

*Vietnam's National Foreign Language 2020 Project after 9 years:
A Difficult Stage*

Thuong Nguyen, National Chengchi University, Taiwan

The Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2017
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Viet Nam has been witnessing many changes in learning language, and the National Foreign Language 2020 project is the latest breakthrough that delves into brand-new advances to improve effectively the quality of English language learning and teaching across all school levels in Vietnam. After nine years, this innovation has attracted considerable public attention and feedback from those concerned. On November 16, 2016, Mr. Phung Xuan Nha - Minister of Education and Training - admitted that the National Foreign Language scheme for the 2008-2020 periods had been failed. However, there is no debate on why the project could not be completed within the defined period. This paper aims to discuss how it has failed by analysing the Vietnam national high school graduation examination results from Ho Chi Minh City's high schools as a case study. In addition, it incorporates findings from an observation of 3 English classes in Dao Son Tay High School that was conducted to provide first-hand evidence for this discussion. Through the analysis and observation, the study finds major obstacles that affect students' performance: the misuse of L1 in class, the unbalanced teaching time for 4 language skills, the lack of teacher – student interactions and the shortage of English teaching equipment. It then concludes that there are still uneven in teachers' ability as well as teaching environments among schools. Moreover, the design of teachers' lesson plan is still in an un-improved way.

Keywords: NFL 2020, language policies, Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), pedagogy, teaching materials

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

From the welcoming of “open door” policy during the 1980s’s Economic Renovation stages to the becoming an official member of the TPP in 2016, Vietnam has been being experienced the deeper and wider international integration. In response to the developmental process, the increasing competition between knowledge-based economies has a requirement of basic skills to human resources. The introduction of foreign languages into one of the advantages of human resources is crucial for the success of the integration process.

Following the perspective outlined in the guidance of the Party Central Committee's Resolution 8 Conference XI of radical innovation, comprehensive education and training: "To be self-motivated and active in the international integration for the development of education and training, simultaneously education and training need to be met the requirements of international integration for the development of country", Vietnamese educational managers have been planning and implementing new advances in teaching and learning foreign languages (FL) of all levels, focusing on from primary to higher education level, and even in vocational schools and training level. Although there has been some initially achievements, the overall of FL education has not yet reached objectively significant results. In order to enhance the FL ability of Vietnamese student, the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) issued National Foreign Languages Project scheme for the 2008-2020 periods as a comprehensive solution for the English language teaching and learning in Viet Nam.

Nevertheless, on November 16, 2016, Mr. Phung Xuan Nha - Minister of Education and Training announced that “*the government had failed to meet the goals of the NFL scheme for the 2008-2020 periods*”(VBN, 2016). However, there is no debate on why the project could not be completed within the defined period. This paper is aimed at discussing how it has failed by analysing the Vietnam national high school graduation examination results from Ho Chi Minh City’s high schools as a case study. In addition, it incorporates findings from an observation of three (3) English classes in Đào Sơn Tây High School that was conducted to provide first-hand evidence for this discussion. It should be noted that NFL 2020 for high school level is beyond the discussion mentioned in this paper.

Old And New Approaches In Practice

Vietnamese education system

Generally, there are three levels (12 grades) in the Vietnamese school-level system including primary level (grades 1-5) from the age of 6 to 11, secondary level (grades 6–9) from the age of 11–15) and high school level (grades 10–12) for the age of 15–18 (T. T. L. Nguyen, 2016). In this system, MOET assign foreign language as a separately school subject and student will start learning it from grade 6. Accordingly, all curriculums for all school levels are also designed by MOET (T. T. L. Nguyen, 2016). Regarding textbooks, MOET regulates the standards, the process of compiling, editing and decides on the official textbooks used for all schools in general education throughout the country (EducationalLaw, 2005).

Since 2002, all students in grade 3 (age 8) start learning English as an optional course or in grade 1 in several schools, and it is a required subject for students from grade 6 until the end of upper-secondary education (grade 12) (Hoang, 2010). When graduating from a secondary school, one student had spent nearly 600 periods for learning FL (with an average of 3 periods for each week in 35 weeks academic year system). For higher education, a curriculum with 10 up to 12 percentages of total credit hours can be applied for FL study.

The existing problem and new direction

Despite positive changes, teaching and learning English in Vietnam nowadays still have low quality. The English capacity of Vietnamese people is limited (To, 2010). According to the executive manager of Project 2020, 98% of Vietnamese students study English for seven years (from grade 6 to grade 12, age 11–18), but cannot use it for basic communication (Nhan, 2013).

In order to enhance English language teaching and learning in Vietnam in all school level, Prime Minister has announced Decision No. 1400/QĐ-TTg “Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in the National Education System, Period 2008 to 2020”. The general goal of this project is that *“by the year 2020 most Vietnamese youth whoever graduate from vocational schools, colleges and universities gain the capacity to use a foreign language independently. This will enable them to be more confident in communication, further their chance to study and work in an integrated and multi-cultural environment with variety of languages. This goal also makes language as an advantage for Vietnamese people, serving the cause of industrialization and modernization for the country”* (MOET, 2008).

Nguyen (2015) mentioned in his paper that in order to facilitate the implementation of project, especially in measuring and assessing FL proficiency focusing on both users: teachers and students, Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and a Language Proficiency Framework are adopted as support tools. All educational managers hope that CEFR will direct appropriate curriculums, practices in learning and teaching, and evaluations. With a remarkable material resource as well as the widely usage in Europe education systems, CEFR is believed to get credibility in the case of Vietnam.

The project has a total budget of 9,400 billion, of which 2008-2010 is 1,000 billion; the period of 2011-2015 is nearly 4,400 billion, the period of 2016-2020 is around 4,000 billion (MOET, 2008). After 9 years with trillions of dong, the expected achievements have not been reached because of too many shortcomings. In fact, at the conference on the implementation of project in the period of 2016-2020 held on 17/9 by MOET, the new phase of plan do not refer to the achievements as well as limitations in the period of 2008-2015 (PhapluatVietnamnews, 2016).

The 2014 – 2015 Vietnam National High School Graduation Examination Results from Ho Chi Minh City’s 180 High Schools

As indicated in the assessment of the past period, Mr. Phung - Minister of Education and Training admitted the quality of project has low effectiveness - that is evident from the 2014 – 2015 national high school graduation examination result (Appendix).

point. The rest (71%) is below the score of 5.0 point. Even though the distance among schools is small, the number of schools with very low scores is extremely significant. These results show a certain degree of the un-attainable goals from NFL 2020 scheme. One of the most important reasons might be the low quality of teacher competency in Vietnam:

The shortage of competent teachers in Vietnam

There is a tremendous challenge for educational managers and the Management Board of project because of the supply of proficient teachers for NFL 2020, especially at high school level. When the program is applied with the adoption of the CEFR, the control criteria of teacher competency are being set and teachers need to be retrained to meet these new standards. The problem rapidly recognized is that a large number of teachers are under-qualified to teach English. A survey was conducted in the period of 2011 – 2012 to evaluate teachers' proficiency in English in which there are few upper-secondary school teachers who gain expected quality to teach English (H. N. Nguyen, 2015). In particular, as mentioned in the scheme of foreign language teaching and learning in the national education system from 2008 to 2020, foreign language teachers must guarantee their teaching language proficiency level two degree higher than the general standard of school level. Accordingly, the high school teachers need to gain the level of C2 (CEFR). Nevertheless, the survey shows that upper secondary school teachers with the level of C2 only constitute the low percentage (0.1%) (H. N. Nguyen, 2015). Clearly, these teachers' competency in English is not adequately qualified to the standard of project. There are several reasons on why these teachers' English proficiency does not meet the framework of assessment.

At a conference on the implementation of 2020 national foreign languages schemes held in 2013, some people argued that the program of pedagogical training in higher education was different from the requirements of European standard. Therefore, teachers did not meet the standards is also understandable. Besides, the current teacher training status is a short term training, which is ended right after its practitioners being qualified. There are also lack of advance activities after training for them to put into practice, said Mr. Đỗ Tuấn Minh, Rector of University of Languages and International Studies (Vietnam National University, Ha Noi) (Vnexpress, 2016b). According to Mr. Nguyen Minh Tri, Vice Director of Quang Ngai Education Department, most teachers and high schools rely on training courses organized by the Department and Ministry (Vnexpress, 2016b). Hence, they are not proactive to the teaching plan of this new project. Another problem is that the expense is not used reasonable. Indeed, many localities spent much funds in buying equipment for teaching languages while paying less attention to training and retraining teachers' foreign language ability. There were also prodigal cases resulted from lacking good planning in equipment conditions and their usage in teaching languages (PhapluatVietnamnews, 2016).

The pedagogical approaches

In contrast to discussions above, "Teacher language ability is not as crucial as some authorities seem to think it is" (Ball, Kelly, & Clegg, 2015). In fact, no matter how skillful teacher language ability is, learners with low L2 ability could not understand

them. Therefore, even if teachers have high English proficiency and profound knowledge, they still need to adjust to new pedagogical approaches in this project. Before the announcement of NFL 2020 project, English teaching method is always one way in which teachers introduce lessons and students take notes, and they only focus on grammar without practicing. Additionally, according to Mr. Vu Van Tra - Director of Hai Phong Department of Education, at present, learning English still attaches special importance to reading and writing skills so as to cope with examinations, rather than in practical applications (Vnexpress, 2016b). Clearly, the pedagogical approaches in practice are not sufficient to exploit the potential of the project. If teachers' teaching methods are changed, students might achieve performance objectives proposed in the scheme. Teaching English in high schools should be based on the application of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in line with local conditions and psychophysiological characteristics of the student which forwarding from adolescence to the adulthood. Since then, the objective of teaching and learning is to develop the understanding and communication ability in English of students in different real life situations. In order to achieve this goal, teachers should build actively and diversified pedagogical approaches which orientate the study process of students. For example, teachers need to adjust their language so that students can understand the lectures by modifying talking speed, using synonyms or antonyms, taking some pauses, using various question types, strategies for scaffolding, checking and giving feedback. Unfortunately, they do not recognize the methodological changes or they have not experienced these approaches due to setting some objectives of the scheme too high in comparison with teachers' ability or lacking language ability of teachers (Vnexpress, 2016a).

In brief, besides improving language competence, it is necessary to enable teachers to recognize the change of their pedagogical methods. Teachers themselves, thus, can further modify their teaching approaches in order to ensure the effectiveness of project in practice.

Teaching materials

The shortage of appropriate learning materials for English in the period of implementing the 2020 scheme is also considered as a factor which impact on students' achievement. At present, teachers normally use materials from foreign countries or translate Vietnamese textbooks into English for their teaching. This is the most commonly used solution and it might create a drawback for students since materials for native speakers are not suitable for L2 learners. In terms of the language, the lexical items in authentic materials are not suitable for EFL learners because they are not the target group of those materials.

Observation

Participants

I observed an English study hour from three (3) different groups of student in Dao Son Tay high school, namely group A, B and C.

	Group A	Group B	Group C
Instructor's experience	Freshman	2 years	>20 years
No. of students	42	41	44

Table 1: Observation target groups

They were chosen purposely because of some limitations (time and condition). As a result, I could not observe various classes (grade 11 and 12) and I only observed grade 10 owing to the psychophysiological characteristic and capacity of students at high school level. The transition from secondary to high school level, students at this age are on both mentally and intellectually development and they are capable in perfecting the complex cognitive functions. Furthermore, they can recognize the views of others and put ourselves in their position to have a better awareness. Therefore, there would be hopes of observing progresses in their performance. Besides, the observation of these three classes could provide different information or findings on why NFL 2020 project has failed.

Materials & Equipment

In order to clarify the implement of NFL 2020 project, three English classes were chosen to do observation with 1 period per class. The observations are recorded directly for English study session of 3 classes in grade 10 (1 study hour per class). There are three (3) recorded videos in total and a time observation sheet for measuring the work load of teachers and students.

Due to the difference of these three classes, findings for each observation can be variable in order to bring out objective results.

Procedure

These direct observations were naturalistic ones and they involved studying all activities conducted in an English period per class. Firstly, the researcher relied on three observations recorded from Dao Son Tay high school. It should be noted that the observations were carried out as informal ones to help participants feel comfortable. Next, the researcher collected information by taking note into a time observation sheet. Finally, the researcher referred several relevant documents in order to ensure an English period of each class.

Results

The findings of three observations were listed in a table below:

Time Observation Sheet A			
Location: 10A16, Dao Son Tay High School		Time: 9h05, 2017/01/07	
Teacher: Le Nguyen Truc Nguyen		No. of students: 42	
No.	Task	Duration (minute)	Points observe
1	Old lesson review	10	
		10	
2	Exercise	9	- Teacher writes down new exercise for students
		19	
3	Exercise instruction	3	- Explain what and how to do this exercise
		22	
4	Students start to do exercise	12	
		34	
5	Teacher corrects exercise	8	
		42	
6	Homework	2	
		45	
Total time for this class		45min	

Table 2: Group A time observation sheet result

Time Observation Sheet B			
Location: 10A12, Dao Son Tay High School		Time: 9h50, 2017/01/07	
Teacher: Nguyen Phuoc Ton Nu Dai Trang		No. of Students: 41	
No.	Task	Duration (minute)	Points observe
1	Grammar structure	15	
		15	
2	Exercise	8	- Let students make correction for 12 sentences in workbook, page 103
		23	
3	Creating an interactive game for 2 groups of students	3	- separate student into 2 groups - instruct the rules
		26	
4	Group 1 starts the game as the main role, follow by Group 2	7	- 1 group create 10 "If clause" for 10 sentences while the other write the suitable main clauses
		33	
5	Exchange main role for group2,	7	- Exchange the role between 2 groups
		40	
6	Final decision by Teacher	4	- Group 1 won because they have 7/10 If clause and 8/10 main clause correct.
		44	
7	Homework	1	
		45	
Total time for this class		45min	

Table 3: Group B time observation sheet result

Time Observation Sheet C			
Location: 10A6, Dao Son Tay High School		Time: 10h45, 2017/01/07	
Teacher: Cao Thi Quoc Huong		No. of students: 44	
No.	Task	Duration	Points observe
		(minute)	
1	New vocabulary	10	- Teacher writes 10 new words, and read out the meaning for students write down
		10	
2	Reading exercise 1	12	- Let students make correction for 12 sentences in workbook, page 103
		22	
3	Correction exercise 1	6	
		28	
4	Reading exercise 2	12	- Let students make correction for 10 sentences in workbook, page 103
		40	
5	Correction exercise 2	4	
		44	
6	Homework	1	
		45	
Total time for this class		45min	

Table 4: Group C time observation sheet result

Discussion

In spite of following NFL 2020 project, most teachers in three classes generally show their inappropriate teaching method in Vietnamese formal education. According to teaching methods set forth in the project, teaching English in high schools need to focus on the learning-centered direction. This approach emphasizes the process of training and the development of communication skills through methods, and processes of learning activities that appropriate to the condition and circumstance of teaching and the ability of students (MOET, 2012). However, the outcomes of the observations reflect a considerable limit regarding language focus for NFL 2020 in practice. The reason might be that all English classes are currently taught by content teachers only and teachers still consider themselves as content teachers. As a result, they only teach grammar, vocabulary and require their students to do exercises in most of the time in class; and the teaching time of 4 language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) is unbalanced. Base on the content of project, the communicative competence is ability to use language knowledge (phonetics, vocabulary, grammar) and one of the important parts that each student need to achieve in order to participate in the process of communication. Needless to say, this ability needs to be reinforced continuously through 4 skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, lesson plans for these three classes are not assigned equally for 4 skills due to the shortage of teaching equipment.

Regarding teaching equipment, it is one of the important elements for the implementation of the National Foreign Language 2020 project. In spite of the assistance budget from state, the as yet furnishing and usage of teaching equipment still maintain many unexpected problems. This is mentioned in the workshop of

"Consulting and training the usage of using foreign language teaching equipment" issued by the Management Board of National Foreign Language 2020 project, held in Ho Chi Minh City by the Ministry of Education and Training on August 23, 2012. In fact, there is no equipment supported for three classes at Dao Son Tay high school in teaching English or if they are equipped, they are not used. It might be because Ho Chi Minh city Department of Education has not invested equally teaching equipment for high schools in Ho Chi Minh area or they have completed this furnishing already but the management board of school has not deployed the implementation and usage for teachers. If not, according to one delegate in the Board analysed that it is because we have not checked the capacity of teachers and practical conditions. In addition, one of the current difficulties are some staffs confided in managing and using teaching equipment have been untrained basic skills, thus the effectiveness of using teaching equipment is limited, expressed Mr. Nguyen Nhu Hoa - Deputy Head of the Planning and Finance of Ha Noi Department of Education (DanTri, 2012).

Additionally, there is no interaction between students and teachers, classmates, textbooks and other learning resources, except grade 10A12. The teacher of this class hold a game in terms of the grammar ("If" conditional sentences) that help students in cultivating their knowledge. Although it is a small activity, it promotes the positiveness of students in class's activities. Indeed, the language training activities should be combined to the intensification of fluency, coherence and accuracy in using language. The usage of language is meaningful fundamentals in order to achieve proficiency of any level of communication capability. Unfortunately, this approach is still applied in a limited extent.

In terms of how to increase the effectiveness of teaching and learning English language in high school, MOET suggests that it is necessary to apply the various means of teaching, the use of information technology in designing learning activities. Furthermore, students should be encouraged to the maximum use of English in the classroom and daily communication situations (MOET, 2012). Despite these necessary suggestions, there is no much change in the procedure of lesson delivery. Normally, similar to teaching in Vietnamese language, the most frequently used approach is "teacher asks – students answer" with more teacher talking time. This result is similar to the findings of these three classes observed above. The reason might be that students do not familiar to this new method and/or their English ability is not enough to follow the program, or may be even teacher find it difficult to impart complex ideas in English to students. What is more, because their teacher applies L1 curriculum, then they have no chance to practice as well as cultivate their English. Of course, the quick reflex of those students in listening and speaking English is not improved. Actually, although teachers do provide a list of new vocabulary with its Vietnamese equivalent, teachers deliver the content mainly in L1 and provide a word-list in L2. Therefore, such new vocabulary provision will not improve students' English skill. This activity turns the foreign language, which should be learned in an implicit manner, into explicit knowledge. In addition, explaining new vocabulary by translating into the L1 seems to contradict the cognitive evolvement promoted by project. To cope with this issue, the necessary changes in the teaching method should be encouraged. *"The limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom does not reduce students' exposure to English, but rather can assist in the teaching and learning processes"*(Tang, 2002). By this way teachers could clarify some misconceptions that trouble them and students.

In brief, despite efforts to the implementation of a pilot project of foreign language teaching and learning in high school level, which catch a lot of considerable attentions of insiders and analysts, a number of obstacles and limitation in putting NFL 2020 plan for high school into practice are a significant disadvantage for the success of this new approach in high schools.

Limitation of The Paper

This paper has some limitations. First, due to the shortage of empirical studies into the effect of learning and teaching English in Vietnam and unavailable official statistics, some figures presented in this paper are rather informal, declared by the stakeholders in response to social media. Second, the observation of English classes in many high schools is unfeasible, which makes the investigation of students' performance less informative. Third, the lack of comparison of graduation examination results of previous years, which makes findings less objective. Finally, NFL 2020 for high schools cannot be discussed in depth. However, providing detailed insights of NFL 2020 in Vietnam's high schools is beyond the purpose of this paper. Instead, this paper provides a general picture, from which further research can explore various issues of NFL 2020 in Vietnam.

Conclusion

In order to improve effectively the quality of English language teaching and learning across all school levels in Vietnam as well as enhance the capacity of foreign language using for Vietnamese people, several objectives are set out and piloted in upper-secondary schools. This top-down policy draws many attentions from the public and insiders. After the 2014-2015 Vietnam national high school graduation examination in Ho Chi Minh City, the result reflects the low quality of deploying and implementing project. The first reason for this can be the lack of qualified teachers in teaching English language. Owing to the difference between teachers' education programmes and the assessment from European framework; the lack of innovative training methods and techniques for teachers and the irrational expenses in utilizing budget for project, teachers who have had the limited or even high English ability cannot help students improve their performances in learning English. Besides, in spite of reinforcing English competence for teachers is necessary change, teachers in upper-secondary schools for NFL 2020 should consider and become more awareness of advantages from new pedagogical approaches. The last reason is the lack of teaching materials, which leads to contemporary but problematic solutions. In order to provide first-hand evidence for this discussion, an observation was conducted. To some extent, its outcomes offer evidences of why the scheme could not be completed in the defined period.

In a nutshell, there are still uneven in teachers' ability as well as teaching environments among schools. Moreover, the design of teachers' lesson plan is still in an un-improved way.

Appendix

Name of school	Score	Address	Notes
TH-THCS-THPT Quốc tế Canada	8.81		International
Trường phổ thông Năng Khiếu - Đại học Quốc gia TP.HCM	8.49	153, Nguyễn Chí Thanh, Quận 5	Public/top rank
Trường Trung học phổ thông chuyên Lê Hồng Phong	8.30	235, Nguyễn Văn Cừ, Quận 5	Public/top rank
THCS và THPT Đinh Thiện Lý	8.24	Lô P1, Khu A, Khu đô thị mới Nam Thành Phố, Phường Tân Phong, Quận 7, Tp.HCM	Private/top rank
Trường Trung học phổ thông chuyên Trần Đại Nghĩa	8.18	20 Lý Tự Trọng, Q.1	Public/top rank
THPT Việt Úc	8.12		International
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Thượng Hiền	7.73	544 Cách mạng Tháng 8, Quận Tân Bình	Public/top rank
THPT Thực hành ĐHSP	7.54	280 An Dương Vương, Quận 5 - TP. HCM	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Lê Quý Đôn	7.51	110, Nguyễn Thị Minh Khai, Quận 3	Public/top rank
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Á Châu	7.40	226A Pasteur, Q3	Private
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Thị Minh Khai	7.39	275, Điện Biên Phủ, Quận 3	Public
TH-THCS-THPT Quốc tế	7.36		International
TH,THCS và THPT Thái Bình Dương	7.35	125 Bạch Đằng, P2, Quận Tân Bình - Tp.HCM	International/top rank
Trường Trung học phổ thông Bùi Thị Xuân	7.25	73-75 Bùi Thị Xuân, Q1	Public
THCS và THPT Việt Mỹ	7.04		International
Trường trung học phổ thông Gia Định	7.00	195/29 Xô Viết Nghệ Tĩnh, Quận Bình Thạnh	Public/top rank
Trường Trung học phổ thông Văn Lang	6.98	02-04 Tân Thành, Phường 12, Quận 5	Private
Trường Trung học phổ thông Phú Nhuận	6.91	5 Hoàng Minh Giám Q Phú Nhuận	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Du	6.72	XX1 Đồng Nai, Cư xá Bắc Hải, Quận 10	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Việt Anh	6.71	269A Nguyễn Trọng Tuyển, Phường 10, Quận Phú Nhuận, Tp. Hồ Chí Minh, Việt Nam	International private school
THPT nam Sài Gòn	6.64		Public
THTH ĐH Sài Gòn	6.45		Public

Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Công Trứ	6.36	97 Quang Trung, P. 8, Q. Gò Vấp	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trần Phú	6.36	18 Lê Thúc Hoạch, P. Phú Thọ Hòa, Tân Phú	Public
Song ngữ quốc tế Horizon	6.31		International school
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Hiền	6.27	3 Dương Đình Nghệ, Q11	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Nguyễn Khuyến	6.22	132 Cộng Hòa, Q Tân Bình	Private
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trưng Vương	6.14	Số 3, Nguyễn Bình Khiêm, Quận 1	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Lương Thế Vinh	6.11	131, Cô Bắc, Quận 1	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông Võ Thị Sáu	6.11	95 Đinh Tiên Hoàng, Q Bình Thạnh	Public
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Ngôi Sao	6.00	Đ 18 phường Bình Trị Đông B, quận Bình Tân	Private
THPT Châu Á Thái Bình Dương	5.96		
THPT Bắc Mỹ	5.93		
THCS và THPT Nguyễn Khuyến	5.87	514, Nguyễn Tri Phương, Quận 10	
THPT Việ Mỹ Anh	5.82		
THCS-THPT Sao Việt	5.76		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Hùng Vương	5.74	124, Hùng Vương, Quận 5	
Trường trung học phổ thông Marie Curie	5.71	159, Nam Kỳ Khởi Nghĩa, Quận 3	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Thái Bình	5.60	236/10 Nguyễn Thái Bình, Q Tân Bình	
THCS-THPT Thái Bình	5.60		
Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Hoàng Hoa Thám	5.59	6 Hoàng Hoa Thám, Q Bình Thạnh	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Chí Thanh	5.58	189/4 Hoàng Hoa Thám, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Hưng Đạo	5.45	103 Nguyễn Văn Đậu, Q Bình Thạnh	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Trãi	5.39	364, Nguyễn Tất Thành, Quận 4	
TH-THCS-THPT Úc Châu	5.31		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Hữu Huân	5.29	1 Đoàn Kết, P. Bình Thọ Q Thủ Đức	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trần Khai Nguyên	5.25	225, Nguyễn Tri Phương, Quận 5	

Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Hữu Cầu	5.23	HL80 Ng Anh Thủ, Trung Chánh, Hóc Môn	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tân Bình	5.16	97/11 Nguyễn Cừ Đà,m P. Tân Sơn Nhì, Q Tân Phú	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tây Thạnh	5.10	40/27,Tây Thạnh, Q Tân Phú	
Trường Trung học Phổ Thông Võ Trường Toản	5.01	KP.1 Phường Hiệp Thành Q.12	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Thái Bình	4.97	913-915 Lý Thường Kiệt, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Trương Vĩnh Ký	4.97	43 Bành Nguyễn Quốc Ân, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Huệ	4.86	Châu Phúc Cầm, Long Thạnh Mỹ, Quận 9	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Gò Vấp	4.77	90A Nguyễn Thái Sơn, Q Gò Vấp	
Phân hiệu THPT Lê Thị Hồng Gấm	4.75		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trần Quang Khải	4.74	Lạc Long Quân Q11	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Mạc Đĩnh Chi	4.73	4, Tân Hòa Đông, Quận 6	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Hiệp Bình	4.70	KP6, Hiệp Bình Phước, Q Thủ Đức	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Thủ Đức	4.70	166/24 Đặng Văn Bi, P Bình Thọ, Q. Thủ đức	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Thị Diệu	4.69	12, Trần Quốc Toản, Quận 3	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Bình Phú	4.68	84/47, Lý Chiêu Hoàng, Quận 6	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Phước Long	4.67	Dương Đình Hội, phường Phước Long, Quận 9	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Ngô Quyền	4.65	1360, Huỳnh Tấn Phát, Quận 7	
THPT An Dương Vương	4.60		
THPT Tenloman	4.48		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nam Kỳ Khởi Nghĩa	4.45	269/8 Nguyễn Thị Nhỏ, Q11	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Văn Cừ	4.44	1981Ng Văn Bứa, xã Xuân Thới Sơn, Hóc môn	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn An Ninh	4.43	93, Trần Nhân Tôn, Quận 10	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trần Văn Giàu	4.43	203/40 đường Trục, P.13, Q.Bình Thạnh	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tam Phú	4.43	31 Phú Châu, Ấp Phú Châu, Tam Phú Q Đ	

Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Trần Hữu Trang	4.41	276, Trần Hưng Đạo B, Quận 5	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Nguyễn Trãi	4.39	380 Văn Cao, Phú Thọ Hòa, Q Tân phú	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập An Đông	4.35	91 Nguyễn Chí Thanh, Q5	
THPT Nguyễn Tất Thành	4.28		
THPT Thành Nhân	4.23		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trung Phú	4.19	Ngã tư Tân Quý, Tinh Lộ 8, H Củ Chi	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Lương Văn Can	4.18	173, Chánh Hưng, Quận 8	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Trung Trực	4.18	9/168 Đường 26/3, Q Gò Vấp	
Trường Trung học phổ thông tư thục Vạn Hạnh	4.18	781E Lê Hồng Phong nối dài, Q10	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Phan Đăng Lưu	4.17	27 Nguyễn Văn Đậu, Q Bình Thạnh	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Lý Thường Kiệt	4.17	Xã Thới Tam Thôn H Hóc Môn	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Củ Chi	4.16	Khu Phố 1, Thị trấn H Củ Chi	
THPT Phạm Văn sáng	4.14		
Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Diên Hồng	4.12	553, Nguyễn Tri Phương, Quận 10	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trường Chinh	4.11	Nguyễn Văn Quá, P.Đông Hưng Thuận, Q12	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Bà Điểm	4.09	Áp Bắc Lân, Xã Bà Điểm H Hóc Môn	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tạ Quang Bửu	4.00	909, Tạ Quang Bửu, Quận 8	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Hữu Tiến	4.00	171 Đặng Thúc Vịnh, Xã Thới Tam Thôn, HM	
THPT Nguyễn Hữu Cảnh	4.00		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Duy Tân	3.92	149/2 Trần Huy Liệu, Q Phú nhuận	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Nguyễn Bình Khiêm	3.90	140 Lý Chính Thắng, Q3	
Trường Trung học phổ thông tư thục Ngô Thời Nhiệm	3.90	65D Hồ Bá Phấn, P. Phước Long A Q9	
Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Sương Nguyệt Anh	3.89	249, Hoà Hảo, Quận 10	
THCS-THPT Tân Phú	3.89		

TH-THCS-THPT Nam Mỹ	3.88		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Lê Thánh Tôn	3.86	Đường 17P, Tân Kiểng, Quận 7	
THPT Bình Tân	3.86		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Bình Chánh	3.85	Ấp 4 Xã Bình Chánh, H Bình Chánh	
TH-THCS-THPT Quốc Văn Sài Gòn	3.84		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Thủ Thiêm	3.83	Số 2, Khu B, An Phú, Quận 2	
Trường Trung học phổ thông An Lạc	3.83	319 Kinh Dương Vương, P. An Lạc, Bình Tân	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Long Trường	3.82	309, Võ Văn Hát, Khu phố Phước Hiệp, phường Long Trường, Quận 9	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Đông Đô	3.82	12B Nguyễn Hữu Cảnh, Q Bình Thạnh	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Giồng Ông Tố	3.80	200/10, đường Nguyễn Thị Định, phường Bình Trưng Tây, Quận 2	
THPT Trần Quốc Tuấn	3.80		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tân Thông Hội	3.79	Ấp Bàu Sim, Thông Tân Hội H Củ chi	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Huỳnh Thúc Kháng	3.79	200-202 Võ Thị Sáu, Q3	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Đa Phước	3.78	A3/99 QL 50 Xã Đa Phước H Bình Chánh	
THCS-THPT Quang Trung Nguyễn Huệ	3.78		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Hồng Hà	3.77	2 Trương Quốc Dung P8, Q Phú Nhuận	
Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Hàn Thuyên	3.76	184/7 Lê Văn Sĩ, Q Phú Nhuận	
THCS-THPT Đức Trí	3.76		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Thanh Bình	3.75	192 Nguyễn Thái Bình, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Hữu Thọ	3.73	209, Tôn Thất Thuyết, Quận 4	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Hồng Đức	3.73	20/E15 Hồ Đắc Di, P Tây Thạnh Q Tân Phú	
Trường Trung học phổ thông bán công Lý Tự Trọng	3.69	390 Hoàng Văn Thụ, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Đăng Khoa	3.68	82A Nguyễn Thái Học, Q1	
THCS-THPT Phan Huy Ích	3.67		

Trường Trung học phổ thông Lê Minh Xuân	3.66	G1/11, Ấp 7 Xã Lê Minh Xuân, Bình Chánh	
THPT Đông Dương	3.66		
Trường trung học Chu Văn An	3.64	Số 7, đường số 1, P. Bình Hưng Hòa, Q. Bình Tân	
Trường Trung học phổ thông An Nhơn Tây	3.64	Ấp Chợ Cũ, An Nhơn Tây H Củ Chi	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Thanh Đa	3.62	Lô G CX Thanh Đa Q Bình Thạnh	
THPT Nhân Việtq	3.62		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Thạnh Lộc	3.61	KP2 Phường Thạnh Xuân, Q 12	
THPT Trần Quốc Toản	3.57		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Cần Thạnh	3.53	Duyên Hải, TT Cần Thạnh, H Cần Giờ	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Hermann Gmeiner	3.53	697 Quang Trung,P.12 - Q Gò Vấp	
TH-THCS-THPT Hòa Bình	3.52		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Thăng Long	3.50	118 Hải Thượng Lãn Ông, Q5	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Quang Trung	3.48	Xã Phước Thạnh, H Củ Chi	
THPT Nguyễn Văn Tăng	3.48		
THCS-THPT Âu Lạc	3.47		
THCS-THPT Đinh Tiên Hoàng	3.45		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Trí Đức	3.43	1333A Thoại Ngọc Hầu, P Hòa Thạnh Q Tân Phú	
THPT Vĩnh Lộc	3.43		
Trường Trung học phổ thông tư thục Phan Châu Trinh	3.42	12 Đường 23,Bình Trị Đông, Q Bình Tân	
TH-THCS-THPT Mỹ Việt	3.42		
THPT Đông Á	3.42		
Trường Thiếu Sinh Quân	3.40	Ấp Bến đình, Xã Nhuận đức, H Củ chi	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trần Cao Vân	3.39	Số 1, Đường số 9, P. Phước Bình, Quận 9	
THCS-THPT Khai minh	3.38		
Năng khiếu TDTT	3.37		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Trung Lập	3.29	Xã Trung Lập Thượng, H Củ Chi	
THCS-THPT Bác Ái	3.28		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Phú Hòa	3.27	Ấp Phú Lợi, xã Phú Hòa Đông H Củ chi	

Trường Trung học phổ thông Phạm Ngũ Lão	3.27	69/11 Đường Phạm Văn Chiêu, P.14 - Q.Gò Vấp - Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh	
THPT Việt Âu	3.27		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Tân Phong	3.26	19F, KDC Nguyễn Văn Linh, Tân Phong, Quận 7	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Ngô Gia Tự	3.26	360E, Bến Bình Đông, Quận 8	
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Nhân Văn	3.25	16/3 Tân Kỳ, Tân Quý, Q Tân Phú	
THPT Bách Việt	3.25		
Trường Trung học cơ sở & phổ thông dân lập Đào Duy Anh	3.24	134 Lê Minh Xuân, P.7, Q. Tân Bình	
THPT Thủ Khoa Huân	3.23		
THPT Hai Bà Trưng	3.22		
THPT Phú Lâm	3.22		
Trường Trung học cơ sở và Trung học phổ thông Lạc Hồng	3.21	2276/5, Quốc lộ 1A, Trung Mỹ Tây Quận 12	
THCS-THPT Hoàng Diệu	3.21		
THPT Vĩnh Viễn	3.20		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Bình Khánh	3.18	Bình An, Bình Khánh, H Cần Giờ	
THPT Quốc Trí	3.17		
THPT Hoa Sen	3.16		
Trường Trung học phổ thông Nguyễn Thị Định	3.15	Đường 41, Phường 16, Quận 8	
Trường Trung học phổ thông Long Thới	3.15	1B Nguyễn Văn Tạo, Long Thới H Nhà Bè	
THPT Bình Hưng Hòa	3.15		
THPT Trần Nhân Tông	3.09		
THPT Lý Thái Tổ	3.07		
THPT Hưng Đạo	3.03		
THPT Nguyễn Văn Linh	3.01		
THPT Minh Đức	3.00		
Trường Trung học phổ thông dân lập Bắc Sơn	2.97	12 Hoàng Hoa Thám, P12, Q Tân Bình	
Trường Trung học cơ sở và Trung học phổ thông Hoa Lư	2.95	201 Phan Văn Hớn, P. Tân Thới Nhất, Q12	
THPT Lam Sơn	2.93		
THPT An Nghĩa	2.91		
THPT Hàm Nghi	2.88		
THPT Nguyễn Tri Phương	2.82		
THPT Đào Duy Từ	2.70		
THPT Phước Kiến	2.63		

Trường Trung học cơ sở và trung học phổ thông Nam Việt	2.50	25 Dương Đức Hiền, P. Tây Thạnh, Q. Tân Phú	
--	------	--	--

Acknowledgements

My completion of this paper would not have been possible without the guidance and help of Professor Chuing Prudence Chou. I thank her for devoting her significant time, energy, patience and invaluable advice during my study for the course “Global trends in education”. I am very grateful to her for her support to my paper. I am also fortunate to have a professor who offered me a good opportunity to expand my knowledge in relation to education development.

I am also very thankful to our Teaching Assistant, Jonathan Spangler, for his time and energy in reading and commenting my writing. Besides, I would like to thank the school board of Dao Son Tay high school for allowing me to complete an observation of three English classes. I also want to thank teachers and students of the school for giving me a chance to conduct my observation; joining your classes was one of the important keys of my writing.

Finally, I have to express my thanks to my family. Thank you to my elder sister – Thank – without your support and resources, I would not have been able to complete my paper. Specially, I would like to thank my husband, for always encouraging me to pursue my ideas and go through difficulties when I wrote my paper.

References

Ball, P., Kelly, K., & Clegg, J. (2015). *Putting CLIL into Practice* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DanTri. (2012). “Lỗ hổng” trong sử dụng thiết bị dạy học Ngoại ngữ. Retrieved from <http://dantri.com.vn/giao-duc-khuyen-hoc/lo-hong-trong-su-dung-thiet-bi-day-hoc-ngoai-ngu-1346132941.htm>

EducationalLaw. (2005). Retrieved from http://www.moj.gov.vn/vbpq/Lists/Vn%20bn%20php%20lut/View_Detail.aspx?ItemID=18148

Hoang, V. V. (2010). The Current Situation and Issues of the Teaching of English in Vietnam. *立命館言語文化研究*, 22(1), 7-18.

MOET. (2008). Decision No. 1400/QĐ-TTg: ‘Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in the National Education System, Period 2008 to 2020’. Retrieved from http://www.chinhphu.vn/portal/page/portal/chinhphu/hethongvanban?class_id=1&_page=18&mode=detail&document_id=78437

MOET. (2012). Quyết định 5209 về việc ban hành Chương trình giáo dục phổ thông môn Tiếng Anh thí điểm cấp Trung học phổ thông. In MOET (Ed.), (Vol. 5209/QĐ-BGDĐT, pp. 1-34).

Nguyen, H. N. (2015). Vietnam’s national foreign language 2020 project: challenges, opportunities and solutions. In S. Sharbawi & T. W. Bigalke (Eds.), *English for ASEAN integration: policies and practices in the region* (pp. 62-64). Brunei: Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Retrieved from <http://bruneiusprogramme.org/2013-forum-publication>

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2016). Reconsidering the first steps of CLIL implementation in Vietnam. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 8(1), 29-56. doi:10.3828/ejlp.2016.4

Nhan, T. (2013). Promoting Content and Language Integrated Learning in Gifted High Schools in Vietnam: Challenges and Impacts. *Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society*, 38, 146–153.

PhapluatVietnamnews. (2016). Việt Nam vẫn vật vã với việc học ngoại ngữ Retrieved from <http://baophapluat.vn/ban-doc/viet-nam-van-vat-va-voi-viec-hoc-ngoai-ngu-297585.html>

Tang, J. (2002). Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(1), 36-43. Retrieved from https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/02-40-1-h.pdf

To, T. T. H. (2010). *Insights from VIETNAM Learning through English: Policies, Challenges and Prospects*. Insights from East Asia, R. Johnstone (Ed.) (pp. 96–114). Retrieved from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/publication_1_-_learning_through_english.pdf

VBN. (2016). Minister admits foreign language scheme ineffective. Retrieved from <https://m.vietnambreakingnews.com/2016/11/minister-admits-foreign-language-scheme-ineffective/>

Vnexpress. (2016a). Bộ Giáo dục: Một số mục tiêu của đề án ngoại ngữ quá cao. Retrieved from <http://vnexpress.net/tin-tuc/giao-duc/bo-giao-duc-mot-so-muc-tieu-cua-de-an-ngoai-ngu-qua-cao-3491191.html>

Vnexpress. (2016b). Đề án ngoại ngữ gần 9.400 tỷ sau 8 năm làm được những gì Retrieved from <http://vnexpress.net/tin-tuc/giao-duc/de-an-ngoai-ngu-gan-9-400-ty-sau-8-nam-lam-duoc-nhung-gi-3470788.html>