

Comparison of the Systems and Experience of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education Between China and the Philippines

Yun Pei ^{1, *}

¹ Emilio Aguinaldo College, manila 006302, Philippines

*** Correspondence:**

Yun Pei

125354624@qq.com

Received: 24 May 2025/ Accepted: 14 June 2025/ Published online: 21 June 2025

Abstract

In the social context where the problem of juvenile delinquency is becoming increasingly prominent, the construction of crime prevention education system has become the focus of global attention. This paper takes the juvenile delinquency prevention education system in China and the Philippines as the research object. By comparing the similarities and differences between the two countries in terms of institutional concepts, legal systems, family and community participation mechanisms, school education content and judicial intervention models, it points out that there are problems in China's current system, such as prominent behavior control orientation, weak family and community linkage mechanism, and one-sided education content. Drawing on the Philippines' "child-centered" and "restorative education" concepts and community-oriented practical experience, this paper proposes to promote the systematic reconstruction of China's juvenile delinquency prevention education system from the aspects of establishing a child-centered value orientation, building a multi-faceted collaborative intervention mechanism, reforming the school education system, promoting non-judicial disposal paths, and strengthening data integration and dynamic evaluation mechanisms.

Keywords: Juvenile Delinquency; Preventive Education; Comparison Between China and the Philippines; Education System Reform

1. Introduction

With the accelerated development of globalization, urbanization and informatization, the problem of juvenile delinquency has become increasingly serious. Reports from international organizations such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) show that juvenile delinquency is not only widespread in developing countries, but also in developed countries, where juvenile violence, gang crime, drug crime and cybercrime are prevalent.

Juveniles are in a critical period of immature physical and mental development and are easily induced and influenced by negative social factors. Their illegal and criminal behaviors are often characterized by impulsiveness, imitation and group nature. In addition, the proliferation of the Internet environment has also become a catalyst for new types of juvenile delinquency in recent years. New forms of crime such as cyber violence, fraud and telecommunications crime are becoming increasingly younger.

From the perspective of global governance, the problem of juvenile delinquency is not only related to the growth and destiny of individuals, but also to social stability and the future level of legal development of the country. Many countries generally agree with the governance concept of "education as the main and punishment as the auxiliary", emphasizing the prevention of minors from falling into the criminal track through early education, intervention and guidance. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child clearly states that the personal dignity of minors should be respected and they should be given appropriate protection and education to prevent them from being harmed by crimes or participating in criminal activities.

As important developing countries in Asia, China and the Philippines have some commonalities in terms of juvenile delinquency despite differences in political system, social structure, and legal system: there is a clear trend of younger crime, violent crimes and gang crimes occur from time to time, and the causes of crime are becoming increasingly complex.

In China, the proportion of juvenile delinquency in the total crime structure continues to remain at a high level. According to statistics from the Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate, traditional types of crimes such as theft, robbery, gang fighting, and provoking trouble are still the mainstream. At the same time, some young people are involved in telecommunications fraud, cyber violence, illegal knife possession, sexual assault and other cases. The age of crime tends to be younger, especially minors aged 14-18, who have become a high-risk group for criminal behavior. At the same time, marginal groups such as left-behind children, children of migrant workers, and children from single-parent families generally have weak legal awareness and risk resistance, and are the focus of prevention work.

In the Philippines, juvenile delinquency also shows the duality of complex structure and difficult intervention. Due to unbalanced economic development, uneven distribution of urban and rural educational resources, and high poverty rates, minors in some parts of the Philippines have long been in a vicious cycle of "lack of education - weakened family function - influence of violent culture". According to data from the National Youth Commission (NYC) of the Philippines, theft, drug-related crimes and youth group violence are on the rise in cities such as Manila and Cebu. In addition, the country's long-standing problem of street children has also led some minors to the brink of crime due to survival pressure.

It is worth noting that although the social background of juvenile crime in China and the Philippines is different, they both face similar challenges such as an inadequate preventive education system, weak legal education in schools, lack of family education, and ineffective

grassroots intervention mechanisms. Faced with the growing trend of juvenile crime, both countries generally realize that the strategy of "prevention first" is the fundamental way to solve the problem in addition to punishment and correction. Preventive education, as an important first line of defense for preventing and controlling juvenile crime, has multiple functions such as legal communication, psychological intervention, and value guidance, and should be included as an important part of the national governance system and education system.

In China, with the revision and implementation of laws such as the Law on the Protection of Minors and the Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, the national level has promoted preventive education as a key area. However, in actual operation, the content of school education is still mainly "moral preaching", lacking systematic teaching of legal knowledge and behavioral intervention mechanism; family education has not yet formed a stable responsibility mechanism, and some parents have weak legal awareness; the role of communities and social organizations in educational intervention is insufficient, which restricts the improvement and operation of the prevention system. In recent years, the Philippines has attached great importance to the construction of multi-departmental collaborative intervention, community participation, and school-family interaction mechanisms. In particular, after the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act (RA 9344), the concept of "restorative justice" and "education priority" was established, and some places explored and established relatively effective crime prevention projects. But overall, the country also faces problems such as insufficient resources, weak educational foundation, and poor implementation.

Therefore, studying the juvenile delinquency prevention education systems in China and the Philippines will not only help compare the effectiveness and difficulties of different rule of law and education systems in practice, but also help provide improvement suggestions and cross-border reference paths for relevant systems in my country, promote the construction of a diversified and coordinated prevention mechanism that conforms to local social realities and the laws of child development, and achieve the rule of law goal of "education and persuasion first, crime intervention first".

2. Literature Review

2.1. Current Status of Research on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education in China

In recent years, with the continuous advancement of my country's juvenile protection and juvenile delinquency prevention and control work, the academic community has continuously strengthened its attention to juvenile delinquency prevention education. The research content mainly focuses on the following aspects:

First, the analysis of the causes and characteristics of juvenile delinquency is an important starting point for domestic research. Scholars generally believe that the occurrence of juvenile delinquency is closely related to factors such as their immature psychological development, weak legal awareness, lack of family education, insufficient school education, and unfavorable social environment. For example, Li Li (2020) pointed out that juvenile delinquency often

presents characteristics such as "impulsiveness", "imitation" and "group nature", and criminal behavior often stems from serious defects in individual morality, legal cognition and emotional management.

Second, there are more and more studies on the content and mechanism construction of preventive education. Many scholars have proposed that legal education, mental health education, behavior correction education and other contents should be incorporated into the systematic juvenile education system, and a "family-school-society" trinity collaboration mechanism should be established. For example, Zhang Ning (2019) advocated that preventive education should be "forward-moved" and "normalized", and the educational effect should be improved through the penetration of legal knowledge in school classrooms, mock trials, psychological group counseling and other means.

Secondly, institutional analysis at the legal and policy levels has also become a research focus. With the successive revisions of the "Law on the Protection of Minors" and the "Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency", many scholars have begun to systematically sort out the legal system for the prevention of juvenile delinquency in my country, and analyze the applicable practices and difficulties in the operation of the system under the legal provisions. Wang Xu (2021) believes that the requirements of my country's current laws for preventive education are still relatively principled, lacking operability and implementation details, which makes it easy to become a formality in educational practice.

2.2. Current Status of Foreign Research and Review of Related Research in the Philippines

Internationally, juvenile delinquency prevention education has become an important topic of cross-disciplinary concern, especially in the fields of education, criminology, children's law, and social policy.

In European and American countries, researchers emphasize the concepts of "restorative justice" and "education first", advocating the establishment of a supportive environment to identify adolescent risk behaviors at an early stage, and to achieve correction through educational intervention and community support. For example, the US "Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support" (PBIS) model and the UK's "Youth Crime Intervention Program" (YIP) have achieved certain results. Related research also focuses on the deep impact of social structure on juvenile delinquency, emphasizing the intertwined effects of factors such as family function, school atmosphere, and peer influence (Farrington & Welsh, 2007).

Among Asian countries, the Philippines, as one of the countries with relatively mature education and legal systems in Southeast Asia, has certain characteristics in its institutional design for juvenile delinquency prevention. Since the promulgation of the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act (RA 9344) in 2006, the Philippines has built a relatively systematic juvenile delinquency intervention system, emphasizing the organic combination of education, social services and judicial procedures. Some places have explored community participatory

prevention education models, such as the "Barangay Intervention Program", which focuses on early community identification, psychological counseling and social reintegration services.

Academic research on the Philippine system focuses on the practical effect of its "restorative justice" concept (Villanueva, 2015) and the operation of multi-departmental cooperation mechanisms. For example, Andres & Ilagan (2018) pointed out that although Philippine law attaches importance to educational intervention, it still faces problems such as insufficient financial resources, poor implementation, and uneven local governance capacity in practice. In recent years, some English literature has also focused on new trends such as "legal literacy" education in Philippine youth education and the role of NGOs in preventive education.

In summary, although China and the Philippines are both developing countries, their juvenile delinquency prevention education shows obvious differences in institutional concepts, operating mechanisms, and social coordination. China emphasizes state-led and legal education promotion, while the Philippines emphasizes community orientation and restorative education practices. Therefore, this study attempts to break the single country perspective, and fill the gap in related research through institutional comparison and empirical analysis between China and the Philippines, hoping to provide theoretical support and practical reference for the improvement of China's juvenile delinquency prevention education system, while expanding the international comparative perspective of juvenile legal education research.

3. Methodology

In order to achieve the above research objectives, this paper will use a variety of research methods to conduct a comprehensive and in-depth comparative analysis at the institutional and practical levels. Specifically, it includes:

3.1. Literature Review Method

Through a systematic review of domestic and foreign academic journals, monographs, policy documents, and research reports, this paper will sort out the theoretical achievements and policy progress of juvenile delinquency prevention education in China and the Philippines, and establish the theoretical basis and research perspective of this study. The scope of the literature covers relevant fields such as law, education, sociology, and criminology, with a focus on United Nations child rights related documents, Chinese laws and regulations, and Philippine youth policy documents.

3.2. Comparative Study Method

Using the comparative law perspective, this paper will conduct a horizontal comparison of the juvenile delinquency prevention education systems in China and the Philippines around the dimensions of system design, implementation path, legal support, and intervention methods, revealing the similarities and differences and the differences in legal culture and social structure behind them. The comparison is not limited to the comparison of static legal texts, but also focuses on the actual results of system operation and the impact of the social environment.

3.3. Case Study Method

Representative practice cases are selected for in-depth analysis, such as the "School Rule of Law Education in the Classroom" project in some cities in China, the "Barangay Intervention Program" and "Juvenile Social Service Mechanism" in Manila, Philippines, etc., to analyze their specific implementation process, effectiveness evaluation and existing problems, so as to enhance the empirical and operability of the research.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Overview of China's Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education System

4.1.1. Historical Evolution of the Legal and Policy Framework

The development of China's juvenile delinquency prevention education system is accompanied by the continuous improvement of the national legal system for the protection of minors. Since the 1990s, the "Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency" (1999) and the "Law on the Protection of Minors" (1991) have been successively promulgated, marking that my country's juvenile legal construction has officially entered the systematization stage. The promulgation of the two laws provides a legal basis and direction for crime prevention education. In 2020, the "Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency" was significantly revised, and it was clearly proposed to implement the principle of "prevention first, combining education with protection" in the entire process of juvenile crime prevention and control, and give schools, families, society, government and judicial organs their respective responsibilities in educational intervention. At the same time, the 2020 "Civil Code" also emphasizes the guardian's responsibility for the education and guidance of minors.

In addition, the state has issued special policy documents many times to promote the integration of legal education and moral education, such as "Opinions on Strengthening Legal Education in Primary and Secondary Schools in the New Era" (2021) and "Outline for the Implementation of Ideological and Moral Construction of Minors (Revised)", etc., and gradually established a "three-in-one" preventive education model with school education as the main channel, family education as the basis, and social education as the supplement.

4.1.2. School-led Legal and Moral Education System

In China's juvenile delinquency prevention education system, school education is the most core implementation link. At present, schools mainly educate young people on legal knowledge, behavioral norms, safety precautions, etc. through legal courses, theme class meetings, mock courts, campus lectures, etc. According to the regulations of the Ministry of Education, moral and legal courses are set up from the upper grades of elementary school, and the junior high school stage requires strengthening the systematic teaching of the Constitution, the Law on the Protection of Minors, and the Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. Some regions have tried to introduce the "campus judge" and "deputy principal of the rule of law" system, and personnel from the public security and procuratorate organs regularly go to school to popularize the law. The curriculum design emphasizes guiding young people to understand their rights and obligations, rule awareness and the consequences of violations, but in

implementation, it still faces problems such as insufficient professionalism of teachers and lagging teaching materials.

In recent years, with the frequent occurrence of psychological problems among young people, the education system has increasingly attached importance to the role of psychological intervention in crime prevention. Most primary and secondary schools have set up mental health education courses, psychological counseling centers, and combined with the social psychological service system to conduct regular screening and crisis intervention for students. At the same time, individual correction courses, group counseling and referral mechanisms are carried out for students with bad behavior tendencies to provide targeted prevention measures for "high-risk groups". In addition, the construction of "campus rule of law community" has been launched in some cities, and the procuratorate, courts, and judicial bureaus have established regular cooperation with schools to promote mock trials, rule of law education practice bases, and "one school, one police" mechanisms. The education department also jointly promoted the "Protecting Schools and Ensuring the Garden" special action with the political and legal authorities to implement source governance of public security around campuses and student bullying.

4.1.3. Strengthening the Family Education Responsibility System

Family education, as the basic unit for the prevention of juvenile delinquency, has long been "absent" in China in the past. In response to this problem, the "Family Education Promotion Law" promulgated in 2021 clearly stipulates that parents or guardians shall perform their family education duties in accordance with the law, emphasizing "bringing children and educating people in accordance with the law." The law requires parents to cultivate their children's sense of rules, respect for others, emotional management and self-protection, and they are obliged to cooperate with schools to carry out educational correction. At the same time, women's federations, education, civil affairs and other departments at all levels of government need to establish a family education guidance service platform to provide educational support for high-risk families, divorced families, and migrant families.

At present, various places have gradually established a "home-school collaboration" mechanism to improve parents' awareness of early identification and correction of illegal behaviors through parent schools, online guidance courses, family education manuals and other means. However, in practice, family education still has problems such as large urban-rural differences and uneven parental guardianship capabilities, which affect the consistency and sustainability of education.

4.1.4. Collaborative Participation of Communities and Social Organizations

The systematic requirements of juvenile delinquency prevention education embed education into the social governance system, and the role of communities and social organizations is becoming increasingly prominent. Local governments have established a "youth affairs social worker" system, set up youth comprehensive service centers, psychological service stations, growth guidance stations and other platforms, and carried out psychological counseling,

employment guidance, correction intervention and social integration services for problem youth. Some cities have explored the establishment of a community "observation and assistance" model, and carried out community correction and follow-up counseling for minors with minor violations, striving to "give priority to education and return to normal".

Many NGOs, legal aid agencies, and law schools in universities have actively participated in the education of minors through projects such as the rule of law summer camp, youth mock court, and anti-drug publicity month, enriching the content and form of education. Especially in urban migrant children gathering areas and rural "left-behind children" high-incidence areas, social organizations have become an important supplement to educational resources.

4.1.5. Educational Judicial Intervention By Judicial Organs

As the "last line of defense" for the governance of juvenile crimes, judicial organs have gradually shifted to a juvenile justice model of "giving equal importance to education and correction" in recent years. The procuratorate has set up a special juvenile prosecution department, and implemented the "conditional non-prosecution" and "social guardianship" systems when handling cases. Juvenile suspects who meet the conditions will not be prosecuted, but social education programs and behavior correction plans will be introduced, and professional social workers will follow up and counsel throughout the process. This system effectively avoids the labeling of crimes and guarantees their opportunities to reintegrate into society.

The court system promotes flexible trial methods such as "round-table trials" and "family courts", and attaches importance to family responsibilities and educational guidance. Some regions have piloted "parental education orders" to impose compulsory learning obligations on guardians who fail to fulfill their guardianship responsibilities, urging them to fulfill their educational responsibilities and emphasizing "lifelong educational responsibilities."

4.2. Overview of the Philippine Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education System

4.2.1. Starting Point of the System and Legal Development

The Philippine juvenile delinquency prevention education system started early, and its unique "child-oriented" governance concept and community-led characteristics are the core development direction. Since the promulgation of Republic Act No. 9344 (the 2006 Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act), the Philippines has established a juvenile delinquency governance system that is "oriented towards restorative justice and aims at education and social integration". The promulgation of this law marks the official shift of the Philippines from "punitive juvenile justice" to "education-transformation juvenile justice", and has widely integrated social education resources to deal with juvenile delinquency in a prevention-oriented and education-first manner.

In 2013, the Philippines further revised the law to strengthen the protection of the rights and interests of the "Children in Conflict with the Law (CICL)" group, stipulate that children under

the age of 12 do not bear criminal responsibility, and introduce an "Intervention Program" for offenders between the ages of 12 and 15. Only in the case of "recidivism or serious violent behavior" can they enter the formal judicial process. These regulations have freed up a lot of space and resources for crime prevention education, emphasizing the use of community education, parenting counseling, psychological intervention and other means to solve the causes of crime. In addition, laws and regulations such as the "Declaration of the Rights of the Child Act", "Family Code", "Local Government Act" and "Education Act" together constitute a cross-departmental, multi-level and multi-participation educational governance system for minors.

4.2.2. School Education Mechanism and "Value Formation" System

In the Philippines, the school system is the first line of defense for crime prevention education. The basic education curriculum (K-12) contains a lot of moral education, behavioral norms and legal awareness education content, focusing on the comprehensive cultivation of students' "social adaptability". One of the compulsory courses in the basic education stage in the Philippines is "Values Education", and the teaching syllabus is uniformly formulated by the Ministry of Education. The content covers respect, responsibility, social obligations, non-violent communication, self-management, etc., emphasizing the value guidance of the individual socialization process, and has obvious preventive functions. In addition, the course also intersperses basic legal knowledge such as the "Child Rights Law", "Anti-Bullying Law" and "Sexual Harassment Law" to help students understand the boundaries of their rights and responsibilities.

According to the Anti-Bullying Act of 2013 (Republic Act 10627), all primary and secondary schools must establish a campus bullying reporting mechanism, anti-bullying policies, and full-time anti-bullying coordinators, and incorporate anti-bullying education into daily teaching and class meetings. This has effectively reduced the problem of juvenile delinquency caused by factors such as school violence and marginalization, and has become an important part of crime prevention education. Public schools at all levels in the Philippines are gradually equipped with social workers (school social workers) to assist in identifying "high-risk students" and conduct family interviews, behavioral interventions and psychological counseling. Schools can detect signs of problems in advance through the three-dimensional monitoring mechanism of "academic-behavior-attendance" (known as ABC Framework), and establish referral links with community service agencies to achieve early warning and multiple interventions.

4.2.3. Family Participation and Parenting Education System

The Philippine government attaches great importance to the fundamental position of the family in crime prevention, and believes that "family disintegration and parenting disability" are one of the key causes of juvenile delinquency. To this end, the policy forces local governments and social organizations to carry out parenting education programs (PES), focusing on serving high-risk groups such as poor families, single-parent families, and migrant workers' families. The local Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) implements the "PES Community Education Course" every year, which covers positive

discipline, psychological support, family communication skills and value guidance, and includes the results of the course in the local government assessment. The course requires parents to participate in no less than 6 counseling sessions each year and receive training on topics such as "child behavior identification" and "alternative methods of violent punishment".

In the juvenile delinquency prevention project, community workers need to conduct a systematic assessment of high-risk families (Family Risk Assessment Tool, FRAT), and the results determine whether the child needs further social intervention or transfer to the "community care program". This model plays a core role in the specific operation of the "Barangay Child Welfare Committee (BCPC)".

4.2.4. Community-Led and Local Governance System

The most distinctive juvenile delinquency prevention mechanism in the Philippines is reflected in its strong "grassroots governance unit" - Barangay (village/community) level participation. The Barangay Child Welfare Committee (BCPC) is a decision-making and executive body composed of locally elected councilors, teachers, church representatives, parents' association members and social organization representatives. When the community finds that a minor has committed a minor offense, behaved abnormally or dropped out of school, the BCPC can initiate a "community intervention plan" to conduct non-judicial corrections through home visits, educational counseling, social worker tracking, volunteer projects, etc., to prevent the young person from entering the formal judicial system.

Barangay-level units have a dedicated child hotline to receive reports of school violence, domestic abuse, street crimes, etc., and the BCPC will intervene in time. At the same time, community police are also trained in child rights protection courses and strictly abide by the principle of "non-violent intervention". The "Youth Development Centers" (YDC) widely established in cities and rural areas provide after-school learning counseling, skills training, psychological support and social participation projects for young people, which is a model of both preventive education and capacity building. Some centers are also equipped with misdemeanor correction projects to provide alternative correction services for non-violent CICL.

4.2.5. Collaborative Model Between the Judicial and Social Service Systems

The Philippine juvenile justice system emphasizes educational justice. The procuratorate, courts and social welfare departments work together to pursue an intervention model of "minimizing detention and maximizing education". For the CICL (12-15 years old) group, the government sets up an "intervention program" instead of traditional punishment, which includes regular counseling, vocational training, social services and parent-child education, and is implemented by local governments and NGOs. Before handling a case, the court must evaluate whether the youth can be transferred to the intervention mechanism to protect their right to growth and education.

Cities in the Philippines have set up "multi-agency intervention teams", whose members include police, teachers, psychologists, social workers and parent representatives, to develop

personalized prevention plans for high-risk youth, emphasizing case tracking, service integration and information sharing.

4.3 Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education Systems in China and the Philippines

4.3.1. Comparison of Legislative Concepts

There are significant differences in the legislative concepts of juvenile delinquency prevention education between China and the Philippines.

China's crime prevention education system is centered on "rule of law orientation" and "educational transformation", emphasizing state leadership, order stability and the integration of morality and law. China's "Law on the Protection of Minors" and "Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency" and other legal documents emphasize the "school, family, society, and justice" as a whole, but focus on the implementation of the concept of "legal norms + moral education", advocating education as a prerequisite and behavior management as the core.

The Philippines adheres to the concepts of "child rights first" and "restorative justice". The Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act (RA9344) clearly states that juvenile delinquency should be resolved through "community integration" and "educational reintegration into society", opposes stigmatization and labeling, and prefers a "non-judicial" and "non-custodial" disposal model, emphasizing the maximum protection of children's individual dignity.

4.3.2. Comparison of Education Implementation Mechanisms

In the school education system, both China and the Philippines attach importance to the establishment of moral education and rule of law courses, but the content and implementation methods are different: China: With the "Morality and Rule of Law" course as the main focus, legal education is more formal and classroom-based, often relying on teachers to give lectures and political and legal organs to assist (such as the "Deputy Principal for Rule of Law" system); emphasizing the cultivation of legal norms, social order and national consciousness; Philippines: Through the "Values Education" course, behavioral norms, value choices, emotional control and social responsibility are embedded, teaching is more life-oriented and interactive, and school social workers are used for long-term follow-up services; educational content is more inclined to psychological, personality and social relationship adjustment. In addition, the institutionalized arrangements such as "anti-bullying coordinators" and "reporting mechanisms" in Philippine schools are significantly better than those in China. The former focuses more on "problematic interactions between students" in crime prevention, while the latter relies more on "teacher guidance and disciplinary management".

In recent years, China has gradually established mental health courses and psychological counseling centers, but due to the lack of professional resources and cultural identity barriers, the overall implementation results are uneven. In this regard, the Philippines has a relatively mature "campus social worker" system, which combines the "ABC student early warning mechanism" (Attendance, Behavior, Class performance) to dynamically identify and refer high-

risk students to the community. This integrated mechanism of "identification-intervention-tracking" reflects a stronger systematization and prevention.

4.3.3. Comparison of Family and Community Participation Mechanisms

Although the laws of both countries stipulate the core responsibilities of the family in the education of minors, the actual implementation is different: China: The "Family Education Promotion Law" clearly states that parents must educate their children in accordance with the law, but family education still exists in a "supplementary role". Some parents have weak legal awareness and insufficient ability, and home-school collaboration is often formal; Philippines: Local governments widely carry out parenting education (PES), parenting courses are embedded in the grassroots governance system, and education effectiveness is improved through community supervision and social worker follow-up; At the same time, a "family risk assessment mechanism" is established to regularly intervene in high-risk families, significantly enhancing the initiative of families in preventive education.

China's juvenile crime prevention focuses on the leadership of the administrative system, and community participation has not yet formed a stable mechanism, relying on special governance projects (such as "nursing schools and ensuring safety") and government purchase of services. The Philippines has established a relatively mature "Barangay Child Welfare Committee" (BCPC) system, in which the community has the right to intervene, make decisions and implement education; at the same time, NGOs, churches and volunteer groups are deeply involved in youth education, forming a "social collaborative education structure" with local governments as the main body, which is highly flexible and responsive.

4.3.4. Comparison of Judicial Intervention Models

When dealing with juvenile delinquency, the Chinese judicial system has gradually strengthened its educational and tolerant nature, but it is still dominated by the procuratorate and the courts as a whole, and informal disposal (such as conditional non-prosecution) has not yet been fully popularized. The judicial system emphasizes "legal application" rather than "social service" integration. The Philippines regards judicial intervention as the "last choice", and a large number of behavioral problems have been identified and handled educationally at the community level. For minor offenders, the first choice is "intervention plan" instead of punitive disposal, which is implemented by local governments and non-governmental organizations, emphasizing "minimizing judicialization" and "maximizing community reintegration".

China is currently promoting a "joint mechanism" between juvenile procuratorates, courts, judicial administration, education, civil affairs and other institutions, but in practice, it is often difficult to effectively collaborate due to information barriers and overlapping responsibilities. The Philippines has implemented a "Multi-Agency Intervention Team" (MIAT), in which the judiciary, education, social workers and parents jointly participate in case handling. The system is more holistic, with clearer information sharing mechanisms and allocation of rights and responsibilities, which improves the durability and operability of prevention effects.

Table1. Comparison of institutional design models

Comparative Dimensions	China	Philippines
Legislative Concept	Rule of law-oriented, integration of morality and law, emphasis on order	Child-centered, restorative justice, emphasis on protection
Education system	State-led, school-centered, classroom education	Community participation, value education, personality construction
Family roles	Legal responsibility but weak enforcement	Institutionalization of parenting education, community support
Community mechanisms	Assisted participation	Leading participation, institutionalization of governance
Judicial system	Based on legal handling, with educational enhancement	Non-judicial, multi-institutional collaborative education

5. Suggestions for Improvement of The System of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education in China

5.1. Reshape the Value Orientation of Crime Prevention Education

The current juvenile crime prevention education system in China still has the tendency to replace "personality development" with "behavior control" and weaken "social integration" with "standardized management". In contrast, the system of the Philippines, which takes "child-oriented" and "restorative education" as the core concept, pays more attention to the development of adolescent psychology, social relations and self-cognition. Its institutional practice proves that "protective education" is more sustainable than "punitive control".

5.1.1. Break Through the Institutional Limitations of "Behavior Control" Orientation

The current juvenile crime prevention education system in my country still exhibits significant limitations in its value orientation. It primarily focuses on "behavioral control" as the central objective, rather than emphasizing the personal development and social integration of adolescents. This approach, which substitutes humanistic care with standardized management, often results in a simplistic and rigid disciplinary model in practice. Such a model tends to overlook the individuality and developmental potential of young people, making it difficult to achieve the long-term goal of preventing delinquency. In contrast, the Philippines adopts a "child-centered" and "restorative education" framework, which highlights respect for the dignity of minors, the cultivation of mental well-being, and the restoration of social relationships. The Philippine experience demonstrates that an educational philosophy grounded

in respect, inclusiveness, and personal development is more effective in guiding at-risk youth back on the right path, enabling both personal growth and social reintegration. Therefore, it is imperative for my country to move beyond the restrictive "prevention and control" mindset and to establish a "child development-oriented" educational philosophy at the institutional level. By doing so, juvenile crime prevention efforts can be infused with more humane, inclusive, and sustainable values.

5.1.2. Construct an Institutional Framework of Respect for Rights and Education Priority

In order to achieve the transformation of concepts, my country should establish the three-in-one institutional goals of "respect for rights, early intervention, and education priority" at the legislative and policy levels based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child. First, respect rights, fully guarantee the personal dignity, freedom of expression and participation opportunities of minors in all intervention measures, and eliminate the tendency of labeling and stigmatization; second, early intervention, through the dynamic monitoring of daily signals such as campus discipline, psychological assessment, and behavioral deviation, realize the transformation from "post-punishment" to "pre-education"; third, education priority, promote psychological counseling, behavioral correction, social services, etc. as the priority means of dealing with minor violations, and avoid excessive judicial intervention. In order to ensure the effective implementation of the above-mentioned value goals, we should promote the amendment of the existing "Law on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency" or add the "Regulations on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Education", write the child development orientation into the statutory system framework, and serve as the fundamental guide for the government, schools, families and judicial systems to formulate specific measures. Only in this way can preventive education truly return to value rationality from the level of institutional design.

5.2. Promote the Collaboration and Linkage of Families, Schools and Communities

In the context of China's reality, the imbalance of family education quality, the pressure orientation of school education and the lack of community role are the core factors that restrict the function of crime prevention education. Drawing on the Philippines' experience in prevention and governance of "family + community-led", we should strengthen the coordination and linkage of multiple subjects from the following aspects:

5.2.1. Promote the Legalization and Systematization of Family Education

The legalization and systematization of family education can promote the detailed measures of the "Family Education Promotion Law" at the implementation level in the form of local pilot projects. First, the Education Bureau and the Civil Affairs Bureau will take the lead in setting up a "Family Education Center" to improve parents' parenting ability through systematic courses, family consultation, case guidance, etc.; then, establish a high-risk family identification mechanism (refer to the Philippines FRAT) and incorporate family function assessment into daily community governance; finally, include parenting education in the

supporting projects of the compulsory education stage and connect it with the school registration management system to ensure effective coverage.

5.2.2. Promote the "Institutionalized" Participation of Community Education Subjects

At present, Chinese communities mainly play an auxiliary role in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, lacking formal responsibilities and stable mechanisms. It is suggested to build a "community education coordination platform", which can refer to the model of the Barangay Committee in the Philippines. The street comprehensive management office will take the lead and jointly form a "youth affairs joint meeting" with community workers, school representatives, police officers and psychological counselors to be responsible for: dynamically grasping the list of key youth in the community (such as those who drop out of school, those involved in the Internet, and those involved in drugs, etc.); launching a "community education intervention program" to provide psychological counseling, vocational training and volunteer service opportunities for teenagers with deviant behavior; and establishing a "home visit + behavior tracking + education return visit" three-in-one tracking system.

5.3. Establish a Three-Dimensional and Hierarchical Preventive Education Content Structure

The moral education curriculum in Chinese schools is characterized by unification, abstraction and theorization, which makes it difficult to effectively deal with the diverse psychological and behavioral deviations of young people. The teaching system of crime prevention education should be reformed in terms of both content and form.

5.3.1. Enriching Educational Content: From Legal Education to Comprehensive Behavioral Education

Currently, the "morality and rule of law" course focuses on the inculcation of legal provisions. It is recommended to expand it to "comprehensive behavioral education", including: Emotional management and conflict resolution: teach teenagers how to deal with emotions such as anger, jealousy, loneliness, etc., and set up special courses such as "life education" and "emotional expression"; interpersonal communication and value cognition: introduce modules such as "peer relationship management", "cyberbullying response", "gender respect and consent"; rights and responsibilities education: explain legal obligations from the perspective of children's rights, and enhance students' "boundary awareness" and "negotiation awareness".

5.3.2. Reform Teaching Methods: From Teacher-Led to Multi-Participation

Promote "experiential teaching methods", such as situational mock courts, campus mediation practices, and legal script performances; introduce judicial organs and social work organizations into campuses to participate in "situational legal education"; encourage the construction of "student self-management organizations", such as "student rights protection groups", to enhance their self-governance capabilities.

5.3.3. Constructing a School-Psychology-Law Three-Line Integration Mechanism

Combining the psychological education center with legal aid services, establish: a youth psychological screening mechanism (basic assessment once a semester, key student tracking intervention); campus legal consultation sites, where the Bureau of Justice arranges legal volunteers to provide permanent services; crisis reporting and handling procedures, when involving serious deviant behavior, initiate a multi-department joint handling mechanism.

5.4. Promote the "Non-Judicialization" Reform of the Judicial System and Expand the Space for Educational Handling

Although the Chinese judicial system has initially established a special system for juvenile prosecution and trial, it still focuses on legal response and judicialization as a whole. Drawing on the Philippines' "intervention plan" system, the following reforms should be promoted:

5.4.1. Constructing an "Alternative Handling" System

For minors who commit minor offenses for the first time, the "conditional non-prosecution + community education plan" model can be used for handling; "behavior correction, skills training, and psychological counseling" should be included in the content of compulsory handling to avoid the phenomenon of "free from punishment and free from management"; formulate the "Operational Procedures for Alternative Handling of Youth" to clarify the specific path and responsible units of educational substitution.

5.4.2. Promote the Multi-Institutional Case Cooperation Mechanism

Establish a "Youth Behavior Intervention Joint Group" in the procuratorate, whose members include schools, social workers, judges, and psychologists; formulate the "Multi-institutional Cooperation Standards for Juvenile Judicial Intervention", unify the process and evaluation form; strengthen the "process tracking" responsibility, and conduct 6-12 months of follow-up visits to the subjects of educational disposal.

5.5. Strengthen System Integration and Data Sharing To Improve the Effectiveness of the Preventive Education System

China's current preventive education system shows a "fragmented and departmentalized" tendency, lacks a unified data platform and collaborative governance mechanism, and seriously restricts the effectiveness of governance.

5.5.1. Establish a Database of Risky Behaviors of Minors

Education bureaus, public security organs, and community service centers in various regions should share "risky behavior files of youth"; data content includes: school discipline records, psychological assessments, family guardianship status, violation records, etc.; under the premise of ensuring privacy and security, information should be shared across departments to evaluate intervention priorities and resource allocation.

5.5.2. Build a "Youth Crime Prevention Education Information Platform"

Integrate data from education, justice, civil affairs, health and other systems to establish an online research and early warning system; implement "one file for each risk youth" and

dynamically update intervention status; set up an education resource center on the platform to provide education courses, intervention cases, teacher training resources, etc.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization, Y. P.; methodology, Y. P.; software, Y. P.; validation, Y. P.; formal analysis, Y. P.; investigation, Y. P.; resources, Y. P.; data curation, Y. P.; writing—original draft preparation, Y. P.; writing—review and editing, Y. P.; visualization, Y. P.; supervision, Y. P.; project administration, Y. P.; funding acquisition, Y. P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding:

Not applicable.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement:

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement:

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments:

This is a short text to acknowledge the contributions of specific colleagues, institutions, or agencies that aided the efforts of the authors.

References

- Alampay, L. P. (2014). Parenting in the Philippines. *Parenting Across Cultures*, 17, 105–117.
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2011). Social foundations of Filipino adolescent development: Research and implications. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 44(2), 119–145.
- Chen, X. (2021). The rule of law and juvenile justice reform in China. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 64, 100462.
- Cilliers, J., Fleisch, B., & Prinsloo, C. (2020). How to improve teaching practice? An experimental comparison of centralized training and in-classroom coaching. *Journal of Human Resources*, 55(3), 926–962.
- Cruz, C. J., & Balanon, F. (2010). Alternative child discipline and youth reintegration in the Philippines. *Save the Children Philippines*.

- Fang, M. & Zhao, X. (2020). Social control and prevention of juvenile delinquency in China: From compulsory education to criminal law. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 15(2), 189–207.
- Liem, M. (2016). Community-based juvenile justice practices in Asia. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 65(3), 245–261.
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2022). Guidelines on strengthening mental health education for primary and secondary school students.
- Republic of the Philippines. (2006). Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act (RA 9344). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1356-1294\(06\)70541-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1356-1294(06)70541-0)
- Restorative Justice for Children (UNICEF, 2022). Global implementation and best practices. <https://doi.org/10.18356/12b983aa-en>
- UNICEF Philippines. (2019). Children in conflict with the law in the Philippines: A case for change.
- Wang, Z., & Deng, X. (2022). The transformation of school-based juvenile delinquency prevention in China: A legal and pedagogical analysis. *Education and Law Review*, 31(4), 332–348.
- Wu, Y., & Sun, I. Y. (2021). Juvenile justice and restorative practices in East Asia. *Youth Justice*, 21(3), 206–223.
- Zhang, L. (2020). Development and challenges of juvenile delinquency prevention education in China. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences)*, 38(1), 43–51.
- Zhao, B., & Wang, H. (2023). Early prevention and social intervention for at-risk youth in China. *International Journal of Child and Adolescent Health*, 16(1), 57–72.