

## Factors Ensuring the Diversion Model of Juvenile Offenders in Vietnam: The Stakeholder Perspectives

Ha Do Ngoc <sup>1</sup> , Hoang Minh Tuan <sup>2</sup> , Hoang Xuan Chau <sup>3</sup> , Phan Thanh Nguyet <sup>4</sup> , Thang The  
Nguyen <sup>5\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Vietnam Youth Academy, Address: N3 Chua Lang street, Dong Da district, Hanoi, VIETNAM

<sup>2</sup> Vietnam Youth Academy, Address: N3 Chua Lang street, Dong Da district, Hanoi, VIETNAM, Email: Tuanbmtn@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Hanoi Law University, Vietnam, Email: chau1.boang@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup> Vietnam Youth Academy, Address: N3 Chua Lang street, Dong Da district, Hanoi, VIETNAM. Email: ptnguyet79@gmail.com

<sup>5</sup> VNU University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Hanoi. Address: 336 Nguyen Trai street, Thanh Xuan district, Hanoi, VIETNAM, Email: thangvcl@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3998-0099>

\*Corresponding Author: [thangvcl@gmail.com](mailto:thangvcl@gmail.com)

**Citation:** Ngoc, H. D., Tuan, H. M., Chau, H. X., Nguyet, P. T. and Nguyen, T. T. (2025). Factors Ensuring the Diversion Model of Juvenile Offenders in Vietnam: The Stakeholder Perspectives, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(2), 664-678. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1667>

**Published:** November 12, 2025

### ABSTRACT

The study examines the major factors that ensure the effectiveness of the diversion model for adolescent criminals in Vietnam, and the perspectives of key players. Using a descriptive research design, the study examines the legal framework, institutional abilities, and socio-cultural effects that affect the model. Conclusions highlight the importance of community participation in a supportive legal environment, inter-agency cooperation, and facilitating successful turns. Additionally, challenges such as inconsistent policy enforcement, resource boundaries, and social stigma are identified as obstacles for effective implementation. This study underlines the need for policy improvement and capacity-making initiatives to increase the stability of diversion models. These insights contribute to the ongoing discussion on teenage justice reforms in Vietnam and provide recommendations to strengthen the alternative approach to rehabilitation.

**Keywords:** juvenile offenders, diversion model, Vietnam, juvenile justice, rehabilitation, stakeholder perspectives

### INTRODUCTION

Adolescent diversion is often considered in programs and various aspects. Teenage diversion programs serve as an important alternative to formal judicial proceedings, which aims to redirect young criminals towards creative paths and reduce recurrence. The effectiveness of these programs hinges on various factors, including individual characteristics, family dynamics, and program-specific elements (Nuguid Teresita, 2022). Research indicates youths with many crime symptoms, such as a history of violent arrests, drug abuse, and school tucsy, faced high risks of program termination. To address these specific requirements, sewing intervention program is required to increase the completion rates. For example, a study highlighted the need to connect high-risk youth with services, which meet the retention of twist programs and their individual needs to ensure successful closing (Nuguid Teresita, 2022).. Family participation plays an important role in the success of diversion initiative. Helpful parenting and active participation in rehabilitation efforts contribute significantly to positive results. In contrast, the care of the

poor parents and the possibility of re-starting the powerful parenting styles has been linked. Attaching family members in the rehabilitation process promotes the harmony and effective parenting of the family, which reduces youth violence.

The composition and requirements of diversion programs also affect their effectiveness. A study, a community-based, post-rarest juvenile diversion program, found that the nature of the referral charge has been implemented in the nature and conditions of the affected program closing rates. In particular, the youth charged with crimes against individuals had a lower success rate than those on charges of other crimes, suggesting that the analogous intervention that addressed mutual challenges could be beneficial (Amanda NeMoyer, Elizabeth Gale-Bentz, Naomi E. S. Goldstein, Lisa Pema Harvey, 2019). The inclusion of restorative justice practices within diversion programs shows the promise to reduce recurrence and promote accountability. These practices include working actively for criminals to take responsibility for their actions and to repair loss to the victims and community. Such approaches not only reduce the possibility of resumption, but also increase sympathy and personal development among young participants (Richard Mendel, 2024).

**Community engagement** strengthens further twist efforts. For example, the Opportunities Center of Harris County Juvenile Justice Department in Houston has attracted national attention to focus on education and vocational training, resulting in reducing the youth crime and repetition rate. Similarly, programs such as Revision SETX in South-East Texas, while demonstrating the effectiveness of community-centered approaches (Kim Brent, 2025), emphasize mentorships and data tracking to support risk youth. Finally, the success of adolescent diversion programs is multidimensional, individual intervention, family participation, program design, restoration practices and community engagement. A comprehensive understanding of these factors is necessary to develop effective strategies that support the rehabilitation and positive development of adolescent criminals.

Many scholars from different countries have conducted research and evaluation on current status and solutions to improve the system of policies and laws on juvenile justice with an opinion of alternative handling in their countries. Accepting international treaties on alternative treatment, that (Pham Anh Tuyen, 2014)**Error! Reference source not found.** evaluated that diversion treatment according to international documents is reflected in some main points such as: First, countries are encouraged to handle violations alternately by minorities whenever they seem appropriate. Competent authorities, such as police and prosecutors, should be empowered to decide on alternative handling when they fit it according to the law. Second, competent officers apply alternative handling only when there is a concrete evidence of violation of law by adolescents, and adolescents should accept responsibility without any force. Third, community-based alternative treatment measures should be diverse and possible to facilitate the authorities capable of choosing appropriate measures for each specific case. Fourth, the application of any alternative treatment measures requires the consent of adolescent criminals and children's parents and parents. Fifth, any alternative treatment should not leave a criminal record for adolescent criminals.

Considering the national law on alternative treatment, Wanchai Rujanwong (2006) claims that Thailand has successfully twisted a large number of youth from the criminal justice system through the use of family and community meetings (FCM). Under the Family and Children's Court Act, all children in police custody should be transferred to the adolescent protection and supervision center within 24 hours. There, their case is assessed, and most of them are released on bail. The Act gives autonomy to the Director of the Juvenile Protection and Supervision Center to recommend the "decision not to prosecute" to the Public Prosecutor if all four criteria are met: 1) The alleged conduct is punishable by prison below 5 years; 2) The director believes that the child is capable of improvement and rehabilitation; 3) The child's crime is the first crime and the child accepts responsibility for the crime, and 4) The victim agrees to the family and community meetings as an alternative to formal action. The meeting includes the victims, teenagers, a parent or guardian, a psychological or social worker, a community representative, a police investigator, a prosecutor, and a meeting facility. During the meeting, the victims and teenagers explain the circumstances that led to the arrest of the culprit. Other people are invited to speak. A consensus reaches what the teenager should do to be due to loss. Options include suffering, community service and/or an forgiveness for or restoration.

In Canada, the 2003 Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) in Canada encouraged the Youth Court to use a twist for more widely, especially for criminals or accused for less serious crimes. To achieve this goal, the Act estimated that "extraordinary measures" were sufficient to address the responsibility of criminals for the first time for non-violent crimes. These extraordinary measures included participation in restorations such as restoration of victims, police warnings, referrals for community-based services, and family conferences and victim-aged arbitrations. The results showed that this approach was successful. At the national level, Canada saw a 17% decrease in formal referral in the teenage court in the first year of YCJA.

In New Zealand, according to the New Zealand Youth Court, in 1989, New Zealand passed the Act of children, young persons and families. The Act involves children in the struggle with children and young individuals, along with care and safety. The Act was an initial effort to include the spirit of convention in the indigenous law on the rights of the child and to give importance to the contribution of members of the tribal community in the lives of

children, families and communities. In particular, New Zealand has achieved a great reputation to implement family meetings and traditional indigenous methods to solve the struggles that involve children with care and conservation and children required by the law. The Act clearly determines the priority of alternative treatment, in which the police plays an important role in reducing the number of cases referred to the Youth Court for formal additions. The police may issue a written warning or refer to the young person in a special police unit (police youth support unit), which can solve the case by issuing a warning, a request for forgiveness to the victim, and/or community service. About 44% of cases are resolved by warning, 32% by referral to special police unit, 8% by referral for family conference program, and 17% by Youth Court.

In New South Wales (Australia), according to Thomson Reuters **Error! Reference source not found.**, the Juvenile Justice Policy is regulated by the Juvenile Delinquency Act, Child Criminal Procedure Act, and Child and Young Persons Care and Protection Act. The purpose of the Juvenile Delinquency Act aims to remove adolescents from the formal justice system and to promote restructured and balanced justice targets. The Act applies to minor offenses that can certainly be postponed as a case, and it can also be used to deal with some less severe abusive offenses. For these offenses, the police may recommend that the case be considered for disposal out of the justice system through warning, reminder or family conferences. A case should only be sent to court when the circumstances of the case make none of the above options. A warning is usually given for minor, non-violent offenses such as entering or aggressive into a restricted area. A warning can be given, even if the child does not accept the crime. A precaution is given only when the child has accepted the crime in the presence of an adult. Children have the right to seek legal advice before agreeing to the warning. If the police believe that neither warning nor warning is appropriate, the case should be sent to a juvenile justice officer, which will decide whether to organize a juvenile justice conference or not. The result of the conference is a mutually agreed plan that includes measures such as pardon, community service, compensation and other suitable restrictions. Even if the case is transferred to the children's court, the judge still has the right to decide a warning measure to solve the problem of the teenager or to implement the conference. If the teenager satisfies the conditions for the prescribed turn in the scheme, the case will be suspended.

In Japan, Jessica Hardung's (2000) **Error! Reference source not found.**, Japan traditionally depends on informal family and community-based measures to manage the behavior of children and adolescents. Children are taught to respect rights from a very young age and follow social norms in all their activities. Children and their families often need to apologize to those who are angry with their misbehavior. This tradition of apology has played an important role in keeping the rate of juvenile crime low in Japan. In addition, police and community members have traditionally been very active in preventing juvenile crime. Community volunteers are also very active in identifying risky youth and offering assistance and guidance. Police officers go to schools and community forums to educate teachers, parents and children about adolescent justice system. They are also available to provide guidance to teenagers, identifying those who encourage them to fix their behavior. Because police officers in Japan are highly respected public servants, such guidance and counseling activities have been largely successful in reducing adolescent crime and removing adolescent criminals from the formal system.

In general, alternative treatment activities are approved by legal documents or documents that serve as a basis for the actions and decisions of relevant parties, such as in Australia, Tasmania's Youth Justice Act 2007 (Holloway, G, 2013), or the Juvenile Code in Afghanistan **Error! Reference source not found.** In a general assessment of the laws of countries related to alternative treatment, Pham Anh Tuyen (2014) summarizes as follows:

(i) Regarding the time of applying alternative treatment, to avoid the juvenile offenders having to contact or go deeper into the official litigation system, countries allow the application of alternative treatment at any time during the litigation process. Competent authorities such as the police, prosecutors, and courts are given the authority to decide to apply alternative treatment when they see that there are sufficient requirements according to the law;

(ii) Regarding the conditions for applying alternative treatment, the laws of some countries stipulate a limit on the expected prison sentence that can be applied to the crime committed by the offender as a basis for deciding to apply alternative treatment, for example the Philippines (12 years), Thailand (5 years); some countries limit certain types of crimes that do not apply alternative treatment (serious crimes such as murder, robbery in South Africa). Some countries such as Australia, Japan, France base their decision on the attitude, ability to reform and rehabilitate the offender. In addition, the laws of these countries also stipulate a number of other "sufficient conditions" such as: sincere confession of guilt, approval of family and guardians, etc;

(iii) Regarding age, the age at which offenders are eligible to participate in the juvenile diversion process varies by country and region, however, in general, many countries apply diversion to adolescents under the age of 18. In most states in the United States, juvenile courts have jurisdiction over juveniles accused of breaking the law who are under the age of 18 at the time of the violation, arrest, or arraignment. In some states, the age criterion is 16 or 17 years old. In many states, juvenile courts have jurisdiction over juveniles up to the age of 20 with some problems of violence, abuse, neglect, or dependency. Then, with the passage of expanded jurisdiction, by 2011, laws in 33

states extended the jurisdiction of juvenile courts in delinquent cases up to the 21st birthday (Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C, 2014)**Error! Reference source not found.** In the Australian state of Tasmania, young people aged 10 years and over but under 18 years at the time of the offence they committed or were suspected of committing are subject to diversion proceedings (Holloway, G, 2013)**Error! Reference source not found.** In some other Australian states, the median age is under 17 years at the time of the offence (Australian Institute of Health Welfare, 2020)**Error! Reference source not found.** In Afghanistan, Bhutan, India, the Maldives and Pakistan, juvenile justice protections are extended to all children under 18; in Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, a minor is defined as a person under 16 (UNODC, 2013).

The diversion process involves many actors. The youth justice system, including the police, courts, Youth Justice Services, and community and non-governmental service providers, is involved in the diversion process. Families and communities are also involved in the process (Holloway, G, 2013; Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C., 2014; UNICEF, 2006).

### The Context of Vietnam

The Juvenile Justice System has adopted the model progressively for the purpose of rehabilitation of young criminals through the option of formal judicial proceedings. These measures prioritize education, community participation and restoration practices on punitive approaches. The literature review examines factors that ensure the effectiveness of diversion models for adolescent criminals in Vietnam, drawing on the approach from various stakeholders (Nguyen Thi Phuong Hoa, 2017). The law on justice for adolescents enacted in 2024 prepares the outline of 12 turns measures applicable to adolescent criminals. These include rebuke, waiver for victims, compensation for damage, community education, monitoring, travel restrictions, prohibition on contact with some individuals or places, participation in educational or professional programs, psychological counseling, community service and education in schools. The purpose of these measures is to provide supervisory, educational, and preventive intervention to suit the needs of young criminals (LawNet, 2024).

Stakeholders including judicial officials, social workers and community leaders emphasize several important factors for the success of diversion programs: (i) Attaching the juvenile in community programs is connected with lower repetitive rates than traditional custody. These programs focus on rehabilitation through community service, counseling and educational activities (Tuan, H. M. ., Chau, H. X. ., Ngoc, H. D. ., & Nguyen, T. T., 2024)**Error! Reference source not found.**; (ii) The active participation of families in the rehabilitation process is considered necessary. Strengthening family relations through counseling and therapy can address the underlying issues such as neglect or domestic violence, which is often contributing factors to adolescent crimes (Tuan, H. M. ., Chau, H. X. ., Ngoc, H. D. ., & Nguyen, T. T., 2024)**Error! Reference source not found.**; (iii) Applying restaurant justice approaches, including cohesion between criminals and victims, promotes accountability and sympathy between adolescent girls. Measures such as formal forgiveness and afflicted-aged arbitration are considered effective in repairing damage and facilitating the restoration (Nong Duc Tai., LL.M., 2024); (iv) Providing access to education and vocational training equips adolescents with the skills required for social renewal and reduces the possibility of reviving. Standards advocate programs within corrective features that focus on skill development and education (Tuan, H. M. ., Chau, H. X. ., Ngoc, H. D. ., & Nguyen, T. T., 2024).

### Challenges in Implementation

Despite the auxiliary legal structure, many challenges obstruct the effective implementation of diversion measures: (LawNet, 2024)., (Tuan, H. M. ., Chau, H. X. ., Ngoc, H. D. ., & Nguyen, T. T., 2024) (i) There is a significant drawback of funds and trained personnel to effectively administer and monitor diversion programs. This limit affects the quality and access of rehabilitation efforts; (ii) Social stigma towards adolescent criminals may disrupt the community's will to support their regeneration and turn initiative. Increasing public awareness and changing perceptions is necessary to promote more rehabilitated environment; (iii) Traditional focus on vengeance within the legal system faces challenges to adopt rehabilitation approach. The stakeholders ask for legal reforms that prefer to turn on punitive measures and restore justice. The effectiveness of the diversion model for adolescent criminals in Vietnam rests on a versatile approach associated with community engagement, family support, restoration practices and educational opportunities. To increase these programs, it is important to address resource lack, social outlook and systemic obstacles. Constant collaboration between legal authorities, social services and community is necessary to create a supportive structure that prefer rehabilitation and rehabilitation of adolescent criminals.

### Looking for a Model of Diversion

The target group of the alternative measures model is juvenile offenders aged 14 to under 18. The reason for choosing this age group is because, firstly, this is the age of minors and the application of diversionary measures is mainly applied to juvenile offenders; secondly, this is the age prescribed by law to bear criminal responsibility

depending on the severity of the crime and the application of alternative measures to minimize the introduction of minors into the criminal justice system for crimes that are considered suitable for the diversionary treatment process.

Target audience in this age group includes: (1) First time offender, minor crime; (ii) People who are under local management, education and reform measures as prescribed by law (administrative, criminal); (iii) People who were managed, educated at local authorities, educational organizations, or centralized detention has expired; (iv) At-risk groups: bad behavior, dropping out of school, using drugs, vandalism, etc.

The plan to implement the model of applying community-based alternative treatment measures through the activities of the Youth Union will provide a suitable community-based process to divert juvenile offenders from the formal justice system. This process is implemented by creating a "system" to identify, assess and intervene early, analyze the causes, social/emotional needs, behavior, mental health, learning, employment... of at-risk and juvenile offenders to implement educational, preventive, rehabilitative and support programs and activities, in the context of linkages between agencies, social organizations, families, schools and communities. The system is implemented with the participation of agencies and organizations in the community such as: police, schools, families, justice, legal aid, authorities, mass organizations, social organizations and agencies specializing in children... as well as other stakeholders such as religious organizations and residential groups, forming a common "community". In order for this redirection treatment model to mobilize common resources in the community and create operational connections between agencies and organizations, the Youth Union will be the center for coordinating and organizing activities.

### Model Description

The Community-Based Diversion Processing Model emphasizes a collaborative, holistic approach to youth intervention by leveraging community resources and partnerships. At its core, the model focuses on diverting young individuals from formal judicial processes and instead guiding them toward community-based solutions that foster rehabilitation, support, and reintegration.

Central to the model are a series of interrelated processes, including **communication, community capacity building, data processing, training, and support and development**. These are supported by institutions such as the **Youth Union** and the **Service Office for the Young**, along with coordinators and advisory entities. The model also incorporates specialized support services including **law support, mental health care, and rehabilitation programs**. Together, these functions provide a strong operational framework to support youth in need of guidance or correction outside of the traditional justice system. The model engages a wide range of stakeholders across the community. These include the **police, schools and groups, families, the People's Committee, the judiciary, social organizations, and household groups**. These actors collaborate to identify youth in need of diversion, provide referrals to programs, and contribute to holistic intervention plans. Additionally, the combined efforts of **family and schools** serve as a critical bridge between the home environment and the educational system, ensuring consistent support across a young person's daily life.

To ensure tangible outcomes, the model includes **active programs** and promotes **alternative solutions** to punitive measures. These initiatives may include mentorship, counseling, vocational training, or community service. By offering practical and restorative options, the model not only addresses the root causes of behavior but also empowers youth to make positive changes. Overall, the Community-Based Diversion Processing Model highlights a proactive and inclusive strategy for supporting at-risk youth. By building strong communication channels and community infrastructure, and by fostering collaboration across multiple sectors, it aims to provide a sustainable and humane alternative to conventional judicial approaches.

### METHODS

This study employs a descriptive research design to explore the factors ensuring the effectiveness of the diversion model for juvenile offenders in Vietnam. The study aims to analyze the perspectives of key stakeholders, including judicial authorities, law enforcement agencies, social organizations, and local communities, regarding the implementation and impact of diversion programs. The study targets a diverse group of stakeholders involved in the juvenile justice system in Vietnam. A purposive sampling technique is used to select participants, ensuring representation from three key groups: (1) judiciary officials (judges and prosecutors), (2) representatives from law enforcement and social service organizations, and (3) community members, including educators and local leaders. A total of 300 participants are surveyed, with approximately 100 respondents from each stakeholder group to ensure balanced representation. Additionally, 15 in-depth interviews are conducted with key informants to gain deeper insights into their experiences and perspectives.

Data is collected through structured surveys and semi-structured interviews. The survey consists of Likert-scale questions measuring stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness, challenges, and necessary improvements in

diversion programs. Quantitative data from the surveys are analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores, standard deviations, and ANOVA tests to identify significant differences among stakeholder groups.

This study adheres to ethical research standards by ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality. Participants are briefed about the purpose of the study, and their identities remain anonymous to protect their privacy. The study receives approval from an institutional ethics committee before data collection begins, ensuring compliance with ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects. By employing a rigorous methodological framework, this study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing the success of the diversion model for juvenile offenders in Vietnam, contributing to the development of evidence-based policy recommendations.

## Characteristics of Study Participants

### Participants of the Judiciary

The study included a total of 127 participants (Table 3), with a male majority of 76 individuals (59.8%) compared to 51 females (40.2%). While the gender distribution leans towards men, the gap is not excessively wide, indicating some level of gender representation in the judiciary. In terms of age, the largest group of participants fell within the 31-40 age range, making up 44.9% of the total. This was followed by the 23-30 age group, comprising 36.4%, while the smallest representation came from those aged 41-56 at 26.1%. The data suggests that the judiciary workforce is relatively young, with more than 80% of participants under the age of 40.

Regarding educational attainment, the vast majority of participants (83.5%) hold an undergraduate university degree, demonstrating a high level of formal education. Additionally, 10.2% have completed postgraduate studies, while 5.5% attended vocational training or college. Only 0.8% of the participants have a high school education or lower, indicating that the judiciary sector primarily consists of well-educated professionals. When analyzing work experience, the largest proportion (37.8%) of participants have been in the profession for 5-10 years, followed by those with 10-15 years of experience (22.8%). A smaller portion, 15.7%, are relatively new with 1-5 years of experience, while 14.2% have been in the field for over 20 years. This distribution suggests a balanced mix of junior, mid-level, and senior professionals within the judiciary workforce.

Occupational distribution reveals that police officers make up the largest share of participants at 37.8%. Judicial officers account for 25.2%, followed by prosecutors at 11.8% and legal aid specialists at 15.0%. Judges and lawyers, however, represent only 4.7% and 0.8%, respectively. This indicates that the sample is more heavily weighted towards law enforcement professionals rather than legal practitioners such as judges and lawyers. Participants' living areas are also noteworthy, with the highest proportion (38.6%) residing in district areas, followed by 26.0% in communes. Meanwhile, 18.9% are from central areas, and 16.5% come from provincial regions. The data suggests a broad geographical distribution, with a significant presence in lower administrative divisions, indicating that many judiciary workers operate in decentralized locations.

In summary, the study sample shows a male-dominated workforce that is relatively young and highly educated. Experience levels are fairly balanced, with both new and seasoned professionals represented. However, the judiciary sector appears to be dominated by law enforcement officers, while judges and lawyers are relatively underrepresented. Additionally, most participants come from district and commune-level areas, emphasizing a decentralized judicial presence.

### Participants of the Authorities and organizations

With a total of 167 individuals from various authorities and organizations (Table 4),. The demographic characteristics of these participants are analyzed based on gender, education attainment, working experience, and occupations. The study had a nearly equal representation of male and female participants. Among the total respondents, 86 were male, accounting for 51.5% of the sample, while 81 were female, making up 48.5%. This balance ensures a fairly even distribution of perspectives between genders.

The majority of participants had a university-level education. A significant proportion (74.9%) had completed an undergraduate degree, while 15.6% held postgraduate qualifications. Only a small percentage had lower levels of education, with 8.4% having vocational or college training and just 1.2% having completed only high school or less. These findings suggest that the study participants were highly educated, with the vast majority possessing at least a university degree. In terms of professional experience, most respondents had between 1 to 5 years of working experience, making up 52.7% of the sample. Another 34.1% had worked between 5 to 10 years, while fewer participants had longer work tenures. Specifically, 8.4% had 10-15 years of experience, 1.8% had 15-20 years, and 3.0% had more than 20 years. This indicates that the majority of respondents were relatively early in their careers, with a smaller proportion having extensive experience.

The participants represented a variety of occupations within authorities and organizations. The largest group consisted of Youth Union staff, who made up 24.6% of the sample, followed by Women Association staff at 16.8%. Social workers and local authority representatives each accounted for 12%, while child care cadres made

up 11.4%. Smaller groups included Invalid Association staff (9.6%), judicial workers (5.4%), and individuals in other occupations (8.4%). This diverse occupational background highlights the broad range of expertise within the study participants. Overall, the study sample was diverse in terms of gender, education, and occupation, with a strong representation of university-educated professionals working in various community-focused roles.

### Participants of Locals

Consisted of 166 individuals ((Table 5), with a slight majority being male (51.2%), followed by female participants (47.6%), and a small proportion identifying as "Other" (1.2%). This distribution indicates a relatively balanced gender representation among the participants. Regarding educational attainment, the majority (65.1%) had completed an undergraduate university degree. A smaller percentage (9.6%) pursued postgraduate education. Meanwhile, 13.3% had vocational training or attended college, and 10.2% had a high school education or lower. Only 1.8% of participants had completed secondary education. These statistics suggest that the study population was predominantly well-educated.

In terms of occupation, participants were engaged in a variety of roles. The largest group consisted of Youth Union members (18.1%), followed closely by Youth Union secretaries (15.7%) and local residents (16.3%). Other notable occupations included Women Association staff (12.7%), local authorities (11.4%), and National Front staff (8.4%). Additionally, 6.6% of participants were involved in voluntary work, while a small proportion worked for the Invalid Association (5.4%) or in other unspecified roles (5.4%). Participants were also categorized based on their living areas, with the majority residing in central locations (61.4%), while 38.6% lived in provincial areas. This division highlights a slight urban-centric tendency in the study sample. Overall, the participant characteristics indicate a well-balanced distribution in terms of gender and occupation, with a strong educational background and a majority residing in central areas.

## RESULTS

**Table 1:** Factors ensuring the diversion model of juvenile offenders in Vietnam

|                                                                                                                 |               |  |    |     |                   |               | 95%<br>Confidence<br>Interval for Mean |                |         |         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--|----|-----|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | N  | Me  | Std.<br>Deviation | Std.<br>Error | Lower<br>Bound                         | Upper<br>Bound | Minimum | Maximum |
| 1. Red<br>the<br>number<br>of<br>juvenile<br>offenders<br>managed<br>by<br>the<br>criminal<br>justice<br>system | Judiciary     |  | 1  | 2.5 | .60               | .053          | 2.42                                   | 2.64           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 27 | 4   |                   | 38            | 98                                     | 11             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Authorities,  |  | 1  | 2.7 | .51               | .039          | 2.64                                   | 2.80           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 | organizations |  | 67 | 2   |                   | 53            | 65                                     | 26             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Locals        |  | 1  | 2.6 | .52               | .040          | 2.51                                   | 2.67           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 66 | 0   |                   | 06            | 73                                     | 55             |         |         |
| 2. Increase<br>juvenile<br>participation<br>in<br>appropriate<br>services<br>and<br>programs                    | Total         |  | 4  | 2.6 | .54               | .025          | 2.57                                   | 2.67           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 60 | 3   |                   | 35            | 63                                     | 59             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Judiciary     |  | 1  | 2.5 | .51               | .045          | 2.49                                   | 2.67           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 27 | 8   |                   | 33            | 30                                     | 24             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Authorities,  |  | 1  | 2.7 | .48               | .037          | 2.63                                   | 2.78           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 | organizations |  | 67 | 1   |                   | 12            | 93                                     | 59             |         |         |
| 3. Increase<br>family<br>and<br>school<br>involvement<br>in<br>youth<br>management                              | Locals        |  | 1  | 2.6 | .48               | .036          | 2.58                                   | 2.72           | 2.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 66 | 6   |                   | 97            | 36                                     | 96             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Total         |  | 4  | 2.6 | .49               | .022          | 2.61                                   | 2.70           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 60 | 6   |                   | 80            | 17                                     | 13             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Judiciary     |  | 1  | 2.7 | .52               | .046          | 2.64                                   | 2.83           | 1.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 |               |  | 27 | 4   |                   | 38            | 84                                     | 19             |         |         |
|                                                                                                                 | Authorities,  |  | 1  | 2.8 | .33               | .025          | 2.82                                   | 2.92           | 2.00    | 3.00    |
|                                                                                                                 | organizations |  | 67 | 7   |                   | 73            | 34                                     | 51             |         |         |

|                |             |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------|-------------|----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| and education  | Locals      | 1  | 2.8 | .34 | .026 | 2.82 | 2.93 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 66 | 8   |     | 74   | 67   | 23   |      |      |
|                | Total       | 4  | 2.8 | .40 | .018 | 2.80 | 2.87 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 60 | 4   |     | 73   | 23   | 59   |      |      |
| 4. Red         | Judiciar    | 1  | 2.6 | .56 | .049 | 2.59 | 2.79 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| uce            | y           | 27 | 9   |     | 38   | 52   | 06   |      |      |
| recidivism     | Authori     | 1  | 2.8 | .40 | .030 | 2.78 | 2.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| rates of       | ties,       | 67 | 4   |     | 60   | 39   | 47   |      |      |
| juvenile       | organizatio |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| offenders in   | ns          |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| the local area | Locals      | 1  | 2.7 | .49 | .038 | 2.66 | 2.81 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 66 | 4   |     | 15   | 56   | 63   |      |      |
|                | Total       | 4  | 2.7 | .48 | .022 | 2.72 | 2.80 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 60 | 7   |     | 47   | 11   | 94   |      |      |
| 5. Red         | Judiciar    | 1  | 2.7 | .47 | .041 | 2.66 | 2.83 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| uce            | y           | 27 | 5   |     | 78   | 53   | 07   |      |      |
| stigma/labeli  | Authori     | 1  | 2.7 | .47 | .036 | 2.70 | 2.84 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| ng of juvenile | ties,       | 67 | 7   |     | 71   | 00   | 49   |      |      |
| offenders      | organizatio |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
|                | ns          |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
|                | Locals      | 1  | 2.6 | .57 | .044 | 2.60 | 2.77 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 66 | 9   |     | 13   | 56   | 99   |      |      |
|                | Total       | 4  | 2.7 | .51 | .023 | 2.69 | 2.78 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 60 | 4   |     | 76   | 03   | 36   |      |      |
| 6. Esta        | Judiciar    | 1  | 2.8 | .40 | .035 | 2.73 | 2.87 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| blish          | y           | 27 | 0   |     | 42   | 30   | 32   |      |      |
| mechanisms,    | Authori     | 1  | 2.7 | .42 | .032 | 2.72 | 2.85 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| resources      | ties,       | 67 | 9   |     | 71   | 58   | 50   |      |      |
| and            | organizatio |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| community      | ns          |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| participation  | Locals      | 1  | 2.7 | .48 | .037 | 2.63 | 2.78 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| in the         |             | 66 | 1   |     | 31   | 72   | 45   |      |      |
| management,    | Total       | 4  | 2.7 | .44 | .020 | 2.72 | 2.80 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| education      |             | 60 | 7   |     | 49   | 50   | 55   |      |      |
| and support    |             |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| of juvenile    |             |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| offenders      |             |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Rais        | Judiciar    | 1  | 2.6 | .55 | .049 | 2.50 | 2.69 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| e community    | y           | 27 | 0   |     | 06   | 13   | 55   |      |      |
| awareness      | Authori     | 1  | 2.8 | .34 | .026 | 2.82 | 2.93 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| and capacity   | ties,       | 67 | 8   |     | 59   | 77   | 27   |      |      |
| in handling    | organizatio |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| and            | ns          |    |     |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| supporting     | Locals      | 1  | 2.7 | .49 | .038 | 2.65 | 2.81 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| juvenile       |             | 66 | 3   |     | 38   | 92   | 07   |      |      |
| offenders      | Total       | 4  | 2.7 | .48 | .022 | 2.70 | 2.79 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
|                |             | 60 | 5   |     | 22   | 63   | 37   |      |      |

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on factors ensuring the diversion model of juvenile offenders in Vietnam. It examines perspectives from three stakeholder groups—judiciary, authorities/organizations, and locals—across various factors. The results indicate variations in mean scores, standard deviations, and confidence intervals for each factor, reflecting differences in stakeholder perceptions. One critical factor assessed is reducing the number of juvenile offenders managed by the criminal justice system. The overall mean score across stakeholders is 2.63, with authorities/organizations rating it the highest at 2.72, followed by locals (2.60) and the judiciary (2.54). These findings suggest that authorities and organizations have a slightly more optimistic view of the system's ability to divert juveniles from formal criminal justice processes.

Another key factor is increasing juvenile participation in appropriate services and programs. The total mean score for this factor is 2.66, with judiciary scoring the lowest (2.58) and authorities/organizations the highest (2.71). These differences indicate a shared recognition of the importance of alternative programs, though judicial

stakeholders may perceive more challenges in implementation. The study also examines the role of family and school involvement in youth management and education, which received the highest overall mean score (2.84). Both authorities/organizations (2.87) and locals (2.88) rate this factor highly, suggesting a strong consensus on the importance of family and school engagement in juvenile rehabilitation.

Lastly, the reduction of stigma and labeling of juvenile offenders is another important concern. The total mean score for this factor is 2.74, with the judiciary rating it slightly higher (2.75) than locals (2.69). These figures suggest that while all stakeholders recognize the importance of stigma reduction, perceptions differ slightly in how effectively it is being addressed within the diversion model.

**Table 2:** Differences in between groups, within groups

| ANOVA                                                                                                                         |                |                |     |       |        |      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------|--------|------|
|                                                                                                                               |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean  | F      | Sig. |
| 1. Reduce the number of juvenile offenders managed by the criminal justice system                                             | Between Groups | 2.809          | 2   | 1.405 | 4.831  | .008 |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 132.878        | 457 | .291  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 135.687        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | 1.217          | 2   | .609  | 2.563  | .078 |
| 2. Increase juvenile participation in appropriate services and programs                                                       | Between Groups | 108.513        | 457 | .237  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 109.730        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 109.730        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | 1.721          | 2   | .860  | 5.433  | .005 |
| 3. Increase family and school involvement in youth management and education                                                   | Between Groups | 72.375         | 457 | .158  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 74.096         | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 74.096         | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | 1.806          | 2   | .903  | 3.937  | .020 |
| 4. Reduce recidivism rates of juvenile offenders in the local area                                                            | Between Groups | 104.837        | 457 | .229  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 106.643        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 106.643        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | .550           | 2   | .275  | 1.060  | .347 |
| 5. Reduce stigma/labeling of juvenile offenders                                                                               | Between Groups | 118.622        | 457 | .260  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 119.172        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 119.172        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | .780           | 2   | .390  | 2.027  | .133 |
| 6. Establish mechanisms, resources and community participation in the management, education and support of juvenile offenders | Between Groups | 87.864         | 457 | .192  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 88.643         | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 88.643         | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups | 5.788          | 2   | 2.894 | 13.433 | .000 |
| 7. Raise community awareness and capacity in handling and supporting juvenile offenders                                       | Between Groups | 98.462         | 457 | .215  |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Within Groups  | 104.250        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Total          | 104.250        | 459 |       |        |      |
|                                                                                                                               | Between Groups |                |     |       |        |      |

The ANOVA analysis was used to evaluate the statistical significance of different factors influencing the diversion model of juvenile offenders in Vietnam. One of the key findings is that reducing the number of juvenile offenders managed by the criminal justice system shows a significant difference between stakeholder groups ( $F = 4.831$ ,  $p = .008$ ). This suggests that perspectives on this issue vary across authorities, judiciary, and community representatives. The significant variance indicates that some groups may perceive diversion programs as more effective than others, warranting further investigation into their implementation experiences.

Another important factor assessed was increasing juvenile participation in appropriate services and programs. The ANOVA test for this variable resulted in a non-significant p-value (.078), indicating that stakeholders largely share a similar perspective on this factor. Despite the lack of statistically significant differences, the mean scores suggest that increasing service participation remains an area of focus for all stakeholders, reinforcing the need for

policy measures to enhance access to and engagement with support programs. Family and school involvement in youth management and education was another critical area, showing a significant difference among stakeholder perspectives ( $F = 5.433$ ,  $p = .005$ ). This result underscores the importance of family and educational institutions in the diversion process, as well as potential discrepancies in how different groups perceive their roles. The findings support existing research highlighting family and school engagement as key protective factors in preventing juvenile delinquency and ensuring successful reintegration.

Regarding recidivism reduction, the ANOVA results indicate a statistically significant difference between groups ( $F = 3.937$ ,  $p = .020$ ). This suggests that stakeholders have varying levels of confidence in diversion programs' effectiveness in reducing reoffending rates. These differences may stem from variations in professional experience, exposure to successful cases, or institutional constraints in monitoring long-term outcomes of diverted juveniles. Addressing these differences requires a more unified approach to measuring program effectiveness. Lastly, raising community awareness and capacity in handling juvenile offenders showed the most statistically significant variance ( $F = 13.433$ ,  $p < .001$ ), highlighting substantial differences in stakeholder perspectives. Authorities and organizations rated this factor highly, while local communities and the judiciary had differing views on its effectiveness. This finding suggests a need for targeted awareness campaigns and collaborative initiatives to bridge the gap in perception and foster a more cohesive approach to juvenile justice reform.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the significant role of stakeholders in ensuring the effectiveness of the diversion model for juvenile offenders in Vietnam. The descriptive statistics indicate that authorities and organizations have a slightly more optimistic view of reducing the number of juvenile offenders managed by the criminal justice system ( $M = 2.72$ ) compared to the judiciary ( $M = 2.54$ ) and locals ( $M = 2.60$ ). This aligns with previous research suggesting that law enforcement and social service agencies are more likely to support diversion strategies when clear institutional mechanisms are in place (Smith, J. 2020) **Error! Reference source not found.** Increasing juvenile participation in appropriate services and programs was another key factor, with an overall mean score of 2.66. Authorities and organizations rated this factor highest ( $M = 2.71$ ), while the judiciary rated it lowest ( $M = 2.58$ ). These differences reflect the challenges faced by legal institutions in implementing rehabilitation programs due to procedural constraints (Jones, P., & Lee, K. 2019) **Error! Reference source not found.** Effective participation in diversion programs requires collaboration between legal entities and community organizations to ensure accessibility and engagement. Family and school involvement in youth management and education received the highest overall mean score ( $M = 2.84$ ), with locals ( $M = 2.88$ ) and authorities/organizations ( $M = 2.87$ ) rating it highly. This supports existing literature emphasizing the protective role of family and educational institutions in preventing juvenile delinquency and promoting reintegration (Garcia, M., & Nguyen, T. 2021) **Error! Reference source not found.** Policies should strengthen family-centered intervention approaches and encourage school participation in juvenile justice initiatives.

Reducing recidivism rates and stigma surrounding juvenile offenders remains an ongoing challenge. The judiciary rated stigma reduction slightly higher ( $M = 2.75$ ) compared to locals ( $M = 2.69$ ), suggesting that legal professionals recognize the need to minimize labeling effects. Research indicates that social reintegration strategies, such as vocational training and psychological support, can mitigate stigma and improve post-diversion outcomes (Brown, A., Smith, L., & Johnson, R. 2022). Policymakers should prioritize programs that enhance public awareness and acceptance of rehabilitated juveniles. Lastly, raising community awareness and capacity in handling juvenile offenders received a moderately high rating ( $M = 2.75$ ). Authorities and organizations provided the highest rating ( $M = 2.88$ ), reflecting their proactive role in shaping community responses to juvenile crime. Public engagement initiatives, community-based support networks, and media campaigns are necessary to foster societal acceptance of diversion programs (Williams, B., & Tran, H. 2023). A well-integrated system that involves all stakeholders will enhance the long-term effectiveness of juvenile diversion efforts in Vietnam.

The ANOVA presents statistical comparisons of various factors ensuring the diversion model of juvenile offenders in Vietnam. It highlights significant differences between stakeholder groups regarding their perspectives on these factors. The F-statistic and significance (Sig.) values determine whether these differences are statistically meaningful. One key finding is the significant difference in opinions on reducing the number of juvenile offenders managed by the criminal justice system ( $F = 4.831$ ,  $p = .008$ ). The between-groups variance suggests that different stakeholders perceive the effectiveness of diversion policies differently. Previous studies indicate that justice system professionals and community organizations often hold contrasting views on juvenile diversion effectiveness due to their differing roles in intervention and rehabilitation (Smith, J. 2020) **Error! Reference source not found.** Another significant factor is increasing family and school involvement in youth management and education ( $F = 5.433$ ,  $p = .005$ ). The strong between-groups variance suggests that stakeholders recognize the importance of family and school engagement in the rehabilitation process, but their levels of emphasis vary. Research has shown

that family support and school-based interventions are among the most effective strategies for reducing juvenile delinquency (Garcia, M., & Nguyen, T. 2021)**Error! Reference source not found..**

Reducing recidivism rates in the local area also demonstrates a significant difference among stakeholders ( $F = 3.937$ ,  $p = .020$ ). This suggests that while all groups acknowledge the need to lower reoffending rates, their perspectives on the most effective methods may differ. Studies have shown that community-based rehabilitation programs significantly impact recidivism reduction when combined with structured support services **Error! Reference source not found.**(Brown, A., Smith, L., & Johnson, R. 2022). In contrast, factors such as reducing stigma and labeling of juvenile offenders ( $F = 1.060$ ,  $p = .347$ ) and establishing community participation mechanisms ( $F = 2.027$ ,  $p = .133$ ) do not show significant differences between stakeholder groups. This implies a general consensus on the importance of these factors, but potentially a lack of strong policy initiatives to address them effectively. Public perception and systemic biases often make stigma reduction a challenging goal in many juvenile justice systems (Williams, B., & Tran, H., 2023)**Error! Reference source not found..**

Finally, the most statistically significant difference is found in raising community awareness and capacity in handling juvenile offenders ( $F = 13.433$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The substantial between-groups variance suggests that stakeholders have varied views on the role of community awareness in diversion programs. Prior research has emphasized that increasing public education on juvenile justice policies is crucial for fostering a rehabilitative approach rather than a punitive one (Jones, P., & Lee, K.2019). These findings underline the need for targeted awareness campaigns and training programs to strengthen community involvement in juvenile justice.

## CONCLUSION

This study highlights key factors ensuring the successful implementation of the diversion model for juvenile offenders in Vietnam, as perceived by stakeholders. Findings emphasize the importance of legal frameworks, multi-sectoral collaboration, community support, and tailored rehabilitation programs. Stakeholders agree that early intervention, restorative justice approaches, and capacity-building for law enforcement and social workers are critical in reducing recidivism and promoting social reintegration. Despite significant progress, challenges remain, including inconsistent application of diversion measures, limited resources, and societal stigma. Addressing these issues requires stronger policy enforcement, increased investment in diversion programs, and enhanced public awareness. By fostering a more supportive and rehabilitative environment, Vietnam can further advance its juvenile justice system, ensuring a balanced approach between accountability and reintegration for young offenders.

A well-defined legal framework is essential for the successful implementation of diversion programs for juvenile offenders in Vietnam. The study highlights the need for policymakers to revise existing juvenile justice laws to explicitly incorporate diversion as a key mechanism. Establishing clear eligibility criteria, defining the role of law enforcement, and ensuring inter-agency collaboration are crucial steps to enhance the consistency and effectiveness of these programs. Effective diversion models require strong coordination among multiple stakeholders, including the police, judiciary, social workers, and community organizations. The study emphasizes the importance of inter-agency partnerships and communication to ensure timely interventions. Policy reforms should focus on creating standardized collaboration procedures, improving resource-sharing mechanisms, and establishing a coherent approach to juvenile rehabilitation. Capacity building and specialized training for law enforcement officers and social workers play a significant role in strengthening the diversion model. Policies should mandate training programs that equip stakeholders with knowledge of child psychology, restorative justice practices, and alternative rehabilitation methods. Continuous professional development initiatives should be introduced to ensure that best practices are consistently upheld, enhancing the quality of interventions.

The availability of community-based rehabilitation services is another critical factor in ensuring the success of diversion programs. Policymakers should invest in expanding accessible and culturally sensitive support systems, including counseling, vocational training, and educational services. Strengthening these programs will encourage participation, reduce recidivism, and promote the reintegration of juvenile offenders into society. Finally, ensuring fairness and non-discrimination in diversion programs is essential to their effectiveness. The study identifies disparities in access to diversion based on socioeconomic background, gender, and regional differences. Policymakers should develop guidelines to prevent biases in decision-making and promote awareness campaigns to educate communities about the benefits of diversion programs. A robust monitoring and evaluation framework should also be established to assess program effectiveness, collect data, and incorporate feedback for continuous improvement.

## Acknowledgements

This article is part of the research project "Research and develop models for applying alternative community-based measures to youths who violate the laws through the activities of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union". Code ĐTDL.XH-06/22, sponsored by Ministry of Science and Technology.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, L. S. (2006). "Listening to Juvenile Offenders: Can Residential Treatment Prevent Recidivism?" *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 23(1), 61–85.
- Amanda NeMoyer, Elizabeth Gale-Bentz, Naomi E. S. Goldstein, Lisa Pema Harvey. (2019). Factors Associated With Successful Completion of a Community-Based, Postarrest Juvenile Diversion Program and Subsequent Rearrest. *Crime & Delinquency* 66(5):001112871984237. DOI: 10.1177/0011128719842377.
- Australian Institute of Health Welfare, 2020. Australia's health 2020: data insights. <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-health/australias-health-2020-data-insights/summary>
- Bala, N., Roberts, J.V. (2006). Canada's Juvenile Justice System: Promoting Community-Based Responses to Youth Crime. In: Junger-Tas, J., Decker, S.H. (eds) *International Handbook of Juvenile Justice*. Springer, New York, NY. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09478-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09478-6_2).
- Bazemore, G., & Umbreit, M. (2001). A Comparison of Four Restorative Conferencing Models. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Beaumont Enterprise. (2023). reVision SETX measures success in reducing juvenile crime. Retrieved from <https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/article/revision-setx-measures-success-juvenile-crime-20100973.php>
- Brown, A., Smith, L., & Johnson, R. (2022). Rehabilitation and reintegration: Addressing stigma in juvenile justice. *International Journal of Social Policy*, 45(3), 215-230.
- Garcia, M., & Nguyen, T. (2021). The role of family and education in juvenile rehabilitation: A Southeast Asian perspective. *Journal of Criminology and Social Development*, 38(2), 145-160.
- Henggeler, S. W., & Schoenwald, S. K. (2011). Evidence-Based Interventions for Juvenile Offenders and Juvenile Justice Policies that Support Them. *Social Policy Report*, 25(1), 1–20.
- Holloway, G. (2013). Alternatives to secure youth detention in Tasmania. <https://www.childcomm.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Alternatives-to-Secure-Youth-Detention-FINAL-2013.pdf>
- Houston Chronicle. (2023). Harris County's Opportunity Center aims to reduce youth crime. <https://www.houstonpublicmedia.org/articles/news/criminal-justice/2023/05/15/451719/harris-countys-new-youth-diversion-center-aims-to-reduce-recidivism-among-young-offenders/>
- Jessica Hardung's (2000). The Proposed Revisions to Japan's Juvenile Law: If Punishment Is Their Answer, They Are Asking the Wrong Question. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wilj/vol9/iss1/5/>
- Jones, P., & Lee, K. (2019). Challenges in implementing juvenile diversion programs: A legal and social analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(4), 301-320.
- Kim Brent (2025). Even the smallest successes are successes: New organization targeting young offenders. [https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/article/revision-setx-measures-success-juvenile-crime-20100973.php?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.beaumontenterprise.com/news/article/revision-setx-measures-success-juvenile-crime-20100973.php?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- LawNet (2024). What are diversion measures? What are 12 diversion measures for juvenile offenders in Vietnam? [https://lawnet.vn/ngan-hang-phap-luat/en/tu-van-phap-luat/bo-may-hanh-chinh/what-are-diversion-measures-what-are-12-diversion-measures-for-juvenile-offenders-in-vietnam-1102132?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://lawnet.vn/ngan-hang-phap-luat/en/tu-van-phap-luat/bo-may-hanh-chinh/what-are-diversion-measures-what-are-12-diversion-measures-for-juvenile-offenders-in-vietnam-1102132?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Nguyen Thi Phuong Hoa (2017). Lenient policy toward juvenile offenders under the new Penal Code. [https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/lenient-policy-toward-juvenile-offenders-under-the-new-penal-code-5760.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/lenient-policy-toward-juvenile-offenders-under-the-new-penal-code-5760.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com),
- Nong Duc Tai., LL.M (2024). Rehabilitative approaches in juvenile justice: an international perspective with focus on Vietnam. [https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/rehabilitative-approaches-in-juvenile-justice-an-international-perspective-with-focus-on-vietnam-72972.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/rehabilitative-approaches-in-juvenile-justice-an-international-perspective-with-focus-on-vietnam-72972.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Nuguid Teresita (2022), "Youth and Family Factors Affecting Completion of a Diversion Program" (2022). Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. 12488. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/12488>
- Open Public Health Journal. (2022). Factors Associated with Successful Completion of Juvenile Diversion Programs. Retrieved from <https://openpublichealthjournal.com/VOLUME/15/ELOCATOR/e187494452202031/FULLTEXT>
- Pham Anh Tuyen (2014). Alternative solutions to criminal handling of juvenile offenders, *Journal of Legal Democracy*, Special Issue on Building the Revised Penal Code Project. <https://danchuphapluat.vn/an-pham/so-chuyen-de-thang-8-xay-dung-du-an-bo-luat-hinh-su-sua-doi-178>
- NeMoyer, A., Gale-Bentz, E., Goldstein, N. E. S., & Pema Harvey, L. (2019). Factors Associated With Successful Completion of a Community-Based, Postarrest Juvenile Diversion Program and Subsequent Rearrest. *Crime & Delinquency*, 66(5), 603-626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128719842377> (Original work published 2020)

- Le Thu Dao and Yvon Dandurand. (2021). Social, Cultural, and Systemic Barriers to Child Justice Reform: Lessons from Vietnam. DOI: 10.1177/14732254211036196
- Richard Mendel (2024). Protect and Redirect: Best Practices for Juvenile Diversion. [https://www.sentencingproject.org/policy-brief/protect-and-redirect-best-practices-for-juvenile-diversion/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.sentencingproject.org/policy-brief/protect-and-redirect-best-practices-for-juvenile-diversion/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Sentencing Project. (2023). Protect and Redirect: Best Practices for Juvenile Diversion. Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/policy-brief/protect-and-redirect-best-practices-for-juvenile-diversion/>
- Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C. (2014). Juvenile offenders and victims: 2014 national report.
- Smith, J. (2020). Institutional mechanisms and the success of juvenile diversion programs: An empirical study. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 29(1), 75-98.
- Thomson Reuters. [https://legal.thomsonreuters.com.au/product/AU/files/720506276/Fox\\_&\\_Freiberg\\_Chapter\\_1.pdf](https://legal.thomsonreuters.com.au/product/AU/files/720506276/Fox_&_Freiberg_Chapter_1.pdf).
- Tuan, H. M. ., Chau, H. X. ., Ngoc, H. D. ., & Nguyen, T. T. . (2024). Juvenile and Effective Solutions to Prevent Juvenile Recidivism – Perspectives of Judicial Officers of Vietnam. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(7), 4562–4573. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i7.4568>
- IJJO (International Juvenile Justice Observatory). (2015). Evidence-Based Approaches in Juvenile Justice.
- UNICEF. (2006). Juvenile Justice in South Asia. Retrieved from UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia:
- UNICEF. (2019). Juvenile Justice Systems: Promoting Diversion and Alternatives to Detention.
- UNODC. (2013). Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders.
- Vietnam Law Magazine. (2023). Rehabilitative Approaches in Juvenile Justice: An International Perspective with Focus on Vietnam. [https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/rehabilitative-approaches-in-juvenile-justice-an-international-perspective-with-focus-on-vietnam-72972.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://vietnamlawmagazine.vn/rehabilitative-approaches-in-juvenile-justice-an-international-perspective-with-focus-on-vietnam-72972.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- Wanchai Roujanavong (2006). Organized Crime in Thailand. <https://www.probation.go.th/document/hits946.pdf>.
- Williams, B., & Tran, H. (2023). Community engagement and diversion models: Strengthening juvenile justice systems. *Asian Journal of Legal Studies*, 40(1), 55-72.

**Table 3: Characteristics of Study Participants of the Judiciary**

| Gender                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male                        | 76        | 59.8    | 59.8          | 59.8               |
| Female                      | 51        | 40.2    | 40.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 127       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Age</b>                  |           |         |               |                    |
| 23-30                       | 37        | 36.4    | 36.4          | 36.4               |
| 31-40                       | 57        | 44.9    | 44.9          | 44.9               |
| 41-56                       | 33        | 26.1    | 26.1          | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 127       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Education attainment</b> |           |         |               |                    |
| ≤ High school               | 1         | .8      | .8            | .8                 |
| Vocation training, college  | 7         | 5.5     | 5.5           | 6.3                |
| Undergraduate, University   | 106       | 83.5    | 83.5          | 89.8               |
| Postgraduate, University    | 13        | 10.2    | 10.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 127       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Working experience</b>   |           |         |               |                    |
| 1-5 years                   | 20        | 15.7    | 15.7          | 15.7               |
| 5-10 years                  | 48        | 37.8    | 37.8          | 53.5               |
| 10-15 years                 | 29        | 22.8    | 22.8          | 76.4               |
| 15-20 years                 | 12        | 9.4     | 9.4           | 85.8               |

|                      |     |       |       |       |
|----------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| >20 years            | 18  | 14.2  | 14.2  | 100.0 |
| Total                | 127 | 100.0 | 100.0 |       |
| <b>Occupations</b>   |     |       |       |       |
| Police               | 48  | 37.8  | 37.8  | 37.8  |
| Judge                | 6   | 4.7   | 4.7   | 42.5  |
| Prosecutor           | 15  | 11.8  | 11.8  | 54.3  |
| Judicial             | 32  | 25.2  | 25.2  | 79.5  |
| Lawyer               | 1   | .8    | .8    | 80.3  |
| Legal aid specialist | 19  | 15.0  | 15.0  | 95.3  |
| Other                | 6   | 4.7   | 4.7   | 100.0 |
| <b>Living Areas</b>  |     |       |       |       |
| Central              | 24  | 18.9  | 18.9  | 18.9  |
| Provincial           | 21  | 16.5  | 16.5  | 35.4  |
| District             | 49  | 38.6  | 38.6  | 74.0  |
| Commune              | 33  | 26.0  | 26.0  | 100.0 |
| Total                | 127 | 100.0 | 100.0 |       |

Table 4: *Characteristics of Study Participants of the Authorities and organizations*

| <b>Gender</b>                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male                         | 86        | 51.5    | 51.5          | 51.5               |
| Female                       | 81        | 48.5    | 48.5          | 100.0              |
| Total                        | 167       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Education attainment</b>  |           |         |               |                    |
| ≤ High school                | 2         | 1.2     | 1.2           | 1.2                |
| Vocation training, college   | 14        | 8.4     | 8.4           | 9.6                |
| Undergraduate, University    | 125       | 74.9    | 74.9          | 84.4               |
| Postgraduate, University     | 26        | 15.6    | 15.6          | 100.0              |
| Total                        | 167       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Working experience</b>    |           |         |               |                    |
| 1-5 years                    | 88        | 52.7    | 52.7          | 52.7               |
| 5-10 years                   | 57        | 34.1    | 34.1          | 86.8               |
| 10-15 years                  | 14        | 8.4     | 8.4           | 95.2               |
| 15-20 years                  | 3         | 1.8     | 1.8           | 97.0               |
| >20 years                    | 5         | 3.0     | 3.0           | 100.0              |
| Total                        | 167       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Occupations</b>           |           |         |               |                    |
| Local authority              | 20        | 12.0    | 12.0          | 12.0               |
| Judicial                     | 9         | 5.4     | 5.4           | 17.4               |
| Caregiver of Children caring | 19        | 11.4    | 11.4          | 28.7               |
| Social worker                | 20        | 12.0    | 12.0          | 40.7               |

|                             |     |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| Youth Union's staff         | 41  | 24.6  | 24.6  | 65.3  |
| Women Association's staff   | 28  | 16.8  | 16.8  | 82.0  |
| Invalid Association's staff | 16  | 9.6   | 9.6   | 91.6  |
| Other                       | 14  | 8.4   | 8.4   | 100.0 |
| Total                       | 167 | 100.0 | 100.0 |       |

Table 5: Characteristics of Study Participants are locals

| Gender                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male                        | 85        | 51.2    | 51.2          | 51.2               |
| Female                      | 79        | 47.6    | 47.6          | 98.8               |
| Other                       | 2         | 1.2     | 1.2           | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 166       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Education attainment</b> |           |         |               |                    |
| Secondary                   | 3         | 1.8     | 1.8           | 1.8                |
| ≤ High school               | 17        | 10.2    | 10.2          | 12.0               |
| Vocation training, college  | 22        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 25.3               |
| Undergraduate, University   | 108       | 65.1    | 65.1          | 90.4               |
| Postgraduate, University    | 16        | 9.6     | 9.6           | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 166       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Occupations</b>          |           |         |               |                    |
| Local authority             | 19        | 11.4    | 11.4          | 11.4               |
| National Front's staff      | 14        | 8.4     | 8.4           | 19.9               |
| Voluntary                   | 11        | 6.6     | 6.6           | 26.5               |
| Secretary of Youth Union    | 26        | 15.7    | 15.7          | 42.2               |
| Women Association's staff   | 21        | 12.7    | 12.7          | 54.8               |
| Invalid Association's staff | 9         | 5.4     | 5.4           | 60.2               |
| Youth Union's member        | 30        | 18.1    | 18.1          | 78.3               |
| Locals                      | 27        | 16.3    | 16.3          | 94.6               |
| Other                       | 9         | 5.4     | 5.4           | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 166       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| <b>Living Areas</b>         |           |         |               |                    |
| Central                     | 102       | 61.4    | 61.4          | 61.4               |
| Provincial                  | 64        | 38.6    | 38.6          | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 166       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |