

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Thi Hoang, T., Thi Hong Vu, P., & Hong Do, Q. (2026). The dual nature of colonial higher education in Vietnam: policy, institutional structure, and social impact (1858–1945). *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20930>



| **Submitted:** 06/01/2026
| **Revisions required:** 16/02/2026
| **Approved:** 10/03/2026
| **Published:** 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: The dual nature of colonial higher education in Vietnam: policy, institutional structure and social impact (1858-1945)

A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION
Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas.
1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the introduction make the research topic clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the introduction make it clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the theoretical framework presented in sufficient quantity and quality for the research construct and are the ideas presented in sufficient depth for the study in question?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
7. Does the theoretical framework presented include classic authors in the field who are still relevant to the discussion, and does it also include work from the last five years?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out the limitations of the research itself and future research?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension.
-
B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION
Precise description of the methods and techniques used.
1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally and the subtitle (if there is one) is a technical title more related to the topic? Another possible approach is when the title refers to the theoretical object and the subtitle to the empirical object.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described or the approval number of the work by the research ethics committee indicated?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.
-
C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION
Writing, form and normalization.
1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the text show correct accentuation and typing of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension
-
Recommendation
<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept with mandatory corrections
<input type="checkbox"/> Submit again for evaluation

Submit to another journal

Reject

The reviews will be published without the identity of the reviewer, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must state whether he/she authorizes the publication of the review with his/her identity or authorizes it without his/her identity.

Once the reviewer agrees to the review, the review will be published without their identity. If the reviewer wishes to authorize their identification, please inform it in response to the review request.

Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- The text presents a fascinating account of the development of an educational system during the colonial period in Vietnam, associating this process with both positive and negative influences that seem to permeate the country's educational reality to this day, thereby making a very interesting contribution to the study of educational institutions in that country and the relevance and, above all, the weight of colonial processes on a country's society and education.

Nevertheless, I believe there are some issues that need to be addressed before the text can be recommended for publication:

- The authors propose to work with historical documents and analyses combined with ideas and perspectives from the sociology of education, and although we can see this development throughout the text, which mixes historical accounts with societal analyses that extend to the present day, this development that begins in the analyses does not lead to conclusions. There is a presentation of several negative and positive points that could be analyzed from the implementation of the educational system, but there was no conclusion showing this and closing the text in an authorial manner. It would be highly relevant for the considerations to go beyond simply closing the historical analysis and continue the sociological analysis that was started, clearly showing the authors' voice and position on these issues. For example, they could continue discussing the impact of the formation of this new "intellectual class" and its impact on the current system, and elaborate more on the inclusion of women in the educational system and its impact on Vietnamese society. Many issues were raised but not finalized in the final considerations. I am not saying that these issues need to be worked on at length, but a position of the authors on these issues seems to be the

objective of the entire article, which was not done, so it becomes imperative that the final considerations do this work and bring more of the authors' voice to the text.

- There is also the issue of the lack of references to recent bibliography (last 5 years). The previous point I mentioned in this opinion may contribute to this, as it requires a little more sociological analysis from the authors to connect the analyses presented and initiated throughout the text. If, in view of the topic, recent literature addressing the topic is not readily available, this should be made explicit in the text, but I believe that, especially when considering the sociology of education, there must be many works that address the consequences of French education on the Vietnamese educational system and also the role of Vietnamese women in current education, something that can be correlated with what was mentioned about their inclusion in the educational system from that historical moment onwards.

I believe that these changes are fundamental to the work because, despite its great potential, without a consolidated educational analysis in the text, it is more of a historical account than a text in the field of education, something that does not detract from the value of the work produced but would not be relevant to the scope of the journal or the objectives presented by the authors at the beginning of the work.

I reiterate that the purpose of this opinion is solely to collaborate with the work carried out by the authors in the best way possible.

List of mandatory corrections

- Incorporate the changes noted in the opinion into the final considerations, bringing closure to the various points that were opened during the historical analyses presented in the writing.

- Bring contemporary bibliography (last 5 years) to the work, not just for references, but actually incorporate it into the text

Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards

I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer

I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer

I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação
Review, formatting, standardization, and Translation

