers in the judicial system; (5) Promoting the role of mass organizations, especially the Youth Union, in managing, educating and preventing juvenile offenders in the community is still limited and has not received due attention.

In recent years, Vietnamese laws have made progress in the field of juvenile justice, in a friendly, rehabilitative and best-interested direction for juveniles. Current legal provisions require priority to apply informal handling measures, instead of administrative violations and prosecuting criminal liability, in which, the requirement that "coercive measures and restrictions on freedom are only applied after other preventive and educational measures are not suitable" is an important legal basis for applying alternative handling measures in education, reformation, and prevention of juvenile offenders. In practice around the world, there have been many socialized models applying alternative handling measures in the management, education, and reformation of juvenile offenders in the community (such as the model of organizations and individuals doing social work; the YOT model (youth offending team) that have brought positive results in the education and reformation of juvenile offenders. Research and survey practical experiences, learn good experiences domestically and internationally, build and organize a pilot model of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union applying alternative measures in the management, education and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents in the community. The Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union is a political and social organization of the youth, with the basic function of caring for and educating ideals and ethics so that the youth can become good citizens. The educational work of the Union, especially in the field of legal education, organizing activities to prevent and support juvenile delinquents has achieved positive results. Many initiatives, models and creative ways of transforming and helping juvenile delinquents of grassroots Youth Union organizations have been strongly implemented throughout the country. Promoting the role, experience and resources of the Youth Union in educating, preventing and reforming juvenile delinquents in the community is a necessary need in participating in social management today, contributing to preventing and reducing.

Juvenile recidivism is a growing concern in many countries, including Vietnam, where young offenders often face challenges reintegrating into society after release from correctional facilities. Despite reforms aimed at addressing the root causes of youth offending, the high rate of recidivism underscores the need for more effective prevention strategies. Judicial officers play a critical role in the justice system, offering insights into the causes of juvenile recidivism and potential solutions. Juvenile recidivism refers to the tendency of young offenders to relapse into criminal behavior after release from detention or correctional programs. Vietnam has been implementing legal reforms in response to international treaties such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which emphasize rehabilitation over punitive measures for juvenile offenders. However, despite these reforms, the recidivism rate remains high. Research conducted in Vietnam shows that many juvenile offenders come from disadvantaged backgrounds with limited access to education, support systems, and employment opportunities (Nguyen & Hoang, 2020). Factors such as family dysfunction, peer pressure, drug use, and poverty are significant contributors to criminal behavior among Vietnamese youth.

Judicial officers, including judges and prosecutors, are tasked with balancing legal justice and the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. Interviews with judicial officers in Vietnam suggest that one of the key challenges is the limited capacity of the correctional system to provide individualized treatment (Le & Tran, 2019). Rehabilitation programs are often underfunded and lack the necessary personnel and resources to address the diverse needs of young offenders. Furthermore, judicial officers point out that many juveniles lack legal representation, leading to insufficient understanding of their rights during legal proceedings (Nguyen, 2021). This results in a punitive approach rather than a rehabilitative one, increasing the likelihood of reoffending.

Several preventive strategies have been proposed based on the insights of judicial officers and recent studies in Vietnam: (1) **Community-Based Rehabilitation Programs:** One of the most effective solutions involves shifting away from detention and focusing on community-based rehabilitation programs (Le, 2020). These programs emphasize reintegration into society through education, vocational training, and

counseling. Studies show that juveniles who participate in community-based programs have lower rates of recidivism compared to those who undergo traditional detention (Nguyen et al., 2018); (2) **Family-Centered Approaches:** Judicial officers emphasize the importance of involving families in the rehabilitation process (Tran, 2022). Strengthening family relationships through counseling and therapy can mitigate risk factors such as neglect and domestic violence. Programs that include parental training and family mediation have proven to be effective in reducing recidivism; (3) **Restorative Justice:** Restorative justice, which focuses on repairing harm caused by criminal behavior rather than simply punishing the offender, has been gaining traction in Vietnam. Judicial officers believe that involving victims, communities, and offenders in the resolution process fosters accountability and emotional healing. This approach has been effective in reducing reoffending rates by promoting a sense of responsibility and remorse among juvenile offenders (Nguyen, 2020).; (4) **Education and Vocational Training:** Lack of access to education and vocational opportunities is a major contributing factor to juvenile offending in Vietnam. Judicial officers suggest that enhancing access to educational and vocational training programs within correctional facilities can empower young offenders with the skills needed for reintegration into society (Do & Nguyen, 2021). Studies highlight that when juveniles receive job training and education, their likelihood of reoffending is significantly reduced.

While judicial officers support many of these preventive solutions, they also acknowledge several barriers to successful implementation. These include limited funding, lack of trained personnel, and societal stigma towards juvenile offenders. Judicial officers argue that more investment is needed to create effective rehabilitation programs, as well as broader public awareness campaigns to change perceptions of juvenile delinquency. Additionally, the legal system's focus on retribution rather than rehabilitation presents a major challenge. Judicial officers advocate for legal reforms that prioritize diversion programs, which redirect young offenders away from the justice system and into community-based services (Tran, 2021).

The strategies for preventing juvenile recidivism in Vietnam mirror trends in other countries, especially within Southeast Asia. For example, Thailand has adopted restorative justice and community-based approaches to successfully reduce juvenile recidivism (Kanchanachitra, 2020). Similar programs in Cambodia have shown promising results, suggesting that Vietnam could benefit from regional collaboration in the development of best practices (Sok & Phon, 2019).

Preventing juvenile recidivism in Vietnam requires a multi-faceted approach that emphasizes rehabilitation, family involvement, and community-based solutions. Judicial officers play a pivotal role in guiding these strategies, and their perspectives offer valuable insights into the most effective preventive measures. To reduce the high rate of reoffending, Vietnam must invest in comprehensive rehabilitation programs, strengthen legal representation for juveniles, and shift from punitive to restorative justice models. With the right resources and political will, Vietnam can make significant progress in addressing juvenile recidivism.

Method

From June to September, the survey was conducted by self-reported questionnaire with 444 people who are officials in the judicial system: police, prosecutors, courts. Officials of relevant agencies: local authorities, unions, schools, social workers, enterprises. People who are organizing model activities in the locality. The quantitative survey toolkit includes: Structured questionnaire for officials in the judicial system. Structured questionnaire for officials of relevant agencies, people who are organizing model activities in the locality.

The survey was implemented in 10 provinces and cities nationwide, representing typically geographical areas. The selected research areas are places with prisons, educational institutions, reform schools, and at the same time, these areas are implementing projects to support youth reintegration into the community or have models of coordinating activities of the Youth Union in educating, preventing, and supporting youth who violated the law in the community.

To objectively and truthfully assess the activities of preventing, managing and educating juvenile delinquents, assess the causes affecting these activities and the factors and conditions ensuring the

development of models applying alternative treatment measures in preventing, managing and educating juvenile delinquents.

Table 1. Characteristics of Study Participants

	No	%		No	%
Age	444	100.0	Education attainment		
20-40	338	83.7	≤ High school	1	.2
40-50	106	26.2	Vocation training, college	18	4.1
Gender	444	100.0	Undergraduate, University	360	81.1
Male	276	62.2	Postgraduate, University	65	14.6
Female	168	37.8	Working experience		
Occupations	444	100.0	1-5 years	114	25.7
Police	187	42.1	5-10 years	105	23.6
Judge	6	1.4	10-15 years	107	24.1
Prosecutor	62	14.0	15-20 years	60	13.5
Judicial	128	28.8	>20 years	58	13.1
Lawyer	4	.9	Living Areas		
Legal aid specialist	42	9.5	Central	28	6.3
Other	15	3.4	Provincial	135	30.4
			District	87	19.6
			Commune	194	43.7

Table 1 illustrates the study participants consisted of 444 individuals with diverse backgrounds, primarily aged between 20-40 years (83.7%), with a smaller proportion aged 40-50 (26.2%). The majority were male (62.2%), while 37.8% were female. In terms of education, most participants had an undergraduate university degree (81.1%), followed by those with postgraduate qualifications (14.6%), while only a small percentage had vocational training (4.1%) or high school education (0.2%). Occupation-wise, the largest group were police officers (42.1%), followed by judicial officers (28.8%) and prosecutors (14.0%). A smaller number were legal aid specialists (9.5%), judges (1.4%), and lawyers (0.9%). Participants were geographically dispersed, with 43.7% working at the commune level, 30.4% at the provincial level, and smaller proportions in district (19.6%) and central areas (6.3%). In terms of work experience, most had between 1-15 years of experience, with 25.7% having 1-5 years, 23.6% having 5-10 years, and 24.1% with 10-15 years of experience, while fewer had over 15 years in their field.

The Table 1 is a summary of the participant characteristics, offering clear insights into the demographic, educational, and professional diversity of the sample. It highlights a strong representation of younger professionals, with over 80% of participants in the 20-40 age range, and a male-dominated sample, which could indicate gender dynamics in the relevant fields of law enforcement and judicial occupations in Vietnam. The educational attainment of the participants is notably high, with the majority holding undergraduate or postgraduate degrees, suggesting a well-educated group, especially for those involved in critical legal and judicial roles. The prominence of police officers and judicial staff underscores their central roles in the justice system, while the geographical distribution reflects a strong presence at the commune and provincial levels, which may point to the focus of juvenile justice efforts in local communities. Overall, the paragraph effectively conveys the key characteristics of the sample, but it could benefit from a deeper exploration of how these demographics might influence their perspectives on juvenile recidivism and its prevention.

Results

Table 2. The Perspectives of Judicial Officers on Effective Solutions to Prevent Juvenile Recidivism

Solutions	Mean
[1]. Sentencing the juvenile offender to a reformatory facility	2.12
[2]. The juvenile offender must compensate for the damage he has done	2.62
[3]. The juvenile offender talks to the victim about his crime and tries to find a solution (reconciliation) with the victim to resolve the problem	2.78
[4]. The juvenile offender participates in community work	2.74
[5]. The juvenile offender compensates for the damage caused by his crime	2.71
[6]. The juvenile offender receives attention and support from his family	2.85
[7]. Supporting the juvenile offender in vocational training and employment	2.90
[8]. Providing psychosocial support to the juvenile offenders	2.88
[9]. The juvenile offender is always monitored and supported by social workers	2.80
[10]. The juvenile offender is always monitored and supervised by local police	2.87
[11]. Providing psychosocial support to the juvenile offender's family	2.83
[12]. Always receiving help and support from the Youth Union	2.84
[13]. Organizing models of management and education activities education, support for juvenile offenders in the community	2.84
[14]. Families of juvenile offenders receive support from local authorities, organizations and the community	2.85

The data from the Table 2 provides insights into the perspectives of judicial officers across various provinces in Vietnam on effective solutions to prevent juvenile recidivism. The study focuses on several key approaches, ranging from punitive measures, such as sentencing offenders to reformatory facilities, to rehabilitative and supportive strategies, like providing psychosocial support and vocational training.

Punitive Measures: The average response suggests that sentencing juveniles to reformatory facilities was not seen as the most favored solution, with a mean score of 2.12 across provinces. Similarly, making juveniles compensate for the damage caused had a higher average approval of 2.62, indicating some judicial preference for restitution as part of accountability.

Reconciliation and Community Work: Approaches like reconciliation with victims and participating in community work had moderate support, with mean scores of 2.78 and 2.74, respectively. These reflect an interest in restorative justice where the offender makes amends, though it's not the top priority.

Family Involvement and Vocational Support: The most favored solutions were those involving support from the family and the community, along with vocational training for juveniles. Receiving family support had an average score of 2.85, while supporting juveniles through vocational training and employment had one of the highest averages at 2.90. This reflects a judicial belief that rehabilitation through social and familial support is key to preventing recidivism.

Monitoring and Social Support: Judicial officers also emphasize continuous monitoring and social support, with strong scores for both monitoring by police (2.87) and social workers (2.80). This shows that judicial officers favor structured supervision alongside rehabilitative support.

Community and Youth Union Involvement: The role of community organizations and the Youth Union is also viewed positively, with scores of 2.84 for Youth Union support and 2.84 for organizing community management and education programs for juvenile offenders. This indicates the officers' recognition of the importance of integrating juvenile offenders into their communities as a means of reducing recidivism.

Overall, the data highlights a shift toward rehabilitation through family support, community engagement, and vocational training, with less emphasis on punitive approaches. Judicial officers in Vietnam appear to favor holistic, supportive measures over strict penalties, believing that addressing the social and psychological needs of offenders will yield better outcomes in preventing juvenile recidivism.

Discussion

The data collected from judicial officers across various provinces in Vietnam reflects regional differences in perspectives on effective solutions to prevent juvenile recidivism. The provinces included in the study are Ninh Binh, Hai Phong, Thai Nguyen, Nghe An, Đa Nang, Đac Lac, Binh Định, Ho Chi Minh City, Binh Duong, and Can Tho. Each province provides unique insights based on local judicial experiences and socio-cultural contexts.

Sentencing to Reformatory Facilities: The average scores for sentencing juvenile offenders to reformatory facilities reflect varying degrees of support. In Đac Lac and Binh Định, this option received the highest support (2.55 and 2.35, respectively), indicating a stronger belief in punitive measures within these provinces. In contrast, Hai Phong, Ninh Binh, and Can Tho showed lower scores (1.80, 2.30, and 1.89), reflecting less preference for reformatory sentencing. These differences may stem from regional variations in judicial philosophy or the availability of reformatory institutions. Provinces with fewer alternative rehabilitation programs might lean toward punitive measures due to limited resources.

Compensation for Damage: Requiring the juvenile offender to compensate for damages caused by their crime received consistent support across provinces, with an overall average of 2.62. Provinces like Hai Phong, Nghe An, Đa Nang, and Đac Lac displayed strong support (all around 2.70 to 2.74), while Ho Chi Minh City and Binh Duong expressed slightly less enthusiasm (2.33 and 2.48, respectively). This reflects a general consensus that financial restitution is a key part of accountability, though urban centers like Ho Chi Minh City may have more emphasis on rehabilitative solutions over financial penalties.

Reconciliation with the Victim: The idea of facilitating a dialogue between the offender and the victim as part of a reconciliation process shows notable regional variation. Hai Phong, Thai Nguyen, and Đac Lac show higher mean scores of 3.00, indicating a stronger belief in restorative justice practices. This contrasts with Can Tho and Binh Duong, where the scores were lower (2.50 and 2.53), suggesting a lesser focus on victim-offender dialogue as a recidivism prevention tool. The higher scores in certain provinces may reflect local initiatives or cultural practices that promote mediation and conflict resolution.

Participation in Community Work: Community work as a form of restitution and rehabilitation garnered substantial support across all provinces, with a mean score of 2.74. In Đac Lac, this approach received the highest support (2.95), while Ho Chi Minh City showed a more moderate approval (2.53). The strong support in Đac Lac could be influenced by community-based justice systems or rural traditions that emphasize collective responsibility and rehabilitation. In contrast, urban centers like Ho Chi Minh City might place more emphasis on structured rehabilitation programs than on community service alone.

Family Support and Involvement: Receiving attention and support from family members as a means of preventing recidivism received widespread support, with an overall average score of 2.85. Across all provinces, there was little variation in scores, with most provinces scoring between 2.83 and 2.91. This

uniformity suggests a shared understanding across regions of the crucial role families play in reintegrating juvenile offenders. The slight variations, such as in Nghe An (2.75), may reflect regional differences in family dynamics or the availability of family support programs.

Vocational Training and Employment Support: The solution of providing vocational training and employment opportunities was one of the most highly rated strategies, with a mean score of 2.90. Scores across provinces were very close, ranging from 2.85 in Nghe An to 2.93 in Ninh Binh and Đac Lac. This suggests a national consensus on the importance of equipping juvenile offenders with skills for future employment as a crucial step in reducing recidivism. Provinces that rated this highly may have more developed vocational training programs or may have seen positive outcomes from such initiatives.

Psychosocial Support for Offenders: Providing psychosocial support to juvenile offenders also received high approval across provinces, with an average score of 2.88. Nghe An and Hai Phong showed slightly lower scores (2.75 and 2.88), while most other provinces, including Ho Chi Minh City and Binh Duong, scored around 2.90. This minimal variation suggests that psychosocial support is broadly recognized as essential, though implementation may vary depending on the availability of trained counselors and support services in different regions.

Monitoring by Police and Social Workers: Monitoring by local police and social workers as part of the offender's reintegration into society also received considerable support, with local police monitoring scoring 2.87 and social worker monitoring at 2.80. Provinces like Thai Nguyen and Binh Duong placed more emphasis on police monitoring (2.95 and 2.90, respectively), whereas Binh Dinh and Can Tho showed more support for social worker involvement (2.93 and 2.85, respectively). These differences could reflect variations in the capacities of local law enforcement and social services to manage juvenile offenders.

Youth Union and Community Involvement: Support from the Youth Union, a prominent social organization in Vietnam, was highly valued, with mean scores of 2.84 across provinces. The strongest support came from Đac Lac and Hai Phong (2.90 and 2.86, respectively), while Can Tho and Ho Chi Minh City rated it slightly lower (2.73 and 2.85). This difference could reflect regional disparities in the strength of Youth Union programs or differing levels of engagement with juvenile offenders. Similarly, organizing community education and management activities for offenders was viewed positively, with a mean score of 2.84, with the highest ratings in Thai Nguyen (2.85) and Nghe An (2.90).

Support for Families: Finally, providing psychosocial and other support to the families of juvenile offenders was another well-supported strategy, with a mean score of 2.83. Provinces such as Hai Phong, Đa Nang, and Đac Lac rated this higher (around 2.85 to 2.95), suggesting a stronger belief in the importance of family support in those areas. In contrast, Nghe An (2.65) showed a slightly lower score, possibly reflecting fewer family-based intervention programs.

Overall, the data from the various provinces indicates a broad consensus on the importance of rehabilitation, family support, and vocational training in preventing juvenile recidivism. However, there are notable regional differences in the emphasis placed on punitive measures, restorative justice practices, and the role of community organizations. Provinces like Đac Lac and Hai Phong show stronger preferences for both punitive measures (such as sentencing to reformatory facilities) and restorative practices (such as victim-offender reconciliation), while urban centers like Ho Chi Minh City and Can Tho lean more toward rehabilitative solutions like vocational training and community service. These differences could be attributed to varying levels of infrastructure, local judicial philosophies, and the socio-economic conditions prevalent in each province. In conclusion, while there is a general preference for supportive and rehabilitative solutions to juvenile recidivism across Vietnam, regional contexts influence the extent to which certain strategies are prioritized. Judicial officers in rural provinces may lean toward more community-based and punitive measures, whereas those in urban areas tend to favor structured rehabilitation programs that integrate family and vocational support.

The Differences and the Similarities

The document highlights regional differences and similarities in judicial perspectives on preventing juvenile recidivism across various provinces in Vietnam. Below is a comparative analysis of the solutions discussed, structured around similarities and differences in the approaches adopted by the provinces.

The Similarities

- *Compensation for Damage:* Requiring juvenile offenders to compensate for the damages they caused was widely supported across the provinces, indicating a shared belief that financial restitution is a key part of accountability. The overall average score for this measure was 2.62, reflecting a general consensus, with most provinces scoring around this value. Provinces such as Hai Phong, Nghe An, Đa Nang, and Đac Lac showed particularly strong support (around 2.70-2.74). Although urban areas like Ho Chi Minh City (2.33) and Binh Duong (2.48) showed slightly lower enthusiasm, the overall view supports compensation as a necessary measure.
- *Family Support and Involvement:* The involvement of families in preventing recidivism also saw uniform support across the regions, with most provinces scoring between 2.83 and 2.91. This indicates a common understanding of the critical role families play in reintegrating juvenile offenders into society. The slight differences, such as Nghe An's slightly lower score of 2.75, are attributed to regional variations in family dynamics or the availability of family support programs.
- *Vocational Training and Employment Support:* Another widely supported strategy was providing vocational training and employment opportunities, which had a mean score of 2.90. The scores across provinces were consistent, ranging from 2.85 in Nghe An to 2.93 in Ninh Binh and Đac Lac. This broad agreement suggests a national consensus on equipping juvenile offenders with employment skills to prevent recidivism, likely influenced by successful outcomes from such programs.
- *Psychosocial Support for Offenders:* Similarly, providing psychosocial support was recognized as essential across most provinces, with minimal variation in scores. The average was 2.88, with Nghe An and Hai Phong scoring slightly lower (2.75 and 2.88, respectively), while other provinces like Ho Chi Minh City and Binh Duong remained around 2.90. This broad recognition suggests that psychosocial support is widely accepted as a key component of juvenile rehabilitation.
- *Youth Union and Community Involvement:* Support from the Youth Union and other community organizations was valued similarly across regions, with an average score of 2.84. The highest support came from Đac Lac and Hai Phong (2.90 and 2.86, respectively), while Can Tho and Ho Chi Minh City rated this slightly lower (2.73 and 2.85). The similar scores indicate a shared belief in the importance of community involvement in juvenile rehabilitation.

The Differences

- *Sentencing to Reformatory Facilities:* The regions showed significant variation in their support for sentencing juvenile offenders to reformatory facilities. For instance, Đac Lac and Binh Dinh were more supportive of punitive measures, scoring 2.55 and 2.35, respectively. In contrast, provinces like Hai Phong, Ninh Binh, and Can Tho displayed lower scores (1.80, 2.30, and 1.89), favoring alternative forms of rehabilitation. These differences may stem from regional judicial philosophies and the availability of reformatory institutions.
- *Reconciliation with the Victim:* Reconciliation through dialogue between offenders and victims showed varying degrees of support across the provinces. Hai Phong, Thai Nguyen, and Đac Lac showed strong support for restorative justice with high scores around 3.00. However, Can Tho and Binh Duong scored lower (2.50 and 2.53, respectively), suggesting less emphasis on victim-offender dialogue as a

preventive measure. This regional variation may be influenced by local cultural practices or judicial priorities.

- *Participation in Community Work:* There was a notable difference in support for community work as a form of rehabilitation, with Đac Lac showing the highest approval (2.95) compared to more moderate approval in urban centers like Ho Chi Minh City (2.53). The strong support in Đac Lac could be attributed to community-based justice systems or rural traditions, whereas urban centers might prioritize structured rehabilitation programs over community service.
- *Monitoring by Police and Social Workers:* Monitoring by police and social workers as part of the juvenile's reintegration into society showed regional differences. Provinces like Thai Nguyen and Binh Duong emphasized police monitoring, with scores of 2.95 and 2.90, respectively. On the other hand, Binh Định and Can Tho showed more support for social worker involvement (2.93 and 2.85, respectively). These variations could reflect differences in local law enforcement capacities and the availability of social services.
- *Support for Families:* Providing psychosocial and other forms of support to the families of juvenile offenders also displayed regional differences. While provinces like Hai Phong, Đa Nang, and Đac Lac rated this strategy highly (with scores around 2.85 to 2.95), Nghe An scored slightly lower at 2.65. This could suggest that certain regions may have fewer family-based intervention programs or a lesser focus on family dynamics in the rehabilitation process.

The analysis of solutions to prevent juvenile recidivism across provinces in Vietnam highlights both shared perspectives and regional differences. While most provinces agree on the importance of measures like compensation, vocational training, family involvement, and psychosocial support, there are notable differences in preferences for sentencing, reconciliation, community work, and monitoring mechanisms. These differences likely stem from varying judicial philosophies, cultural practices, and the availability of local resources, reflecting the complex and multifaceted nature of juvenile justice across regions.

Conclusion

The regional differences and similarities in addressing juvenile recidivism across provinces in Vietnam suggest that both policy adjustments and practical interventions must be tailored to local contexts while maintaining a cohesive national framework. The data highlights several strategies that are widely supported, indicating areas where national-level policies can be effectively implemented. However, the variation in the support for certain solutions also suggests the need for flexible, region-specific approaches.

National Framework with Regional Flexibility: While compensation for damages, vocational training, and family involvement are universally supported, provinces show divergence in their preference for other strategies like reformatory sentencing and community work. This suggests that national juvenile justice policies should emphasize rehabilitation, vocational support, and family involvement as foundational principles, but allow for regional variations based on local needs and capacities. For instance, urban centers like Ho Chi Minh City may benefit more from structured rehabilitation programs, while rural areas may find community-based solutions more effective.

Strengthening Restorative Justice Practices: The strong support for reconciliation and victim-offender dialogue in provinces like Hai Phong and Đac Lac points to the potential for expanding restorative justice practices nationally. These initiatives could be developed as part of a broader policy that promotes reconciliation, not only as a method of resolving conflict but also as a tool for healing and reducing recidivism. Expanding training for judicial officers and social workers in conflict mediation and restorative techniques could further enhance these efforts, especially in provinces that currently show lower support for such measures.

Enhanced Monitoring and Support Systems: The mixed preferences for police versus social worker monitoring suggest that strengthening both law enforcement and social service networks is necessary for a

comprehensive juvenile justice system. Policies should focus on building the capacity of both police forces and social workers, ensuring that provinces can rely on adequate resources to manage the reintegration of juvenile offenders. Provinces such as Thái Nguyên and Bình Dương, where police monitoring is preferred, could receive additional training and support to balance this with social worker engagement.

Localized Community Programs: Provinces that strongly favor community work as a form of rehabilitation, such as Đac Lac, could serve as models for expanding community-based programs nationally. These programs could be adapted to align with local traditions of collective responsibility and community involvement. For provinces where community work is less supported, policies should integrate these programs with more structured rehabilitation services, creating hybrid models that respect local preferences while encouraging restorative practices.

Focus on Family-Centered Approaches: The broad agreement on the importance of family support suggests that practical interventions should focus on strengthening family dynamics through education and support programs. Provinces that lag behind in family-based interventions, such as Nghe An, may benefit from increased funding and the establishment of family counseling services, which would address specific regional challenges like lack of support infrastructure.

Cross-Province Knowledge Sharing: Given the variation in support for different measures, provinces that have demonstrated success in certain strategies—such as vocational training or reconciliation—should be encouraged to share best practices with other regions. Policymakers can facilitate this by creating platforms for inter-regional collaboration, enabling provinces to learn from one another's experiences and successes.

In conclusion, preventing juvenile recidivism in Vietnam requires both a unified national approach and sensitivity to regional differences. By integrating the most effective practices from across the provinces and adapting them to local contexts, Vietnam can create a robust and multifaceted juvenile justice system that reduces recidivism and promotes long-term rehabilitation.

Acknowledgement

This article presents a part of the results of the research project on **“Research and development the models for applying community-based alternative measures for juvenile delinquents through the activities of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union.”**. Code: ĐTĐL.XH-06/22. (Nghiên cứu phát triển các mô hình áp dụng các biện pháp xử lý thay thế dựa vào cộng đồng đối với thanh thiếu niên vi phạm pháp luật thông qua hoạt động của Đoàn TNCS Hồ Chí Minh. ĐTĐL.XH-06/22).

References

- Do, H., & Nguyen, M. (2021). Vocational training programs for juvenile offenders: An evaluation of effectiveness. *Vietnam Journal of Criminology*, 12(3), 145-160.
- Kanchanachitra, C. (2020). Restorative justice in Thailand: Lessons for Southeast Asia. *Journal of Southeast Asian Legal Studies*, 9(1), 78-95.
- Le, P. (2020). Rehabilitation or detention: The role of community-based programs in reducing juvenile recidivism. *Vietnam Social Science Review*, 15(2), 120-135.
- Le, P., & Tran, H. (2019). Challenges of juvenile justice system in Vietnam: Perspectives of judicial officers. *Asian Criminology Journal*, 8(4), 98-114.
- Nguyen, H. (2020). Restorative justice and its impact on juvenile offenders in Vietnam. *International Journal of Restorative Practices*, 5(2), 85-102.
- Nguyen, M., & Hoang, L. (2020). Juvenile delinquency in Vietnam: A socio-economic analysis. *Vietnam Development Journal*, 9(4), 67-85.
- Nguyen, P. (2021). The legal representation gap in Vietnam's juvenile justice system. *Vietnamese Law Review*, 17(1), 45-60.
- Nguyen, Q., Tran, P., & Le, T. (2018). Community-based rehabilitation programs for juvenile offenders in Vietnam. *Journal of Crime Prevention*, 22(3), 112-128.
- Sok, S., & Phon, R. (2019). Juvenile justice reform in Cambodia: Lessons for Vietnam. *Asian Law Journal*, 14(1), 56-72.
- Tran, T. (2021). Judicial perspectives on juvenile recidivism and legal reforms in Vietnam. *Journal of Criminal Justice Studies*, 12(4), 204-220.
- Tran, V. (2022). Family-based interventions in reducing juvenile reoffending rates in Vietnam. *Vietnam Journal of Family Studies*, 19(2), 89-102.

Table 3. Mean Values of Surveyed Provinces of Community-Based Alternative Measures for Juvenile Delinquents in Vietnam

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
1. Sentencing the juvenile offender to a reformatory facility	2.30	1.80	1.93	2.35	2.32	1.90	2.55	2.00	2.25	1.89	2.12
2. The juvenile offender must compensate for the damage he has done	2.55	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.74	2.68	2.65	2.33	2.48	2.73	2.62
3. The juvenile offender talks to the victim about his crime and tries to find a solution (reconciliation) with the victim to resolve the problem	2.83	3.00	3.00	2.68	2.76	3.00	2.63	2.53	2.50	2.95	2.78
4. The juvenile offender participates in community work	2.58	2.80	2.80	2.70	2.72	2.78	2.95	2.53	2.85	2.82	2.74
5. The juvenile offender compensates for the damage caused by his crime	2.73	2.72	2.75	2.75	2.82	2.70	2.63	2.57	2.70	2.77	2.71
6. The juvenile offender receives attention and support from his family	2.83	2.88	2.90	2.75	2.88	2.88	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.91	2.85
7. Supporting the juvenile offender in vocational training and employment	2.93	2.92	2.90	2.85	2.88	2.90	2.93	2.87	2.90	2.91	2.90
8. Providing psychosocial support to the juvenile offender	2.88	2.88	2.90	2.75	2.92	2.88	2.88	2.90	2.88	2.91	2.88
9. The juvenile offender is always monitored and supported by social workers	2.73	2.74	2.80	2.78	2.80	2.75	2.93	2.83	2.85	2.77	2.80
10. The juvenile offender is always monitored and supervised by local police	2.90	2.92	2.95	2.78	2.84	2.93	2.80	2.80	2.90	2.95	2.87
11. Providing psychosocial support to the juvenile offender's family	2.75	2.88	2.85	2.65	2.80	2.85	2.88	2.87	2.88	2.86	2.83
12. Always receiving help and support from the Youth Union	2.75	2.86	2.90	2.88	2.84	2.88	2.90	2.73	2.85	2.91	2.84
13. Organizing models of management and education activities	2.73	2.80	2.85	2.90	2.88	2.80	2.90	2.77	2.93	2.86	2.84

education, support for juvenile offenders in the community											
14. Families of juvenile offenders receive support from local authorities, organizations and the community	2.73	2.92	2.95	2.58	2.90	2.95	2.95	2.77	2.90	2.91	2.85

NOTES: 1 = Ninh Binh; 2 = Hai Phong; 3= Thai Nguyen; 4=Nghe An; 5=Đa Nang; 6=Đac Lac; 7=Binh Đinh; 8=Ho Chi Minh City; 9=Binh Dương; 10=Can Tho.