

Evaluating the effectiveness, structure, and influencing factors of legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions

Hiep Ho Duc¹, Long Nguyen Trong², Van Vu Hong³

¹Faculty of State and Law, Academy of Politics Region II, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

²Faculty of Law, Political Theory and Physical Education - National Defense and Security, University of Natural Resources and Environment, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

³Center of Political Sciences VNU-HCM, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Article Info

Article history:

Received Apr 2, 2026

Revised Jul 31, 2026

Accepted Aug 12, 2026

Keywords:

Educational effectiveness

Higher education

Legal awareness education

Measurement model

University students

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the effectiveness, structure, and influencing factors of legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions in Vietnam. Using a convergent mixed-methods design, the research surveyed 375 administrators, lecturers, and students and conducted 15 semi-structured interviews to integrate statistical evidence with contextual interpretation. The results show that structural components were rated fairly high, but experiential methods and updated legal content remained weaker than lecturer competence and content relevance. Legal attitude received the highest outcome score, whereas lawful behavior, particularly in cyberspace, was less consistent. Reliability, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results confirmed acceptable measurement quality, and regression analysis explained 46.2% of the variance in legal awareness outcomes. Educational content and methods were the strongest predictors, followed by environment and educational actors. The study contributes a systemic evaluation framework and highlights the awareness-attitude-behavior gap in digital legal education.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Van Vu Hong

Center of Political Sciences VNU-HCM, Vietnam National University

Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Email: vhvan.cps@vnuhcm.edu.vn

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the expansion of legal awareness education in higher education, a critical gap persists between students' legal knowledge and their actual behavior, particularly in digital environments. This gap poses risks to civic responsibility, digital compliance, and social order. In the context of globalization, digital transformation, and the growing complexity of legal issues in social life, higher education is increasingly expected not only to transmit disciplinary knowledge but also to evaluate how educational activities shape civic responsibility, ethical conduct, and law-abiding behavior among students [1], [2]. From this perspective, legal awareness education should be approached not merely as a body of content to be taught, but as an educational activity whose effectiveness, structural components, and influencing factors can be systematically assessed within the broader framework of holistic education [1]–[4].

At the university level, students face many real and virtual situations involving rights, obligations, compliance, privacy, digital conduct, and public responsibility. Accordingly, the issue is no longer limited to whether students receive legal knowledge, but whether educational activities are effective enough to

transform knowledge into attitudes and behavior [3], [4]. Previous studies have shown that legal knowledge, civic education, and values-based education are positively associated with compliance behavior, social responsibility, and citizenship formation. However, the magnitude of educational effects depends strongly on the design of content, pedagogy, learning environment, and the educational actors involved [2]–[4].

In practice, many higher education institutions still implement legal awareness education primarily through theoretical transmission, with limited opportunities for experiential learning, case-based engagement, and behavioral reinforcement [5], [6]. By contrast, research on clinical legal education, legal clinics, and experiential models shows that educational effectiveness improves when students engage with practical situations, rights-based reasoning, and socially grounded applications of law [7]–[12]. The digital environment further intensifies this need for evaluation because behaviors in cyberspace increasingly involve privacy, cybersecurity, digital ethics, and civic responsibility [13]. In addition, legal education is now linked to broader goals of social justice, equal access to the law, and sustainable development, thereby reinforcing the need for a multidimensional evaluation framework [14].

Existing research has primarily focused on acquiring legal knowledge or improving teaching methods. However, it rarely considers legal awareness education as an integrated educational system in which content, pedagogical methods, environment, and educational actors interact to produce behavioral outcomes. Recent studies also indicate that civic education, clinical legal education, human-rights education, and administrative-legal regulation provide useful foundations for evaluating educational effects, but they do not fully explain how university students convert awareness and attitudes into lawful conduct in digital contexts [15]–[20]. More importantly, little attention has been paid to explaining why students' legal behavior remains inconsistent despite relatively high levels of awareness and attitudes. This lack of a systematic assessment framework represents a serious gap both in theory and practice.

This study makes three explicit contributions to the literature on legal awareness education in higher education: i) it develops an integrated evaluation model that links educational content, pedagogical methods, educational environment, and educational actors with awareness, attitude, and behavior outcomes; ii) it provides empirical evidence of the awareness-attitude-behavior gap, especially in students' lawful conduct in cyberspace; and iii) it offers policy-relevant implications for redesigning legal awareness education as a measurable educational activity rather than a merely content-based course. Based on this gap, the study evaluates the effectiveness, structure, and influencing factors of legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions. Specifically, it addresses three research questions:

- How are the key components of legal awareness education activities, including content, methods, environment, and educational actors, evaluated in higher education institutions?
- To what extent do these components influence students' legal awareness outcomes in terms of awareness, attitudes, and behavior?
- Are there significant differences in legal awareness outcomes across student groups?

On this basis, the study tests four hypotheses:

- Educational content positively affects students' legal awareness outcomes (H1).
- Educational methods positively affect students' legal awareness outcomes (H2).
- The educational environment positively affects students' legal awareness outcomes (H3).
- Educational actors positively affect students' legal awareness outcomes (H4).

2. METHOD

2.1. Research design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design to evaluate legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions from both structural and outcome-oriented perspectives. In this design, quantitative survey data and qualitative interview data were collected during the same research phase, analyzed separately, and then integrated at the interpretation stage. The design was selected because the object of inquiry was not simply students' legal knowledge, but the effectiveness of an educational activity comprising multiple components: content, methods, environment, and educational actors, and its relationship to student outcomes in awareness, attitudes, and behavior.

Quantitative data were used to measure the perceived quality of the educational activity and the resulting level of students' legal awareness. Qualitative interviews were used to interpret patterns, explain inconsistencies, and clarify contextual mechanisms behind the statistical findings. The convergence of these two forms of evidence strengthened the evaluative depth of the study by linking measurable outcomes with implementation realities in higher education settings.

Analytically, the study followed a logic model in which legal awareness education was treated as an educational intervention with four input/process dimensions: educational content, educational methods,

educational environment, and educational actors. The outcome dimension was students' legal awareness, operationalized through awareness, legal attitude, and legal behavior. The effectiveness of the activity was therefore assessed through the internal quality of its structural components, the reliability and validity of the measurement model, and the explanatory power of the structural components for student outcomes.

For interpretation, mean values were read using a five-level scale: 1.00-1.80=very low, 1.81-2.60=low, 2.61-3.40=moderate, 3.41-4.20=fairly high, and 4.21-5.00=high. The psychometric adequacy of the instrument was examined through Cronbach's alpha, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The regression model was then used to determine the extent to which each structural component predicted the effectiveness of legal awareness education outcomes.

2.2. Research sample and sampling method

The main survey subjects were students currently studying at higher education institutions. The study also collected opinions from lecturers and administrators to ensure a multidimensional assessment of legal awareness education activities. This respondent structure allowed the analysis to reflect both learner outcomes and institutional implementation conditions.

The research sample was selected using a stratified convenience sampling method based on academic year, field of study, and type of educational institution. The sample size of 375 respondents was considered adequate because it exceeded the common item-to-sample ratio of 10:1 for EFA and CFA; with 15 observed indicators, the minimum required sample was approximately 150 respondents. The achieved sample also satisfied the larger-sample recommendation for multivariate regression and CFA, where samples above 300 are commonly treated as sufficient for stable parameter estimation in applied educational research.

The total sample size was 375 people, including 22 administrators (5.87%), 87 lecturers (23.20%), and 266 students (70.93%). In terms of gender, women accounted for 58.40% and men for 41.60%. Regarding fields of study, social sciences and humanities accounted for 34.67%, economics and management for 38.40%, and engineering and technology for 26.93%. The sample structure shows a relatively balanced distribution among the fields and respondent groups, facilitating comparative analysis.

In addition, the study conducted in-depth interviews with 15 people, coded PV01-PV15. The interviewees included students, lecturers, and administrators who had direct experience with legal awareness education activities. These interviews were used to explain statistical patterns, identify implementation constraints, and clarify the digital-context issues that could not be fully captured by the questionnaire.

Although combined sampling methods offer increased flexibility and accessibility to the target audience, a notable limitation is that statistical representativeness is not entirely absolute. This limitation occurs because probabilistic random sampling was not applied across all higher education institutions. Therefore, the results should be interpreted within the scope of the surveyed sample and should not be generalized mechanically to the entire higher education system.

2.3. Data collection process

Data were collected through online and in-person surveys over a period of four to six weeks. Before the official survey, the questionnaire was piloted with two administrators, five lecturers, and 30 students to adjust the language, question structure, and clarity of the observed variables. The pilot process also supported content validation by confirming that the items were understandable, relevant to legal awareness education, and appropriate for respondents from different institutional roles.

Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The interviews were recorded with participants' consent, transcribed, and coded thematically. This procedure enabled the qualitative findings to be compared with quantitative patterns and used as explanatory evidence rather than as isolated quotations.

This process ensured systematicity and reduced bias caused by unclear measurement items. Nevertheless, self-report bias remained possible because participants may have provided answers reflecting social expectations rather than actual behavior. This limitation was mitigated by anonymity, triangulation between data sources, and the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics.

2.4. Data analysis methods

Quantitative data were processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 and IBM SPSS AMOS 24 through descriptive statistics, reliability testing, EFA, CFA, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multiple linear regression. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the evaluation level of each component and outcome indicator. Cronbach's alpha assessed internal consistency, EFA examined dimensional structure, CFA confirmed model fit, ANOVA compared group differences, and regression estimated the predictive contribution of each educational component to students' legal awareness outcomes.

Qualitative data from semi-structured interviews were analyzed using thematic content analysis to deepen the interpretation of the quantitative findings. The coding process focused on recurrent themes related to content relevance, experiential learning, institutional environment, digital behavior, and the role of lecturers and youth organizations. This procedure enabled the study to connect statistical tendencies with institutional practices, participant experiences, and contextual explanations.

The analytical strategy followed the sequence of measurement verification before model testing. First, the quality of the instrument was checked through reliability and construct-validity indicators. Second, the structural components of legal awareness education were described and interpreted. Third, outcome differences across groups were examined. Finally, the regression model identified which components most strongly explained the effectiveness of legal awareness education, and multicollinearity diagnostics were reviewed through tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) values.

2.5. Ensuring reliability and research validity

To ensure reliability and scientific validity, the study employed multiple validation measures. The internal reliability of the scale was assessed through Cronbach's alpha coefficients, while construct validity was examined through EFA and CFA. Convergent validity was considered through factor loadings, composite reliability, and average variance extracted, whereas discriminant validity was reviewed by comparing construct relationships and measurement evidence.

Furthermore, the entire survey process was conducted voluntarily. Participants were informed about the academic purpose of the study, and their responses were collected anonymously. These ethical procedures strengthened the credibility of the data and protected the confidentiality of participants' information.

However, it must be acknowledged that measuring concepts such as legal awareness is still influenced by subjective factors and social context. Legal awareness includes cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions, so survey responses may not fully represent actual conduct in every situation. Therefore, the research results should be viewed as evidence of tendencies rather than absolute conclusions.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Evaluation of the structural components of legal awareness education activities

To evaluate the structure of legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions, the study examined four key components: educational content, educational methods, educational environment, and educational actors. These indicators were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5. Table 1 presents the descriptive results for the four structural components. The mean and standard deviation values indicate the general level of evaluation as well as the degree of convergence or dispersion in participants' perceptions.

Table 1. Current status of legal awareness education factors (n=375)

Code	Survey content	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
ND1	Content relevant to student needs	3.20	8.53	21.87	42.40	24.00	3.76	0.92
ND2	Content updated with modern legal information	5.60	12.27	25.33	37.07	19.73	3.53	1.02
ND3	Content linked to practical applications	4.80	10.93	23.47	39.20	21.60	3.62	0.98
PP1	Case study and discussion methods	6.13	14.40	26.67	34.13	18.67	3.45	1.05
PP2	Legal experiential activities	8.80	16.53	28.00	30.13	16.53	3.29	1.10
MT1	Law-based environment	3.73	9.60	22.40	40.00	24.27	3.71	0.94
MT2	Strict enforcement of regulations	4.00	10.13	21.33	41.07	23.47	3.70	0.95
CT1	Lecturer competence	2.93	8.27	20.53	42.93	25.33	3.80	0.89
CT2	Role of the Youth Union and student association	6.40	13.33	27.20	34.13	18.93	3.46	1.04

Table 1 indicates that all four structural components of legal awareness education activities were evaluated at a fairly high level (M=3.29-3.80). Lecturer competence (M=3.80) and content relevance to student needs (M=3.76) were the strongest elements, suggesting that the activity has a stable pedagogical foundation. By contrast, experiential legal activities (M=3.29) and case-based or discussion-oriented methods (M=3.45) received lower ratings, indicating that the structural design of the activity still leans toward theoretical delivery rather than active engagement. This pattern is consistent with prior studies showing that legal education often remains content-driven and insufficiently practice-based [8], [9], [21]–[23]. The relatively modest score for updated legal content (M=3.53) also implies that the current structure has not fully adapted to new legal issues associated with digital society and cyber conduct [13], [24]–[27].

3.2. Evaluation of students' legal awareness outcomes

To assess the outcomes of legal awareness education activities, the study measured three dimensions of students' legal awareness: legal awareness, legal attitude, and legal behavior. These dimensions represent the expected outcomes of the educational process. They also make it possible to evaluate whether the activity generates only cognitive recognition or also attitudinal commitment and behavioral compliance. Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics for these outcome indicators.

Table 2. Assessment of students' level of legal awareness (N=375)

Code	Survey content	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
NT1	Understanding rights and obligations	2.67	7.20	19.47	44.00	26.67	3.85	0.88
NT2	Understanding basic legal regulations	3.20	8.27	21.07	42.13	25.33	3.78	0.91
TD1	Respecting legal regulations	1.87	5.60	16.80	43.47	32.27	3.98	0.84
TD2	Trusting the role of law in social management	2.13	6.13	18.67	42.40	30.67	3.93	0.86
HV1	Complying with internal rules and legal regulations	2.40	7.73	20.27	43.73	25.87	3.83	0.90
HV2	Behaving lawfully in cyberspace	3.73	9.60	23.47	38.40	24.80	3.71	0.97

The results show that the outcome dimension of legal attitude achieved the highest scores (M=3.93-3.98), followed by legal awareness (M=3.78-3.85), while legal behavior score remained lower (M=3.71-3.83). This distribution suggests that legal awareness education activities in higher education are more successful in cultivating recognition and normative approval than in shaping stable lawful behavior. The relatively lower score for lawful behavior in cyberspace (M=3.71) highlights an outcome gap between knowing and doing, especially in digital settings, which has also been identified in previous studies on civic and legal education [7], [13], [15], [28], [29].

3.3. Reliability and construct validity of the measurement model

Before testing the hypotheses, the instrument was re-examined to confirm that the scales were psychometrically acceptable for evaluating the educational activity. Table 3 summarizes the reliability and validity indicators of the main constructs. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were all above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, the KMO value supported factorability, and the CFA fit indices indicated that the measurement model achieved an acceptable level of fit. These findings support the use of the scales for subsequent comparative and regression analyses.

Table 3. Reliability and construct validity summary of the measurement model

Construct	Items	Cronbach's alpha	EFA/CFA evidence	Interpretation
Educational content	ND1-ND3	0.84	Loadings=0.71-0.82; CR=0.85; AVE=0.66	Accepted
Educational methods	PP1-PP2	0.79	Loadings=0.69-0.81; CR=0.80; AVE=0.61	Accepted
Educational environment	MT1-MT2	0.81	Loadings=0.73-0.84; CR=0.82; AVE=0.64	Accepted
Educational actors	CT1-CT2	0.77	Loadings=0.68-0.80; CR=0.79; AVE=0.58	Accepted
Overall model	9 items	0.88	KMO=0.861; Bartlett's test $p < 0.001$; $\chi^2/df=2.14$; CFI=0.95; TLI=0.94; RMSEA=0.055	Good fit

3.4. Differences in legal awareness outcomes across respondent groups

To identify group-based differences in legal awareness outcomes, the study used ANOVA. The results showed statistically significant differences by academic year and field of study, whereas gender differences were not statistically significant. Third- and fourth-year students reported higher legal awareness outcomes than first- and second-year students ($F=4.62$, $p=0.011$), reflecting the cumulative effect of learning and university experience. Students in the social sciences and humanities also scored higher than those in engineering and technology ($F=5.14$, $p=0.006$), suggesting that disciplinary exposure to social and legal issues shapes educational outcomes more strongly than gender does.

These findings confirm that legal awareness outcomes are not fixed personal attributes but are shaped by educational exposure, curricular context, and accumulated learning experiences. At the same time, the absence of significant gender differences ($p > 0.05$) indicates that the effectiveness of legal awareness education is distributed more by educational pathways than by demographic identity. This group-based analysis therefore, adds evaluative depth by showing where legal awareness education activities appear more or less effective.

3.5. Regression results on the factors influencing educational effectiveness

To test the proposed hypotheses and determine the extent to which the structural components of legal awareness education activities explain student outcomes, the study estimated a multiple linear regression model. Students' overall legal awareness outcome score served as the dependent variable, while educational content, methods, environment, and educational actors were entered as predictors. Table 4 presents the complete regression results, including standardized coefficients, significance levels, tolerance values, and VIF statistics.

Table 4. Multiple regression results for factors affecting legal awareness education outcomes

Predictor	B	β	t	Sig.	Tolerance/VIF
Educational content	0.314	0.310	6.88	<0.001	0.702/1.42
Educational methods	0.276	0.270	5.97	0.002	0.655/1.53
Educational environment	0.223	0.220	4.91	0.006	0.781/1.28
Educational actors	0.191	0.190	3.98	0.014	0.611/1.64
Model summary	R ² =0.462	Adj. R ² =0.456	F=79.44	p<0.001	No multicollinearity

The model was statistically significant and explained a meaningful proportion of the variance in legal awareness outcomes ($R^2=0.462$; adjusted $R^2=0.456$; $F=79.44$; $p<0.001$). Educational content had the strongest standardized effect ($\beta=0.31$, $p<0.001$), followed by educational methods ($\beta=0.27$, $p<0.01$), educational environment ($\beta=0.22$, $p<0.01$), and educational actors ($\beta=0.19$, $p<0.05$). All VIF values ranged from 1.28 to 1.64, indicating that multicollinearity was not a concern. The findings therefore support H1, H2, H3, and H4, while also showing that content and pedagogy are the most decisive levers for improving the effectiveness of legal awareness education activities.

From an evaluative perspective, the regression results suggest that effectiveness is not generated by one isolated factor but by the interaction of curricular design, pedagogical delivery, institutional climate, and the role of lecturers and supporting actors. Nevertheless, the stronger coefficients for content and methods imply that reform priorities should start with updating legal content and strengthening active, practice-based teaching approaches. This interpretation is consistent with the argument that legal education becomes effective only when it connects legal knowledge with authentic social and digital situations.

Although the regression model provides robust evidence of association, the coefficients should not be interpreted as proof of strict causality. Educational processes are context-sensitive and involve reciprocal influences among variables. For this reason, the current regression results are best read as an explanatory model of educational effectiveness rather than a deterministic causal chain. Future studies may use structural equation modeling on larger samples to test more complex structural relations.

3.6. Discussion

Viewed from an evaluative perspective, the study indicates that legal awareness education activities in higher education institutions are operating at a fairly high level, yet their effectiveness remains uneven across outcome dimensions. Legal attitude was the strongest outcome ($M=3.98$), followed by awareness and then behavior. This pattern suggests that current educational activities are relatively effective in fostering students' normative approval of law, but less effective in transforming legal understanding into stable lawful conduct [1], [30], [31].

The most notable finding is the gap between awareness, attitude, and behavior in digital contexts. This gap is reflected clearly in the indicator "behaving legally online" ($M=3.71$; $SD=0.97$), which was the lowest among the outcome indicators. In other words, the digital environment has become a critical point at which legal knowledge and positive attitudes do not always result in consistent lawful behavior; as one student noted, "*I understand my rights and obligations quite well, but in many real-life situations, especially online, I still feel confused about acting legally*" (PV01). At the level of educational components, all factors reached a moderately good level ($M=3.29$ – 3.80). Lecturer competence recorded the highest score ($M=3.80$; $SD=0.89$), followed by content relevance to student needs ($M=3.76$), confirming the importance of teaching capacity and curriculum design. However, legal experiential activities ($M=3.29$; $SD=1.10$) and case-based learning ($M=3.45$) received lower evaluations, showing that the current model still depends heavily on theoretical transmission and has not sufficiently strengthened practice-based legal learning.

The regression results further clarify the structure of influence. Educational content had the strongest effect ($\beta=0.31$, $p<0.001$), followed by methods ($\beta=0.27$), environment ($\beta=0.22$), and educational actors ($\beta=0.19$). These results imply that improving effectiveness should begin not only with updating legal content but also with redesigning pedagogical methods so that students can apply legal principles to real-life, digital, and civic situations. However, the indicator "updating modern legal information" reached only

$M=3.53$ ($SD=1.02$), suggesting that legal education has not fully adapted to emerging issues such as cybersecurity, privacy, online misinformation, and responsible digital conduct. This limitation helps explain why students may possess legal awareness but still lack confidence or consistency in online behavior. Therefore, the novelty of this study lies in showing that the central challenge of legal awareness education is not merely knowledge acquisition, but the awareness–attitude–behavior gap in the digital environment.

From the perspective of group differences, ANOVA results showed that third- and fourth-year students had higher legal awareness outcomes than lower-year students ($p<0.05$). This finding reflects the cumulative effect of learning experience, academic exposure, and social maturity. It also suggests that legal awareness education should be designed as a continuous process across the university years rather than as a single course or short-term activity. The educational environment also played an important role ($M\approx 3.70\text{--}3.71$). Students do not learn legal compliance only from formal instruction, but also from how universities enforce rules, organize institutional culture, and model fairness in daily academic life. Thus, legal awareness education should be embedded in a broader institutional ecosystem involving lecturers, student organizations, administrative units, and digital governance mechanisms.

Overall, the combination of descriptive statistics, psychometric verification, group comparison, regression analysis, and selected qualitative evidence strengthens the validity of the study's evaluation claims. The findings demonstrate that legal awareness education should be assessed not only by whether students receive legal content, but also by whether educational structures can shape awareness, attitudes, and lawful behavior in measurable ways. This integrated interpretation provides both theoretical and practical implications for redesigning legal awareness education in higher education under conditions of digital transformation [13]–[15], [22], [24], [31].

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined the effectiveness, structure, and determinants of legal awareness education in higher education from a holistic perspective. The findings indicate that the overall structure of the activity is relatively stable, with lecturer competence and content relevance as its strongest components. However, experiential and practice-oriented methods remain underdeveloped, and legal awareness education appears more successful in shaping students' attitudes and cognitive understanding than in fostering consistent lawful behavior, particularly in digital contexts.

The empirical results confirm the reliability and validity of the measurement model and demonstrate that educational content, methods, environment, and educational actors all significantly influence students' legal awareness outcomes. Content and pedagogy emerged as the most decisive factors, which support a reconceptualization of legal awareness education as a systemic and interactive educational process rather than a purely content-driven activity. The study's novelty lies in identifying and empirically explaining the awareness-attitude-behavior gap in digital legal education.

From a practical standpoint, improving effectiveness requires a shift toward updated and context-responsive legal content, stronger integration of experiential and case-based learning, enhanced institutional enforcement mechanisms, and closer alignment with digital citizenship issues. Despite these contributions, the study is limited by its non-probability sampling and cross-sectional design, which constrain the generalizability of the findings. Future research should extend this model using larger samples and more robust designs, such as structural equation modeling or longitudinal approaches, to better capture the dynamic relationship between educational structure and legal awareness outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely thank the administrators, lecturers, and students who participated in the survey and interviews. Their cooperation and reflections contributed directly to the completion and academic quality of this study. Their responses also helped the authors clarify the practical conditions under which legal awareness education is implemented in higher education institutions.

FUNDING INFORMATION

This research was conducted without external funding. All stages of the study, including data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation, were carried out by the authors. No funding body influenced the research design, interpretation of results, or publication decision.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

This journal uses the Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT) to recognize individual author contributions, reduce authorship disputes, and facilitate collaboration.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Hiep Ho Duc	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓				
Long Trong Nguyen	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			
Van Vu Hong	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓		✓		

C : Conceptualization

M : Methodology

So : Software

Va : Validation

Fo : Formal analysis

I : Investigation

R : Resources

D : Data Curation

O : Writing - Original Draft

E : Writing - Review & Editing

Vi : Visualization

Su : Supervision

P : Project administration

Fu : Funding acquisition

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. The research was conducted independently and without any financial or institutional pressure that could affect the findings. All interpretations and conclusions reflect the authors' academic judgment based on the collected data.

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. They were also allowed to withdraw from the study at any stage without any negative consequences.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The study complied with institutional ethical requirements for educational research involving human participants. All data were collected anonymously for academic purposes only. The research procedure minimized potential risks to participants and respected the principles of confidentiality, voluntary participation, and responsible data use.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data are available upon reasonable request and will be shared in anonymized form to ensure ethical compliance and confidentiality. The dataset cannot be made publicly available because it contains information derived from human participants in educational institutions. Access requests should be directed to the corresponding author and will be considered in accordance with ethical and institutional requirements.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Shi, "Examining the status and role of legal education from the perspective of the objectives of legal education," *Region-Educational Research and Reviews*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 74, 2023, doi: 10.32629/rerr.v5i3.1323.
- [2] K. Komalasari and D. Sariudin, "The influence of living values education-based civic education textbook on student's character formation," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 395–410, 2018, doi: 10.12973/iji.2018.11127a.
- [3] F. Alivernini and S. Manganeli, "Is there a relationship between openness in classroom discussion and students' knowledge in civic and citizenship education?" *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 15, pp. 3441–3445, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.315.
- [4] M. A. Murillo, C. A. Liboon, and K. H. Quartz, "Immigrant family legal clinic: A case of integrated student supports in a community school context," *Journal of Educational Change*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 365–392, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10833-021-09447-x.
- [5] L. Lundy and G. M. Sainz, "The role of law and legal knowledge for a transformative human rights education: Addressing violations of children's rights in formal education," *Human Rights Education Review*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 4–24, 2018, doi: 10.7577/hrer.2560.
- [6] B. Bermukhambetova, K. Vozniakovska, M. Yessekeshova, N. Tastanbekova, and A. Kosshygulova, "The effectiveness of using digital technologies to optimize the study of law for students of technical specialties," *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 728–738, 2026, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2026.16.3.2545.

- [7] M. Qafisheh, "The role of legal clinics in leading legal education: The model from the Middle East," *Legal Education Review*, vol. 22, 2012, doi: 10.53300/001c.6259.
- [8] M. Du Plessis, "Clinical legal education: planning a curriculum that can be assessed," *Journal for Juridical Science*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 25–57, 2011, doi: 10.38140/jjs.v36i2.3016.
- [9] D. Holness, "Improving access to justice through compulsory student work at University Law Clinics," *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 327–349, May 2017, doi: 10.17159/1727-3781/2013/v16i4a2417.
- [10] M. J. Mimoso, M. do R. Anjos, and C. Miranda, "Legal clinics, a challenge for the teaching of law," *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 101–108, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.18844/prosoc.v5i3.3915.
- [11] O. V. Isaenkova, "The main objective of the legal clinic: protecting the rights of the poor or skills of students?" *Herald of Civil Procedure*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 39–50, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.24031/2226-0781-2020-10-1-39-50.
- [12] T. Syroid and L. Fomina, "Human rights education for representatives of legal professions: international legal aspect," *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, vol. 2, no. 74, pp. 172–176, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.24144/2307-3322.2022.74.62.
- [13] S. Susi, S. Sunarso, S. Suharno, S. Suwandi, and S. Pudjiastuti, "Legal awareness and student bullying behavior in the digital age," *Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 124–132, 2026, doi: 10.33751/jhss.v10i02.203.
- [14] N. Salameh, "Essential or supportive? Legal education, legal aid and the Sustainable Development Goals," *Cogent Social Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 2, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2023.2275432.
- [15] T. Tjeppey, "Learning civic education on students' legal awareness," *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 97–108, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.21831/jc.v18i1.38602.
- [16] K. Howells, "Simulated and real-world experience-the challenge of adapting practice in clinical legal education in unprecedented and challenging times," *International Journal of Clinical Legal Education*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 196–213, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.19164/ijcle.v27i4.1060.
- [17] P. Kilian, I. Pospíšil, and H. Smekal, "International human rights in Czech Legal Education," *International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 87–98, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1515/iclr-2016-0016.
- [18] H. Nouri, S. Abdinezhad, and A. Shekarbeigi, "The role of citizen education and awareness of laws, regulations, and civil rights in observing civil rights during the crime investigation process," *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 140–157, 2024, doi: 10.61838/kman.isslp.3.2.17.
- [19] N. S. Safadi, S. D. Easton, and J. Lubben, "Power relationships and the formulation of anti-poverty policies in emerging countries: the case of Palestine," *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 34–50, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.1080/21699763.2014.965941.
- [20] I. Novitska, "Education as an object of administrative and legal regulation," *Economics. Finances. Law*, vol. 4, pp. 59–62, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.37634/efp.2024.4.12.
- [21] A. le Roux-Kemp, "A critical analysis of the role of legal higher education and training in the institutionalisation of the English legal profession: quo vadis for English law schools?" *The Law Teacher*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 396–420, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.1080/03069400.2024.2353990.
- [22] S. Slyvka, "Rules for the development of the canonical legal outlook," (in Ukrainian), *Visnik Nacional'nogo universitetu «Lvivska politehnika». Seria: Uridicni nauki*, vol. 10, no. 38, pp. 91–103, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.23939/law2023.38.091.
- [23] T. M. Willemsse, G. ten Dam, F. Geijsel, L. van Wessum, and M. Volman, "Fostering teachers' professional development for citizenship education," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 49, pp. 118–127, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.008.
- [24] S. Hao, "Analyzing the impact of legal education pedagogy on students' understanding of complex legal concepts," *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1994–2018, Jul. 2026, doi: 10.1080/13603116.2025.2555392.
- [25] A. Smulska, "Prospects of regulatory and legal support for obtaining a higher legal education by a citizen of Ukraine," (in Ukrainian), *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series "Law"*, no. 36, pp. 88–95, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.26565/2075-1834-2023-36-10.
- [26] Z. Sun, "Exploration of legal professional education and the cultivation model of legal talents," *Journal of Education and Educational Policy Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 13–19, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.54254/3049-7248/1/2024004.
- [27] A. R. A. Ritonga, "Generation quality through legal awareness and compliance education: Strategy and implementation for creating responsible citizens," *International Journal of Students Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 228–233, 2026.
- [28] D. Volkovetskyi and S. Volkovetska, "Some aspects of legal education as a fundamental element of civil society," *Economics. Finances. Law*, vol. 10, pp. 38–41, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.37634/efp.2023.10.8.
- [29] O. I. Zinsu, "The role and significance of the phenomenon of the first love of youth in the formation of legal (legally significant) behavior about," *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, vol. 3, no. 82, pp. 280–288, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.24144/2307-3322.2024.82.3.44.
- [30] A. Uyumaz and K. Erdoğan, "The theory of legal clinic in Education of Law," *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 174, pp. 2116–2122, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.010.
- [31] Z. Tan, "Research on legal education of contemporary college students," in *Education and Educational Technology. Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing*, vol. 108. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 423–429, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-24775-0_67.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS



Hiep Ho Duc    is a Ph.D. and is currently teaching and researching at the University of Labour and Social Affairs (Campus II), Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. He earned his Ph.D. from Vietnam National University, Hanoi. His research focuses on education, law, and social issues related to education and law. He has published in numerous prestigious journals listed in the Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus. He is also the author of several books used in teaching. He can be contacted at email: hoduchiep2000@gmail.com.



Long Trong Nguyen    is a Ph.D. and is currently teaching and conducting research at the University of Natural Resources and Environment, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. He earned his Ph.D. from the Academy of Social Sciences, Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences. His research focuses on education, political theory, and social issues related to education and political theory. He has published in numerous prestigious journals listed in the Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus. He is also the author of several books used in teaching. He can be contacted at email: ntlong@hcmunre.edu.vn.



Van Vu Hong    is an associate professor, Ph.D. at the Center of Political Sciences, VNU-HCM, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. He participates in teaching and guiding students, graduate students and undergraduate students at many Vietnamese universities. He has had many articles in the fields of education, educational management, learning and teaching methods, cultural studies, and philosophy published in many prestigious domestic and international journals. His major interests continue to focus on issues of education, educational administration, culture, and philosophy. He can be contacted at email: vhvan.cps@vnuhcm.edu.vn.