

TO WHAT EXTENT DO VIETNAMESE UNIVERSITIES' RESOURCES MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE TRAINING? PERSPECTIVES FROM LECTURERS AND STUDENTS

ATÉ QUE PONTO OS RECURSOS DAS UNIVERSIDADES VIETNAMITAS ATENDEM ÀS EXIGÊNCIAS DO ENSINO DA LÍNGUA FRANCESA? PERSPECTIVAS DE PROFESSORES E ALUNOS

Article received on: 12/10/2025

Article accepted on: 2/9/2026

Ngoc Nhu Quynh Dang*

*Saigon University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9183-452X>

quynhdnn@hcmue.edu.vn

Van-Loc Vo**

**Gia Dinh University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9871-9915>

loc@sgu.edu.vn

Nhu Thuy Vy Dang***

***Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6893-2259>

vydnt@pnt.edu.vn

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract

This study examines the extent to which the resources of Vietnamese universities meet the requirements for French language training from the perspectives of lecturers and students. The research employed a mixed-methods design combining quantitative survey data from 77 lecturers and 317 students across nine universities with qualitative interviews involving nine academic managers and 18 lecturers. The findings indicate that the resources supporting French language training generally reach a moderate level. While the teaching staff are considered to possess appropriate qualifications and professional competence, some limitations remain regarding lecturer quantity, pedagogical development, and research capacity. The training programmes are evaluated as relatively appropriate but require further improvement in curriculum structure and clearer communication of training objectives. Facilities and learning materials meet basic requirements but lack specialized infrastructure and updated digital resources. Financial resources remain limited and heavily dependent on tuition fees, while stakeholder engagement, particularly with employers, remains modest. These findings provide empirical evidence to suggest that improving the quality of French language

Resumo

Este estudo examina em que medida os recursos das universidades vietnamitas atendem aos requisitos para o ensino da língua francesa. a partir das perspectivas de professores e alunos. A pesquisa empregou um desenho de métodos mistos, combinando dados de pesquisa quantitativa de 77 professores e 317 alunos de nove universidades com entrevistas qualitativas envolvendo nove gestores acadêmicos e 18 professores. Os resultados indicam que os recursos que apoiam o ensino da língua francesa atingem, em geral, um nível moderado. Embora se considere que o corpo docente possua qualificações e competência profissional adequadas, persistem algumas limitações no que diz respeito ao número de professores, ao desenvolvimento pedagógico e à capacidade de pesquisa. Os programas de formação são avaliados como relativamente adequados, mas requerem melhorias adicionais na estrutura curricular e uma comunicação mais clara dos objetivos de formação. As instalações e os materiais didáticos atendem aos requisitos básicos, mas carecem de infraestrutura especializada e de recursos digitais atualizados. Os recursos financeiros continuam limitados e fortemente dependentes das mensalidades, enquanto o envolvimento das partes



training requires a comprehensive approach, including strengthening lecturer professional development, updating curricula, investing in specialized facilities, diversifying financial resources, and enhancing stakeholder collaboration.

Keywords: French Language Training. Higher Education in Vietnam. Educational Resources. Training Quality Assurance.

interessadas. particularmente dos empregadores. permanece modesto. Essas conclusões fornecem evidências empíricas que sugerem que a melhoria da qualidade do ensino da língua francesa requer uma abordagem abrangente. incluindo o fortalecimento do desenvolvimento profissional dos professores. a atualização dos currículos. o investimento em instalações especializadas. a diversificação dos recursos financeiros e o aprimoramento da colaboração entre as partes interessadas.

Palavras-chave: Ensino da Língua Francesa. Ensino Superior no Vietnã. Recursos Educacionais. Garantia de Qualidade do Ensino.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and the internationalization of higher education, foreign language competence has become an essential requirement for university graduates. Universities are increasingly expected to equip students not only with disciplinary knowledge but also with the linguistic and intercultural skills necessary for participation in the global labour market and academic mobility (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2004). Within this context, foreign language training is considered a strategic component of higher education development, contributing to graduate employability and international cooperation. The quality of foreign language training, however, depends significantly on the adequacy of institutional resources such as qualified lecturers, appropriate curricula, modern facilities, learning materials, and academic support services (OECD, 2019; Forest & Altbach, 2007). From a quality assurance perspective, the alignment between programme objectives, learning outcomes, and available resources is widely recognized as a key factor influencing educational effectiveness (Harvey & Green, 1993).

In foreign language training, the role of institutional resources is particularly critical because language learning requires specific learning conditions, including opportunities for interaction, access to authentic materials, and supportive learning environments. Previous studies have indicated that effective language programmes require not only competent lecturers but also access to language laboratories, digital

learning platforms, and updated instructional materials (e.g., Nation & Macalister, 2010; Richards, 2015). Furthermore, the integration of educational technologies has increasingly become an important condition for improving the effectiveness of language teaching and learning, especially in developing communicative competence. Therefore, evaluating the adequacy of training resources is an important step in improving the quality of foreign language programmes.

In Vietnam, foreign language training has been strongly promoted as part of national education reforms and international integration policies. While English has received the greatest attention, French continues to play an important role due to Vietnam's historical and educational connections with Francophone countries and ongoing cooperation within the Francophonie community. French language programmes in Vietnamese universities aim to develop students' linguistic competence and prepare them for careers in areas such as education, translation, tourism, and international cooperation. However, these programmes are also facing various challenges related to resource constraints, changing labour market demands, and competition from other foreign language programmes. Previous research on Vietnamese higher education has suggested that limitations in infrastructure, teaching materials, and institutional support may affect programme quality and student learning experiences (e.g., Pham & Fry, 2004; Nguyen, 2009, 2024; Tuyet, 2014). Nevertheless, most existing studies have mainly focused on curriculum reform or teaching methods, while relatively little attention has been paid to the adequacy of institutional resources supporting foreign language training, particularly in French language programmes.

Moreover, there remains a lack of empirical studies examining this issue from the perspectives of lecturers and students, who are the primary stakeholders directly involved in the teaching and learning process. Their perceptions are particularly important because they are the direct users of educational resources and can therefore provide practical insights into both the strengths and limitations of existing conditions. Understanding these perspectives may help universities identify areas for improvement and support evidence-based decision-making in programme development and quality assurance. Therefore, this study aims to examine the extent to which the resources of Vietnamese universities meet the requirements for French language training from the perspectives of lecturers and students. Specifically, the study seeks to: 1) assess the current status of training resources;

2) analyse lecturers' and students' perceptions of their adequacy; 3) propose implications for improving the quality of French language training. By doing so, the study contributes empirical evidence to support the improvement of foreign language education quality in the context of higher education internationalization in Vietnam.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the extent to which Vietnamese universities' resources meet the requirements for French language training. The use of mixed methods allows researchers to benefit from the strengths of both quantitative data, which provide generalizable findings, and qualitative data, which offer deeper insights into participants' experiences and perspectives (Creswell & Clark, 2018). In this study, the quantitative component aimed to examine lecturers' and students' perceptions of training resources, while the qualitative component was used to further explain and enrich the quantitative findings through in-depth interviews with lecturers and institutional managers.

2.2 Data collection methods

Data were collected through two methods: questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews.

The questionnaire was designed to assess participants' perceptions of the adequacy of training resources, focusing on key dimensions such as human resources, teaching and learning facilities, training programmes, financial resources, and stakeholder engagement. The questionnaire was distributed to lecturers and students at the participating institutions, and responses were collected using a Likert-scale format to facilitate quantitative analysis. A total of 394 participants were involved in the survey, including 77 lecturers (Group A) and 317 students (Group B) enrolled in French language programmes. The lecturers were directly involved in teaching French courses, while the

students were currently undertaking French language training. The inclusion of both groups aimed to ensure a comprehensive assessment of training resources from both teaching and learning perspectives.

In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 27 participants, including 9 academic managers (coded MG1 to MG9) and 18 lecturers (coded LT1 to LT18), to obtain more detailed insights into their experiences and evaluations of training resources. Academic managers included programme leaders, department heads, or faculty administrators responsible for managing French language programmes. These participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure that they possessed relevant experience and knowledge regarding programme resources and management conditions. Interview questions focused on the strengths and limitations of existing resources, challenges in programme implementation, and suggestions for improvement. Interviews were conducted either face-to-face or online, depending on participants' availability, and were recorded with participants' consent for subsequent analysis.

2.3 Data analysis

Quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires were analysed using descriptive statistics to examine the general trends in participants' perceptions. In addition, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the perceptions of lecturers and students regarding the adequacy of training resources. These analyses helped identify similarities and differences between the two groups' evaluations.

Qualitative data from the interviews were analysed using content analysis. Interview recordings were transcribed and coded to identify major themes related to the adequacy of training resources, existing challenges, and proposed improvements. The coding process followed a thematic approach, allowing patterns and recurring issues to be identified and interpreted systematically.

2.4 Limitations

First, the study relied primarily on self-reported data collected through questionnaires and interviews. While these methods are useful for capturing participants'

perceptions, they may be subject to response bias or personal interpretation. Future studies could complement perception-based data with additional sources such as classroom observations, document analysis, or institutional performance indicators to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of training resources.

Second, although the mixed-methods design allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem, the qualitative sample was limited to managers and lecturers and did not include student interviews. Including student interviews in future research could provide a more balanced and in-depth understanding of learners' experiences.

Finally, this study focused mainly on the adequacy of training resources and did not examine in detail the relationship between resource conditions and student learning outcomes. Future research could further explore this relationship to better understand how institutional resources influence the effectiveness of French language training programmes.

3 RESULTS

3.1 French language lecturers

Table 1 shows that the assessment levels from the stakeholder groups regarding the French Language lecturers generally reach an average level (with means ranging from 3,05 to 3,08). This reflects a relatively moderate, rather than truly positive, perception of the quality and capacity of the current French Language lecturers. The maximum mean difference between criteria is only 0,03, indicating that the ranking of criteria holds little significance in evaluating the lecturers participating in French Language training at these universities.

Table 1*Assessment of French Language lecturers at universities*

Factor	Stakeholder				Overall		
	Group	Mean	SD	p-value	Mean	SD	Rank
Quantity	A	3,29	0,971	0,047	3,08	1,168	1
	B	3,03	1,206				
Qualifications, training majors	A	3,27	1,034	0,120	3,08	1,222	1
	B	3,03	1,260				
Professional & pedagogical capacity	A	3,13	1,104	0,597	3,06	1,227	3
	B	3,05	1,256				
Other institutional requirements	A	3,30	1,040	0,056	3,05	1,256	4
	B	2,99	1,297				

Regarding the evaluation of the lecturers involved in French Language training, interview results from MG3 indicated that “lecturers in the French Language department at universities are well aware of the field’s position in the current context”. According to MG6, “lecturers possess diverse professional backgrounds (linguistics, pedagogy, cultural studies, etc.), and the number of lecturers holding doctoral degrees has increased annually”. Furthermore, LT14 noted that “several lecturers trained abroad possess progressive mindsets that help lead the unit’s training activities”. A specific advantage mentioned by MG1 is that “some lecturers maintain strong connections with other entities, serving as a bridge between the university and various educational, cultural, and friendship organizations”.

However, several opinions highlighted certain limitations within the current French Language lecturers. According to LT5, “peer-to-peer collaboration among lecturers remains weak, so professional activities often occur in isolation without a sense of collective connection”. Both MG5 and MG9 agreed that the younger lecturers lack training experience. MG4 further remarked that “the scientific research capacity serving French Language training among a segment of lecturers is still limited”.

Nevertheless, a gap in perception between lecturers and students persists across all criteria. In general, lecturers tend to rate themselves higher than students do in every aspect, reflecting greater confidence in their existing capacity and team structure. The scores suggest that students tend to give slightly lower ratings based on their direct classroom experiences. While both groups recognize that the lecturers possess the professional capacity to meet teaching requirements, there is a consensus on the need for continued professional development to enhance relevant pedagogical skills. Additionally,

students may not clearly perceive or feel the extent to which lecturers meet internal institutional standards, whereas lecturers have a deeper understanding of management aspects and professional benchmarks.

Specifically, the “Quantity” criterion showed a statistically significant difference ($p = 0,047$), indicating that students are somewhat concerned about personnel shortages at certain institutions. In practice, a single lecturer at many current universities may handle multiple modules within the French Language curriculum without violating university or Ministry of Education and Training regulations. For students, this reduces their choice of instructors, leading to lower ratings. Conversely, lecturers view this as a normal practice aligned with their expertise, resulting in higher ratings. Despite this discrepancy, both stakeholder groups agree that the current number of lecturers does not fully meet the demands of French Language training at universities today.

3.2 French language training program

Table 2 shows that the assessment levels from stakeholder groups regarding the French Language training program reach an average level, with overall means ranging from 2,99 to 3,08. This reflects that the training program is designed relatively reasonably and fundamentally meets training requirements, yet many points still require adjustment for improvement.

Table 2

Assessment of French Language training programs at universities

Factor	Stakeholder				Overall		
	Group	Mean	SD	p-value	Mean	SD	Rank
Training objectives	A	3,32	0,924	0,014	3,07	1,200	2
	B	3,01	1,252				
Overall module structure	A	3,10	1,119	0,351	2,99	1,194	5
	B	2,96	1,211				
Training plan	A	3,19	1,101	0,332	3,08	1,196	1
	B	3,05	1,217				
Program implementation requirements	A	3,17	1,056	0,187	3,01	1,174	4
	B	2,97	1,200				
Testing & evaluation regulations	A	3,19	1,089	0,266	3,06	1,222	3
	B	3,02	1,251				

Interview results also indicate that most managers and lecturers are not entirely satisfied with the current French Language training program and believe further development is necessary. Two notable directions mentioned include “supplementing objectives and modules to enhance professional capacity for students” (according to MG7) and “updating the program with new, modern linguistic knowledge” (according to LT5 and LT10).

Among the criteria for the French Language training program, the mean assessment from the lecturer group is consistently higher than that of the student group. This trend suggests that students perceive limitations in the actual implementation of the program, whereas lecturers view the program as more logical and comprehensive, reflecting their confidence in the current organizational and management system. This discrepancy also highlights that academic requirements are sometimes perceived as administratively heavy and lacking flexibility. Notably, the gap between lecturers and students regarding “training objectives” is statistically significant ($p = 0,014$), reflecting that students may not fully understand or perceive the orientation, philosophy, and goals of the program. Meanwhile, lecturers, in their roles as designers and implementers, have a clearer awareness of the program’s suitability and developmental direction.

3.3 Technical facilities and infrastructure for French Language training

Table 3 shows that the technical facilities and infrastructure serving French Language training are rated at an average level, with overall means ranging from 2,96 to 3,04. This reflects that existing physical conditions fundamentally meet teaching and learning requirements but are not yet truly modern, comprehensive, or synchronized.

Table 3

Assessment of technical facilities and infrastructure for French Language training at universities

Factor	Stakeholder				Overall		
	Group	Mean	SD	p-value	Mean	SD	Rank
Land and specialized facilities	A	2,73	1,047	0,036	2,96	1,239	3
	B	3,02	1,276				
Specialized machinery and equipment	A	2,82	1,022	0,178	2,97	1,228	2
	B	3,00	1,272				
	A	3,17	1,174	0,315	3,04	1,221	1

Training materials and documents	B	3,01	1,232				
----------------------------------	---	------	-------	--	--	--	--

Regarding the “Training materials and documents” criterion, the mean rating from lecturers is higher than that of students. Conversely, for the remaining two criteria, students’ mean ratings are higher than those of lecturers. This suggests that lecturers prioritize training materials over equipment and architectural infrastructure, while students hold the opposite perception. This reflects the practical perspectives of both groups regarding how well the facilities meet the specific needs of French Language training.

Notably, there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups regarding “Land and specialized facilities” ($p = 0,036$). In the training process, lecturers organize and lead the students’ learning; therefore, they identify which specialized rooms are essential and must flexibly adapt to the university’s reality if standards are not met. Consequently, the lecturer group provides a more realistic assessment of this criterion compared to the student group.

Interview results from MG3 regarding facilities indicated: “The French Language major does not demand excessive technical infrastructure, so basically, universities still meet the necessary conditions. However, for specialized tracks such as French for Tourism, simulation rooms and practical equipment are essential but have not yet been provided”. Meanwhile, LT17 evaluated the local training resources, stating: “Training materials need to be further updated and supplemented; they should be published within the last 5 – 10 years rather than 10 – 20 years or older as currently used”.

An analysis of quality assurance conditions described in self-assessment reports and admission schemes reveals that: specialized infrastructure for French Language training (such as language labs, academic activity zones, or French cultural centers) is still lacking and does not fully meet the needs of competency-based and applied teaching. Learning equipment (projectors, audiovisual tools, language software, e-learning systems, etc.) is currently at a sufficient level but is not updated regularly and lacks in-depth investment for digital pedagogy. Furthermore, limitations in updated documents, digital resources, and specialized French-language materials mean that the capacity to

utilize modern learning resources does not yet match the demands of program development.

3.4 Financial resources for french language training

Table 4 shows that the level of financial assurance for French Language training at universities currently only reaches a low-average level, with overall means ranging from 2,96 to 2,99. This rating is relatively low compared to other quality assurance factors, reflecting limitations in the scale and stability of financial resources dedicated to the French Language major, a field characterized by a small student body and limited revenue generation. Regarding the finances serving training activities, MG1 stated: “Expenditure limits for training activities are strictly governed by internal expenditure regulations and other policies, so they are indisputable; however, more investment is needed for scientific research serving training”. According to MG3, “revenue for French Language training primarily comes from tuition fees, with little external sponsorship or international cooperation projects”.

Table 4

Assessment of Financial Resources for French Language Training at Universities

Factor	Stakeholder				Overall		
	Group	Mean	SD	p-value	Mean	SD	Rank
Revenue sources for French Language training	A	2,66	1,021	0,008	2,99	1,193	1
	B	3,07	1,219				
Regular and irregular expenditure for training	A	2,92	0,957	0,703	2,96	1,192	2
	B	2,97	1,244				

Regarding the “Revenue sources for French Language training” criterion, lecturers gave a significantly lower rating (Mean = 2,66) than students (Mean = 3,07). This difference is statistically significant ($p = 0,008$), reflecting the reality that with a deeper understanding of management activities and budget allocation, lecturers are acutely aware of the limitations of existing revenue streams. In contrast, students have less access to financial administration aspects and thus tend to rate this factor higher than it actually is. This indicates that financial issues remain a major bottleneck in developing and maintaining the quality of French Language training at many universities.

The criterion “Regular and irregular expenditure for training” reached an overall mean of 2,96, reflecting a stable but inefficient level of spending. This result suggests that the operating budget for teaching and research in this major is still limited. According to LT7, the university has not allocated much funding to support lecturers in “methodological innovation, learning material development, and organizing academic extracurricular activities”. Furthermore, LT15 remarked: “Budget allocation is still spread too thin, and there is no mechanism to encourage focused investment in low-enrollment foreign language majors like French”.

3.5 Stakeholder engagement in French Language training

Table 5 shows that the level of stakeholder engagement in French Language training activities is rated at an average level, with overall means ranging from 2,90 to 3,01. Generally, both lecturers and students provide fairly similar assessments, with no statistically significant differences between the two groups. This reflects that while stakeholders fundamentally participate in the management, support, and connection of training activities, the level of coordination remains limited, lacking depth and regularity.

Among the three surveyed criteria, the university’s training management apparatus received the highest rating. However, the score only reaches the average threshold, indicating a need to strengthen the roles of coordination, supervision, and connection between functional departments and faculties/units to enhance the efficiency of the training management system.

Table 5

Assessment of stakeholder engagement in French Language training at universities

Factor	Stakeholder				Overall		
	Group	Mean	SD	p-value	Mean	SD	Rank
University training management apparatus	A	2,99	1,141	0,882	3,01	1,185	1
	B	3,01	1,197				
Sociopolitical organizations (internal & external)	A	2,95	1,234	0,664	2,90	1,114	3
	B	2,89	1,085				
Employers/labor utilization units	A	3,03	1,308	0,360	2,91	1,176	2
	B	2,88	1,142				

Regarding the evaluation of sociopolitical organizations both within and outside the university, interview results indicate that these organizations play a relatively faint supporting role in the French Language training process. LT16 remarked: “The social activities, extracurricular movements, or academic exchanges organized by unions and associations are not yet closely aligned with the objectives of developing students’ professional and vocational competencies, particularly in applied French language and career-oriented soft skills”.

Concerning employers, MG4 stated: “Many entities participate in the French Language training process, but their role is very faint. This is a general limitation of the university’s current training work, not just specific to this major”. Sharing this view, MG6 noted: “Although relationships between the university and enterprises or employing organizations have been established, they are not yet truly tight or governed by a regular cooperation mechanism”. The limitations of this connection were further described by LT18: “Activities such as internships, recruitment, and career seminars remain at a preliminary stage and have not yet exerted a strong impact on adjusting curriculum content, learning outcomes, or teaching methods”.

4 DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that the resources supporting French language training in Vietnamese universities generally reach only a moderate level across most dimensions, including lecturers, training programmes, facilities, financial resources, and stakeholder engagement. This overall pattern suggests that while French language programmes are still able to operate and meet minimum quality assurance requirements, they are facing structural constraints that may affect their long-term sustainability and competitiveness. This finding is consistent with previous research on higher education in developing contexts, which highlights that specialized foreign language programmes often face resource limitations due to smaller enrolment sizes and lower financial returns compared to more popular disciplines (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Pham & Fry, 2004).

Regarding human resources, the results show that the French language lecturers generally possess the necessary qualifications and professional competence to meet training requirements. This finding aligns with studies emphasizing the central role of

qualified lecturers in maintaining the quality of foreign language education (Richards, 2015). However, the moderate evaluation levels and the perception gap between lecturers and students suggest that professional competence alone is insufficient if it is not accompanied by effective pedagogical practices and strong student engagement. The finding that students consistently rated lecturers lower than lecturers rated themselves may reflect the growing expectations of learners in modern higher education, where teaching effectiveness is increasingly evaluated based on learning experience rather than solely on academic qualifications. This result supports the argument of Harvey (2004) that quality in higher education should be viewed not only from institutional or academic perspectives but also from the viewpoint of learners as primary beneficiaries.

The statistically significant concern regarding lecturer quantity also reflects a structural challenge faced by many French language programmes. Due to limited enrolment numbers, universities often maintain relatively small teaching teams, which may lead lecturers to teach multiple modules. While this arrangement may be administratively efficient, it may also limit pedagogical diversity and reduce students' exposure to different teaching approaches. This finding suggests that universities should consider more flexible human resource strategies, such as inviting visiting lecturers, strengthening inter-university collaboration, or promoting joint teaching arrangements to diversify academic expertise.

With regard to training programmes, the results indicate that although the programmes are generally perceived as appropriate, there remain concerns about curriculum structure and the clarity of training objectives. The significant difference between lecturers' and students' perceptions of training objectives suggests that programme goals may not be sufficiently communicated to students. This finding reflects a common issue in higher education programme design, where intended learning outcomes are clearly defined at the management level but are not always effectively translated into students' learning experiences (Biggs & Tang, 2011). This suggests the need for curriculum transparency and stronger communication of programme expectations to students, particularly through course syllabi, academic advising, and orientation activities.

The findings related to facilities and infrastructure also reveal important insights. While the basic requirements for teaching and learning are met, the lack of specialized

facilities such as language laboratories and simulation environments for applied French (e.g., tourism or business French) may limit the development of students' practical competencies. This finding is consistent with research highlighting the importance of authentic learning environments and technology-supported learning spaces in language education (Godwin-Jones, 2018). The difference in perception between lecturers and students may also reflect differences in professional awareness: lecturers are more conscious of the technical limitations affecting pedagogy, while students may evaluate facilities based on general usability rather than pedagogical effectiveness.

Financial resources appear to be one of the most significant constraints affecting French language training. The relatively low ratings for financial conditions confirm that programmes with smaller enrolment sizes often face challenges in securing sufficient funding for development. This situation reflects broader trends in higher education financing, where programmes that generate lower tuition revenue may struggle to compete for institutional investment (Johnstone, 2004). The heavy reliance on tuition fees identified in this study suggests the need for diversification of financial resources, particularly through international cooperation, partnerships with Francophone organizations, and short-term training programmes. Such strategies could help improve financial sustainability while also strengthening the international profile of French language programmes.

Finally, the findings related to stakeholder engagement highlight an important structural limitation in the current training model. Although universities have established connections with employers and social organizations, these relationships remain relatively formal and have not yet translated into strong collaboration in curriculum development or experiential learning opportunities. This finding reflects a common challenge in higher education systems transitioning toward competency-based education, where university–industry collaboration remains underdeveloped (OECD, 2019). Strengthening these connections could play a critical role in improving the relevance of French language programmes, particularly by enhancing internship opportunities, career orientation activities, and curriculum consultation with employers.

Taken together, these findings suggest that improving the quality of French language training requires a systemic approach rather than isolated improvements in individual resource components. Universities should consider adopting integrated quality

improvement strategies that simultaneously address human resources, curriculum design, infrastructure investment, financial sustainability, and stakeholder engagement. Such an approach is consistent with quality assurance models emphasizing the interdependence of educational inputs and processes in determining training outcomes (Harvey & Green, 1993).

Overall, the results of this study highlight that French language training programmes in Vietnamese universities possess important foundational strengths but require strategic investment and stronger coordination mechanisms to adapt to changing educational and labour market demands. Addressing these challenges will be essential for ensuring the long-term viability and relevance of French language education within Vietnam's increasingly competitive higher education landscape.

5 CONCLUSION

This study examined the extent to which Vietnamese universities' resources meet the requirements for French language training from the perspectives of lecturers and students. The findings indicate that although the basic conditions for implementing French language programmes are generally ensured, most resource dimensions (including lecturers, training programmes, facilities, financial resources, and stakeholder engagement) are only rated at a moderate level. This suggests that while French language programmes are still able to meet fundamental training requirements, further improvements are necessary to enhance their quality and sustainability in the context of higher education reform and international integration.

The study also reveals several important issues. While lecturers generally possess appropriate qualifications and professional capacity, differences in perception between lecturers and students indicate the need to further improve pedagogical practices and strengthen communication regarding training quality. In addition, although the training programmes are considered relatively appropriate, improvements are needed in curriculum structure and in helping students better understand programme objectives. Limitations in specialized facilities, updated learning materials, and financial resources also represent important challenges affecting programme development. Furthermore, stakeholder engagement, particularly collaboration with employers and social

organizations, remains limited and has not yet fully contributed to improving training relevance and graduate employability.

These findings suggest that improving the quality of French language training requires a comprehensive approach, including strengthening lecturer professional development, updating training programmes, investing in specialized facilities, diversifying financial resources, and enhancing collaboration with external stakeholders. Establishing effective feedback mechanisms between lecturers and students is also important for improving training effectiveness.

Future research could expand the scope to include more universities, examine the relationship between training resources and learning outcomes, and incorporate the perspectives of employers. Such efforts would contribute to strengthening the evidence base for improving the quality and sustainability of French language training programmes in Vietnam.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J.. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 290–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. SRHE & Open University Press.
- Forest, J. J. F., & Altbach, P. G. (eds.) (2007). *International handbook of higher education*. Springer.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2018). *Using mobile devices in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, L. (2004). The power of accreditation: views of academics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 26(2), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080042000218267>.
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>.
- Johnstone, D. B. (2004). The economics and politics of cost sharing in higher education: comparative perspectives. *Economics of Education Review*, 23(4), 403–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2003.09.004>.

- Knight, J.. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Nguyen, T. A. (2009). The internationalization of higher education in Vietnam in the context of East Asian regional integration: national policies and institutional implementation at Vietnam National University, Hanoi. *Journal of the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 18(11), 257–287.
- Nguyen, T. A. (2024). The internationalization of higher education in Vietnam: impacts of study abroad programs. In Kayashima, N., Sugimura, M., Kuroda, K., Kitamura, Y. (eds), *Impacts of study abroad on higher education development* (pp. 183–208). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-0775-1_10.
- OECD. (2019). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. OECD Publishing.
- Pham, L. H., & Fry, G. W. (2004). Education and economic, political, and social change in Vietnam. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 3, 199–222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-005-0678-0>.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tuyet, T. T. (2014). Internationalization of higher education in Vietnam opportunities and challenges. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 30(3), 61–69.

Authors' Contribution

All authors contributed equally to the development of this article.

Data availability

All datasets relevant to this study's findings are fully available within the article.

How to cite this article (APA)

Dang, N. N. Q., Vo, V.-L., & Dang, N. T. V. (2026). TO WHAT EXTENT DO VIETNAMESE UNIVERSITIES' RESOURCES MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRENCH LANGUAGE TRAINING? PERSPECTIVES FROM LECTURERS AND STUDENTS. *Veredas Do Direito*, 23(5), e235365. <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.5365>