ISSN 2348-3156 (Print)
International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research ISSN 2348-3164 (online)
Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp: (322-330), Month: October - December 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

THE CURRENT SITUATION OF THE ASSESSMENT OF YOUTH UNION OFFICIALS ON THE RESULTS OF EDUCATION, PROPAGATION AND DISSEMINATION OF LAWS RELATED TO YOUTH IN THE CONTEXT OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION

Hoang Minh Tuan[1], Nguyen Dieu Linh[2], Au Thanh Ngoc[3]

Vietnam Youth Academy[1], Vietnam Youth Academy[2], Hanoi National University of Education[3]*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24036153

Published Date: 03-November-2026

Abstract: **The article analyzes the evaluation of Youth Union officials on the results of education, propagation and dissemination of laws (DOL) related to youth in the context of digital transformation, on the basis of a questionnaire survey of 390 Youth Union officials in Hanoi, Da Nang and Ho Chi Minh City. The evaluation framework is built from the planned behavior model, legal socialization theory and the DigComp 2.2 digital competency framework, including 17 indicators under four criteria: (1) legal awareness and understanding; (2) legal attitude and awareness; (3) change and implementation of legal acts; (4) capacity to access and implement the law in the digital environment. The overall average score is 4.19/5, which is good and close to the good level; an average of 83.1% of the assessments were at a good or good level, only 1.7% were at a poor or very poor level. Legal behavior (4.22) and legal attitudes and awareness (4.21) were rated the highest; competence in the digital environment reached 4.20; legal awareness and understanding were the lowest (4.15). The two lowest indicators were in the awareness criteria: understanding of basic rights and obligations (4.12) and the law on learning, labor, employment, and entrepreneurship (4.13). The differentiation between the indicators was very narrow (about 0.13 points). All 19 proposed solutions were considered necessary (average 4.14; from 4.11 to 4.17); solutions for multimedia products and digital communication skills had the highest scores (same 4.17), but the difference between the six groups of solutions was only about 0.03 points. On that basis, the article discusses the prioritization of legal education content, strengthening online legal information appraisal skills and perfecting assessment tools.**

Keywords: **Youth Union cadres; youth; legal education; law propagation and dissemination; digital transformation.**

1. ASK THE PROBLEM

Digital transformation fundamentally changes the way young people access, receive and interact with legal information. The Law on Digital Transformation No. 148/2025/QH15, effective from July 1, 2026, defines digital transformation for the first time as the process of transforming modes of operation, administration and service provision based on digital technology, digital data, digital systems, digital platforms, and digital processes to create new, effective and transparent

value. In the field of DOL, the Project "Digital transformation in legal dissemination and education in the period of 2025 – 2030" (Decision No. 766/QD-TTg) requires innovation in the direction of personalization, people-centeredness, connection and sharing of data between systems.

For young people (citizens from full 16 to 30 years old) (Youth Law 2020), this requirement is of special significance, because this is the social group that participates most deeply in the digital environment, and at the same time faces many new legal risks in cyberspace. The Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union is the direct subject of education, propaganda and DOL for young people; the Youth Union officials are both the organizers of the implementation and the ones who directly observe the changes in the awareness, attitudes and legal behaviors of young people at the grassroots. Therefore, the assessment of the Youth Union officials is an important source of information to identify the current situation, although it needs to be compared with the assessment of the youth themselves.

On the basis of the survey data of the Youth Union officials, the article answers three questions: (i) What level and on what criteria do the Youth Union officials evaluate the results of education, propaganda and PBPL for young people; (ii) In each criterion, which indicators are highly appreciated, which indicators are still limited and what is the degree of differentiation between indicators; (iii) How do Youth Union officials assess the necessity of solutions to improve the efficiency of this work, and with what limitations should the above results be interpreted.

2. THEORETICAL BASIS AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

2.1. Theory of DOL for youth in the context of digital transformation

DOL related to youth in the context of digital transformation is a purposeful and planned impact process of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union to young people, implemented through the application of digital technology and digital platforms to convey legal knowledge, raise awareness, strengthen trust, form correct legal attitudes and behaviors, contribute to building a legal culture and a socialist state under the rule of law. This process includes the following elements: subjects, objects, objectives, principles, content and methods.

In essence, DOL does not stop at communicating normative documents but is the process of transforming legal knowledge into beliefs, attitudes and compliance behaviors. Digital transformation changes this process in three points. Firstly, the approach channel shifts from one-way communication to multi-dimensional interaction on digital platforms, so young people are both recipients and creators and disseminators of legal information. Secondly, unorthodox or false legal information spreads faster, so the requirement for reliability appraisal becomes a necessary competency. Third, cyberspace has created new legal relationships (personal data, electronic transactions, digital content) that young people must identify and behave appropriately. Therefore, evaluating DOL results in this context needs to cover knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and the capacity to implement laws in the digital environment.

2.2. Awareness – attitude – behavior and socialization of the law

Ajzen's (1991) model of planned behavior argues that behavior is directly affected by intention; intention is formed from attitudes toward behavior, subjective standards, and awareness of behavioral control. Knowledge and beliefs about behavior are the basis of these factors, but knowledge itself is not enough to determine behavior. Applied to PBPL, the first three criteria of the assessment framework correspond to the cognition, attitude and behavior of young people; the fourth criterion (the ability to access and implement the law in the digital environment) is close to the factor of ability to control behavior, that is, the conditions for young people to do what they know and want to do.

From the perspective of legal socialization, Fagan and Tyler (2005) describe this as the process by which individuals, especially adolescents and young adults, form attitudes towards the law and law enforcement actors through social experience and interaction; this attitude, especially the recognition of the legitimacy of the law, is related to the level of compliance. The implications for this study are twofold: attitudes and legal consciousness (criterion 2) are not only a consequence of "knowing the law" but are also influenced by the experiential environment; and the Youth Union, as an organization of activities and activities at the grassroots, is an agent of legal socialization for young people, not just a communication channel.

2.3. Legal capacity in the digital environment

The DigComp 2.2 Digital Competency Framework for Citizens (Vuorikari et al., 2022) includes 21 competencies in five areas: information and data, communication and cooperation, digital content creation, safety, and problem-solving. At the field level, the indicators of criterion 4 can be compared as follows: searching, exploiting information and assessing the reliability of information (6.13, 6.14) associated with the field of information and data; protecting legal rights and interests in cyberspace and identifying and preventing legal risks (6.15, 6.16) associated with the field of safety; sharing and disseminating accurate legal information (6.17) associated with the field of communication and cooperation. This way of comparison helps criterion 4 have an international reference basis instead of just a set of descriptive indicators.

In the above competencies, assessing the reliability of information should be considered separately. A comparative study between professional fact-checkers, historians, and university students by Wineburg and McGrew (2019) found that validators assessed the reliability of a source by leaving the page they were reading to compare it with other sources ("horizontal reading"), rather than just reading the content of the page itself. This result suggests that fact-checking is a skill that requires its own strategy, not automatically accompanied by the ability to search for information; so the separation of indicator 6.14 from indicator 6.13 in the questionnaire is well-founded.

2.4. Evaluation Framework

On the basis of the above approaches, the results of the process are considered in four criteria: three criteria associated with the awareness, attitude and behavior of young people, plus a specific criterion of the digital context is the ability to access and implement the law in the digital environment. The questionnaire is concretized into four criteria with 17 indicators (Question 6), scored on a 5-level scale: 1 – very poor; 2 – poor; 3 – average; 4 – good; 5 – good:

- Criterion 1 – Level of awareness and understanding of the law of young people (indicators 6.1–6.4): basic rights and obligations; laws on learning, labor, employment, and entrepreneurship; laws on national defense, security, social order and safety; laws when participating in the digital environment.
- Criterion 2 – Level of legal attitude and awareness formation (6.5–6.8): awareness of the role of the law; respect and voluntary compliance; responsibility for themselves, the community and in the digital environment; opposition and condemnation of violations.
- Criterion 3 – Extent of change and implementation of legal acts (6.9–6.12): proactively learn and update the law; apply the law to solve problems; properly perform the rights and obligations of citizens; comply with the law, limit the risk of violations.
- Criterion 4 – Capacity to access and implement law in the digital environment (6.13–6.17): search and exploit legal information; assess the reliability of information; protect legal rights and interests in cyberspace; identify and prevent legal risks; share and disseminate accurate legal information.

From the above framework, the paper reads the data in three directions: (i) if knowledge is the starting point of the chain of cognition – attitude – behavior, it is necessary to see whether the cognitive criterion is lower than the rest of the criteria; (ii) in the criterion of digital competence, it is necessary to separately monitor the indicator of appraisal of the reliability of information; (iii) because the only source of information is the Youth Union officials, the distribution of points can deviate to high levels, so the results are read simultaneously through the average score, the good + good ratio and the level of dispersion, instead of relying only on the average score.

3. RESEARCH METHODS AND SURVEY SAMPLES

The paper uses data from the poll for Youth Union officials of the Vietnam Youth Academy (code KXDTN 26.05), including 390 valid votes; the demographic variables and the analyzed questions (Question 6, Question 8) have no defective values. The data are processed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation) on the SPSS software. The score of each criterion is the average plus the average score of the indicators belonging to that criterion; the "good + good" ratio is the total percentage of respondents who chose level 4 and level 5 in each indicator. To interpret the average score, the paper uses an even distance of 0.8 points: 1.00–1.79 very poor; 1.80–2.59 poor; 2.60–3.39 average; 3.40–4.19 fair; 4.20–5.00 is good. The GPA is rounded to two decimal places; when the value is close to the boundary between the two levels of interpretation, the paper states the value before rounding.

ISSN 2348-3156 (Print)
International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research ISSN 2348-3164 (online)
Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp: (322-330), Month: October - December 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

In terms of measurement, all data is collected from one source (Youth Union officials) using one tool. According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), this method of collection is susceptible to the influence of biases due to general methods, such as the tendency to respond simultaneously or social desires, and can skew the observed scores. Therefore, the results below are presented with a proportional distribution of each score level and are interpreted as initial signals that need further comparison.

Table 1. Characteristics of the survey sample (N = 390)

Characteristics	Groups	Quantity	Rate (%)
Gender	Female	268	68,7
	Male	122	31,3
Ethnicity	Glasses	335	85,9
	Other Ethnic Groups	55	14,1
Living area	Urban	211	54,1
	Rural	179	45,9
Youth Union Cadre Level	Establishments (communes, wards)	349	89,5
	Provinces and cities	34	8,7
	Central	7	1,8
Qualifications	Undergraduate	341	87,4
	Postgraduate	22	5,6
	Intermediate	21	5,4
	College	6	1,5
Political Theory	Beginner	299	76,7
	Intermediate	81	20,8
	Premium	10	2,6
Location	Hanoi	139	35,6
	Da Nang	126	32,3
	Ho Chi Minh City	125	32,1

The sample has four characteristics to note. First, women account for 68.7%, more than twice as high as men (31.3%). Secondly, grassroots Youth Union cadres account for 89.5%, while the provincial, municipal and central levels only account for 8.7% and 1.8%, respectively. Thirdly, 87.4% have a university degree and 76.7% have just reached the elementary political theory level. Fourth, the sample was collected in three areas with a relatively balanced proportion (Hanoi 35.6%; Da Nang 32.3%; Ho Chi Minh City 32.1%) and fairly evenly distributed between urban (54.1%) and rural areas (45.9%). The sample therefore reflects quite clearly the perspective of grassroots Youth Union officials in the three study areas, but is not a representative sample of the whole country.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

4.1. General assessment level

The overall average score of the 17 indicators reached 4.19/5 (4.1947 when unrounded), which is good and only about 0.005 points lower than the good level threshold (4.20). Considering all 6,630 reviews (17 indicators × 390 people), level 4 accounted for 44.6% and level 5 accounted for 38.5%, or 83.1% of the evaluations were at the fair or good level; the average level accounted for 15.2%; the poor and very poor levels accounted for 1.4% and 0.3% respectively (1.7% in total). According to each indicator, the good + good rate ranged from 80.0% to 84.9% and the poor or very poor rate ranged from 1.0% to 2.3%.

The distribution of scores is highly concentrated. In all 17 indicators, levels 4 and 5 together account for 80.0% to 84.9% of respondents, while levels 1 and 2 are almost negligible. Therefore, the difference between the indicators is mainly in how respondents distribute between levels 3 and 5, not between positive and negative rating groups: indicator 6.6 has 41.8% choosing level 5 (the highest), while indicator 6.1 has 32.8% choosing level 5 (lowest) and indicator 6.2 has 18.2% choosing level 3 (highest). Since this is the implementation subject's own assessment of the results of their work, this level of appreciation and focus should be interpreted with caution (see section 5).

ISSN 2348-3156 (Print)
International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research ISSN 2348-3164 (online)
Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp: (322-330), Month: October - December 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

4.2. Evaluation according to each criterion and indicator

Table 2. Evaluation of education, propaganda and PBPL results according to criteria and indicators (N = 390)

Indicators	Medium	SD	Fair + Good (%)
Criterion 1 – Legal awareness and understanding	**4,15**	–	81,6
6.1 Understanding basic rights and obligations	4,12	0,77	81,0
6.2 Grasp the law on study, labor, employment, entrepreneurship, and social life	4,13	0,79	80,0
6.3 Legal awareness of national defense, security, social order and safety	4,19	0,75	83,6
6.4 Legal understanding when participating in the digital environment	4,17	0,77	81,8
Criterion 2 – Attitude and legal awareness	**4,21**	–	83,5
6.5 Awareness of the role of law	4,20	0,74	83,8
6.6 Respect and voluntarily obey the law	4,24	0,76	84,4
6.7 Responsibility to self, community, and digital environment	4,22	0,77	84,6
6.8 Objection and condemnation of violations	4,19	0,79	81,3
Criterion 3 – Change and implementation of legal acts	**4,22**	–	83,8
6.9 Proactively learn and update the law	4,19	0,78	82,8
6.10 Applying the law to solve problems	4,22	0,76	83,8
6.11 Properly perform the rights and obligations of citizens	4,23	0,75	84,9
6.12 Comply with the law, limit the risk of violations	4,23	0,75	83,8
Criterion 4 – Legal capacity in the digital environment	**4,20**	–	83,3
6.13 Searching and exploiting legal information on digital platforms	4,19	0,76	84,1
6.14 Assessment of accuracy and reliability of information	4,18	0,79	82,1
6.15 Protection of legitimate rights and interests in cyberspace	4,22	0,75	83,6
6.16 Identification and prevention of legal risks	4,19	0,78	82,8
6.17 Sharing and disseminating accurate legal information	4,21	0,75	83,8
17 indicators in total	**4,19**	–	83,1

Note: In the criteria line and the total line, the average score is the average plus the average score of the indicators, the good + good ratio is the average of the indicators in the group; the "–" sign means that the standard deviation is not presented at the criteria level and the whole scale. Source: Results of processing survey data of Youth Union officials (N = 390).

Hierarchy of criteria. Legal behavior (criterion 3) scored the highest (4.22), followed by legal attitudes and awareness (criterion 2: 4.21), the ability to access and implement the law in the digital environment (criterion 4: 4.20; 4.197 to be exact, close to the good boundary) and the lowest was legal awareness and understanding (criterion 1: 4.15). The difference between the highest and lowest criteria was 0.07 points, less than one-tenth of the standard deviation of the indicators (0.74–0.79), so it should be read as a trend. This trend is consistent at the distribution level: criterion 1 has a higher rate of selecting level 3 (16.7% vs. 14.6–14.9%) and a lower rate of selecting level 5 (35.6% vs. 38.6–39.8%) of the other three criteria.

Outstanding indicators. The highest indicator is "respect and voluntary compliance with the law" (6.6: 4.24; 84.4% good + good), followed by "properly performing citizens' rights and obligations" (6.11) and "complying with the law, limiting the

ISSN 2348-3156 (Print)
International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research ISSN 2348-3164 (online)
Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp: (322-330), Month: October - December 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

risk of violations" (6.12), both reaching 4.23. The two lowest indicators are both in the cognitive criteria: "understanding basic rights and obligations" (6.1: 4.12) and "grasping the law on learning, labor, employment, entrepreneurship, and social life" (6.2: 4.13); indicator 6.2 also has the lowest good + good ratio in the whole scale (80.0%). The difference between the highest and lowest indicators is only about 0.13 points (4.241 compared to 4.115 when unrounded), indicating that the divergence between the indicators is very small.

Digital competence. In criterion 4, the indicator "assessing the accuracy and reliability of information" (6.14) has the lowest score (4.18), about 0.04 points lower than the indicator "protection of legitimate rights and interests in cyberspace" (6.15: 4.22). Compared to the indicator of searching and exploiting information (6.13: 4.19; 84.1% fair + good; 1.8% poor or very poor), indicator 6.14 has a lower rate of good + good (82.1%) and a higher rate of poor or very poor (2.1%). This difference is small, but in the same direction as the requirements of Project 766/QD-TTg on ensuring accurate and official legal information.

4.3. Assessment of the necessity of solutions

The Youth Union officials assessed the necessity of 19 solutions, which were organized into six groups: mechanisms and policies (GPCC1–3); capacity of the Youth Union (GPNL4–6); content (GPND7–9); method (GPPT10–13); coordination and resources (GPPH14–16); monitoring and evaluation (GPDG17–19) (Table 3 and Table 4). All 19 solutions were evaluated at a good level: the overall average score was 4.14 and ranged very narrowly from 4.11 to 4.17 (difference of 0.06 points); the rate of good + good from 79.7% to 83.1%; the rate of choosing level 1 or 2 was only from 1.0% to 2.3%. Combining 7,410 evaluations, level 4 accounted for 47.2%, level 5 accounted for 34.4% and the good + good rate was 81.6%, 1.5 percentage points lower than Question 6 (83.1%), mainly due to the lower rate of choosing level 5 (34.4% vs. 38.5%). The two scales reflect two different aspects, so the comparison is only descriptive: Youth Union officials broadly agree on the need for solutions, but none of the solutions have more than 36.7% of respondents choosing the highest level.

Table 3. Assessment of the need for solutions (Question 8; N = 390)

Solutions Code	Solution content	DTB	SD	Fair + Good (%)
SLT1	Clearly stipulate the responsibilities of the Youth Union and coordinating agencies in educating, propagating and disseminating the law for young people.	4,13	0,73	81,8
SLT 2	Integrate the goal of digital transformation in the plans and programs of law dissemination of the Youth Union at all levels.	4,12	0,75	81,3
SLT3	Promulgate standards on digital content, data, information security and personal data protection during implementation.	4,15	0,73	83,1
SLT4	Fostering legal knowledge and basic legal consultancy and guidance skills for Youth Union officials.	4,11	0,76	80,5
SLT5	Fostering digital communication skills, multimedia content production and using artificial intelligence tools.	4,17	0,75	82,6
SLT6	Build a network of experts, rapporteurs and legal collaborators to support the Youth Union's cadres.	4,13	0,74	81,0
SLT7	Periodically survey the needs and legal issues that arise for each youth group.	4,12	0,75	80,8
SLT8	Grouping and personalizing content according to age, occupation, area and level of legal understanding.	4,13	0,77	79,7
SLT 9	Build a digital legal learning repository that is standardized, concise, easy to understand and has practical situations.	4,14	0,74	81,3
SLT10	Develop a unified digital platform or column for young people to look up, learn and interact with the law.	4,14	0,76	81,3

ISSN 2348-3156 (Print)
International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research ISSN 2348-3164 (online)
Vol. 14, Issue 4, pp: (322-330), Month: October - December 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

SLT11	Enhance multimedia products such as short videos, infographics, podcasts, ebooks, and gamification.	4,17	0,76	82,6
SLT12	Expand forms of online interaction such as livestreams, forums, e-learning and online competitions.	4,14	0,76	80,3
SLT13	The chatbot application, virtual assistant, and intelligent question-and-answer system have a professional moderation mechanism.	4,14	0,74	82,6
SLT14	Allocate funds to stabilize and invest in infrastructure and equipment for activities in the digital environment.	4,15	0,75	81,5
SLT15	Strengthen coordination with judicial agencies, educational institutions, technology enterprises and media agencies.	4,15	0,77	82,1
SLT16	Mobilize resources for socialization and share databases and learning materials between units.	4,16	0,75	81,8
SLT17	Build a set of metrics and data systems that track the reach, engagement, and results of activities.	4,15	0,78	82,6
SLT18	Conduct periodic assessments, collect youth feedback and publicize appropriate results.	4,14	0,77	81,8
SLT19	Use the results of the assessment to adjust content, methods, and resource allocation.	4,15	0,77	81,8

Table 4. Average score and appreciation rate by solution group (N = 390)

Solution Group	GP Number	Team Team	Fair + Good (%)	Level 5 (%)
Mechanisms and policies (GPCC1–3)	3	4,132	82,1	32,8
Capacity of the Youth Union (GPNL4–6)	3	4,137	81,4	33,9
Contents (GPND7–9)	3	4,129	80,6	33,9
Method (GPPT10–13)	4	4,146	81,7	34,7
Coordination, resources (GPPH14–16)	3	4,155	81,8	35,5
Monitoring and evaluation (GPDG17–19)	3	4,149	82,1	35,3
Common 19 solutions	19	4,142	81,6	34,4

At the group level, the coordination and resource group had the highest score (4,155), followed by the monitoring and evaluation group (4,149) and the method group (4,146); the content group (Content Solutions) had the lowest (4,129), and the lowest good + good rate (80.6%) and the highest rate of selecting level 3 (18.0%).

At the solution level, the two solutions with the highest scores are strengthening multimedia products (SLT11: 4.17; 36.7% choose level 5, the highest) and fostering digital communication skills, multimedia content production, using artificial intelligence tools (SLT5: 4.17; 35.6%), followed by mobilizing socialization resources (SLT16: 4.16). The three solutions with the lowest scores are fostering legal knowledge and basic legal consulting skills for Youth Union officials (SLT4: 4.11), integrating digital transformation goals in plans and programs (SLT2: 4.12) and periodic surveys on the legal needs of young people (SLT7: 4.12). The solution of grouping and personalizing content (SLT8) has the lowest rate of good + good in the whole scale (79.7%) and the highest rate of selecting level 3 (18.7%), although personalization is an orientation of Project 766/QD-TTg.

Firstly, the most evaluated solutions are associated with digital communication tools and skills, in accordance with the context of digital transformation and with the criteria of digital competence. Secondly, there is a discrepancy between diagnosis and solution priority: the awareness layer is the lowest criterion among the 17 evaluation criteria, but the group of content solutions, including fostering legal knowledge for officials and personalizing content, is in the group with the lowest score among the 19 solutions given.

5. DISCUSSION

The evaluation of the Youth Union officials showed that they viewed the results of education, propaganda and PBPL for youth as good on all four criteria (4.15–4.22), with more than four-fifths of the assessments being good or good. This result is consistent with the fact that the Youth Union's PBPL work is regularly implemented at the grassroots level and the content has been gradually associated with the digital environment. However, the distribution of points is very concentrated: the average score of the 17 indicators is only about 0.13 points different and the standard deviation of each indicator is in the range of 0.74–0.79.

In terms of the cognition-attitude-behavior chain (Ajzen, 1991), the cognitive layer has the lowest score (4.15), while attitude (4.21) and behavior (4.22) are more highly valued. There are two ways of interpreting. The first interpretation is substantial: young people have a good attitude of compliance, but their specific knowledge of the rights, obligations, and laws of learning, labor, employment, and entrepreneurship (4.12–4.13) is not commensurate, which is a point that needs to be supplemented. The second interpretation is related to the evaluator: it is easier for Youth Union officials to observe the attitude and behavior of compliance than the level of understanding, so it is possible to score knowledge more cautiously. The fact that attitudes are appreciated is also consistent with the view of Fagan and Tyler (2005) that attitudes towards the law are formed through social experience and interaction, and that grassroots Youth Union activities can be part of that experiential environment; However, the existing data does not allow to verify this connection. In practice, the reasonable priority is to add practical content, associated with the actual situation of young people, instead of just expanding the number of activities.

Although criterion 4 reached 4.20, the appraisal of the reliability of online legal information (6.14: 4.18) was the lowest indicator of this criterion, with a good + good ratio lower than the information search and exploitation indicator (82.1% vs. 84.1%). The difference is small, but it is notable because information appraisal is a skill that requires its own strategy (Wineburg & McGrew, 2019) and is a competency in the field of information and data in DigComp 2.2 (Vuorikari et al., 2022). In the context of the rapid spread of false legal information on digital platforms, this capacity should be associated with solutions for official learning materials, information verification points, correction mechanisms, and guidance for youth to cross-collate multiple sources.

The survey results show a high consensus on the need for solutions but has not clearly differentiated the order of priority (the gap between the six groups of solutions is about 0.03 points). It is worth noting that solutions on digital communication tools and skills are the most prioritized, while solutions on legal knowledge for officials and content personalization are in the lowest group, although awareness is the criterion with the lowest score.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A survey of 390 Youth Union officials showed that the results of education, propaganda and DOL related to youth in the context of digital transformation were rated at a good level (4.19/5), an average of 83.1% of the evaluations were good or good and 1.7% were poor or very poor. Legal behavior (4.22) and legal attitudes and awareness (4.21) were rated higher than legal awareness and understanding (4.15); in the criteria of digital competence, the ability to assess the reliability of legal information (4.18) is a point of concern. All 19 proposed solutions were assessed as necessary (4.14 on average; from 4.11 to 4.17), with a high level of consensus but not yet clearly differentiated in order of priority. Due to the level of differentiation between small indicators and the only source of information is Youth Union officials, the above conclusions should be considered as a trend that needs further verification.

From the above results, the article proposes five more complete directions in the practice of disseminating laws related to youth. First, it is necessary to prioritize strengthening the awareness layer with concise digital learning materials, with practical situations about the rights, obligations and laws of learning, labor, employment and entrepreneurship of young people (indicators 6.1 and 6.2 have the lowest scores). In addition, the association of legal education with information appraisal skills: establishing a focal point for verifying, correcting false legal information and guiding young people to identify official sources of information, including cross-collating many sources (indicator 6.14). The training and fostering of Youth Union officials in digital communication and content design according to situations and directions are highly appreciated by Youth Union officials (SLT5: 4.17), and at the same time maintain fostering legal knowledge for officials. Moreover, it is also necessary to focus on reviewing and upgrading the Youth Union's specialized digital platforms (the "Vietnam Youth" application, electronic law bookcases, etc.) and taking advantage of popular social networks such as spreading channels, with specific effectiveness evaluation indicators.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The article is the result of the research of the Ministerial Scientific Project "Solutions of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union in educating, propagating and disseminating laws related to youth in the context of digital transformation", code DT.KXDTN 26-05.

REFERENCES

[1] National Assembly (2020). *Youth Law 2020*, Law No. 57/2020/QH14. National Political Publishing House.

[2] National Assembly (2025). *Law on Digital Transformation*, No. 148/2025/QH15 dated 11/12/2025.

[3] Prime Minister (2025). *Decision No. 766/QD-TTg approving the Project "Digital transformation in legal dissemination and education in the period of 2025 – 2030"*.

[4] Duong Tu Dam (editor) (2017). *Dictionary of Vietnamese Youth*. Vietnam Education Publishing House.

[5] Do Dinh Huynh (2025). Improving the quality and effectiveness of law propagation, dissemination and education in new conditions. *Vietnam Journal of Integration*, No. 370, pp. 70–74.

[6] Vietnam Youth Academy (2026). *Thematic report: Theoretical basis for education, propagation and dissemination of laws related to youth in the context of digital transformation*. Topic at the level of the Ministry of Education, Planning and Investment 26-05, Hanoi.

[7] Vietnam Youth Academy (2026). *Opinion poll for Youth Union officials* (code KXDTN 26.05) and Youth Union cadre survey database.

[8] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.

[9] Fagan, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2005). Legal socialization of children and adolescents. *Social Justice Research*, 18(3), 217–241.

[10] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.

[11] Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). *DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens – With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/115376

[12] Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record*, 121(11), 1–40.