



Innovations of education socialisation in Vietnam: from participation towards privatisation

Thi Kim Phung Dang

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

ABSTRACT

Education reforms worldwide, in both developed and developing countries, address the content of education programmes and/or changes education systems. There are different paths, and different socioeconomic contexts, for those nations which pursue education reform, and Vietnam makes for an instructive example. The country's socioeconomic renovation, known as *Doi Moi* since the late 1980s, has put forward the discourse of socialisation, which generally advocates greater public participation in all areas of society. Although socialisation has been the central ideology of the *Doi Moi* process, there is still a dispute about its meaning and implications. This paper contributes to debates about reforms by examining the discourse of socialisation in Vietnam through analysis of government documents and public opinion in various media. These secondary documents on education socialisation in Vietnam, highlight the institutionalisation of education socialisation in an apparent movement from general public participation to a form of privatisation. This institutionalisation has dramatically transformed the conditions of people's access to education in Vietnam.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 25 November 2019
Revised 22 March 2020
Accepted 22 March 2020

KEYWORDS

Discourse analysis; *Doi Moi*; educational privatisation; governance; public participation; socialisation; Vietnam

Introduction

The case of the Vietnamese education system is a relevant instance of the global trend of education reform in response to economic pressures. After sequential and devastating wars, victorious Vietnam nevertheless suffered economic crisis due to the US-led embargo in response to reunification (Tran, 2008; Van Arkadie & Mallon, 2004). Despite severe impacts upon the centrally planned economy, the socialist model of government still supported education and health care for all. As the central state took responsibility for all fields, outstanding aspects of Vietnamese education during this time were public educational institutions and free schooling. However, the period was characterised by severe food shortages and widespread poverty (Ari, 1999; Bui, 2000) and the limited budget of the state could not maintain more than a low quality of public services, especially in the education sector (UNESCO, 2016). The country's socioeconomic renovation, known as *Doi Moi* since 1986, moved in the direction of establishing a market economy setting the stage for education reforms in Vietnam (Trines, 2017). The discourse of 'socialisation' with its storyline '*Nhà nước và nhân dân cùng làm*' (the state and people work together) has been the central ideology of *Doi Moi* (London, 2013). Although socialisation has been explored in several

studies (Bui, 2000; Hamano, 2008; London, 2013; Van Tuan, 2014), its impacts on Vietnam's social changes are not yet well understood.

This paper seeks to address this knowledge gap by using discourse analysis of government regulations and relevant documents. The paper asks how the innovations entailed in the meaning of socialisation have been structured and institutionalised in *Doi Moi*, and to what extent this has influenced different areas of society, particularly education. First, the paper examines the key concepts of socialisation, participation and educational privatisation. It then presents commentary on the regulatory discourse since the 1990s. Having discussed the unintended impacts of socialisation in education and the recent privatisation of schooling in Vietnam, it is possible to offer several relevant conclusions.

Concepts

Educational socialisation in Vietnam's *Doi Moi* framework may be viewed from conceptual perspectives on public participation and educational privatisation. These perspectives guided following analysis of the discourse institutionalisation and its impacts on Vietnam's education.

Socialisation

The concept of 'socialisation' in Vietnam's *Doi Moi* has a different meaning from the same word in sociology. Overall, it denotes discourses, policies and practices that help mobilise resources for development activity among a variety of social actors. This mobilisation is considered primarily as a cost-sharing scheme between the state and non-state actors involved in the production and services (London, 2013). This cost-sharing takes two forms: co-production and co-payments (Phan, 2016) and is justified by an affirmative discursive storyline '*Nhà nước và nhân dân cùng làm*' (the state and people work together). This partnership highlights individual obligations and the privatisation of public resources in development activities (Nguyen, 2018). Given consensus on the narrative, there is still, however, a pressing debate on social media over the meaning of socialisation in Vietnam. For example, Bui (2007) states that the concept of socialisation in Vietnam contrasts with the meaning commonly used in western countries, which refers to the sense of 'collectivization', 'under the community management', or 'managing or controlling [the state] in the name of society'. At the beginning of Vietnam's *Doi Moi*, the concept did refer to this meaning with the storyline 'the state and people work together'. For example, Nong (2000) claims that socialisation is a mechanism for exploiting all social resources for development activities and Phan (2016) specifies it as the cooperation between state and non-state actors to provide funding for development projects. Subsequently, use of the concept in Vietnam's *Doi Moi*, nonetheless, came to denote putting the financial burden on citizens, and giving the private sector some responsibilities of the state.

Public participation

Emerging within 1960s' governance discussions (Quick & Bryson, 2016), the concept of public participation had become a critical public policy term by the early 2000s (Bingham et al., 2005). Public participation refers in the extent to which stakeholders (especially lay people) can engage with and be involved in decision-making processes across a range of relationships, organisations and activities (Birch & Miller, 2002; Matshe & Pitsoe, 2013).

Arnstein (1969) suggests the idea of a citizen participation ladder that ranges from low to high levels of decision-making engagement. These rungs of this ladder include informing, consulting, conciliation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control. Public participation advocates argue that it helps decision-makers gain insight into public service expectations.

Additionally, it helps leverage the knowledge and experience of stakeholders to solve problems (Innes & Booher, 2004; Suebvises, 2018). Together it makes the provision of service more effective.

Educational privatisation

Public education has long been the dominant form of education in many countries around the world, which highlights education as a public good provided by the state (Locatelli, 2018, p.1; Peña-López, 2015). Public education is standardised to promote social integration and human resource development. Critics of state education, however, often point to problems of stagnation and ineffectiveness (Pedró et al., 2015). Responding to these issues, privatisation is increasingly seen as an alternative option, with the privatisation of education described as ‘the transfer of assets, management, functions or responsibilities previously owned or carried out by the State to private entities’ (Coomans et al., 2005, p. 241). This transfer can take different forms including cost-sharing between state and non-state organisations or institutions, corporatisation of public schools (business-like management), voucher systems (providing markets and public funding) and the development of private schools (Rizvi, 2016). Privatisation in educational reform has been a worldwide phenomenon trend since the late 1970s (Sahlberg, 2006) occurring in both developed and developing countries (Donnelly, 2004). This process includes reforming the content of the education programmes and/or restructuring education systems to meet human development goals and employment needs for globalisation (Patrino, 2017; Sahlberg, 2006). Countries with different socio-economic and economic context seem to follow different paths to pursue their agendas (Donnelly, 2004). Despite these differences, educational reforms, in general reflect changing governance in the education sector in ways that facilitate the participation of multi-actors in education activities (Arrove, 2005).

Discourse analysis

The paper uses discourse analysis to track the structuration and institutionalisation of education socialisation in Vietnam’s *Doi Moi* period. Hajer defined discourse as ‘a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorisations that are produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities’ (Hajer, 1995, p. 44). Discourse analysis focuses upon storyline, which is ‘a generative sort of narrative that allows actors to draw upon various discursive categories, to give meaning to specific physical and social phenomena’ (Hajer, 1995, p. 56). Various storylines of education socialisation in regulatory documents (resolutions, decisions, decrees, reports, laws) and relevant papers (scientific reports, articles in newspapers) were systematically sought out and analysed to track the discursive structuration and institutionalisation across the past 20 years.

The structuration and institutionalisation of education socialisation of education in Vietnam from the late 1990s

Although free schooling provided by the state as a public good was considered a flagship characteristic of socialism in Vietnam prior to 1997 (Duong, 2015), the constraints upon the state budget made education stagnant: during that time, schools were inadequate and largely deteriorated, with obsolete learning and teaching facilities (Euro Vietnam Business Network, 2018; UNESCO, 2016). Guided by *Doi Moi*’s prevailing socialising discourse, Vietnam’s educational reforms began in the late 1990s (UNESCO, 2016), promoting the participation of multiple actors in education co-production and co-payment, so that education socialisation was structured and

institutionalised into a series of key legislation and education laws. These together highlight a significant development of co-production and co-payment in Vietnam's education

Co-production in Vietnam's education socialisation

To embrace the innovative idea of co-production in the field of education, Resolution No 90/NQ-CP by the Prime Minister in 1997 (hereby called Resolution 90) put forward the main storyline '*Vận động toàn dân tham gia sự nghiệp giáo dục*' (Mobilise all people to participate in education) (Government of Vietnam, 1997, p. 1). The word 'mobilise' in this statement indicates both the problem and solution in Vietnam's education orientation: combatting a lack of public participation was considered essential for educational development. Discursive moments in the Resolution further elaborated this mobilisation as diversifying schools, which inserted three kinds of non-public school into Vietnam's educational provision system: these were,

- Semi-public schools (*trung ban công*): schools were established with government and private partnerships. Though they were state-owned and run by a state organisation, all operational expenses were covered by tuition (Kelly, 2000). Under Resolution 90, all economic sectors or individuals were able to involved in the partnership with state organisation to establish semi-public schools. These schools can also be transferred from public schools (Government of Vietnam, 1997).
- People-founded (*trung dân lập*): schools were owned and run by non-state organisations or private associations such as trade unions, cooperatives, youth organisations and women's associations. Like semi-public schools, the cost of operating these schools comes from tuition fees (Kelly, 2000).
- Private schools (*trung tư thục*): these were private schools in its true sense (Kelly, 2000) because they were owned and managed by private individuals (Government of Vietnam, 1997). These schools represented a significant change in Vietnam's education system, which was almost provided by the state until the late 1990s (London, 2011).

It should be noted that the first people-founded school under Vietnam *Doi Moi* was Luong The Vinh school, established in 1989, and the first private university under *Doi Moi* was Thang Long University, established in 1988. Nevertheless, both schools were only considered as experimental models at that time by policy makers (World Bank, 1997). Non-public schools were legalised by Resolution 90 in 1997 (Government of Vietnam, 1997).

Diversifying schools and instituting new schools were expected to provide 'opportunities for people to participate actively and equally in education' as well as to 'expand opportunities for people to access education' (Government of Vietnam, 1997, pp. 1–2). According to the Resolution (p. 1), this development was deemed necessary to realise 'social justice in education', because 'people were both educational contributors and educational beneficiaries'. Nevertheless, the resolution still restricted the establishment of non-public schools only to locations with favourable economic conditions, and for non-profit purposes.

The development of non-public schools was further emphasised by Decree No. 73/1999/ND-CP by the Prime Minister (hereafter Decree 73). Though the Decree still highlighted a need to strengthen public schools, it equated the storyline 'Mobilise all people to participate in education' with the discursive emphasis of 'Encourag[ing] broad development of non-public establishments in accordance with state planning' (Government of Vietnam, 1999, p. 1). To support the private sector's investment in education, Decree 73 offered preferential policies on land lease, land allocation, taxation, etc. Yet the development of the three types of non-public schools remained only for non-profit purposes.

In 2005, the Resolution No. 05/2005/NQ-CP (here called Resolution 05) put forward a discursive shift in the development of private schools by equating the low number of private schools with the low speed of education socialisation. The Resolution thus set the targets to increase private schools up to 80% for kindergartens and preschools, 70% for elementary schools, 40% for high schools, 30% for vocational schools, 60% for training units and 40% for universities and colleges. Private schools were allowed to seek profits and were no longer limited to areas with economic development. The opening of new public schools in economically developed regions was restricted, and some public schools were encouraged to transform into non-public schools. Another striking discursive change of co-production could be observed when Resolution 05 allowed the application of market mechanisms for educational services in both public and non-public schools, 'ensuring equal rights and opportunities for access of education beneficiaries' and ensuring the 'beneficiary has the right to choose a service provider suitable for each field' (Government of Vietnam, 2005, p. 2).

Co-payment in Vietnam's education socialisation

Co-payment for university students in Vietnam after liberation was introduced in 1988 with the operation of Thang Long University (World Bank, 1997, p. 35). Nevertheless, this co-payment was still considered experimental and decades of free schooling in Vietnam were only officially ended in 1997 when Resolution 90 institutionalised the co-payment in education through tuition schemes. Tuition was considered as providing a share of teaching costs and other related services between schools and students. Since the late 1990s, students from both public and private schools have had to pay tuition fees (excluding primary-age students). Nevertheless, students in rural and remote areas where local income was lower than the national average were eligible for lower tuition. Decision-makers for the specific tuition levels included the Prime Minister, provincial People's Committee and university principals. Besides tuition, students were required to contribute towards the cost of school buildings and facilities. This regulation argued that co-payment denoted the meaning of social justice in education because users were both beneficiaries of and contributors to education. In addition, beneficiaries had the right to select the services they wished (Government of Vietnam, 1997). Despite these arguments, the resolution still regulated preferential policies to reduce/exempt tuition for the poor, the disadvantaged and people who had provided certain forms of good service for the country.

The rhetoric on tuition fees shifted in 2009 when Resolution 35/2009/QH 12 of the National Assembly of Vietnam (Resolution 35), regulated that tuition fees for vocational training and public universities must ensure the principle of cost-sharing between educational institutions and learners. Nevertheless, the application of tuition fees for nurseries, kindergartens and high schools in different areas must take into account the economic conditions of the regions (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2009). Tuition exemption was applied for the children of people who were recognised as having provided good service for the country, poor households, and those in difficult circumstances. Tuition fees for students from households with near-poor economic status were also reduced. After the revised Law of Education in 2018, private schools could decide not only cost-determined but also profitable levels of tuition fee.

Education socialisation has been institutionalised in Article 10 of the 2005 Education Law, which stated: 'All citizens are equal in terms of learning opportunities' (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2005, p. 2) and 'Developing education, building a learning society is the cause of the state and the entire people' (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2005, p. 3). The Education Law 2012 and its amendment in 2018 institutionalised the development of private schools, especially private universities (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2015, 2018). It may seem unconvincing that these Laws considered the application of market mechanisms for educational services as necessary for 'ensuring equal rights and opportunities for access of the education beneficiaries'. This is because

according to market mechanisms, the quality of education students receive should depend on the tuition they pay. Although a small proportion of students, who can afford high tuition 'have the right to choose a service provider they want' (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2005, p. 2), most students from poor and disadvantaged families find their opportunities and access to education significantly reduced.

Notwithstanding, Resolution 90, Decree 73 and Resolution 05, the revised Law of Education in 2018 still stipulated that the State is responsible for 'objectives and programme, contents, education plans, and exam rules' (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2018, p. 16).

Impacts of education socialisation in Vietnam

Research findings reveal some implications of education socialisation under *Doi Moi*. They embody changes and improvement in Vietnam's educational provision system and normalisation of tuition fees and other learning costs that gave rise to concerns over social justice and equity.

The normalisation of private schools in Vietnam's society

It is widely agreed that the institutionalisation of co-production and co-payment in education has mobilised more resources from the private sector for educational activities. The number of public universities, colleges and vocational schools significantly increased after the government allowed the application of market mechanisms in education services in Resolution 35.

Public opinion on social media tends to buy the argument for co-production in education. There is also advocacy for more private school development, arguing that private schools have better infrastructure than that of public schools, thus providing better learning conditions (Ha, 2019a). It is not uncommon to read internet articles in which wealthy families shared their explanations as to why they preferred sending their children to high-quality classes in public schools or private schools, especially international schools, which were not available before the reforms (Private schools to take more important role in education development, 2019). Dr Phan Thanh Binh, the committee chairman of Hong Bang International University (Ho Chi Minh City) even stated: 'Private and public schools are the two wings of education' (Private schools to take more important role in education development, 2019). Such a comparison, made by a chairman from a private university, though might be exaggerated, still shows the normalisation of private schooling in Vietnamese society, which used to see public schools as a norm. The image 'two wings' in his view clearly equated private schools with public ones, and this use of words also highlighted the recognition of private schools in Vietnam's education development since the wings were for flying. The National Assembly's Committee for Culture, Education, Youth and Children has also confirmed that the government recognises the importance of private schools to development of the national education system (Private schools to take more important role in education development, 2019). However, the high competitiveness of entrance exams into public upper secondary schools and universities every year reveals the society still prefers public schools. Many people still considered private schools to be primarily for profit, and thus they view private schools as 'a last resort' for students who failed the entrance examination into public schools (Private schools to take more important role in education development, 2019).

Increasing learning costs

Like co-production, co-payment by tuition fees and other learning costs have become norms in Vietnam society. More funding from the co-payment schemes helped improve school infrastructures and teaching quality (Duong, 2015; Minh, 2018; UNESCO, 2016). This is particularly essential in view of the inadequate state funding for public schools. It also promoted private actors to

invest in education. However, research findings also showed the negative impacts of co-payment in Vietnam's education.

Tuition for public pre-schools and general education schools at VND 30,266–200,225 (USD 1.30 - 8.60) per month per student has been generally considered reasonable (Euro Vietnam Business Network, 2018; HCMC People's Committee, 2016). Nonetheless, private international schools of general education received high tuition fees, approximately VND 10–40 Million (USD 432–1,727) per student, per month in 2019 (Dang, 2019). Several private schools charged very high fees. Upper secondary students at Australian International School in Ho Chi Minh city, for example, had to pay around VND 72 Million (USD 3,108) per student per month (Minh, 2019).

Tuition fees in public universities and colleges are particularly high compared to public general education schools. Tuition fees in public universities have increased nearly three times since the revised Law of Education came into force in 2019 (Ha, 2019b). Although the state imposes ceiling levels for university tuition (Hayden & Thiep, 2010), autonomous universities will be free to decide on their own fees on the basis of their revenue according to Article 25 of the revised Law of Education 2018 (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2018). In the school year 2019–2020, students of autonomous medical and pharmacy universities must pay VND 46 million/year/student (USD 1,986.18) while students in other universities which are not autonomous only paid VND 13 million/year/student (USD 561.31) (Ha, 2019b). Private universities collected much higher tuition fees, particularly international universities. RMIT international university in Ho Chi Minh city, for example, received VND 289,036,700 (USD 12,479) per year per student for the academic year 2019–2020 (RMIT University in HCM city, 2020). Such tuition fees in higher education were well in excess of the average monthly income of workers around VND 5.5 M, USD 237.48 (Vietnam General Confederation of Labor, 2018) and monthly income of poor households VND 700,000–900,000, USD 30.22–38.86 (Government of Vietnam, 2019).

Besides tuition fees, students in general education schools had to pay for 'contribution to building school infrastructure'. This contribution, which was considered voluntary from students' families, was decided during Parents Association meetings. In different schools and locations, the amount of contribution varied, ranging around VND 7–10 M, USD 302–432 annually (Dong, 2019). Such additional costs, in some cases, were five to seven times higher than the charges for denounced on social media as overcharging (*lam thu*). 'Overcharging' is seen as a downside to socialisation, becoming a burden on poor and low-income households (Xuan, 2016).

Learning costs (tuition, contribution and other) accounted for an average of 34.4% of household expenditure (General Statistics Office of Vietnam, 2019). Consequently, public opinion did not seem to accept the argument of social justice by co-payment. Parents saw high learning cost as an obstacle for students from poor and low-income families to access high schools and universities (Duong, 2015; Pham, 2010; Thuy, 2017).

Discussion: changing governance in Vietnam's education

There is no doubt that education socialisation with its main storyline 'Mobilise all people to participate in education' is about people's participation in education. This was confirmed by Vietnam's Laws of Education in 2005, 2012 and 2018 as well as relevant state regulations. However, there has been a debate on whether or not the ongoing socialisation in Vietnam is in fact a process of people's participation in different stages of education activities including planning, decision making, implementing, and reviewing (Loan, 2015; Quan diem ve xa hoi hoa giao duc o Viet Nam hien nay, 2017; Ta & Duong, 2013; Vo, 2017). The research findings supply some significant insights into the debate.

In general, the structuration and institutionalisation of education socialisation in the past 20 years, significantly embraced *Doi Moi* policy to develop a market-oriented economy. Discursive fragments in the regulations showed that diversifying educational activities and

applying tuition fees, the two main contents of Vietnam's education socialisation seemed to show the trend of privatisation of education according for the following reasons. *First*, there were shifting views of the role of public schools from Resolution 90 and Decree 73 to Resolution 05. Public schools which used to play a dominant role in Vietnam's education system were not encouraged to develop in areas of economic importance. Some were transformed into private ones. *Second*, with preferential policies to promote the steady development of private education institutions (Decree 73), private schools have moved from something additional in Vietnam's education system, which should only be operated in areas with economic development, to be an important part of its development (Private schools to take more important role in education development, 2019). *Third*, the application of market mechanisms in both public and private schools (Resolution 05 and 35) shows a clear indication of educational privatisation from the mid-2000s because the operation of schools is driven by profitability under this mechanism. It is profits that facilitate the transformation of public schools into private schools (Resolution 05, Law of Education 2012). Under market mechanisms, public schools are allowed to run as businesses (Resolution 05). This corporatisation of public schools is also a form of educational privatisation. *Fourth*, the government set targets to increase the number of students' enrolment in private higher education institutions to 40% by 2020 (Harman et al., 2009; UNESCO, 2016). These changes represent the transfer of assets of education from a number of public schools to private management and decision-making, the most typical feature of privatisation by any account.

The changing roles of public and private schools from the late 1990s also indicated a shift in power. It is true that discursive fragments from governmental decisions, decrees, resolutions to Vietnam's Law of Education still maintain the dominant role of the Ministry of Education and Training in decision-making in the context of education, curriculum, ceiling for tuition fees, and even the level of development of private schools. Nevertheless, private actors have gained ground since 2005 when Resolution 05 allowed private schools to operate with market mechanisms and especially since 2018 when the revised Law of Education allowed schools to decide the tuition fees. This development was related to the two big phrases endlessly repeated in regulations: equality in education and learning opportunities. The fact that regulations, especially The Laws of Education 2012, 2018 equated the development of private schools and the application of market mechanism in educational services with the condition for equal rights in education and learning opportunities is a striking discursive move for a socialist country.

Although it can be argued that the establishment of private educational institutions genuinely has confirmed the involvement of non-state actors in Vietnam's education, this level of participation has, for some reasons, been restricted. First, mobilising people to participate in the socialisation of education focussed primarily on investing in school building. In the meantime, the contents of educational programmes and development plans were decided primarily by the State (Vietnam's National Assembly, 2005, 2018). Second, public consultation on these contents was not fully implemented and transparent. Public participation in deciding the sharing-costs through tuition fees was particularly lax in terms of information flow. Tuition was under the control of central government (in the 1990s) and has more recently been decided by provincial government and schools/universities. Users are not entitled to participate in decisions on this issue. In some cases, parents were only informed during meetings of the Parents Association.

In general, although the diversification of schools offers more choices in schooling (Duong, 2015; Pham, 2017), students from well-off families are more able to enjoy the outcomes for better learning opportunities (School Privatisation 'Slow', 2010). Because participation focussed on mobilising economic resources rather than public consultation in education, only the resource-capable individuals or organisations get involved in school diversification.

Conclusions

With the main storyline 'Mobilize people to participate in education', education socialisation advocates a shift of Vietnam's education from a monopoly of state actors to co-production and co-payment between the state and people in education. Since the late 1990s, the socialisation of Vietnam's education system has centred on diversifying schools and applying tuition fees in both public and private areas. Private actors (individuals, households, organisation) were permitted to open and run three non-public schools (semi-public, people founded, private schools). This co-production was expected to expand learning opportunities for users of education. On their part, beneficiaries of education are required to contribute to the cost of teaching and learning. This co-payment is considered as social justice in education.

The institutionalisation of educational socialisation has some impact on the country's education. While the diversification of schools significantly improves systems of educational provision, the tuition fee schemes have led to increasing learning cost. In general, there is a change in governance of Vietnam's education. With the storyline 'State and people work together', the discourse of socialisation in Vietnam's *Doi Moi* provides grounds for a privatisation process in the country's education sector. Although the current privatisation of education may not have been the intention of the government in the 1980s and 1990s, the corporatisation of public schools and the growth of private profit-making schools have been able to gain more public respect thanks to the political support of socialisation. Despite central actors' power and control over educational and content, private schools have had a say in building and operating new schools as well as providing educational services.

Although education socialisation stressed the rhetoric of greater public participation in education, the institutionalisation of educational socialisation over the past 30 years has been reduced to a restricted meaning which focuses upon developing private schools and applying tuition fees in both public and non-public schools. The demotion of education socialisation from public participation to a form of privatisation thus generates trade-offs between the rhetorics of learning opportunities and social justice. Since education activities become a profitable commodity in the name of socialisation, students from well-off families are more able to reap the benefits of learning opportunities and have the possibility to choose whatever services they want. That the benefits of school diversification could not be accessed by students from poor and low-income families is incompatible with the objective of equal learning opportunities for all citizens as described in the Laws of Education in 2005, 2012 and the revised Law of Education in 2018. Education socialisation is thus far from representative of the widely agreed meaning of social justice: the right for everyone to get access to education.

The evaluations of education socialisation policy studied here suggest that there could still be support for a convergence of responsibility and contribution towards a participatory, co-produced and co-funded education sector. However, the current systems for implementation have been derailed somewhat by an uneven market bias. The intent of the Laws of Education have not been successfully delivered or negotiated with public opinion for support, the slogans have not been taken up in the way intended in all cases, and the work to do what is implied by socialisation, and as called for by the public, requires policy to trust and follow the public lead in its demand for better education in all areas and for all people. No doubt this is difficult, as no doubt has already been recognised.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Conference on Innovations in The Social Sciences and Humanities, 4–5 October 2019, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. It has been substantially rewritten, with new research, thanks to the comments of those who attended the conference.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributor

Thi Kim Phung Dang is a lecturer at the Department of Sociology, and the Head of the Global Inquiries and Social Theory Research Group (GIST), Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam. She was a fellow of Newton Mobility Grant (British Academy) with the project: Between Dark Heritages and Ecotourism: Post-colonial Ecologies in Vietnam. Dang holds a PhD degree in Policy and Management of Wageningen University, the Netherlands. She used to serve as a forestry expert at the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Tay Ninh province and then as the Vice-Director of the National Park *Lo Go Xa Mat*, responsible for ecotourism and environmental education. Her research focuses on governance, discourses, and the relationship between society and environment, and society and development.

References

- Ari, N. (1999). Vietnam's Doi Moi Policy and Forest Protection The Possibility of People's Participation. Available on line at www.iges.or.jp/en/fc/phase1/ir99/1-2-Nakano%20.PDF (Accessed 28 February 2019).
- Arnove, R. F. (2005). To what ends: Educational reform around the world. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 12(1), 79–95. doi:10.2979/gls.2005.12.1.79
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216–224.
- Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T., & O'Leary, R. (2005). The new governance: Practices and processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government. *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), 547–558. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00482.x
- Birch, M., & Miller, T. (2002). Encouraging participation: Ethics and responsibilities. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop, & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in qualitative research* (pp. 91–106). SAGE Publications.
- Bui, T. T. (2000). After the War: 25 years of Economic Development in Vietnam. NIRA Review: pp 22–25. Available on line at <http://www.nira.go.jp/publ/review/2000spring/06thang.pdf>. (Accessed 15 March 2019)
- Bui, T. L. (2007, December 11). Nhung ky di dang sau cum tu 'xa hoi hoa giao duc' [Irregularities behind the phrase 'Education Socialisation']. *Vietnamnet*. <http://vnn.vietnamnet.vn/10nam/donghanh/2007/12/759151/> (Assessed on 08 February 2020).
- Coomans, A. P. M., Hallo de Wolf, A. G., de Feyter, K., & Gómez Isa, F. (2005). Privatisation of education and the right to education. In K. D. Feyter & F. G. Isa (Eds.), *Privatisation and human rights in the age of globalisation* (pp. 229–258). Intersentia.
- Dang, T. (2019, May 8). Nieuu truung tu thuc tai thanh pho Ho Chi Minh cong bo hoc phi gan 50 trieu dong/thang [Many primary schools in HCMC announces school fees near 50 million VND/month]. *Người lao động*. <https://nld.com.vn/giao-duc-khoa-hoc/nhieu-truong-tu-thuc-tai-tp-hcm-cong-bo-hoc-phi-gan-50-trieu-dong-thang-20190508151153384.htm> (Assessed on 14 January 2020).
- Donnelly, R. (2004). Critical evaluation of the impact of global educational reform: An Irish perspective. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(6), 351–359. doi:10.1108/09513540410554004
- Duong, B. H. (2015). *Examining the relation between "socialization" practices and the quality of primary school student learning in Vietna* (Working paper No. 73). PERI/Young Lives.
- Euro Vietnam Business Network. (2018). *Education in Vietnam. Edition 2018* (Research Report). Retrieved from <https://nld.com.vn/giao-duc-khoa-hoc/nhieu-truong-tu-thuc-tai-tp-hcm-cong-bo-hoc-phi-gan-50-trieu-dong-thang-20190508151153384.htm>
- Government of Vietnam. (1997). Nghi quyet so 90/CP cua Thu tuong chinh phu ngay 01/8/1997 ve phuong huong va chu truong xa hoi hoa cac hoat dong giao duc, y te va van hoa [Resolution no. 90/CP by the Prime Minister of August 1, 1997 on orientations and social policies of education, health and culture activities]. Hanoi.
- Government of Vietnam. (1999). Nghi dinh so 73/1999/ND-CP ngay 19/8/1999 cua Thu tuong chinh phu ve khuyen khich chinh sach xa hoi hoa doi voi cac hoat dong trong linh vuc giao duc, y te, van hoa, the thao [Decree No. 73/1999/ND-CP of August 19, 1999 of the Prime Minister on encouraging socialisation policies for activities in the fields of education, healthcare, culture and sports]. Hanoi.
- Government of Vietnam. (2005). Nghi quyet so 05/2005/NQ-CP ngay 18/4/2005 cua Thu tuong chinh phu ve day manh xa hoi hoa cac hoat dong giao duc y te, van hoa va the duc the thao [Resolution No. 05/2005/NQ-CP dated April 18, 2005 of the Prime Minister on promoting socialisation of health education, culture and sports activities]. Hanoi.
- Government of Vietnam. (2019). Quyet dinh so 59/2015/QĐ-TTG ngay 19/11/2015 cua Thu tuong chinh phu ve viec ban hanh chuan ngheo tiep can đa chieu ap dụng cho giai đoạn 2016 – 2020 [Decision No. 59/2015/QĐ-TTG

- dated November 19, 2015 of the Prime Minister on promulgating multi-dimensional poverty lines applicable to the period 2016-2020]. Hanoi.
- General Statistics Office of Vietnam (2019). Khảo sát mức sống dân cư 2010-2016 [Survey on residents' standard of living 2010-2016]. Hanoi.
- Ha, A. (2019a, April 30). Private school brands grow. *Vietnam Investment Review*. <https://www.vir.com.vn/private-school-brands-grow-67435.html> (Assessed on 20 February 2020).
- Ha, A. (2019b, June 8). Học phí trường đại học công sẽ tăng đến đâu? [How much will public university tuition cost increase?]. *Thanh Niên online*. <https://thanhnien.vn/giao-duc/hoc-phi-truong-dai-hoc-cong-se-tang-den-dau-1100830.html> (Assessed on 20 February 2020).
- Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: Ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford University Press.
- Hamano, T. (2008). Educational reform and teacher education in Vietnam. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34(4), 397–410.
- Harman, G., Hayden, M., & Pham, T. N. (Eds.). (2009). *Reforming higher education in Vietnam: Challenges and priorities*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hayden, M., & Thiep, L. Q. (2010). Vietnam's higher education system. In G. Harman, M. Hayden, & T. N. Pham (Eds.), *Reforming higher education in Vietnam* (pp. 14–29). Springer.
- HCMC People's Committee. (2016). Quyết định 34/2016/QĐ-UBND của UBND thành phố Hồ Chí Minh (13/9/2016) Về thực hiện Nghị định 86/2015/NĐ-CP ngày 02 tháng 10 năm 2015 của Chính phủ [Decision 34/2016/QĐ-UBND of HCMC People's Committee (September 13, 2016) on the implementation of the government's Decree 86/2015/NĐ-CP of October 2, 2015]. HCMC.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4), 419–436. doi:10.1080/1464935042000293170 (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Kelly, K. (2000). The higher education system in Vietnam. *World Education News and Reviews*, 13(3), 5–6.
- Loan, T. (2015, October 11). Ranh giới giữa xã hội hóa giáo dục và tư nhân hóa giáo dục? [Boundary between educational socialisation and educational privatisation?]. *Kinh tế và Dân báo*. <https://cvi.vn.net/2015/10/11/ranh-gioi-giua-xa-hoi-hoa-giao-duc-va-tu-nhan-hoa-giao-duc/> (Assessed on 25 November 2019).
- Locatelli, R. (2018). *Education as a public and common good: Reframing the governance of education in a changing context* (Education Research and Foresight, Working papers). UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002616/261614e.pdf> (Assessed on 15 October 2019).
- London, J. (2013, May 30). *The contribution and limit of 'socialization': The Political Economy of Essential Services in Viet Nam*. <http://blog.jonathanlondon.net/?p=142> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- London, J. D. (Ed.). (2011). *Education in Vietnam*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Matshe, P. F., & Pitsoe, V. J. (2013). Promotion of public participation in school environment. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(13), 643–651. doi:10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n13p643 (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Minh, N. (2019, August 21). 13 trường quốc tế tại tp.hcm có học phí cao nhất bao nhiêu? [13 international schools in Ho Chi Minh City have the highest tuition?]. *Zing.vn*. <https://news.zing.vn/13-truong-quoc-te-tai-tphcm-co-hoc-phi-cao-nhat-bao-nhieu-post981007.html> (Assessed on 15 October 2019).
- Minh, Q. (2018, September 3). Can trong hóa với xã hội hóa giáo dục [Be cautious with education socialisation]. *Saigongiaiphongonline*. <https://www.sggp.org.vn/can-trong-voi-xa-hoi-hoa-giao-duc-543217.html> (Assessed on 10 November 2019).
- Nguyen, M. T. (2018). Vietnam's 'socialization' policy and the moral subject in a privatizing economy. *Economy and Society*, 47(4), 627–647. doi:10.1080/03085147.2018.1544397 (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Nong Phu Binh, (2000). *Mot số thuật ngữ hành chính*. Nhà xuất bản Trẻ giới.
- Patrino, A. H. (2017, 20 March). Education and economic development: Five reforms that have worked. *Education for Global Development*. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/education/education-and-economic-development-five-reforms-have-worked> (Assessed on 20 January 2019).
- Pedro, F., Leroux, G., & Watanabe, M. (2015). *The privatization of education in developing countries: Evidence and policy implications*. UNESCO.
- Peña-López, I. (2015). *Rethinking education. Towards a global common good?* UNESCO.
- Pham, P. T. (2010, June 7). *Bức tranh hai mặt về xã hội hóa giáo dục* [Two-sided picture of education socialisation]. *Vnexpress*. <https://vnexpress.net/y-kien/buc-tranh-hai-mat-ve-xa-hoi-hoa-giao-duc-2163980.html> (Assessed on 25 June 2019).
- Pham, T. T. H. (2017, November 8). Socialization of education in Vietnam-Current issues to be resolved. *Tap Chí Công San (Communist Review)*. <http://english.tapchiconsan.org.vn/Home/Culture-Society/2017/1080/Socialization-of-education-in-VietnamCurrent-issues-to-be-resolved.aspx>
- Phan, M. N. (2016, April 9). Xã hội hóa-không có bữa trưa miễn phí [Socialisation-No free lunch]. *Báo Kinh tế Saigon online*. <https://www.thesaigontimes.vn/144639/Xa-hoi-hoa-khong-co-bua-trua-mien-phi.html> (Assessed on 12 October 2019).

- Private schools to take more important role in education development. (2019, May 5). *Vietnam News*. <http://vietnamnews.vn/society/519520/private-schools-to-take-more-important-role-in-education-development.html#HfABJWjfp3dabWoh.99> (Assessed on 15 September 2019).
- Quan diem ve xa hoi hoa giao duc o Viet Nam hien nay. (2017, August 19). (Viewpoints on socialisation of education in Vietnam today). *Uy ban thuong vu Quoc hoi*. <http://tailieu.ttbdd.gov.vn:8080/index.php/tin-tuc/tin-tuc-ho-tro-boi-duong/item/964-quan-diem-ve-xa-hoi-hoa-giao-duc-o-viet-nam-hien-nay?tmpl=component&print=1> (Assessed on 25 June 2019).
- Quick, K. S., & Bryson, J. M. (2016). Public participation. In C. Ansell & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Handbook on theories of governance* (pp. 158–169). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rizvi, F. (2016). *Privatization in education: Trends and consequences* (Education research and foresight working paper). UNESCO.
- RMIT University in HCM city. (2020). *Standard tuition fees 2020 for undergraduate programs (Estimated)*. Retrieved from <https://www.rmit.edu.vn/study-at-rmit/tuition-fees> (Assessed on 05 March 2020).
- Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education reform for raising economic competitiveness. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 259–287. doi:10.1007/s10833-005-4884-6
- School Privatisation ‘Slow’. (2010, September 07). *VietnamNews*. <https://vietnamnews.vn/society/education/203360/school-privatisation-slow.html#poYDpY35tvSIGi72.97> (Assessed on 10 November 2019).
- Suebvises, P. (2018). Social capital, citizen participation in public administration, and public sector performance in Thailand. *World Development*, 109, 236–248. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.05.007
- Ta, V. T., & Duong, T. V. A. (2013). *Socialization policy and access of the rural poor to education in Vietnam*. PERI, Open Society Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.periglobal.org/sites/periglobal.org/files/WP-No51-01-21-2014-FINAL.pdf> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Thuy, M. (2017, September 22). Dang so cho cum tu ‘hoi phu thu’ và ‘hoi hoa si [Scary for the phrases ‘Surcharge Association’ and ‘Painter Association’]. *Dantri*. <https://dantri.com.vn/giao-duc-khuyen-hoc/dang-so-cho-cum-tu-hoi-phu-thu-va-hoi-hoa-si-20170922072028915.htm> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Tran Duc Luong (2008). *Đôi moi, su lua chon dung dan vi muc tieu phat trien hien dai cua Viet Nam*. Available on line at http://www.mofa.gov.vn/vi/cs_doingoi/cs/ns04081808401042/. (Accessed 13 March 2008).
- Trines, S. (2017). Education in Vietnam. *World Education News + Review*. <https://wenr.wes.org/2017/11/education-in-vietnam> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- UNESCO. (2016). *Institute for Statistics. Educational financing in Vietnam 2009-2013*. Retrieved from <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/vietnam-nea-report.pdf> (Assessed on 05 March 2020).
- Van Arkadie, B., & Mallon, R. (2004). *Viet Nam—a Transition Tiger?* ANU Press. Retrieved February 11, 2020
- Van Tuan, T. (2014). Socialisation policy and access of the rural poor to education in Vietnam. In I. Macpherson, S. Robertson, & G. Walford (Eds.), *Education, privatisation and social justice: Case studies from Africa, South Asia and South East Asia* (pp. 199–218). Symposium Books Ltd.
- Vietnam General Confederation of Labor. (2018). *Bao cao khao sat tinh hình lương, doi song nguoi lao dong ca nuoc nam 2018 [Survey report on the situation of wages and living conditions of workers in the whole country in 2018]*. Hanoi.
- Vietnam’s National Assembly. (2005). *Luat giao duc [The Law of Education]*. Hanoi.
- Vietnam’s National Assembly. (2009). *Nghi quyet 35/2009/QH 12 ve chu truong dinh huong doi moi mot so co che tai chinh trong giao duc va dao tao tu nam hoc 2010 - 2011 den nam hoc 2014-2015 [Resolution 35/2009/QH 12 on guidelines for renovating a number of financial mechanisms in education and training from the 2010-2011 school year to the 2014-2015 school year]*. Hanoi.
- Vietnam’s National Assembly. (2012). *Luat giao duc [The Law of Education]*. Hanoi.
- Vietnam’s National Assembly. (2015). *Luat giao duc [The Law of Education]*. Hanoi.
- Vietnam’s National Assembly. (2018). *Luat giao duc sua doi [The revised Law of Education]*. Hanoi
- Vo, T. H. (2017, March 15). ‘Xa hoi hoa nhung khong thuong mai hóa’: Can toi uu hoa cac tham so [‘Socializing but not commercializing’: Need to optimize the parameters]. *Thoi bao Kinh te Saigon Online*. <https://www.thesaigontimes.vn/165708/Xa-hoi-hoa-nhung-khong-thuong-mai-hoa-Can-phai-toi-uu-hoa-cac-tham-so.html> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- World Bank. (1997). *Vietnam: Education financing. A World Bank Country Study*. ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/562431468779652034/Vietnam-Education-financing> (Assessed on 05 May 2019).
- Xuan, C. (2016, September 10). *Khoan thu truong hoc: Dung lay hoc sinh lam “buc binh phong” [Additional contribution to school revenue: Do not take a student as ‘shields’]*. *Dan Tri*. <https://dantri.com.vn/giao-duc-khuyen-hoc/khoan-thu-truong-hoc-dung-lay-hoc-sinh-lam-buc-binh-phong-20160910081506266.htm> (Assessed on 15 October 2019).