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Abstract: Vietnam’s general education institutions are undergoing a significant transformation to meet the demands of the new policy system in terms of governance and to make internal changes to be able to meet society's demands as well. However, the content and concept of governance are still quite novel in the perception and operation of parents of students, professional groups, administrators, principals, vice principals, and other stakeholders who are primarily responsible for the institutions' operation. To determine how these participants understand the elements of the notion of "governance", an online survey was conducted. The responses were then collected and processed by Excel software. The findings indicate that these respondents' levels of awareness are generally similar, with a mean of over 4.3 on a five-level Likert scale. However, most noticeably, the professional group has a higher level of awareness than the other groups. Additional research is required on certain features of governance awareness and the connection between governance aspects and issues at institutions of general education.
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1. Introduction

Today, improving the quality of education is an objective requirement in the face of the trend toward international integration and is also a decisive factor for educational institutions. Vietnam is in a period of industrialization and modernization, so high-quality human resources are urgently needed to promptly grasp scientific and technical advances worldwide. Without measures to improve the quality of education, first, educational institutions will not keep up with the development of society and will not receive the trust of social forces; moreover, beyond these measures, they will fail to achieve the goal of modernization. Educational governance is a quality assurance trend that aims to provide reliable results by controlling the conditions and processes of educational organizations through standards, criteria, and indicators in fundamental fields. In the context of the education system as well as of educational institutions, good governance in developed countries has become a regular, familiar, and even a condition for many educational institutions. The social context and requirements of the education system make the operation of general education institutions (in the 2021-2022 school year, this sector has 23.270 schools, 447.052 classes, 15.127.505 pupils, 52.397 principals and vice principals, 323.343 teachers (MOET, 2022b) more difficult than ever (MOET, 2022a).

According to Circular No. 42/2012/TT-BGDĐT dated November 23, 2012, of the Minister of Education and Training on the Organization and Administration of the School, the following statements were used: (1) The school's organizational structure is in accordance with the provisions of the charter of the upper secondary school and the regulations of the Ministry of Education and Training: Classes, number of students, and school grades as prescribed by the charter of the upper secondary school; the organization of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Trade Union, the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union, the Ho Chi Minh Young Pioneers Team, and other social organizations and councils operating under the provisions of the High School Charter and the provisions of the law; (2) The organizational structure and performance of tasks of the specialized groups, the Office groups (the Education and Student, and other departments for special schools) as prescribed in the Clauses of the High School Charter; develop a school development strategy; abide by the guidelines and lines of the Party, the policies and laws of the State and localities; and the leadership and direction of education management agencies at all levels; and ensure the Regulation on the implementation of democracy in the operation.

Briefly, general school governance is the content of state management of education and is the process of building orientations, regulations, and operational plans in schools; organizing teaching activities, educating students through mobilizing and using resources, monitoring and evaluating on the basis of autonomy and accountability to develop the school
according to the mission, vision and educational goals of the school” regulated in the Article 3 (MOET, 2018). School governance includes 6 activities: (1) developing school plans; (2) governing teaching and educating students; (3) teaching and educating school personnel; (4) organizational and administrative governance; (5) school financial governance; and (6) governing the quality of education mentioned in the Article 4 (MOET, 2018). These activities are evaluated according to 14 specific criteria.

2. Literature Review

General education is also a service sector subject to changes in public management due to the country’s international relations and the demands for public education services. The term "governance" refers to the modifications made to the state's character and function throughout the 1980 s and 1990 s public sector reforms. (Bevir, 2007), it evolved as a result of a shift away from the hierarchical model of public governance toward one in which the state's involvement in the provision of public services is diminished or diminished. Certainly, this role has been partially or completely replaced by nonstate entities such as markets and quasimarkers (Bevir, 2007). Encyclopaedia of governance (Bevir, 2007), (Osborne, 2010). This can be understood to mean that governance represents the belief that the state is increasingly dependent on other organizations to make policies and laws; this is the positivist aspect of the term (Bevir, 2012). Considering this term theoretically, governance refers to the process of governance in which the enactment of laws and the making of organizational decisions are not controlled. They are carried out by players in the hierarchical administrative paradigm, such as the school board in a public institution of learning. (Bevir, 2012).

There are numerous studies in general education institutions, including those on lost instructional time and local government (Abadzi, 2007); the differences between attaining educational equity and shared governance (Castagno & Hausman, 2017); and the procedures for making decisions and putting policies into action (Cha, 2016). The decision-making process for school governance continues to exclude parents. (Chikoko, 2008), decentralization in the management of educational processes and outcomes (Daun, 2004), the conflict between these spheres of professional control and lay governance are largely unexplored (Dunn, 1998), governance as mediation (Garvin & Bogotch, 1994), inconsistencies in educational governance (Lo & Maclean, 2015), the system of checks and balances for school leadership in public schools (Nishimura, 2019), schools' present governing models (Reitzug, 1992), network governance (Tao, 2022), and the equitable growth of compulsory education (Zhang, 2009). These studies can be classified into those on the roles of governing players, governing functions, and governing schemes.

2.1. The roles of governing players

Abadzi (2007) assessed the length of school days in Tunisia, Morocco, Ghana, and the Brazilian state. The author found that local governance must advance if services are to be provided to the underprivileged in terms of the time governments require, teacher attendance, and oral reading tests (Abadzi, 2007). Nishimura takes into account the government's obligations in all areas, particularly the public school accountability system. The author even criticizes the approach to community involvement in school governance and highlights the disadvantages of the binary lens of "service provider" and "client" (Nishimura, 2019). Chikoko (2008) examined the roles of parent governors and showed that despite the existence of a legally empowered governance structure in which parents constitute the majority, they lacked the ability to participate despite their efficiency; moreover, they remained on the periphery of school governance decision-making. (Chikoko, 2008). While Reitzug (1992) asserts that teacher empowerment is frequently too narrowly defined, this system prevents teachers from solving problems (Reitzug, 1992). Zhang (2009) mentioned that family and school social capital harm the possibility of educational equality because of their influence on the school selection process (Zhang, 2009). More noticeably, Garvin & Bogotch (1994) considered governance to be mediation, and governance is a negotiation process that looks for middle ground between group and individual objectives in political processes (Garvin & Bogotch, 1994).

2.2. The governing functions

Castagno and Hausman (2017) analyzed district regulations, rhetoric, and practices regarding site-based management and shared decision-making in the framework of equity in their study on the disparities between shared governance and achieving educational equity. The authors considered that top-down, directive leadership in districts may be the most effective way to promote educational parity (Castagno & Hausman, 2017). According to a study conducted by Cha (2016), educational policy conflicts frequently arise and intensify during the process of making decisions and putting policies into effect according to research on Korea's governance challenges, and the causes of conflicts come from ambiguous educational administration authority and responsibility, political and educational ideologies, and insufficient conflict prevention and coordination (Cha, 2016). Dunn (1998) examined the lay board of education as the traditional location of the center of control over teaching and learning. The author presented the numerous school governance models that have been created to think about how such structures, while still offering an essential lay viewpoint on public education, could also help teachers deal more professionally with the diversity of students (Dunn, 1998).
2.3. The governing schemes

Daun (2004) considers the Czech Republic and Sweden to have the most extreme levels of decentralization in managing educational processes and outcomes according to case studies on educational restructuring as well as evaluation, assessment, and reporting in these five European countries, while France has decentralized some decision-making to bodies at lower levels while still acting as representatives of the central state, and England has centralized curriculum policy (Daun, 2004). Tao (2022) used network governance theory to examine how Chinese education governance changed between 1985 and 2020. The author found that the Chinese central state has moved by incorporating local governments, schools, and societal factors in education regulation, from centralization to network control (Tao, 2022). Inconsistencies in educational governance are highlighted by Lo & Maclean (2015), particularly those between international standards and the state’s ability to oversee the implementation of educational reforms and between the government’s and the local community’s responsibilities for addressing sociocultural barriers. Two significant issues affecting national strategy implementation are poverty and gender bias (Lo & Maclean, 2015).

There is a wide range of studies on general education, particularly in regard to school governance, from the functions of links or accountability systems to features of governance processes. Resources, policies, and practices have shown that there is a very diverse relationship between school governance and academic accomplishment when deciding what to do to make schools effective. In terms of program design and assessment, schools are typically more autonomous and actively seek student input to ensure quality improvement. There are many stakeholders in schools, and they rely on the system. The socioeconomic makeup of a set of schools significantly impacts children’s learning levels when compared to schools that focus on student input and teacher monitoring.

Goverance has been used in the education sector, as an approach is appropriate in the context of the current change in school management and administration. However, this concept is still not clearly understood in Vietnam, so it could be an important factor affecting the implementation of this management method in educational practice. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to determine and show the level of awareness of the functions and contents of governance by parents, professional teams, administrators, principals, vice principals, and other stakeholders related to general education institutions. The content to ask the respondents is

[1]. Governance is the process of making decisions on objectives, directions, and developmental solutions.
[2]. Governance is the process of making decisions on the mission, vision, policies, planning, and school development plans.
[3]. Governance is the impact of the subject of governance on the object of governance to achieve the set goals.
[4]. Governance is the effective coordination of organizational resources to achieve a set goal, to effectively control and effectively organize
[5]. Governance is a way for people to lead, guide and monitor the targets and values of an organization through policies and implementation processes.
[6]. Governance is the enforcement of power in a control system; accountability
[7]. Good governance represents the participation of representatives of organizations and a consensus orientation for common purposes, accountability, efficiency, fairness, and compliance with the law.
[8]. Governance is the process of deciding on planning, resource allocation, regulations and development policies, accountability and supervision of activities.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Research Design

The method uses a questionnaire to determine the perceptions of five different groups of subjects who are doing work related to the administration of general education institutions in Vietnam. The scale is designed with five levels, and management perception content is divided into eight different aspects. The results are processed according to the criteria of the mean and standard deviation for the population of each aspect of the term’s content. To generalize cognitive perspectives on the governance of a general education institution, the information obtained is only within the scope of the proposed concept in the Vietnamese context and not within the scope of comparisons with other educational institution concepts that already exist and are common in other scientific literature.

The method used for this research, as described above, involves determining the levels of knowledge and awareness of school board members about governance that are prescribed by law, thereby providing conclusions and policy recommendations that can improve governing competencies in particular and the quality of general education in general.

3.2. Sample and Data Collection

Most of the participants were female, which resulted from cultural tradition that the education sector should be operated by women (over 63 percent), and their educational attainment is mainly postgraduate and university
(approximately 58 percent). Approximately 39 percent of these people have 5-10 years of experience; more than 40 percent of the heads of departments whose duties involve guiding the subjects or taking responsibility for what and how students should be taught in schools.

The online questionnaire was administered from September to December 2022 in four cities, namely, Hai Phong, Ho Chi Minh City, Nghe An, and Hanoi, which are developed cities in Vietnam. This form is intended to collect opinions from the members of the School Council of the General Education Institution (MORT, 2021) (administrative officer, principal, deputy principal, secretary of the Party Committee, representative of the expert group, secretary of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union/or the General Secretary of the Ho Chi Minh Young Pioneer Organization), the Parent Committee, the representative of the office group, and the representative of the local authorities. The content of the questionnaire consists of the following parts: A: Some general information about the respondent (06 questions); B: Contents of opinion (08 questions); and this article is written from the information of question 1: Could you give your opinion on the term of governance by degrees (Completely inappropriate, less appropriate, relatively suitable, quite suitable, and quite suitable)? At the time of writing this article, the data were collected from 112 people, and the characteristics of the respondents are described in Table 1.

The participants who completed the questionnaire have significant implications for this study: first, they are individuals identified by state documents as having particular roles, responsibilities, and jobs within the council school structure; second, they are the most directly accountable and constantly receive requests from the public and related stateholders to implement governing issues of general education institutions; and third, they are the most qualified individuals who choose to operate and create high-quality general education. As a result, their viewpoints accurately represent governing concerns and current awareness in general education institutions.

| Table 1 Characteristics of Study Participants in Governance Understanding. |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------|-----------------|------------------|
| Gender                     | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Male                       | 41     | 36.6    | 36.6           | 36.6             |
| Female                     | 71     | 63.4    | 63.4           | 100              |
| Total                      | 112    | 100     | 100            | 100              |
| Education attainments      |         |         |                |                  |
| Vocation training, college | 3      | 2.7     | 2.7            | 2.7              |
| Undergraduate, University   | 44     | 39.3    | 39.3           | 42               |
| Postgraduate, University    | 65     | 58      | 58             | 100              |
| Total                      | 112    | 100     | 100            | 100              |
| Working experience         |         |         |                |                  |
| <5 years                   | 37     | 33      | 33             | 33               |
| 5-10 years                 | 38     | 33.9    | 33.9           | 100              |
| 11-20 years                | 18     | 16.1    | 16.1           | 66.1             |
| >20 years                  | 19     | 17      | 17             | 50               |
| Total                      | 112    | 100     | 100            | 100              |
| Occupations                |         |         |                |                  |
| Parent board               | 13     | 11.6    | 11.6           | 11.6             |
| Staff of PDET/DDET         | 21     | 18.8    | 18.8           | 30.4             |
| Head of the Department     | 45     | 40.2    | 40.2           | 70.5             |
| Vice/principals            | 18     | 16.1    | 16.1           | 86.6             |
| Others                     | 15     | 13.4    | 13.4           | 100              |
| Total                      | 112    | 100     | 100            | 100              |

Notes: PDE = Provincial Department of Education and Training; DDET = District Department of Education and Training.

3.3. Analysis of the Data

The study team concentrated on examining the perceptions of those who provided their comments on the term “governance” based on knowledge about the features of the survey sample. This approach is crucial since, in Vietnam, the term "governance" refers to the management or administration of high schools. According to the law, each component is responsible for different things, so it is important to examine what the various components have said about this idea at other levels to determine how well they comprehend the nature of the issue and their respective legal obligations to school governance.

3. Results

The general education institution is prescribed in Article 33 of the 2019 Education Law. The general education institution includes (1) primary school, (2) junior high school, (3) high school, and (4) high schools with many education levels.
Based on the inside and outside, school governance consists of two aspects. Internal governance includes all activities related to the school’s internal elements, such as admission; the library; the laboratory; facilities and other equipment; finance; inspection and evaluation; and relationships with colleagues and students. External governance includes relationships with the community, departments, individuals and other relevant agencies to establish and operate the functions of the school well.

Table 2 provides cognitive information about the governance terms of managers and members of general education institutions today. The level of judgment of term governance is high; in particular, governance involves executing all power in a control system and explaining responsibility, with the highest average of 4.59. In brief, the above conclusions are highly accurate. These results represented the aspects of school governance in general education; one of those is that the workload of these people in school settings has become much greater than that in previous school years because general education involves curriculum reform and new teaching methods that teach staff to be mastered to meet the demands of curriculum renovation. For this reason, these governing people understand their responsibilities for their job descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Awareness of the term &quot;governance&quot;.</th>
<th>PB Mean</th>
<th>PT Mean</th>
<th>M Mean</th>
<th>P/VP Mean</th>
<th>O Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Governance is the process of making decisions on objectives, directions, developmental solutions.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governance is the process of making decisions on the mission, vision, policies, planning, school development plans</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Governance is the impact of the subject of governance on the object of governance to achieve the set goals</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Governance is an effective coordination of resources of the organization to achieve the set goal, to effectively control and effectively in the organization</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governance is ways for authorized people to lead, guide and monitor the targets and values of the organization, by policies and implementation processes</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Governance is enforcement of power in a control system, accountability</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Good governance represents the participation of representatives of organizations, and consensus orientation for common purposes, accountability, efficiency, fairness, compliance with the law</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Governance is the process of deciding on planning, resource allocation, regulations and development policies, accountability and supervision of activities</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PB= parent board; PT = professional team; M = manager; P/VP = principal/vice principal; O = other; SD = standard deviation.

The school is a social organization with specific purposes—the key task is to create the quality of education for students. The school has members—human resources, resources—finance, facilities, etc. Principals are school governors who must clearly see the goals and achieve them in the best and least expensive way. The principal needs to plan and organize people and best use resources while simultaneously orienting, inspecting and supervising all activities of the school and making appropriate decisions.

Additionally, it can be said that school is the last and most basic object of educational governance. In the human collective operating in the education system, teachers are the most important object but also the subject directly governing the educational process, playing a special role in determining most of the success. The performance of the educational goals and tasks of effective school governance is how teachers can fulfill their educational process; the teacher truly owns the school. As a result, teachers serve as both the object and the educational administrator. Students who are educational governors should be the focus of school governance. However, whether the teacher initiates a sense of learning and motivation or whether the students are self-disciplined to actively study to convert knowledge into faith and knowledge is dependent on the teacher; in this sense, students are both the subject and the subject of the educational process. Good governance of the school and how students must master the educational process.

Considering that responders agree at a high level of governance, the process of deciding on the goals, directions and solutions for school development with the highest level of agreement is that of the professional team. The people who...
answered that the professional team leader also agreed with the judgment that the purpose of governance is to effectively coordinate the organization’s resources to achieve the set goal to control the effectiveness and effectiveness of the group. The participants were also the subject of the survey with the highest level of agreement with the surveyed judgments. Moreover, it seems that the Principal/Vice Principal tends to agree at a lower level with surveys; however, the average score is greater than 4. The education reform process in general educational institutions creates more opportunities for key players to fulfill their duties in schooling and their own development; however, on the other hand, they have to take more responsibility, while these kinds of schools become more autonomous of all domains, such as finance, administration, educational quality and other relevant features. These people are more active because of the rapid changes in reality and influence on schools daily.

4. Discussion

The survey included aspects related to the perception of governance concepts, such as (1) the process of making decisions on objectives, directions, and developmental solutions; (2) the process of making decisions on the mission, vision, policies, planning, and development plans; (3) the impact of the subject of governance on the object of governance to achieve the set goals; (5) the effective coordination of resources of the organization to achieve the set goal, to effectively control and effectively work in the organization; and (5) the way for authorized people to lead, guide and monitor the targets and values of the organization through policies and implementation processes. These findings are consistent with the findings of Clause 8 and Article 3 of Circular 14/2018/TT-BGDGT, which regulate the standards of principals of general education institutions established by the Minister of Education and Training, which took effect on September 4, 2018; developed orientations, rules, and operational plans for the school; mobilized and used resources to organize teaching and student education activities; monitored and evaluated on the basis of autonomy and accountability; and developed the school in accordance with its mission, vision, and educational goals. According to Article 5, Standard 2, School Governance,” the criteria include (1) development plans; (2) teaching and student education activities; (3) personnel; (4) administrative governance; (5) financial; and (6) educational quality. Additionally, Bath University (Balarin, M, Brammer, S, James, 2021), (OECD, 2013) studied governance issues, including 1) parents’ activities, 2) staff, 3) communities, and 4) sponsors, and the findings of this research presented governing functions, consisting of 1) governing vision development and targets, 2) monitoring and assessment, 3) budgeting, 4) accountability, 5) headmaster appointment, and 6) critical thinking.

For the contents, (6) governance is the enforcement of power in a control system; (7) good governance represents the representatives of organizations and a consensus orientation for common purposes; (3) accountability, efficiency, fairness, and compliance with the law; and (3) governance is the process of deciding on planning, resource allocation, regulations, and development policies; accountability; and supervision of activities all have very high ratings, near 5.0. This is because, in Vietnam today, general education is also a service sector subject to changes in public management from the country’s international relations as well as the requirements of public education in the country. The school is the last and most basic object of educational management. In the human collective operating in the education system, teachers are the most important object but also the subject directly governing the educational process, playing a special role in determining most of the success. The performance of the educational goals and tasks of effective school governance is how teachers can fulfill their educational process; the teacher truly owns the school. As a result, teachers serve as both the object and the educational administrator. Students who are educational governors should be the focus of school governance. However, whether the teacher initiates a sense of learning and motivation or whether the students are self-disciplined to actively study to convert knowledge into faith and knowledge is dependent on the teacher; in this sense, students are both the subject and the subject of the educational process. Good governance of the school and how students must master the educational process.

According to the innovation requirements of education, general education has achieved many achievements, of which (1) changes in school governance toward the capacity of learners are gradually becoming more specific with quality standards, accreditation, publicity, etc., in countries in the region and around the world and (2) decentralization of educational management from central to local levels in accordance with the theory of unified powers, with assignment and close coordination among state branches and ministries in the exercise of legislative and executive responsibilities and powers. Schools are permitted to establish school councils and enjoy a great deal of autonomy in many parts of the school’s accountability-related operations. (3) Educational socialization has been considered, directed, and deployed widely; initially, it mobilized many resources for educational development to meet the needs of the labor market and learners’ needs. There are some differences in school governance between the United Kingdom and North Island and Wales (Wilkinson, 2017), but there are also differences in school governance in Nepal that come from 1) participation, 2) planning and monitoring, 3) staff, 4) resources, 5) transparency, 6) accountability, 7) control, and 8) regulations (The World Bank, 2014).

As surveyed, managing awareness and content is an inevitable process for changing school governance when many issues are more empowered, decentralized (Nguyen.T.H, 2016), or related to governance trends and school-based management (Pham, D.N.T., 2017). The level of empowerment is also reflected in all activities, such as program implementation, recruitment, and resource mobilization and use (Duong.T.H & C.C.T, 2017). Associated with empowerment
or autonomy is accountability—which involves showing openness and transparency to all stakeholders. However, school accountability or social responsibility is a fundamental process of internal change because it must be proactive and always ready for all relationships outside the school (Dang.T.T.H, 2017), (Pham, 2017) because Vietnam has just begun its journey of autonomy (Pham, 2017).

It cannot be denied that the research results partially illustrate public sector reforms (Bevir, 2007) and the roles of stakeholders (Nishimura, 2019) in order to activate more “customers” in terms of service (Garvin & Bogotch, 1994). In terms of governing functions, so do the governing schemes that are clearly described when compared with the findings of other studies (Castagno & Hausman, 2017), (Cha, 2016) and (Dunn, 1998).

Because the content of the concept of governance in general and school governance in particular is still quite new to the education system and related components of Vietnamese education, it is new to recognize the meaning of understanding the problem occurring in the school that the content of the term governance indicates; in addition, this term explains the practical actions of school education in the field of education under new conditions and contexts. In addition, there are many conflicts in school operations, from administrative, financial, etc., interactions to even conflicts of interest. However, this conflict is likely to occur very quickly before a level of understanding of the term is established, as there are many other educational sectors involved in the general education system in Vietnam, especially the private education sector and educational institutions with foreign elements.

Generally, school governance in Vietnam is in its first stage of development and has all the characteristics of this developing school governance, but based on the context of educational reform, school governance should be carried out much more to obtain experience and feedback from practice.

5. Conclusions

In summary, school governance can be based on administrative or hierarchical organizational structures such as governance boards, teachers’ collectives, subject groups, and students based on groups and classes. There are also groups that are often conceived of as small systems, such as party organizations, trade unions, youth organizations, etc. At the same time, they can be managed according to activities such as teaching, learning in class and outside of class, training, education, tutoring, etc. Governance by activity or organizational structure must be aimed at achieving the school’s goals and objectives. Therefore, to implement school governance well, one must first understand the functions and contents of school governance.

For activities to occur according to the correct procedure and to be effective, in addition to the capabilities of individuals, school leaders need to understand the basic functions of school governance. School leaders must consider all the school conditions to clearly plan problems, organize people and resources, guide staff, coordinate and monitor activities, and evaluate progress, development, and achievements. Although the scope of school governance is quite broad, it can include the following functions: planning, financing, organizing, coordinating, and evaluating activities and programs. In addition to these functions, the content of school governance is complex and challenging. It is expressed through the principal’s duties and powers, with specific content such as building and organizing the school apparatus; formulating plans and organizing the implementation of the school year’s tasks; human resource governance, professional governance, work assignment, examination, evaluation, and the classification of teachers and staff; and performing the work of rewarding, disciplining, and managing recruitment records for teachers and employees. Student administration and student activities organized by the school; a review and approval of student assessment results; financial and property governance of the school; and the implementation of policies for teachers, students, etc.

The perceptions of parents, teachers, governors, and other stakeholders in school governance in Vietnam have many similarities with aspects of governance in other countries around the world, both developed and developing countries. This shows the level of international integration in education in general and school governance in particular in Vietnam during the current educational renovation process. More challenges in school governance are managed according to the organizational structure or by activities due to interactions between small systems according to the purpose of the school. In addition to existing methods that are exposed institutionally because of the development of social life and because the school itself is always at a high level of development, the value of the organization will be a solid fulcrum for the school's development.

There are some notable contributions of this research to school governance: (1) the key players who have been working in different school settings have specific knowledge of school governance and the content that daily schools are experiencing; (2) the policies issued by the Ministry of Education and Training have covered the necessary requirements of school governance in the context of Vietnam and started taking up the criteria of school governance of the world and foreign schools whose headquarters and campuses in Vietnam; and (3) the perspectives of these people also provide concrete evidence for continuing reform of the public governance sector of Vietnam. In summary, this research provides a common picture of school governance in terms of conceptual knowledge, policy implications, and practice.

This is only initial research on school governance in general, especially on the opinions of key components of general education institution governance prescribed in legal documents. There is a need for other in-depth studies to clarify school governance in Vietnam: (1) international comparative research to identify similarities and differences in Vietnamese high
school governance and among countries with the same socioeconomic characteristics as well as comparisons with countries that do not have the same socioeconomic characteristics; (2) practical research on the power and exercise of school governance components in Vietnam because the governance structure is a new form of governance for general education; (3) research to identify the participation and contributions of other social sectors in the process of organizing governance activities inside and outside the school; and (4) macromanagement policy studies to have policy recommendations for the entire general education system while also ensuring a legal corridor for other areas of the whole field, both public and private participation in governance.
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