

To cite this article: Lai Thi Thuy An (2026). CURRENT STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT OF MORAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS IN NON-PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN HO CHI MINH CITY THROUGH A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH, International Journal of Education and Social Science Research (IJESSR) 9 (2): 266-280 Article No. 1222, Sub Id 1882

CURRENT STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT OF MORAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS IN NON-PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN HO CHI MINH CITY THROUGH A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH

Lai Thi Thuy An

Hoang Gia Primary, Lower Secondary and Upper Secondary School, Tan Hung Ward, Ho Chi Minh City

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2026.9221>

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the current status of the management of moral education for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City through a participatory approach, emphasizing the coordinating role of schools, families, and the community in shaping students' moral qualities. The study employed a mixed-methods design, combining questionnaire surveys administered to school administrators, teachers, and parents; in-depth interviews; and analysis of educational management documents. The findings indicate that the management of moral education has been implemented at a fairly good level, with mean scores ranging from 3.38 to 3.45 on a five-point scale. Planning and directing activities achieved relatively positive results, particularly moral education delivered through the Moral Education subject, collective activities, and students' self-education activities. However, issues related to the mobilization of social resources, school-family-community coordination, and monitoring mechanisms remain limited. The strongest influencing factors include the management capacity of school administrators, teachers' capacity for moral education, and the quality of multi-stakeholder coordination. On this basis, the study proposes a model for managing moral education through a participatory approach in order to enhance the effectiveness of school governance in non-public schools in the current context of general education reform.

KEYWORDS: moral education; educational management; non-public schools; primary education; participatory approach.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization, digital transformation, and increasingly profound social changes, moral education for school students has become a strategic concern in many countries. In Vietnam, the 2018 General Education Curriculum identifies the development of learners' qualities as a core objective, emphasizing such values as patriotism, compassion, diligence, honesty, and responsibility.

In Ho Chi Minh City—the country’s largest economic center—the non-public school system has expanded rapidly in response to the diverse demands of parents. However, alongside expectations for academic quality, non-public schools are facing increasing pressure to build a comprehensive educational environment, particularly with regard to moral education for primary school students.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The survey was conducted in 15 non-public primary schools representing different geographical areas and socio-economic conditions in Ho Chi Minh City. The selection of the research sites was intended to ensure representativeness and to provide an objective reflection of the current status of moral education across models of non-public primary schools operating under differing socio-economic, cultural, and educational management conditions.

The survey participants were selected to ensure representativeness and included all major stakeholders involved in the moral education process for students in non-public primary schools, as follows:

Table 1. Survey Participants

Survey participants	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
School administrators	50	4.55
Primary school teachers	150	13.63
Primary school students	800	72.73
Parents	100	9.09
Total	1,100	100

Sampling was conducted using a stratified sampling method to ensure an even distribution across localities, school size, and the level of socio-economic development in the surveyed areas.

To ensure the accuracy and objectivity of the data, the study combined several methods, including sociological survey methods, analysis of activity products, classroom observation, and in-depth interviews, specifically as follows:

- **Questionnaire survey method:**

- Applied to 100% of the surveyed participants (school administrators, teachers, students, and parents).
- The questionnaire was designed using a five-point Likert scale to measure levels of agreement, manifestation, or frequency of behaviors related to moral education.

- **Semi-structured in-depth interviews:**

- Conducted with 10 school administrators, 10 homeroom teachers, and 10 parents to obtain deeper insights into opinions, experiences, and practical recommendations.

- **Observation of moral education activities:**

- Conducted in 6 schools at different points in time, focusing on Moral Education lessons, class meetings, extracurricular activities, and the handling of student disciplinary situations.

• **Analysis of activity products:**

- Included analyses of moral education plans, homeroom records, school regulations, school–parent coordination plans, and school records on the management of educational activities.

The research instruments were developed on the basis of the theoretical framework and a pilot survey conducted in one school before official implementation. Data collection took place from March to May 2025 and strictly adhered to research ethics principles in educational science.

Rating Scale and Data Processing

A five-point Likert scale was used to assess the level of implementation, the level of manifestation, and implementation outcomes, with the following levels:

- Level 1: Completely inappropriate; no influence at all; not implemented at all; very weak.
- Level 2: Inappropriate; no influence; not implemented; weak.
- Level 3: Relatively appropriate; little influence; implemented infrequently; average.
- Level 4: Appropriate; influential; implemented frequently; fairly good.
- Level 5: Highly appropriate; highly influential; implemented very frequently; good.

3.1. Current Status of Planning Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools

Table 2. Current Status of Planning Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
1. The objectives of the moral education plan for students are aligned with the moral education objectives stipulated in the 2018 primary education curriculum	3.50	0.943	6
2. The plan content reflects the education of students' personal awareness regarding patriotism, compassion, honesty, diligence, and responsibility	3.44	0.852	7
3. The plan content reflects the education of students' attitudes toward patriotism, compassion, honesty, diligence, and responsibility	3.38	0.957	8
4. The plan content reflects the education of students' skills, behaviors, and habits related to patriotism, compassion, honesty, diligence, and responsibility	3.34	0.790	10
5. The moral education plan is implemented through teaching the Moral Education subject	3.80	0.693	1
6. The moral education plan is implemented through teaching academic subjects	3.56	0.852	3
7. The moral education plan is implemented through experiential activities	3.52	0.781	5

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
8. The moral education plan is implemented through collective activities	3.54	0.899	4
9. The moral education plan is implemented through Young Pioneer Organization activities and social activities	3.16	0.833	12
10. The moral education plan is implemented through students' self-education activities	3.78	0.807	2
11. The plan includes professional development for teachers' capacity for integrated moral education through educational and instructional activities	3.36	0.843	9
12. The plan includes coordination among school, family, and community to educate students in morality and lifestyle through teaching, experiential activities, and other educational activities	3.30	0.755	11
13. The plan includes the mobilization of resources inside and outside the school to implement moral education for students	3.12	0.909	13
Overall mean	3.45		

The survey findings on the current status of planning moral education for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City indicate that, overall, school administrators have performed planning at a fairly good level, with an overall mean of 3.45 on the five-point Likert scale. This suggests that schools have begun to develop a relatively systematic approach to designing moral education plans, in line with the goal of forming and developing moral qualities in primary school students in accordance with the requirements of the 2018 General Education Curriculum.

More specifically, the item rated highest by school administrators was “planning moral education through teaching the Moral Education subject” ($M = 3.80$), reflecting the strong emphasis schools place on the core subject whose main function is moral education. This is an appropriate direction, as the Moral Education subject provides the clearest and most direct space for content, methods, and values related to moral education. Ranked second was “planning moral education through students' self-education activities” ($M = 3.78$), indicating that school administrators have begun to pay greater attention to students' self-education and self-discipline—a new trend in modern education aimed at promoting students' agency and autonomy in character formation.

In addition, integrating moral education into academic subjects ($M = 3.56$), organizing collective activities ($M = 3.54$), and implementing experiential activities ($M = 3.52$) were also rated at a fairly good level. This reflects a relatively sound awareness among school administrators of the need to employ multiple channels and forms of education to foster students' moral qualities.

However, several planning components received lower scores, pointing to gaps that still need to be addressed. For example, the planning of moral education in terms of specific components such as personal awareness ($M = 3.44$), attitudes ($M = 3.38$), and skills and behaviors ($M = 3.34$) remained at the lower end of the average range, suggesting that planning is still somewhat general and has not yet

clearly specified directions for cultivating each moral dimension in students. In particular, “planning coordination among school, family, and community for moral education” ($M = 3.30$) and “planning the mobilization of internal and external resources” ($M = 3.12$) received the lowest mean scores in the table. This is a noteworthy limitation, because moral education for students in non-public primary schools in the current context requires close coordination and the concerted mobilization of social resources, especially given the diversity of student populations and educational environments in this school sector.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.693 to 0.957 suggest that the dispersion of responses was not overly large, thereby supporting the relative reliability of the survey data. Nevertheless, differences in ratings across some indicators may reflect uneven planning capacity among school administrators, underscoring the need to strengthen professional development in moral education planning.

In sum, the analysis of Table 2 shows that the planning of moral education for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City is currently at a fairly good level. However, limitations remain in terms of emphasizing deeper moral education content and the development of students’ personal capacities. This provides an important empirical basis for proposing management measures based on a participatory approach to improve both the quality of planning and the organization of moral education in non-public primary schools.

3.2. Current Status of Organizing the Implementation of Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools

Table 3. Current Status of Organizing the Implementation of Moral Education Plans for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
1. Providing professional development to enhance teachers’ capacity for integrated moral education	3.42	0.827	5
2. Establishing coordination mechanisms between the school and participating stakeholders in moral education for students	3.12	0.652	10
3. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through teaching the Moral Education subject	3.58	0.874	1
4. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through teaching academic and arts subjects	3.44	0.828	4
5. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through experiential activities	3.40	0.917	6
6. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through collective activities	3.52	0.854	2
7. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through Young Pioneer Organization activities, social activities, and charitable activities	3.36	0.866	7

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
8. Organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through students' self-education activities	3.46	0.877	3
9. Establishing and implementing mechanisms for inspecting and monitoring moral education for students	3.34	0.930	8
10. Organizing the mobilization of resources for moral education for students	3.16	0.758	9
Overall mean	3.38		

The survey results on the current status of organizing the implementation of moral education plans for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City show that school administrators have, in general, implemented a range of moral education activities at a relatively positive level. The overall mean score of 3.38 on the five-point Likert scale indicates a level above average and approaching fairly good, although the implementation has not yet been particularly strong or consistent across content areas.

Among the surveyed items, “organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through teaching the Moral Education subject” received the highest rating ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.874$). This indicates that schools are still concentrating on the traditional channel of formal instruction through the core subject as the primary mode of moral education. This is consistent with the requirements of the 2018 General Education Curriculum, under which the Moral Education subject serves as a foundational subject for the formation and development of students' qualities.

In addition, the two items “organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through collective activities” ($M = 3.52$) and “organizing and guiding teachers to implement moral education through students' self-education activities” ($M = 3.46$) were also rated relatively highly, ranking second and third respectively. This suggests a growing awareness among school managers of the importance of using non-formal educational forms such as collective activities and self-education to cultivate students' character in a more proactive and self-directed manner.

However, several other areas were implemented at a more modest level. In particular, “establishing coordination mechanisms between the school and participating stakeholders in moral education for students” had the lowest mean score ($M = 3.12$; rank 10), indicating that coordination among schools, parents, social organizations, and other stakeholders has not yet received adequate attention. This is a significant limitation, as moral education cannot be separated from the relationship among school, family, and society.

Similarly, “organizing the mobilization of resources for moral education” ($M = 3.16$; rank 9) and “establishing and implementing inspection and monitoring mechanisms for moral education” ($M = 3.34$; rank 8) also received relatively low scores. This reflects insufficient investment in material

resources, human resources, and monitoring mechanisms in the organization of moral education in non-public primary schools—an area that inherently requires coordinated and systematic support.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.652 to 0.930 reveal some dispersion in administrators' ratings, reflecting unevenness in how moral education activities are organized and implemented across schools. This suggests that while some schools have developed relatively systematic approaches, others remain more formalistic and lack a coherent management structure in implementation.

Overall, the analysis of Table 3 indicates that although the implementation of moral education plans for students has received attention in several key areas, important gaps remain, particularly in relation to multi-stakeholder coordination, resource mobilization, and the establishment of inspection and monitoring mechanisms. These limitations provide an important empirical basis for proposing management measures for moral education through a participatory approach, ensuring close coordination among stakeholders and creating favorable and synchronized conditions for moral education in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City.

3.3. Current Status of Directing the Implementation of Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools

Table 4. Current Status of Directing the Implementation of Moral Education Plans for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
1. Directing subject groups/grade-level teams to provide professional development for teachers in integrated moral education linked to instructional content and experiential activities	3.50	0.854	4
2. Directing teachers to regularly coordinate among school, family, and community in moral education for primary school students	3.26	0.844	9
3. Directing teachers to implement moral education through teaching the Moral Education subject	3.62	0.846	2
4. Directing the implementation of moral education through the teaching of academic and arts subjects	3.44	0.898	6
5. Directing teachers to conduct moral education through experiential activities	3.38	0.797	7
6. Directing teachers to conduct moral education through collective activities	3.32	0.989	8
7. Directing teachers to diversify Young Pioneer Organization activities, social activities, and charitable activities for moral education	3.64	0.889	1
8. Directing teachers to promote students' role in self-education and self-discipline across all activities	3.48	0.900	5
9. Directing subject groups/grade-level teams to inspect and monitor teachers' moral education activities for students	3.58	0.896	3

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
10. Directing the effective exploitation and use of resources for moral education for students	3.06	0.947	10
Overall mean	3.43		

The survey findings on the current status of directing the implementation of moral education plans for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City show that the directing function performed by school administrators reached a fairly average level, with an overall mean of 3.43 on the five-point Likert scale. Although this score is slightly higher than the overall mean for the organization of implementation ($M = 3.38$), it still indicates that the directing function has not yet been sufficiently strong or effective to create substantial change in realizing the participatory approach.

A detailed analysis of the directing content reveals an uneven pattern. The most highly rated items (M ranging from 3.58 to 3.64) focused on traditional, specific, and relatively easy-to-implement activities, such as “directing teachers to diversify Young Pioneer Organization activities, social activities, and charitable activities for moral education” ($M = 3.64$), “directing teachers to implement moral education through teaching the Moral Education subject” ($M = 3.62$), and “directing subject groups/grade-level teams to inspect and monitor teachers’ moral education activities” ($M = 3.58$). This reflects administrators’ concern for direct instructional channels and internal monitoring processes.

However, the most crucial directing tasks—those that are decisive in translating the participatory approach into practice—received the lowest ratings. Notably, “directing the effective exploitation and use of resources for moral education” ($M = 3.06$) and “directing teachers to regularly coordinate among school, family, and community in moral education for primary school students” ($M = 3.26$) were the two lowest-ranked items. These findings once again confirm a major bottleneck in management: school administrators have not yet exercised sufficiently decisive or systematic direction in establishing effective coordination mechanisms or in providing clear guidance on mobilizing and using social resources for the purpose of moral education. In the absence of specific direction in these two areas, the participatory approach remains more of a conceptual orientation than a living reality in school practice.

Another noteworthy point is that “directing subject groups/grade-level teams to provide professional development in integrated moral education for teachers” ($M = 3.50$) and “directing teachers to promote students’ self-education and self-discipline in all activities” ($M = 3.48$) were also rated only at an average level. This suggests that professional development in integrated moral education and the promotion of students’ agency and self-management—both important elements of modern education—have not yet been prioritized to the highest degree by school administrators.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.797 to 0.989 indicate considerable differences in perceptions and directing practices among administrators across schools. This variation, particularly in the most crucial areas, reflects a lack of consistency and the absence of a shared strategic orientation across the city.

In conclusion, the analysis of Table 4 shows that the current status of directing the implementation of moral education plans in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City still contains many shortcomings. The directing work has focused mainly on routine pedagogical measures and internal monitoring, while giving insufficient attention to the foundational tasks needed to build a moral education model involving the participation of broader social forces. Weaknesses in directing coordination with families and communities, as well as in resource mobilization, constitute the greatest barriers that need to be addressed. This is an important empirical basis for proposing comprehensive management solutions to strengthen administrators' directing capacity and move toward an open, effective, and sustainable environment for moral education.

3.4. Current Status of Inspecting, Monitoring, and Evaluating the Implementation of Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools

Table 5. Current Status of Monitoring and Evaluating the Implementation of Moral Education Plans for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
1. Inspecting the implementation of coordination mechanisms among school, family, and society in moral education for students	3.34	0.908	7
2. Inspecting coordination activities between the school, teachers, parents, and other educational forces in moral education for students	3.40	0.800	5
3. Inspecting the implementation of goals and content of moral education through instructional activities	3.42	0.802	4
4. Inspecting the implementation of goals and content of moral education through experiential activities	3.30	0.831	8
5. Inspecting the implementation of goals and content of moral education through collective activities	3.48	0.854	2
6. Inspecting the implementation of goals and content of moral education through Young Pioneer Organization activities, social activities, and charitable activities	3.54	0.727	1
7. Inspecting the school's and subject groups' organization and direction of teachers' moral education activities for students	3.36	0.866	6
8. Inspecting the conditions required for carrying out moral education for students in the school	3.44	0.828	3
Overall mean	3.41		

The survey results on the current status of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of moral education plans for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City show that the overall level of implementation by school administrators was fairly average, with an overall mean of 3.41 on the five-point Likert scale. This indicates that monitoring and evaluation in the field of moral education

have been conducted to some extent, but not yet in a sufficiently comprehensive or effective manner to ensure quality and consistency in moral education activities for students.

With regard to specific content areas, the activity rated highest by administrators was “inspecting the implementation of moral education goals and content through Young Pioneer Organization activities, social activities, and charitable activities” ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.727$). This suggests that schools have begun to recognize the role of out-of-class activities, particularly Youth Organization and community-oriented activities, in shaping students’ moral qualities. This was followed by “inspecting the implementation of moral education goals and content through collective activities” ($M = 3.48$) and “inspecting the conditions for implementing moral education” ($M = 3.44$). These findings indicate that administrators relatively positively evaluated the role of the educational environment and collective activities in moral education.

However, several items scored lower, including “inspecting the implementation of moral education goals and content through experiential activities” ($M = 3.30$, rank 8) and “inspecting the implementation of coordination mechanisms among school, family, and society” ($M = 3.34$, rank 7). This suggests that the role of experiential activities in moral education, as well as coordination among the three educational environments—school, family, and society—has not yet been closely monitored or effectively promoted as expected. Yet, under the orientation of the 2018 General Education Curriculum, coordination among these three educational forces and moral education through real-life experiences are essential for students’ sustainable moral development.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.727 to 0.908 indicate a moderate level of variation in administrators’ responses, supporting the reliability of the survey findings. However, since all mean scores remained below 3.60, a gap still exists between theoretical expectations and the actual practice of monitoring and evaluating moral education activities in schools.

In summary, the analysis of Table 5 shows that monitoring and evaluation of moral education plans in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City have been implemented at a fairly average level, with greater attention given to out-of-class activities such as Youth Organization activities, social activities, and collective activities. Nevertheless, important limitations remain in monitoring coordination among school, family, and society and, in particular, in supervising moral education through experiential activities. This provides an important empirical basis for proposing management measures to improve the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation, strengthen inter-sectoral coordination, and better harness the value of experiential activities in moral education, thereby enhancing the overall quality of moral education for students.

Current Status of Factors Affecting the Management of Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Table 6. Factors Affecting the Management of Moral Education for Students in Non-Public Primary Schools in Ho Chi Minh City

Content	Mean	SD	Rank
1. Teachers' awareness and capacity for moral education	4.06	0.705	2
2. School administrators' awareness and management capacity in moral education	4.16	0.731	1
3. Students' motivation and learning attitudes	3.94	0.759	4
4. School facilities, equipment, and ICT infrastructure	3.92	0.796	5
5. Local socio-economic and cultural environment	3.88	0.840	6
6. Coordination among school, family, and community	4.00	0.800	3
7. An open-designed Moral Education curriculum	3.84	0.809	7
Overall mean	3.97		

The survey results on the current status of factors affecting the management of moral education for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City show that school administrators' awareness and management capacity in moral education was rated as the strongest influencing factor, with the highest mean score ($M = 4.16$). This was followed by teachers' awareness and capacity for moral education ($M = 4.06$). These results underscore the pivotal role of school administrators and teachers in organizing and effectively implementing moral education activities for students, suggesting that the awareness and professional capacity of these two groups are the prerequisite conditions for ensuring the quality of moral education management.

Ranked third was coordination among school, family, and community ($M = 4.00$), indicating the substantial influence of the linkage among the three educational environments in shaping students' moral qualities. This is consistent with the participatory approach, which emphasizes the importance of close and synchronized coordination among educational stakeholders inside and outside the school.

Factors related to external conditions—such as students' motivation and learning attitudes ($M = 3.94$), school facilities, equipment, and ICT infrastructure ($M = 3.92$), the local socio-economic and cultural environment ($M = 3.88$), and an open-designed Moral Education curriculum ($M = 3.84$)—were rated as having somewhat lower influence. Although the mean scores for these factors were all above the fairly average level, they remained below 4.0, reflecting the reality that material, social, and curricular conditions have not yet optimally supported moral education in non-public primary schools.

Standard deviations ranging from 0.705 to 0.840 indicate a relatively high level of agreement among school administrators in their evaluations. However, the gap between the highest- and lowest-rated factors was rather narrow (from 3.84 to 4.16), suggesting that all factors exert a certain degree of influence and that none should be underestimated in the overall management of moral education.

In conclusion, the analysis shows that human factors—especially the awareness and capacity of school administrators and teachers—play a decisive role in the management of moral education. However, improving the effectiveness of moral education management also requires the synchronization of other factors, particularly greater investment in facilities, the improvement of the Moral Education curriculum in a more open direction, and stronger coordination among school, family, and community, in keeping with the participatory approach adopted in this study. This provides an important empirical foundation for proposing appropriate management measures in the subsequent chapters.

3.5. Overall Evaluation of the Current Situation

3.5.1. Strengths

- Awareness of the role of moral education has increasingly improved: Most surveyed school administrators and teachers demonstrated positive awareness of the importance of moral education in schools, especially in the context of the fundamental and comprehensive reform of education.
- Some schools have boldly renewed moral education methods: The integration of moral education into subjects, class meetings, and experiential activities has initially been implemented in several non-public schools with advanced educational models, attracting parents' attention.
- The pedagogical environment in schools is relatively friendly and supportive: Moderate class sizes, relatively modern facilities, and friendly relationships between teachers and students as well as among students themselves have created favorable conditions for the formation and cultivation of moral qualities.
- The mobilization of social resources for education has received attention in some schools: Many non-public primary schools have been able to secure support from parents and social organizations to organize moral education programs associated with charitable and life-skills activities.

3.5.2. Limitations

- A lack of long-term strategies for managing moral education: Many schools still pursue achievement-oriented goals and focus on outward factors such as facilities, while not giving sufficient attention to building school culture and discipline.
- Moral education activities are uneven across schools: Some schools implement moral education effectively, whereas many others still treat it lightly, organize it in a reactive manner, and lack depth, creativity, and a student-centered orientation.
- The role of homeroom teachers has not been fully utilized: Many homeroom teachers have not yet been adequately equipped with the skills needed to organize moral education activities effectively, especially skills for handling situations and counseling students when moral issues arise.
- A lack of consistency in moral education orientation: Some schools have not developed long-term strategies or specified moral education goals in their school education plans, resulting in activities that remain formalistic and unsystematic.
- Moral education activities remain overly slogan-driven, lacking depth and experiential character: The organization of moral education activities still tends to rely on propaganda and one-way

imposition, with insufficient attention to experiential and practical interactive methods, thereby reducing the effectiveness of moral formation.

- A lack of effective coordination mechanisms among school, family, and society: The connection between homeroom teachers, school leadership, and parents remains loose; coordination activities are mainly occasional rather than regular, which limits consistency in the moral education process.
- The capacity for managing moral education remains inadequate: Some school administrators and teachers are still uncertain in implementing moral education activities, lacking specialized knowledge and pedagogical skills for organizing integrated, interdisciplinary, or experiential moral education.
- Monitoring and evaluation systems have not yet been effective: There are still no specific criteria and tools for assessing both the process and outcomes of moral education in quantitative and qualitative terms; evaluation is still based mainly on subjective impressions or general conduct results, making it difficult to detect students' early signs of moral deviation.

3.5.3. Causes

- The social environment is becoming increasingly complex, exerting a strong influence on students' moral awareness and behavior, especially due to the explosion of information on the Internet and social media, which makes it difficult to control negative influences.
- There is a lack of consistency in guidance on the implementation of moral education content from different levels of educational management, leaving schools uncertain in selecting appropriate content and methods of implementation.
- Some schools still underestimate the role of moral education, focusing more on academic subjects than on comprehensive educational activities.
- The management capacity of school administrators has not been regularly trained and developed in a specialized manner related to moral education and the management of extracurricular educational activities.
- Limitations in autonomy and financial mechanisms make it difficult for many schools to invest adequately in facilities and to organize diverse and attractive moral education activities.
- Coordination among school, parents, and community remains weak; many parents leave moral education entirely to the school and do not accompany their children sufficiently in behavioral development.
- There is still no close linkage between schools and local social organizations: some schools have not proactively coordinated with organizations such as the Young Pioneer Organization and Parents' Associations in building a comprehensive educational environment.
- There is no specific competency framework for the management of moral education for school administrators and teachers: there remains a lack of specialized professional development materials on organizing moral education activities oriented toward the development of learners' qualities.

- Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for moral education activities remain inconsistent: there is still no system of clear criteria and evidence for evaluating the effectiveness of moral education activities in schools.
- Insufficient time and human resources are allocated to moral education activities: moral education is often simply integrated into other activities without a clear purpose or management orientation.

4. CONCLUSION

The research findings show that the management of moral education for students in non-public primary schools in Ho Chi Minh City has been implemented at a fairly good level, with mean scores ranging from 3.38 to 3.45 on a five-point Likert scale. Management functions such as planning, organization of implementation, directing, and inspection/evaluation have all received attention, with activities internal to the school—such as teaching the Moral Education subject, collective activities, and students' self-education activities—showing higher effectiveness than activities involving external linkages.

However, the study also identifies systemic limitations, particularly in the application of the participatory approach. Coordination among school, family, and community has not yet been truly effective; mechanisms for mobilizing social resources remain limited; and inspection and monitoring activities still lack a clear system of criteria and evaluation tools. These limitations reduce both the sustainability and the overall effectiveness of moral education in the context of modern education.

The analysis of influencing factors indicates that school administrators' management capacity and teachers' capacity for moral education are the decisive factors, while multi-stakeholder coordination plays an important mediating role in operationalizing a participatory model of moral education.

Based on these findings, it can be affirmed that improving the effectiveness of moral education management in non-public primary schools requires a systemic approach, with particular emphasis on building multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms, developing staff capacity, and renewing the organization of education in experiential and integrated directions while promoting students' agency. The study also opens up a new approach to the management of moral education based on stakeholder participation, thereby contributing to the requirements of general education reform in the current context.

REFERENCES

- Bush, T. (2020). *Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fullan, M. (2019). *Nuance: Why some leaders succeed and others fail*. Corwin Press.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2018). *General education curriculum* (Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT). Hanoi, Vietnam.

- Nguyen, T. H., & Tran, V. T. (2020). Moral education in Vietnamese primary schools: Current issues and solutions. *Journal of Education*, 482(2), 15–21.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Hoang, P. H. (2019). School management in the context of educational reform in Vietnam. *Vietnam Journal of Educational Sciences*, 15(3), 45–52.
- Le, T. T. (2021). Participatory approach in school management: Theory and practice in Vietnamese context. *Educational Management Review*, 9(1), 23–30.