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Abstract---Objectives of the study: Assessing the process of students’ forming pedagogical professionalism at Hanoi National University of Education (HNU), Vietnam. Research Methods: We used the polling method through questionnaires to collect information for the research process. Two questionnaires were designed for two groups of subjects, group 1 for 203 students and group 2 for 18 administrators and lecturers. We use mathematical statistical methods, and data analysis to make judgments. Research results: A part of students do not have a full sense of pedagogical professionalism. The process of forming students’ pedagogical professionalism has not been clearly shaped from the identification and implementation of goals, principles, content and activities involved in this process. At the end of the study, we propose four measures to overcome the above limitations at HNU.
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Introduction

In the world of 21st century, all fields of economy, culture, society and education have had a dramatically development along with great progress in science and technology improvement (Lauermann, 2017; Ingvarson, 2001). This innovation has created several potential opportunities as well as harsh challenges for education and training aspects according to the need for high-quality human resources for all professions of social life (Lapuzina et al. 2018; Khanh et al. 2019; Khanh, 2020).

The social education process contributes to the variety and complicity of each individuals' development. In specific, the impact of formal educational lecturers or professors (or pedagogical professions) plays a significant role, which is different from the influence of “non-professional educators” such as parents, unions, local communities, etc. (Lauermann, 2017; Campbell, 2019).

The teaching staff is a core department that actualizes educational goals into practice, playing a decisive role in evaluating process for the quality and effectiveness of education (Aakre et al. 2014; Andrews & Abawi, 2017; Dalli, 2008; Khanh & Phuong, 2017). On the one hand, the trend for new education methods can meet social requirements in the international environment around the world (Dalli, 2008; Lauermann, 2017; Edmond & Hayler, 2013). On the other hand, this field is placing new standards on the level and capacity of teachers (Dalli, 2008; Guerriero, 2017), following with a need for the professionalism of the teacher (Voitovska et al., 2019).

The pedagogical professionalism of teachers directly affects the outcomes of their career activities in particular and their achievements during the he education and training process in general (Khanh, 2020; Khanh et al., 2019; Huong, 2019; Anh, 2019). In this way, the type of research related to teacher training in general and pedagogical professionalism education for future teachers in particular is an ideal concern in Vietnam as well as over the world.

Research Methodology

Survey objectives

The purpose of the survey is to assess the real situation of developing pedagogical professionalism of students at Hanoi National University of Education in Vietnam.

Survey content

The survey content includes the three main parts with an actual status of implementing the goal of forming pedagogical professionalism for students; real situation of forming pedagogical professionalism for students; final result for the practice of the main topic (Markham & Aveyard, 2003).

Survey audience

There are 203 students, including 95 males and 08 females. Regarding participants in the study by year, the proportion of first-year students accounts
for 50 students (24.6%), the rate of second-year students is 50 students (24.6%),
the third-year students number makes up for 52 students (25.6%), and the final
year students group has 51 responders (25.2%). 18 staff and lecturers of the
Department of Psychology - Education of HNUE has been involved in the survey.
In which, the proportion of female subjects has 15 officials and lecturers (83.3%),
and the proportion of male subjects has 3 officials and lecturers (16.7%).

**Survey approach**

Questionnaires are delivered to the participants through polling with a group of
queries to collect information for the research process. There are 02 sample forms
used for two groups of survey subjects, group 1 for students and group 2 for
administrators and teachers. To facilitate the survey data collection, we stipulate
as the following requirements:

- **Ai.1**: Developing and implementing a study and career training plan for
  individual’s purpose in a reasonable, scientific and effective manner
- **Ai.2**: Fulfilling all responsibilities to own self and school requirements
- **Ai.3**: Maximizing concentration and mobilizing all of abilities in learning and
career training activities
- **Ai.4**: Actively and regularly updating professional knowledge in the process
  of studying and training
- **Ai.5**: Building independence, autonomy and cooperation in learning,
  training and other complementary activities
- **Ai.6**: Having a good sense of discipline in study, job practice and daily life
- **Ai.7**: Forming and developing an agile demeanor in performing learning and
  educating tasks
- **Ai.8**: Conducting the appropriate communication and behavior according to
  each relationship
- **Ai.9**: Using appropriate clothes when participating in study activities and
  other situation organized by the school, faculty, and lecturers
- **Ai.10**: Preparing and implementing a reasonable rest plan to ensure the
  health condition
- **Ct.1**: Educating students on the comprehensive content of professionalism
  and pedagogical professionalism concepts
- **Ct.2**: Educating students on the characteristics of pedagogical
  professionalism
- **Ct.3**: Educating students on manifestations of pedagogical professionalism
- **Ct.4**: Delivery knowledge to students about the social requirements for
  pedagogical professionalism
- **Ct.5**: Transferring the career requirements of the profession for pedagogical
  professionalism
- **Ct.6**: Disseminating students the needs of the school for students in the
  process of study and career training
- **Ct.7**: Educating students on the expectations for the process to form and
develop pedagogical professionalism
- **Ct.8**: Inspiring students the career beliefs
- **Ct.9**: Teaching students professional attitudes
- **Ct.10**: Instructing students the system of professional attitudes
• Ct.11: Practicing students in skills and behaviors of a teacher in accordance with the standards of pedagogical professionalism

Data analysis and interpretation

The survey data were collected, classified and checked carefully by the research team. In particular, in terms of data cleaning, which information is considered to have errors, will be re-implemented to ensure that the obtained data source accurately reflects the opinions of all respondents.

These data are aggregated according to different criteria; each category will present the unit in number or percentage (Sriprakash, 2010; Osowski et al., 2013). According to reported data, we will draw several assessments and comments about the status of each surveyed point. Based on the assessments from the survey results, the research team makes some suggestions towards improving the quality of pedagogical professional education for HNUE, Vietnam students, directly matching with the requirements of innovation and quality improvement in teaching force training (Petko, 2012; Lauermann & König, 2016).

Research Results

The actual results of the level of goals implementation for forming pedagogical professionalism for students of the Department of Psychology - Education at Hanoi National University of Education are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table 1 statistical collection, we observed that:

In general, the students of the Faculty of Psychology - Education at Hanoi National University of Education who participated in the survey mostly realized that the necessity of the forming pedagogical professionalism process and conducting self-training is a key to reaching the goal of professionalizing
pedagogical career path for themselves. However, there is a small number of the student not having awareness of pedagogical professionalism role then they are rarely or never try to improve and encourage themselves to construct their special characteristics (Yang et al., 2013; Alemdag & Cagiltay, 2018; Latini et al., 2020). In this way, the lack of consciousness, attitude and positivity can influence the outcome quality when those students join in and carry out learning and training activities during the working process.

In the scope of the Department of Psychology and Education at Hanoi National University of Education, the research results on the actual contents of realizing the goal of forming the pedagogical professionalism of the students have required school leaders to make some instructions (Ginaya et al., 2020). The management staff, teachers of the university should direct the study and the implementation of fostering activities to enhance the students’ ability to cultivate themselves in order to form the professionalism of teachers (Lukman et al., 2016). The Table 2 reveals the real application of the forming pedagogical professionalism result for students of the Faculty of Psychology and Education at Hanoi National University of Education.

Table 2
The result of forming pedagogical professionalism for students in the Faculty of Psychology and Education at Hanoi National University of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Good Qty</th>
<th>Good %</th>
<th>Fairly good Qty</th>
<th>Fairly good %</th>
<th>Average Qty</th>
<th>Average %</th>
<th>Below average Qty</th>
<th>Below average %</th>
<th>Weak Qty</th>
<th>Weak %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ai.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai.10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 reveals that most students have a clear awareness of the levels and outcomes of the pedagogical professionalism building based on the assessments of managers and teachers about the actual performance of students in the Department of Psychology and Education at Hanoi National University of Education. In contrast, there is a minority group of students showing a lack of attention to generate manifestations of pedagogical professionalism and express a serious attitude in training to form specialized pedagogical skills for themselves (Lukiianchuk et al., 2021). As a consequence, the problem causes a significant challenge for a number of school leadership departments (management staff and faculty) of the Psychology - Education Department of Hanoi National University of Education to research and analysis teaching methods to be appropriate in educating and training students to indoctrinate the Pedagogical professionalism.
Table 3
Assessment of management staff, teachers on the actual results of the professional pedagogical education implementation for students in certain contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Good Qty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Fairly good Qty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Average Qty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Under average Qty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weak Qty</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ct.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at Table 3, the result covers the level of the pedagogical-professionalism content appliance for students in the Department of Psychology and Education at Hanoi University of Education with the majority of respondents obtained as “Very often”, “Quite often” and “Frequently”. On the other hand, there are still categories presenting performance levels in “Rarely do” and “Not done yet”.

The actual status of the contents implement related to pedagogical professionalism for students of the Faculty of Psychology - Education at Hanoi University of Education according to the survey result from Table 3 obtained: the mass of collected data stays at “Good” and “Fairly good”. In comparison to other audiences’ replies, the consequence of educational contents implement is still at the “Average” and “Weak” levels.

This circumstance requires the school to focus more on the status of performance and polish up the efficient educational methods to boost the results of the implementation of the pedagogical professionalism content in the education scope for students (Suryasa et al., 2019).

Commute and discussion

A part of students participating in the survey seems not to have a complete awareness of pedagogical professionalism and the operation of forming those essential skills for students in their career path (Smyrna et al., 2021). In case, the issue needs the school and related parties to research, deploy and apply suitable measures to raise knowledge level for administrators, teachers and students for understanding the role of pedagogical professionalism and pedagogical professionalism foundation for learners.
Recently, the process of forming pedagogical professionalism for students has not been clearly shaped from the identification and implementation of goals, principles, contents as well as relevant activities to this process (Zulfija et al., 2013; Bayarystanova et al., 2014). The final outcome of the evaluation through the audiences participating in the survey affirmed that the process of forming pedagogical professionalism for the freshman was mainly achieved at a medium level. This unsatisfied result will ask for the extension of the research and perfecting the process of forming pedagogical professionalism for students. Furthermore, one of the most crucial missions is to focus on building and completing the teaching system to tackle numerous issues related to the process of forming pedagogical professionalism for the learners.

**Conclusion**

The above survey results are quite similar to some extent to recent research by (Khanh et al. 2020; Khanh & Phuong, 2017) which have shown strengths and limitations in developing pedagogical professionalism for students, as well as evaluating the core factors affecting the operation of forming pedagogical professionalism for the knowledge receiver. In the purpose of developing the overall quality and effectiveness, there are some recommendations that the research teams suggest due to the aspect of pedagogical education for students: *Solutions proposed by the research team for implementation at HNUE.*

- The organizations should improve training to raise awareness of the value of Pedagogical professionalism among administrators, lecturers, and students and the educating process of Pedagogical professionalism for students.
- School administrators need to build more discussion to develop and execute strategies to support Pedagogical professionalism.
- Guarantee for students at the University of Education to have the resources they have to participate in the process of improving Pedagogical professionalism.
- Checking, evaluating, and adjusting the process of developing pedagogical professionalism for students.
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