

Tạp chí

ISSN 2354-0788

e-ISSN 3030-4407

KHOA HỌC QUẢN LÝ GIÁO DỤC

JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

TRƯỜNG CÁN BỘ QUẢN LÝ GIÁO DỤC THÀNH PHỐ HỒ CHÍ MINH - BỘ GIÁO DỤC VÀ ĐÀO TẠO

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT IN HO CHI MINH CITY — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

TẠP CHÍ KHOA HỌC QUẢN LÝ GIÁO DỤC - SỐ 01 (50), NGÀY 20 THÁNG 02 NĂM 2026

Số 01 (50)

20/02/2026

TẠP CHÍ XUẤT BẢN
HAI THÁNG MỘT KỶ

Số 01 (50)
20/02/2026

CHỦ TỊCH HỘI ĐỒNG BIÊN TẬP
VŨ QUẢNG

TỔNG BIÊN TẬP

ĐINH THỊ KIM LOAN

ỦY VIÊN HỘI ĐỒNG BIÊN TẬP

PHAN THỊ THÚY QUYÊN

ĐINH THỊ KIM LOAN

VŨ ĐÌNH BẢY

NGUYỄN XUÂN TÊ

NGUYỄN THỊ MỸ LỘC

VŨ HỒNG HUY

PHẠM TUẤN ANH

TRẦN HUY HOÀNG

NGUYỄN BẢO QUỐC

TRẦN MINH HƯỜNG

NGUYỄN ĐẮC THANH

NGUYỄN THỊ PHƯƠNG LAN

CHAI CHING TAN

AGUSTINUS HERMINO SUPERMA PUTRA

BIÊN TẬP VÀ THIẾT KẾ

NGUYỄN THỊ THANH PHƯƠNG

MỤC LỤC

1. NGUYỄN XUÂN TÊ - NGUYỄN HỮU NGHĨA: Vận dụng tư tưởng Hồ Chí Minh về người thầy trong xây dựng đội ngũ nhà giáo đáp ứng yêu cầu mới	1
2. NGÔ MINH OANH - NGÔ THỊ MINH HẰNG: Chuyển đổi số trong giáo dục yếu tố đảm bảo sự thành công của sự nghiệp đổi mới giáo dục và đào tạo	9
3. LÊ THỊ NGỌC GIÀU - DƯ THỐNG NHẤT - PHẠM VĂN HIẾU: Thực trạng giáo dục phòng chống tai nạn thương tích cho trẻ mầm non tại xã Bình Chánh, Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh	17
4. PHAN THỊ TUYẾT NGA: Hứng thú nghiên cứu và tự tin trong nghiên cứu của sinh viên tại một trường đại học ở Việt Nam: Một nghiên cứu tương quan	32
5. PHẠM THỊ TUYẾT MINH - NGUYỄN THỊ THÚY HẠNH - VŨ THỊ LAN ANH - LƯƠNG ANH QUANG - NGUYỄN THỊ MINH THÙY: Năng lực toàn cầu của giáo viên và cán bộ quản lý trường học tại Việt Nam: Nhận thức, sự sẵn sàng, thách thức và thực hành nghề nghiệp	44
6. TRẦN THỊ BÍCH HẠNH - PHẠM TIẾT KHÁNH: Vận dụng lý thuyết mục tiêu tự đặt nhằm nâng cao động lực nội tại trong cơ sở giáo dục đại học: Nghiên cứu trường hợp trường Đại học Trà Vinh.....	53
7. TRẦN THỊ HOÀI THƯƠNG: So sánh phương pháp luận trong nghiên cứu kinh tế chính trị Mác – Lênin và kinh tế học hiện đại.....	60
8. PHẠM VIỆT BÌNH - PHẠM NGỌC QUỲNH ANH - ĐÀM HOÀNG PHƯƠNG THẢO - NGUYỄN NGỌC MAI - VŨ THỊ THÙY DUYÊN - NGUYỄN PHƯƠNG HÀ: Vai trò trung gian của niềm tin đối với ý định sử dụng phần mềm học ngoại ngữ trực tuyến của sinh viên Việt Nam	72
9. TRẦN THỊ HIỀN A - VŨ THỊ THẮNG - ĐÀO THỊ HẰNG: Ứng dụng trí tuệ nhân tạo (Ai) trong nâng cao hiệu quả hoạt động nghiên cứu khoa học của sinh viên ngành Kỹ thuật điện, điện tử tại trường Đại học Sư phạm Kỹ thuật Nam Định	83
10. NGUYỄN THỊ CẨM VÂN, CAO NGỌC BÁU: Thực trạng hoạt động giáo dục y đức cho sinh viên ngành Y khoa trường Đại học Võ Trường Toản	92
11. NGUYỄN ĐÌNH NHƯ HÀ - LÊ THỊ THÙY TRANG -NGÔ PHAN LAN DUNG - HUỲNH THỊ CẨM LOAN: Đánh giá mức độ hoàn thành nhiệm vụ trong dạy học tiếng Anh theo tiếp cận dựa vào nhiệm vụ tại trường đại học	102
12. VŨ THỊ THU HUYỀN: Tác động của động lực đọc đối với đọc hiểu cảm nhận của học sinh lớp 6 học tiếng Anh tại trường trung học cơ sở ở Việt Nam.....	112
13. NGUYỄN THỊ BUỒI: Phát triển đội ngũ giảng viên trong cơ sở giáo dục đại học: Kinh nghiệm quốc tế và hàm ý chính sách cho Việt Nam	122
14. NGUYỄN TIẾN CÔNG: Quản trị bảo đảm chất lượng bên trong theo AUN-QA: Mô hình, bộ công cụ và nghiên cứu trường hợp tại Đại học Quốc gia Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh.....	131
15. LÊ THỊ THANH HÀ: Nhận thức của sinh viên không chuyên tiếng Anh đối với lợi ích và thách thức của việc ứng dụng công nghệ thông tin trong tự học tiếng Anh.....	139
16. ĐẶNG THỊ ÁNH MINH: Quản lý hoạt động trải nghiệm theo chu trình PDCA tại các trường tiểu học: Nghiên cứu trường hợp phường Tăng Nhơn Phú, Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh	148

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. NGUYEN XUAN TE - NGUYEN HUU NGHIA: Transporting the image of Ho Chi Minh to the teacher in building a teaching team that meets the new requirements	1
2. NGO MINH OANH - NGO THI MINH HANG: Digital transformation as a key success factor for educational and training reform.....	9
3. LE THI NGOC GIAU - DU THONG NHAT - PHAM VAN HIEU: The current situation of injury-prevention education for preschoolers in Binh Chanh commune, Ho Chi Minh City.....	17
4. PHAN THI TUYET NGA: Research interest and research self-efficacy among students at a University Vietnam: A correlational study.....	32
5. PHAM THI TUYET MINH - NGUYEN THI THUY HANH - VU THI LAN ANH - LUONG ANH QUANG - NGUYEN THI MINH THUY: Global competence among teachers and school managers in Vietnam: Awareness, readiness, challenges and professional practice	44
6. TRAN THI BICH HANH - PHAM TIET KHANH: Applying the theory of self-setting goals to enhance integrated motivation in higher education institutions: A case study of Tra Vinh University	53
7. TRAN THI HOAI THUONG: A methodological comparison between Marxist - Leninist political economy and modern economics	60
8. PHAM VIET BINH - PHAM NGOC QUYNH ANH - ĐAM HOANG PHUONG THAO - NGUYEN NGOC MAI - VU THI THUY DUYEN - NGUYEN PHUONG HA: The mediating role of trust in Vietnamese undergraduates' intention to use foreign-language education software.....	72
9. TRAN THI HIEN A - VU THI THANG - ĐAO THI HANG: Leveraging artificial intelligence to enhance students' research effectiveness: A case study of electrical and electronic engineering students at Nute	83
10. NGUYEN THI CAM VAN - CAO NGOC BAU: Current status of medical ethics education for medical students at Vo Truong Toan University.....	92
11. NGUYEN ĐINH NHU HA - LE THI THUY TRANG - NGO PHAN LAN DUNG - HUYNH THI CAM LOAN: Đánh giá mức độ hoàn thành nhiệm vụ trong dạy học tiếng Anh theo tiếp cận dựa vào nhiệm vụ tại trường đại học	102
12. VU THI THU HUYEN: The impact of reading motivation on perceived reading comprehension among grade 6 efl students in Vietnamese lower secondary schools	112
13. NGUYEN THI BUOI: Faculty workforce development in higher education institutions: International experience and policy implications for the context of Vietnam	122
14. NGUYEN TIEN CONG: Internal quality assurance management under the AUN-QA framework: A model, toolkit and a case study at Vietnam national University Ho Chi Minh City	131
15. LE THI THANH HA: Non-english majors' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of using information technology for autonomous English learning.....	139
16. ĐANG THI ANH MINH: Applying the pdca cycle to the management of experiential activities: A case study of primary schools in Tang Nhon Phu, Ho Chi Minh City.....	148

**THIS JOURNAL IS ISSUED
ONCE TWO MONTHS**

Number 01(50)

20/02/2026

CHAIRMAN OF EDITORIAL COUNCIL
VU QUANG

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR

ĐINH THI KIM LOAN

MEMBERS OF EDITORIAL COUNCIL

PHAN THI THUY QUYEN

DINH THI KIM LOAN

VU DINH BAY

NGUYEN XUAN TE

NGUYEN THI MY LOC

VU HONG HUY

PHAM TUAN ANH

TRAN HUY HOANG

NGUYEN BAO QUOC

TRAN MINH HUONG

NGUYEN DAC THANH

NGUYEN THI PHUONG LAN

CHAI CHING TAN

AGUSTINUS HERMINO SUPERMA PUTRA

EDITORIAL EDITING AND DESIGN

NGUYEN THI THANH PHUONG

HỨNG THÚ NGHIÊN CỨU VÀ TỰ TIN TRONG NGHIÊN CỨU CỦA SINH VIÊN TẠI MỘT TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC Ở VIỆT NAM: MỘT NGHIÊN CỨU TƯƠNG QUAN

RESEARCH INTEREST AND RESEARCH SELF-EFFICACY AMONG STUDENTS AT A UNIVERSITY VIETNAM: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

PHAN THI TUYET NGA, *ngaphan@iuh.edu.vn*

Faculty of Fundamental Sciences, Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City.

THÔNG TIN	TÓM TẮT
<p>Ngày nhận: 22/12/2025 Ngày nhận lại: 21/01/2026 Duyệt đăng: 12/02/2026 Mã số: TCKH-S01T02-2026-B04 ISSN: 2354 - 0788</p> <p>Từ khóa: Thiết kế nghiên cứu tương quan, tự tin trong nghiên cứu, hứng thú nghiên cứu, sinh viên bậc đại học, Việt Nam.</p> <p>Keywords: correlational research design, research interest, research self-efficacy, undergraduate, Vietnam.</p>	<p>Nhiều tài liệu nghiên cứu cho thấy rằng sự phát triển của tự tin trong nghiên cứu (RSE) và hứng thú nghiên cứu (RI) góp phần làm tăng năng suất và chất lượng nghiên cứu. Tuy nhiên, chưa có nhiều công trình tìm hiểu về RSE và RI ở Việt Nam. Nghiên cứu này sử dụng phương pháp chọn mẫu thuận tiện và thiết kế tương quan để đo lường mức độ RSE và RI của sinh viên tại một trường đại học ở Việt Nam, đồng thời xem xét mối liên hệ giữa hai biến số. Kết quả cho thấy sinh viên thể hiện mức độ trung bình về tự tin và hứng thú. Không có mối quan hệ có ý nghĩa thống kê giữa RSE và RI. Những phát hiện từ nghiên cứu này giúp giảng viên và các nhà giáo dục xây dựng các biện pháp hỗ trợ phù hợp nhằm nâng cao tự tin và hứng thú trong nghiên cứu khoa học - điều đặc biệt quan trọng khi giai đoạn nghiên cứu ở bậc đại học là giai đoạn hình thành bản sắc nghiên cứu khoa học của sinh viên.</p> <p>ABSTRACT The literature shows that the development of research self-efficacy and research interest contributes to improvements in research productivity and quality; however, there has been a limited number of studies investigating undergraduates' research self-efficacy and research interest, especially in the Vietnamese context. This study, using a correlational research design, measured the levels of research self-efficacy and research interest among undergraduates at a university in Vietnam. It also examined whether there was a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. A convenience sampling method was used to recruit a sample of 379 students who completed an online questionnaire. Results indicated that the students demonstrated moderate levels of research self-efficacy and research interest and there was no statistically</p>

significant correlation between the two variables. The findings from this study may help teachers and educators in Vietnam and similar settings to develop initiatives to enhance students' research self-efficacy and interest in research, which are critical during the early stages of undergraduate research identity development.

1. Introduction

To improve the quality and quantity of students' scientific research outputs, a series of policies have been implemented in many universities to encourage students to participate in scientific research, including establishing research centers and organizing scientific conferences (Huang, 2016; Le & Hoang, 2021). Student scientific research has become a topic of growing interest in Vietnam, as reflected in studies that examine students' scientific research capacity (Le & Hoang, 2021) and the current state of their scientific research activities (Ho & Nguyen, 2021; Ninh, 2022).

For undergraduate students, a lack of research experience and limited exposure to research methodologies can create significant barriers, affecting their attitudes toward and confidence in scientific research (van Blankenstein et al., 2019). Previous studies have shown that research self-efficacy (RSE), belief in one's ability to perform research tasks, is one of the most important factors predicting students' performance and level of engagement in scientific research (Seng et al., 2020). Besides RSE, research interest (RI), an individual's interest in conducting research (Bishop & Bieschke, 1994), also has a significant impact on research process and research performance. Literature shows that the development of RI contributes to improvements in research productivity and quality (Sunal, 2016). Scholars have investigated the relationship between RSE and RI, but findings have been inconsistent (Hill et al., 2022; Kerrigan & Hayes, 2016). In addition, there has been a limited number of studies investigating undergraduates' RSE and

RI (Hill et al., 2022), especially in the Vietnamese context.

This study measured the levels of RSE and RI among undergraduates at a university in Vietnam and examined whether there was a significant relationship between the two variables. Findings from this study may help teachers and educators to develop initiatives to enhance students' RSE and RI, which are critical during the early stages of research identity development. The following research questions guide the present study.

What are the research self-efficacy levels of Vietnamese undergraduates?

What are the research interest levels of Vietnamese undergraduates?

Is there a significant relationship between research interest and research self-efficacy?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Research self-efficacy and research interest

An individual's research self-efficacy refers to their belief in their ability to successfully perform a specific research task in the future (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy theory is a core component of social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997), emphasizing that a person's belief in their capability to carry out a particular task has a powerful influence on their motivation, behavior and performance outcomes. When students successfully engage in research practice, participate in successful scientific projects, or complete research papers, they become more confident in conducting future research. When they observe others, especially those similar to themselves in research ability, successfully performing a task, they may believe that they too can succeed.

Besides, encouragement and guidance from lecturers, peers or academic advisors can help strengthen an individual's belief in their own research competence. Students may feel anxious when presenting research; however, with adequate psychological support, their level of self-efficacy can increase. Students with high levels of RSE are generally more willing to participate in research (Wright & Holtum, 2012) and achieve better research outcomes than other students (Poh & Abdullah, 2019; Tiyuri & et al., 2018).

Research interest is a person's interest in conducting a specific task of research (Bishop & Bieschke, 1994), which is grounded in the social cognitive model of academic and career development suggested by Lent et al. (1994). This model has been widely applied in academic settings to explain students' interest development, motivation and performance-related behaviors. It provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how students develop academic interests, make learning-related decisions and persist in challenging academic tasks, such as research activities. This model is considered as a domain-specific application of Bandura's (1986) socio-cognitive theory since it emphasizes the central role of self-efficacy beliefs in shaping students' learning experiences. According to the model, interest in research is a dynamic psychological construct that is influenced by personal characteristics, environmental factors, and primarily from RSE. When students believe that they can do research-related tasks, they are more likely to develop a strong interest in research. In contrast, low self-efficacy may limit students' engagement and hinder the development of RI, even when external resources and opportunities are available.

In this study, Bandura's (1997) socio-cognitive theory and Lent et al.'s (1994) social cognitive model suggest a conceptual relationship between RSE and RI. Specifically,

self-efficacy beliefs are theorized to function as a proximal cognitive mechanism through which students develop their interest in domain specific tasks including research activities. Guided by these theoretical perspectives, the present study conceptualizes RSE as a key predictor of RI among undergraduate students.

2.2. Selective studies in research self-efficacy, research interest, and the relationship between the two variables

Findings from studies measuring the RSE levels have been inconsistent across different settings. For example, Seng et al. (2020) conducted a quantitative study with undergraduates from three Cambodian universities and found that the students demonstrated low levels of RSE. In contrast, Mohamed and Nordin (2013), in a quantitative study with Malaysian seniors, reported high RSE levels (3.71/5). Most scholars agree that students with research experience tend to display greater levels of RSE than those without such experience. Ashrafi-Rizi et al. (2015) examined the RSE levels of Iranian medical students and found that undergraduates had lower RSE levels than their postgraduate peers. Similarly, in the study of Hess et al. (2022), students had limited or no research experience obtained lower levels of RSE compared to students with three or more research experiences. Moreover, undergraduates' RSE will likely increase after participation in research development courses. For example, van Blankenstein et al. (2019) measured the RSE levels of education juniors in the Netherlands after a year-long research course and reported a significant increase in RSE levels. These mixed findings suggest that RSE is highly context-dependent and shaped by students' educational environments and research exposure. Consequently, examining RSE in a specific national and institutional context is necessary to understand how self-efficacy beliefs function as a

foundational component in a research-related framework.

A search on the EBSCO database from 2010 to 2024 shows that the number of studies investigating interest in research remains limited, especially those employing undergraduates as participants. Most studies are outdated and some of them do not use constructs grounded in the social cognitive model suggested by Lent et al. (1994). For example, Moraes et al. (2016) conducted a cross-sectional study to explore the RI of undergraduate medical students. Using a scale consisting of five questions exploring general research interest, the authors found that most students (81.7%) reported being interested in research. Lambie et al. (2014) and Lambie and Vaccaro (2011) similarly found that PhD students had high levels of interest in research, largely due to their research knowledge and experience. However, existing studies primarily reported overall or general levels of RI. No single study has explicitly examined which specific RI aspects that students demonstrate at low or high levels. The tendency to conceptualize RI as a unidimensional or global construct represents a conceptual limitation in existing research. Without examining specific dimensions or aspects of RI, it remains difficult to understand how self-efficacy beliefs may differentially influence students' engagement with various research activities. Besides, identifying specific RI aspects could better inform targeted initiatives to enhance RI. This gap highlights the need for a more fine-grained operationalization of RI within a socio-cognitive framework.

Very few studies investigating the link between RSE and RI have used undergraduates as participants. Although socio-cognitive theory posits a robust relationship between self-efficacy and interest development (Bandura, 1997; Lent et al., 1994), empirical findings regarding the RSE-RI relationship remains inconclusive, particularly among undergraduate populations. Most scholars

agree that the more self-efficacious a student is in research, the greater interest in research he or she is likely to show. For example, Sasson and Miedijensky (2023) found a positive and significant correlation between RSE and RI among faculty members. Hill et al. (2022) similarly reported that undergraduates having higher levels of RI would also display higher levels of RSE. In contrast, Kerrigan and Hayes (2016) found no significant relationship between RSE and RI among education doctoral students. These inconsistent findings are attributed to differences in research methods and research setting. Moreover, much of the existing evidence is drawn from Western or postgraduate samples, raising questions about the generalizability of these theoretical assumptions to undergraduates in non-Western contexts.

To date, there has been no single study measuring the RSE and RI levels, as well as investigating the link between the two variables in the Vietnamese context. Scholars have instead investigated research-related constructs such as research ability, motivation and supervisor role during the research process. For example, Tran et al. (2022) explored English majors' perceptions of thesis supervision and reported that students valued important attributes of supervisors. Specifically, the supervisors were expected to possess strong research knowledge, provide support when needed, offer constructive feedback, and respect students' ideas. Le and Hoang (2021) investigated the research ability of English majors and found that students overestimated their research ability. Although they were aware of the importance of research, they lacked a clear understanding of its components. Pham et al. (2018) explored the predictive role of five factors: university policies, internships, teachers, students themselves and research facilities, on undergraduates' research motivation. Teachers emerged as the most influential factor, while internships had no effect and other factors

showed minimal influence. Notably, none of existing studies have explicitly operationalized RSE or RI within a socio-cognitive framework. As a result, it remains unclear how Vietnamese undergraduates' beliefs about research capabilities translated into sustained interest in research activities.

Given the limited number of research investigating RSE and RI in the Vietnamese context, the under-researched undergraduate population and the inconsistent findings in the existing literature, it remains unclear how the relationship between RSE and RE operates among Vietnamese undergraduate students. This study seeks to address these gaps in the literature, by using a socio-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and a socio-cognitive model (Lent et al., 1994) as its theoretical framework.

3. Methods

The study used a correlational research design to examine the variables. In addition, it adapted validated scales, which were developed within the socio-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1996) and socio-cognitive model (Lent et al., 1994).

3.1. Participants

After obtaining permission from the Human Ethics Review Committee (Reference No. 01/2025-KHCB-ĐĐNC), questionnaire invitations were sent to 420 students enrolled in a research methods course at a university in Southern Vietnam. A convenient sampling method was used to select participants for this study. The study ensured full anonymity and participation was voluntary. A sample of 379 students (197 juniors and 182 seniors) at a Vietnamese university participated in the study. Of these, two hundred and seventy-eight were male (73.4%) and 101 were female (27.6%). One hundred and ninety-seven were juniors (52%), while 182 were seniors (48%). Regarding field of study, 285 students majored in business administration (75.2%), followed by computer science with 54 students (14.2%) and electrical engineering with 40 students (10.6%).

3.2. Instruments

The questionnaire consists of three sections. Section 1 collected participants' demographics information and was developed in Vietnamese. Section 2 was the RSE scale adapted from the 5-point Likert scale developed by Rezaei and Zamani-Miandashti (2013). This scale included 13 question items with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.93. Bandura (1997) suggested using the phrase "I can" when developing self-efficacy scales to reflect individuals' ability judgement. Therefore, the phrase "the ability" in the original scale was replaced with "I can". In addition, Item 3, "The ability to review a particular area of agricultural science theory and research, and write a balanced and comprehensive literature review", in the study of Rezaei and Zamani-Miandashti (2013) was originally designed for agricultural postgraduates. Consequently, it was revised to "I can write a balanced and comprehensive literature review" to suit the undergraduate level in the current study. Moreover, the item "I can write appropriate referencing in my research" was added following a discussion with a group of experienced teachers and researchers. The final scale consisted of 14 items, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.94, indicating high internal consistency.

Section 3 used the RI scale developed by Bieschke and Bishop (1994). This scale reflects principles of Bandura's (1986) socio-cognitive theory and aligns with the socio-cognitive model proposed by Lent et al. (1994). The scale consisted of 16 items, asking respondents to rate their degree of interest on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very uninterested) to 5 (very interested). The internal consistency of the scale was reported to be high, with coefficient alphas of 0.89 (Bieschke & Bishop, 1994). In the current study, several phrases were modified to fit the research context better. Specifically, "Discussing research findings with your colleagues" were changed to "Discussing research findings with your classmates" and

“Conducting research at the site of counseling practice” were changed to “Conducting research within my field of study”. The RI scale had a 0.88 Cronbach’s alpha in the present study.

Although the RSE and RI scales were validated in prior studies, they were translated and adapted for use with Vietnamese undergraduates in the present study. Given the potential influence of linguistic and cultural differences on how scale items are interpreted, an exploratory factor analysis was run to assess the construct validity of the adapted instruments. A KMO value of 0.823 was found and Bartlett’s test was significant ($p = .000$). Data showed that Item 20, “Conducting research within my field of study”, was cross loaded, with a loading difference of $0.049 < 0.2$. Item 15, “Reading a research journal article”, did not display factor loadings. Therefore, the items were removed and the analysis was repeated. The revised factor loadings ranged from 0.607 to 0.856. The final questionnaire consisted of 28 items. The RSE scale remained unchanged with 14 items, while the RI scale had 14 items.

Before being distributed online to participants, the RSE and RI scales were translated into Vietnamese using a translation and back-translation procedure to ensure semantic and conceptual equivalence with the original instruments. The questionnaire was then pilot tested with 30 students to minimize technical difficulties and potential ambiguity.

No revisions were made because students did not report any difficulties. Data were analyzed using SPSS 25.0 for Windows. Descriptive statistics were used to examine the RSE and RI levels. Mean scores were interpreted using predefined cut-off points, with values ranging from 1.00-2.60 indicating a low level, 2.61-3.40 indicating a moderate level, 3.41-5.00 indicating a high level of the measured construct. Pearson correlation analysis was employed to explore the relationship between RSE and RI.

4. Results

4.1. The RSE and RI levels of undergraduates

As can be seen in Table 1, Vietnamese undergraduates demonstrated moderate levels of both RSE ($M=3.30$) and RI ($M=3.24$). An examination of the scores on the RSE scale showed that students reported the highest levels of RSE when referencing ($M=3.61$), followed by searching database for literature ($M=3.47$). They reported the lowest self-efficacy when writing suggestions for future research ($M=3.13$) or writing a balanced and comprehensive literature review ($M=3.16$). Regarding the RI scale, the students expressed the greatest interest in developing a data analysis strategy for a research study ($M=3.91$), followed by leading a research team ($M=3.72$). The lowest levels of interest were in taking a research design course ($M=3.01$) and discussing research findings with classmates ($M=3.01$).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
RSE	379	3.30	.691
RI	379	3.24	.569
Valid N (listwise)	379		

Note: RSE: Research self-efficacy, RI: Research interest

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics of the Research Self-Efficacy Scale*

Research Self-Efficacy Scale	Mean	SD
1. I can do electronic database searching of scholarly literature.	3.47	.858
2. I can realize the research gaps that may contribute to the field I work in.	3.22	.963
3. I can write a balanced and comprehensive literature review.	3.16	.969
4. I can effectively present findings both verbally and in written form.	3.34	.949
5. I can compare the results of my research to prior research results.	3.34	.935
6. I can read and understand research findings and discussions in academic journals/papers.	3.30	.894
7. I can create hypotheses/research questions relevant to my research.	3.22	.938
8. I can write suggestions for future research.	3.13	.997
9. I can interpret and understand statistical information/data.	3.26	.962
10. I can design and implement the best data analysis strategy for the study.	3.18	.926
11. I can evaluate the validity and reliability of my research data through appropriate methods.	3.21	.918
12. I can identify and report the limitations of the study.	3.41	.911
13. I can use various technological advances effectively in carrying out research.	3.38	.922
14. I can write appropriate referencing in my research.	3.61	.976

Table 3: *Descriptive Statistics of the Research Interest Scale*

Research Interest Scale	Mean	SD
16. Being a member of a research team	3.22	.900
17. Conceptualizing a research study	3.30	.924
18. Conducting a literature review	3.06	.899
19. Having research activities as part of every work week	3.06	.975
21. Developing funding proposals	3.02	.924
22. Taking a research design course	3.01	.900

Research Interest Scale	Mean	SD
23. Taking a statistics course	3.04	.946
24. Developing a data analysis strategy for a research study	3.91	.871
25. Analyzing data	3.20	.975
26. Discussing research findings with your classmates.	3.01	.886
27. Writing for publication/presentation	3.06	.908
28. Leading a research team	3.72	.732
29. Designing a study	3.22	.961
30. Collecting data	3.20	.901

4.2. The correlation between RSE and RI

There was no statistically significant

correlation between RSE and RI ($r=.05$, $p=.30$) as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Correlation analysis between research self-efficacy and research interest

		RSE	RI
RSE	Pearson Correlation	1	.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.303
	N	379	379
RI	Pearson Correlation	.053	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.303	
	N	379	379

Note: RSE: Research self-efficacy, RI: Research interest

5. Discussion

The study aimed to examine the levels of RSE and RI of Vietnamese undergraduates, as well as the correlation between RSE and RI, in response to a lack of research in the literature. Results indicated that the students demonstrated moderate levels of RSE and RI, and there was no statistically significant relationship between RSE and RI.

The finding that undergraduates had moderate levels of RSE was inconsistent with previous findings, such as Seng et al. (2020) and Garcia et al. (2025), in which students displayed low levels of RSE. However, this result was in line with the findings of Uçar et al. (2023), where the students also had moderate levels of

RSE. In the study by Seng et al. (2020), the students had the lowest levels of RSE in writing different sections of a research paper. Similarly, students in the study by Garcia et al. (2025) and Mohamed and Nordin (2013) reported lower levels of RSE when writing the research paper. Comparable challenges were observed in this study, as undergraduates reported the lowest self-efficacy when writing suggestions for future research or writing a balanced and comprehensive literature review. In addition, Vietnamese students demonstrated a high level of RSE in searching database for literature, which aligns with the finding of Mohamed and Nordin (2013). Overall, the findings suggest that while undergraduates in this study possessed some

foundational skills for conducting research, they lacked research writing skills. Insufficient experience in research writing skills and limited exposure to critical writing may have contributed to the difficulties.

Regarding RI, given the lack of research examining which specific aspects of RI students demonstrate at low or high levels of RI, this study addressed an important gap in the literature by providing a more nuanced understanding of how RI manifested among Vietnamese undergraduates. The finding that the students showed the greatest interest in developing a data analysis strategy likely reflected a preference for concrete and technical skills. Besides, their high interest in leading a research team might have stemmed from the high social values and status associated with leadership in Vietnamese society. Instead, taking a research design course might have been viewed as abstract or theory-heavy, resulting in their lowest levels of interest. Their low interest in discussing research findings with classmates might have been influenced by teacher-centered instructional traditions commonly found in Asia countries (Phan, 2011).

In the present study, RSE and RI were not correlated, which contrasts with the findings of Sasson and Miedijensky (2023) and Hill et al. (2022) but are consistent with those of Kerrigan and Hayes (2016). The absence of a significant RSE-RI relationship suggests that RI may be driven more strongly by other social and contextual factors such as education norms or perceived academic and career benefits. Lent et al. (1994) suggested that the strength of the RSE-RI relationship depends on individuals' learning experiences. The undergraduates in the present study had limited research exposure, primarily classroom-based or theory-based experiences (Tran & Nguyen, 2022), which were likely not sufficiently differentiated to help them develop

RSE in ways that meaningfully corresponded to their RI. In addition, self-efficacy is task- and context-specific (Bandura, 1997); therefore, limited exposure to authentic research tasks can lead to unstable judgements of RSE, thereby weakening its link with interest in research.

This study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that undergraduate RSE is task-specific rather than uniform, with students reporting greater confidence in technical research skills and lower confidence in higher-order research writing tasks. The study also advances understanding of RI by identifying different levels of interest across specific research activities, thereby addressing the limitations of prior research that has treated RI as a global construct. Most importantly, the absence of a statistically significant relationship between RSE and RI challenges the commonly assumed positive correlation between these constructs and suggests that, in contexts students have limited exposure to authentic experiences, research interest may develop independently of perceived competence. This finding refines socio-cognitive perspectives by highlighting the contingent nature of the self-efficacy-interest relationship during early stages of research development.

As undergraduates are in early stages of research identity development, enhancing their RSE and RI appears to be critical. The findings of these studies emphasize the need for research skill-building interventions that can strengthen these students' RSE and RI. Workshops on research writing skills, especially literature review writing and the discussion and implications sections, which are more abstract and require higher-order critical thinking skills, could help build competence in these areas. Moreover, the lack of a statistically significant relationship between RSE and RI suggests the importance of providing authentic research experiences through which students can ground their RSE and RI in

personal performance, given that interest in research can exist independently of perceived competence (Sasson & Miedijensky, 2023). Authentic research experiences can involve structured mastery experiences in which students are trained to work on discrete components of a research paper such as formulating research questions, writing the literature review, and conducting analyses, under guided supervision. Students can select which components they will engage in based on their actual needs.

6. Conclusion

This study addressed an important gap in literature by examining undergraduates' RSE and RI. It found that while the Vietnamese students demonstrated moderate levels of RSE and RI, they need support regarding research writing skills. The insignificant RSE-RI

relationship suggested the provision of authentic research experiences to help students build their RSE and RI in personal performance. The study is not without limitations. The data were drawn from a questionnaire and were therefore subject to potential biases of self-reported instruments. Researchers may want to employ additional instruments, such as students' research work or research diaries, to get more insights. Besides, the use of the convenient sampling method may reduce the generalizability of the findings; thus, other methods of sampling should be employed in future studies. In addition, participants in this study came from one single university, which may have limited the diverse perspectives of students. Researchers may want to replicate this study across multiple universities to capture more institutional and discipline perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Ashrafi-Rizi, H., Najafi, N. S., Kazempour, Z., & Taheri, B. (2015). Research self-efficacy among students of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 4, 26. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9531.154117>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman
- Bishop, R. M., & Bieschke, K. J. (1994). Interest in research questionnaire. *Unpublished scale*.
- Garcia, Veal Pink, John Arthur Flores, Angelo Vergel de Dios, Nova Cristal Joy Jimenez, Andrea Angela Maniquis, and Hyacinth Gail Pastores. Perceived Level of Research Anxiety and Research Self-Efficacy of Twelfth Graders of a Catholic Senior High School. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 35 (4), 382–95. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.350404>.
- Hess, R. A., Erickson, O. A., Cole, R. B., Isaacs, J. M., Alvarez-Clare, S., Arnold, J., . . . Dolan, E. L. (2023). Virtually the same? Evaluating the effectiveness of remote undergraduate research experiences. *CBE Life Sci Educ*, 22(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.22-01-0001>
- Hill, H., Zwahr, J., & Gonzalez, III. (2022). Evaluating research self-efficacy in undergraduate students: Experience matters. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 22(1), 67-80. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v22i1.31203>
- Ho, T. P., Nguyen, B. T. (2021). Nghiên cứu khoa học của sinh viên trong các cơ sở giáo dục đại học: thực tiễn tại Trường Đại học Luật, Đại học Huế [Student scientific research in higher education institutions: Practices at the university of Law, Hue University]. *Tạp chí Khoa học Đại học Huế: Khoa học Xã hội và Nhân văn [Hue University Journal of Science: Social Sciences & Humanities]*, 130 (6C), 197–204; DOI: 10.26459/hueunijssh.v130i6C.6208

- Huang, J. L. (2016). Challenges in Education Research in Taiwan: Research Institutes and Organizations, Research Policies, and Problems. *Excellence in Higher Education*, 7, 37-44.
- Kerrigan, M. R., & Hayes, K. M. (2016). EdD students' self-efficacy and interest in conducting research. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, 147-162. Retrieved from <http://ijds.org/Volume11/IJDSv11p147-162Kerrigan1975.pdf>
- Lambie, G. W., & Vaccaro, N. (2011). Doctoral counselor education students' levels of research self-efficacy, perceptions of the research training environment, and interest in research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 243–258.
- Lambie, G. W., Hayes, B. G., Griffith, C., Limberg, D., & Mullen, P. R. (2014). An exploratory investigation of the research self-efficacy, interest in research, and research knowledge of Ph. D. in education students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 39(2), 139-153.
- Le, T. T. H., & Hoang, T. H. Y. (2021). Năng lực nghiên cứu khoa học của sinh viên sư phạm tiếng Anh tại Trường Đại học Vinh [Research competence of English-majored student teachers at Vinh University]. *Tạp chí Khoa học Giáo dục Việt Nam [Journal of Vietnam Educational Science]*, 19(5), 108-113.
- Lent, R.W.; Brown, S.D.; Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45, 79–121.
- Mohamed, F., & Nordin, R. (2013). Research efficacy among engineering and science undergraduates. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 102, 164-168.
- Moraes, D. W., Jotz, M., Menegazzo, W. R., Menegazzo, M. S., Veloso, S., Machry, M. C., Costanzi, M., & Pellanda, L. C. (2016). Interest in research among medical students: Challenges for undergraduate education. *Revista da Associacao Medica Brasileira (1992)*, 62(7), 652–658. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9282.62.07.652>.
- Ninh, T. B. D. (2022). Thực trạng và giải pháp nâng cao năng lực Nghiên cứu Khoa học cho sinh viên Trường Đại học Tân Trào trong đào tạo theo tín chỉ [The current situation and solutions to enhance scientific research capacity for students at Tan Trao university in credit-based training]. *Tạp chí Giáo dục [Journal of Education]*, 22(9), 34-39.
- Petko, J. (2012). Counselor education doctoral students' levels of research self-efficacy, interest in research, and research mentoring: A cross-sectional investigation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida). University of Florida Digital Commons. <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/CFE0004583>
- Petko, J. T., Sivo, S. A., & Lambie, G. W. (2020). The research self-efficacy, interest in research, and research mentoring experiences of doctoral students in counselor education. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 13 (1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7729/131.1310>
- Pham, Q. V., Le, V. T., Huynh, V. K., & Hoang, T. X. (2018). Một số yếu tố tác động đến động lực nghiên cứu khoa học của sinh viên [Factors influencing research motivation of university students]. *Tạp chí Khoa học Công nghệ Giao thông Vận tải [Journal of Transport Science and Technology]*, 30, 88-95
- Phan, H. T. T. (2011). *Factors affecting the motivation of Vietnamese technical English majors in their English studies* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Otago).

- Poh, R., & Abdullah, A. (2019). Factors influencing students' research self-efficacy: A case study of university students in Malaysia. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 137-167. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2019.82.8>
- Rezaei, M., & Zamani-Miandashti, N. (2013). The relationship between research self-efficacy, research anxiety and attitude toward research: A study of agricultural graduate students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 3(4), 69-78
- Sasson, I., & Miedijensky, S. (2023). Research Performance: A View of Research Self-Efficacy, Interest, and Gender. *Education Sciences*, 13(12), 1166. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121166>
- Seng, C., Carlon, M. K., & Cross, J. (2020). Research self-efficacy of Cambodian undergraduate students at province-based universities. *International Journal of Sociology of Education*, 9(2), 154-190. <https://doi.org/10.17583/rise.2020.4267>
- Sunal, Z. (2020). *Counselor education doctoral students' research self-efficacy: A concept mapping approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University). Old Dominion University Digital Commons. <https://doi.org/10.25777/pzr8-7z71>
- Tiyuri, A., Saberi, B., Miri, M., Shahrestanaki, E., Bayat, B. B., & Salehiniya, H. (2018). Research self-efficacy and its relationship with academic performance in postgraduate students of Tehran University of Medical Sciences in 2016. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 7, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_43_17
- Tran, H. K. D., Lam, T. N. T., Nguyen T. L. T., Luu N. T. V., Nguyen K. N., Bui M. C., Le T. T. (2022). Vietnamese student researchers' expectations of their supervisor and supervision process. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 9 (10), 230-258. DOI: 10.46827/ejes.v9i10.4525
- Tran, T. M. H., & Nguyen, D. T. (2022). Post-graduate training in Vietnam: Analysis from a manager's perspective. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S5), 486-494. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS5.7795>
- Uçar, S., Kaymakçı, G., & Zarfsaz, E. (2023). An investigation of students' research self-efficacy and research anxiety levels. *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi*, 12(4), 897-906.
- van Blankenstein, F. M., Saab, N., van der Rijst, R. M., Danel, M. S., Bakker-van den Berg, A. S., & van den Broek, P. W. (2019). How do self-efficacy beliefs for academic writing and collaboration and intrinsic motivation for academic writing and research develop during an undergraduate research project? *Educational Studies*, 45(2), 209-225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2018.1446326>
- Wright, A., & Holttum, S. (2012). Gender identity, research self-efficacy and research intention in trainee clinical psychologists in the UK. *Clinical psychology & psychotherapy*, 19 (1), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.732>

THẺ LỆ TẠP CHÍ KHOA HỌC QUẢN LÝ GIÁO DỤC

1. Tiêu đề

Tiêu đề bài báo phải có tiếng Việt và tiếng Anh, phản ánh chính xác nội dung nghiên cứu.

Trình bày viết hoa in đậm, căn giữa, phông Times New Roman, cỡ chữ 14 (tiếng Việt), cỡ chữ 12 (tiếng Anh) mã Unicode.

Không sử dụng ký hiệu, viết tắt hoặc công thức trong tiêu đề.

2. Họ tên tác giả, nơi công tác, tác giả liên hệ

Họ tên tác giả được trình bày ngay dưới tiêu đề bài báo.

Viết hoa, không in đậm, căn lề trái; phông Times New Roman, cỡ chữ 11.

Thứ tự tác giả phản ánh mức độ đóng góp khoa học vào bài báo.

Ghi rõ nơi công tác tương ứng với từng tác giả (tên cơ quan, thành phố, quốc gia).

Tác giả liên lạc được đánh dấu bằng dấu (*), kèm địa chỉ email, điện thoại.

Khuyến khích cung cấp ORCID iD cho từng tác giả.

3. Tóm tắt

Tóm tắt bằng tiếng Anh và tiếng Việt (không khác biệt về nội dung và ý nghĩa), có độ dài không quá 250 từ, được thể hiện thành một đoạn văn duy nhất, bao gồm: Khái quát về mục tiêu, phương pháp nghiên cứu, kết quả đạt được và các kết luận chính. Bản tóm tắt không bao gồm các phương trình, hình ảnh, tài liệu tham khảo.

4. Từ khóa

Từ khóa bằng tiếng Anh và tiếng Việt (tương đương về nội dung và ý nghĩa), từ 3-5 từ khóa, trình bày theo thứ tự alphabet, các từ khóa cách nhau bằng dấu phẩy. Không viết hoa toàn bộ, chỉ viết hoa tên riêng hoặc thuật ngữ khoa học.

5. Bổ cục bản thảo

Bản thảo được soạn thảo bằng microsoft word, khổ giấy A4, độ dài tối đa 6.000 từ (không quá 15 trang A4, bao gồm cả tài liệu tham khảo). Được trình bày theo cấu trúc IMRaD.

5.1. Mở đầu/đặt vấn đề

Phần Mở đầu/đặt vấn đề đề cập sự cần thiết của chủ đề nghiên cứu, mục tiêu nghiên cứu, đóng góp về lý luận và thực tiễn dự kiến đạt được, điểm mới của nghiên cứu, giới thiệu về nội dung bản thảo. Phần giới thiệu ngắn gọn, súc tích, không có tiêu đề phụ.

5.2. Phương pháp nghiên cứu

Dựa vào mô hình nghiên cứu hoặc khung phân tích hoặc các giả thiết nghiên cứu được xác định, bài báo nêu rõ các phương pháp phân tích hoặc mô hình, nghiên cứu, các thí nghiệm, thực nghiệm phù hợp để đưa ra các kết quả có cơ sở khoa học.

Phương pháp thu thập số liệu, nghiên cứu thể hiện một cách rõ ràng phạm vi nghiên cứu và cách thức thu thập số liệu; mô tả chi tiết cách thức đo lường các biến trong mô hình nghiên cứu.

Dữ liệu nghiên cứu, nguồn của dữ liệu hoặc các phương pháp chọn mẫu, thu thập dữ liệu cần được đề cập rõ ràng, đáng tin cậy.

5.3. Kết quả và thảo luận

Phần này sẽ trình bày những kết quả nghiên cứu rút ra từ các phân tích định tính, định lượng, thí nghiệm. Nêu sự khác biệt hoặc tương đồng so với các nghiên cứu khác trước có liên quan. Các đóng góp về mặt khoa học, thực tiễn của nghiên cứu và những hạn chế của nghiên cứu. Các đề xuất những nghiên cứu tiếp theo.

Chỉ thảo luận về những gì đã xác định và nêu ra trong bản thảo và phần kết quả trực tiếp hỗ trợ cho kết luận.

5.4. Kết luận

Kết luận rút ra trực tiếp từ kết quả của nghiên cứu sau khi đối chiếu với mục tiêu nghiên cứu của nghiên cứu trước có liên quan. Gợi ý chính sách và kiến nghị giải pháp dựa trên chính kết quả của nghiên cứu.

5.5. Phụ lục (nếu có)

Phụ lục (nếu có) sẽ được đặt sau phần 'Tài liệu tham khảo', được đánh số bằng các chữ cái A, B, C và được trích dẫn phù hợp trong nội dung bài viết.

Phụ lục không được chỉnh sửa và không phân biệt độc lập cũng như không được xuất bản sau khi bài báo đã được phê duyệt.

5.6. Tuyên bố về đóng góp khoa học (nếu có)

5.7. Lời cảm ơn đối với cơ quan tài trợ và/hoặc tổ chức, cá nhân liên quan (nếu có)

Các tác giả cảm ơn các cá nhân/tổ chức đã hỗ trợ, đóng góp ý kiến và đồng hành trong quá trình thực hiện nghiên cứu.

Chỉ ghi khi có sự đồng ý của các bên liên quan.

Nêu rõ nguồn tài trợ (nếu có).

5.8. Tài liệu tham khảo

Tạp chí tuân thủ theo định dạng APA (phiên bản 7) cho trích dẫn bài và danh mục tài liệu tham khảo. Trích dẫn theo dạng: (tác giả, năm) hoặc tác giả (năm).

Tối thiểu 10 tài liệu tham khảo trong đó 5 tài liệu quốc tế, 5 tài liệu là các công trình công bố trong 5 năm trở lại từ thời điểm nộp bài báo.

6. Các đầu mục

Bài báo được trình bày theo hệ thống phân cấp số Ả Rập:

1. Cấp 1 (1., 2., 3., ...): tiêu đề được viết thường, chỉ in hoa chữ cái đầu tiên, in đậm;

1.1. Cấp 2 (1.1., 1.2., ...): tiêu đề được viết thường, chỉ in hoa chữ cái đầu tiên, in đậm, in nghiêng;

1.1.1. Cấp 3 (1.1.1., ...): tiêu đề được viết thường, chỉ in hoa chữ cái đầu tiên, in nghiêng, không in đậm.

7. Bảng

Bảng được đánh số liên tục bằng số Ả Rập (Bảng 1, Bảng 2, ...), cỡ chữ 10.

Tên bảng phải được đặt ở dòng mới, phía trên bảng, không được in đậm, chỉ viết hoa chữ cái đầu. Bảng được căn giữa và đặt ngay sau đoạn văn bản có tham chiếu.

Nội dung bảng rõ ràng, có đơn vị đo lường và nguồn trích dẫn (nếu có).

8. Hình

Các tác giả sử dụng 'Hình' để mô tả tất cả các hình ảnh, biểu đồ, bản đồ, sơ đồ... được sử dụng trong bản thảo. Đánh số liên tục (Hình 1, Hình 2, ...).

Tên hình được đặt phía dưới hình, không in đậm, cỡ chữ 10.

Hình sử dụng phải rõ ràng và có chất lượng tốt, một màu đen - trắng, ở dạng có thể chỉnh sửa, chữ/ký hiệu trong hình cỡ 10. Tác giả chịu trách nhiệm về bản quyền.

9. Ghi chú và nguồn

Ghi chú (nếu có) phải được đặt ở cuối bảng/hình, cỡ chữ 10, in nghiêng.

Nguồn trích dẫn đặt dưới cùng, căn trái, ghi rõ xuất xứ dữ liệu, cỡ chữ 10, nằm ở góc trái của bảng/hình.

10. Công thức và đơn vị

Công thức toán học trình bày dưới dạng văn bản có thể chỉnh sửa được, không chèn dưới dạng hình ảnh.

Sử dụng các trình soạn thảo Equation đối với các công thức phức tạp. Hệ đơn vị quốc tế (SI). Ký hiệu đơn vị đặt sau giá trị số, có khoảng trắng.

11. Ngày tháng

Trình bày theo định dạng: dd/mm/yyyy.

12. Đóng góp của tác giả

Mô tả rõ vai trò của từng tác giả trong nghiên cứu và bài báo.

Khuyến nghị trình bày theo chuẩn Credit.

13. Cam kết tác giả

Cam kết về mâu thuẫn lợi ích, đạo đức xuất bản theo mẫu của Tạp chí.



TRƯỜNG CÁN BỘ QUẢN LÝ GIÁO DỤC THÀNH PHỐ HỒ CHÍ MINH

Số 07 - 09 Nguyễn Bình Khiêm, Phường Sài Gòn, Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh
ĐT: 02838.291718 - Website: www.iemh.edu.vn

Giá: 50.000 đ