

Developing Speaking and Listening Competence among Grade 5 Students in Vietnamese Language Education: A Needs-Informed Three-Stage Pedagogical Framework

Quyen Nguyen Tu^a, Thoa Dao Thi Kim^b

^a*quyennt@tnue.edu.vn*

^a*University of Education, Thai Nguyen University, Vietnam*

^b*Tan Lap Primary School, Thai Nguyen, Vietnam*

Abstract

Speaking and listening are central components of language competence and essential for students' participation in learning and everyday communication. This study examines Grade 5 students' speaking and listening competence and develops a needs-informed pedagogical framework for Vietnamese language lessons. A descriptive needs analysis was conducted with 231 Grade 5 students and 15 teachers from three primary schools in Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam. Student self-assessment addressed presenting before the class, organizing ideas, identifying main ideas while listening, participating in group discussion, and responding to different viewpoints; teacher data focused on instructional difficulties and techniques used in speaking and listening lessons. The findings indicated uneven student competence, particularly in organizing spoken ideas, identifying key information while listening, and providing constructive responses. Teachers also reported limited use of interactive techniques beyond familiar pair-sharing practices. Drawing on competency-oriented education, communication theory, curriculum requirements, and the identified classroom needs, the study proposes a three-stage framework comprising preparation, practice and interaction, and post-practice consolidation and transfer. Brainstorming, mind mapping, inside-outside circle, fishbowl discussion, and synthesis activities are integrated according to their pedagogical functions. Two classroom illustrations demonstrate how the framework can support presentation- and discussion-oriented Grade 5 speaking and listening lessons.

Keywords: speaking competence; listening competence; spoken interaction; Vietnamese language education; Grade 5; primary education

1. Introduction

Competency-oriented education shifts attention from the possession of disciplinary knowledge to learners' capacity to mobilize knowledge, skills, attitudes, and other personal resources in meaningful contexts. Within language education, this orientation has particular significance because successful language learning cannot be reduced to knowledge of linguistic forms. Learners must be able to use language to present ideas, receive information, negotiate meaning, respond to others, and participate appropriately in social and academic interaction. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's DeSeCo framework conceptualizes competence as the capacity to meet complex demands through the mobilization of psychosocial resources in context (OECD, 2005). Mulder et al. (2007) likewise emphasize the multidimensional nature of competence, drawing attention to behavioral, generic, and cognitive perspectives. These conceptions provide an appropriate theoretical background for understanding oral language competence as a form of situated performance rather than as a collection of isolated linguistic subskills.

The Vietnamese 2018 General Education Curriculum reflects this broader shift by identifying language competence as a subject-specific competence developed through reading, writing, speaking, and listening. At the primary level, Vietnamese language education is expected to provide students with opportunities to use their mother tongue accurately, appropriately, and flexibly for learning and communication (Ministry of Education and Training [MOET], 2018a, 2018b). For Grade 5 students, curricular expectations extend beyond the ability to produce comprehensible speech. Students are expected to adjust vocabulary, speaking rate, volume, gesture, and other expressive resources to suit listeners; present ideas clearly and confidently; listen while identifying important information; recognize reasons and evidence used by speakers; and participate respectfully in discussions involving different viewpoints (MOET, 2018b). These expectations make speaking, listening, and spoken interaction closely interconnected dimensions of language competence.

From a communicative perspective, speaking is not simply the production of sounds or grammatically correct sentences. It requires speakers to select content, organize ideas, choose linguistic resources, and adapt verbal and non-verbal expression to a particular audience and purpose. Richards (2008) distinguishes among talk as interaction, talk as transaction, and talk as performance, highlighting the diversity of communicative purposes that oral language must serve. Listening is similarly active rather than passive. It involves attention, interpretation, selection, memory, evaluation, and response. In authentic communication, speaking and listening are therefore mutually dependent: participants repeatedly move between speaker and listener roles, ask for clarification, elaborate ideas, agree or disagree, and adjust their contributions in response to others.

Despite this curricular and theoretical emphasis, classroom organization may constrain the development of oral competence. Speaking and listening lessons can become teacher-controlled events in which only a small number of students present prepared responses while the majority listen without a defined purpose. Students may possess relevant experiences but lack strategies for generating or structuring ideas; they may hear classmates' contributions without identifying key information; and they may participate in group work without developing reasoned and respectful responses. Such limitations are particularly significant in Grade 5, the final year of primary education, when students are expected to transition toward more independent academic communication.

Against this background, the present study uses classroom needs as the starting point for the development of a structured pedagogical framework. Rather than treating individual active-learning techniques as disconnected activities, the framework organizes them according to the communicative process through which students prepare for oral performance, participate in speaking-listening interaction, and consolidate or transfer learning after practice. The study addresses two research questions: (1) What difficulties in Grade 5 students' speaking and listening competence and classroom instruction are indicated by a needs analysis in selected primary schools in Thai Nguyen Province? and (2) How can instructional measures be organized into a coherent framework that responds to those difficulties in Grade 5 Vietnamese speaking and listening lessons?

2. Theoretical and Curricular Background

2.1. Speaking, listening, and spoken interaction as competence

In competency-oriented education, the significance of knowledge and skills lies in the learner's

ability to mobilize them in action. This view is consistent with the Vietnamese General Education Curriculum, which defines competence as an individual attribute formed and developed through innate qualities and learning, enabling a person to mobilize knowledge, skills, and other personal characteristics to perform activities successfully under particular conditions (MOET, 2018a). When applied to oral language, this definition suggests that speaking competence should be observed through students' ability to use linguistic and non-linguistic resources appropriately in communicative situations rather than through decontextualized knowledge alone.

Speaking competence therefore encompasses more than pronunciation and sentence production. A competent speaker selects content that is relevant to the communicative purpose, organizes ideas in a comprehensible sequence, uses appropriate words and sentence patterns, manages voice and pace, and adapts expression to the listener and context. Listening competence likewise extends beyond auditory reception. In classroom communication, effective listeners need to focus attention, identify central information, interpret the speaker's meaning and attitude, remember or record relevant information, ask questions when clarification is needed, and respond in a manner that advances communication. These processes explain why speaking and listening should be taught in an integrated manner: oral communication normally requires continuous movement between production, reception, interpretation, and response.

2.2. Communication theory as an instructional foundation

Communication theory provides a useful basis for translating the abstract notion of oral competence into classroom task design. A communicative event involves participants, content, context, communicative means, and purpose; these factors jointly influence what is said, how it is expressed, and how meaning is interpreted. Phan and Dang (2011) emphasize the centrality of communicative activity in Vietnamese language teaching at primary school, while Richards (2008) similarly situates speaking and listening within purposeful discourse. Accordingly, speaking and listening tasks should not be reduced to reproducing prepared content. Students need to understand who they are speaking to, what they are speaking about, in what situation the communication occurs, why the communication is necessary, and what listeners are expected to do with the information they receive.

This orientation changes both teacher and learner roles. The teacher becomes a designer of communicative situations, a provider of scaffolds, and an observer who supports interaction without dominating it. Students become active participants who generate ideas, organize content, present, listen for a purpose, ask questions, respond, negotiate differences, and revise their communication. Such organization is particularly relevant for primary learners because oral competence develops through repeated participation in appropriately scaffolded communicative activity rather than through explanation alone.

2.3. Grade 5 Vietnamese speaking and listening tasks

An analysis of the Grade 5 Vietnamese textbooks in the Connecting Knowledge with Life series identifies 15 speaking and listening lessons distributed across the two volumes (Bui & Tran, 2024a, 2024b). The lessons largely fall into two communicative types: presentation or introduction tasks, and discussion tasks. Presentation-oriented lessons require students to introduce or present subjects such as places, books, films, cultural products, historical sites, or personal experiences. These tasks emphasize content selection, coherent organization, audience awareness, and expressive delivery. Discussion-oriented lessons address topics such as wildlife conservation, self-study, school life, different opinions, and summer experiences. They

require students not only to state ideas but also to listen to alternative perspectives, provide reasons, respond, and maintain respectful interaction.

The distinction between these two task types has pedagogical implications. Presentation tasks benefit from scaffolds that help students select and organize information and from repeated opportunities to rehearse with different listeners. Discussion tasks require mechanisms that stimulate multiple ideas, focus listening, and make reasoning and response visible. Nevertheless, both task types share a common developmental sequence: students need preparation before speaking, meaningful speaking-listening interaction during practice, and opportunities after practice to synthesize, reflect, and transfer what they have learned. This shared sequence provides the organizing principle for the framework proposed later in the article.

3. Method

3.1. Research design and participants

The study employed a descriptive needs-analysis design as the empirical foundation for developing instructional measures. Its purpose was to identify areas in which Grade 5 students and teachers required additional support in speaking and listening instruction, rather than to infer population-wide prevalence or causal effects. The participants were 231 Grade 5 students and 15 teachers from three primary schools in Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam. The student sample comprised 76 students from Tan Lap Primary School, 77 from Nguyen Viet Xuan Primary School, and 78 from Doi Can 2 Primary School. Five Grade 5 Vietnamese teachers from each school participated, producing a total teacher sample of 15.

3.2. Data collection and analysis

Student data were collected through a self-assessment questionnaire addressing five observable dimensions of speaking and listening competence: presenting before the class, organizing ideas when speaking, identifying the main content while listening, participating in group discussion, and responding to and respecting different viewpoints. Each dimension was described at three levels: Level 1 (limited), Level 2 (satisfactory), and Level 3 (good). The purpose of the scale was descriptive; it was used to identify areas of perceived strength and difficulty rather than to produce a standardized proficiency score.

Teacher questionnaires focused on the advantages and difficulties encountered when organizing Grade 5 speaking and listening lessons and on the instructional techniques teachers reported using. Classroom observation was also included in the original study to examine students' oral participation in Vietnamese lessons. For the present article, the quantitative results are reported descriptively as frequencies and percentages. The pedagogical framework was then developed by relating the identified classroom needs to the theoretical and curricular analysis. No additional data were generated for this article.

4. Results: Classroom Needs in Speaking and Listening

4.1. Students' self-assessed speaking and listening competence

The student results reveal an uneven profile across the five assessed dimensions. Difficulties were particularly evident in oral organization and purposeful listening. Table 1 presents the distribution of student self-assessments across the three levels.

Table 1. Grade 5 students' self-assessed speaking and listening competence (N = 231).

Indicator	Level 1, n (%)	Level 2, n (%)	Level 3, n (%)
Presenting before the class	94 (40.5)	107 (46.1)	31 (13.4)
Organizing ideas when speaking	93 (40.3)	123 (53.2)	15 (6.5)
Identifying main content while listening	97 (42.0)	84 (36.4)	50 (21.6)
Participating in group discussion	55 (23.8)	82 (35.5)	94 (40.7)
Responding to and respecting different viewpoints	82 (35.5)	80 (34.6)	69 (29.9)

Only 13.4% of students placed themselves at Level 3 for presenting before the class, while 40.5% were at Level 1. The challenge was even more pronounced for organizing ideas: only 6.5% reported Level 3 performance, whereas 40.3% remained at Level 1. This pattern suggests that a substantial proportion of students may have content to share but lack sufficient support for selecting and sequencing ideas into a coherent oral presentation. In speaking and listening instruction, such difficulty is consequential because disorganized preparation can affect confidence, clarity, and listeners' comprehension.

Listening also emerged as an area requiring focused instructional support. For identifying the main content while listening, 42.0% of students were at Level 1 and only 21.6% at Level 3. This result indicates that exposure to classmates' speech does not necessarily produce active listening. Students need explicit purposes for listening and follow-up actions that require them to use what they have heard. Group participation was comparatively stronger, with 40.7% at Level 3; however, the dimension combining response and respect for different viewpoints remained more dispersed, with 35.5% at Level 1 and 29.9% at Level 3. The contrast suggests that being present in a group discussion is not equivalent to participating in high-quality spoken interaction.

4.2. Teachers' reported practices and instructional difficulties

Teachers generally considered the Grade 5 speaking and listening topics to be close to students' experiences and therefore potentially engaging. They also recognized that students at this grade level possessed sufficient vocabulary and life experience to participate in oral activities. At the same time, teachers reported several practical and pedagogical difficulties. Limited lesson time and relatively large classes meant that not every student could present directly to the whole class. Student competence was uneven, and some learners were hesitant, spoke quietly, or struggled to arrange ideas coherently. Teachers also noted that some

students listened without identifying important information, asking questions, commenting, or adding to peers' ideas. Discussion could become unfocused, and students did not always manage turn-taking or support their views with reasons.

The reported use of instructional techniques further illustrates the need for a broader repertoire of structures that can distribute oral participation and make listening purposeful. Table 2 summarizes the techniques used by the 15 participating teachers.

Table 2. Instructional techniques reported by Grade 5 Vietnamese teachers (N = 15).

Instructional technique	Teachers, n	%
Pair sharing	15	100.0
Brainstorming	8	53.3
Mind mapping	3	20.0
Jigsaw	3	20.0
Fishbowl	0	0.0
Inside-outside circle	2	13.3
5W1H	1	6.7
Other techniques	4	26.7

Pair sharing was reported by all teachers and brainstorming by slightly more than half. In contrast, mind mapping and jigsaw were each reported by 20.0%, inside-outside circle by 13.3%, and fishbowl by none of the participating teachers. The pattern should not be interpreted as evidence that frequently used techniques are ineffective. Pair interaction, for instance, can substantially increase oral participation. Rather, the findings indicate limited instructional diversity in relation to techniques designed specifically to support systematic idea organization, repeated oral practice, observation-based listening, argumentation, and constructive response.

Taken together, the student and teacher data point toward a pedagogical issue that is broader than the presence or absence of speaking activities. Students require structured support before oral performance, multiple opportunities to speak and listen during practice, and clear reasons to attend to and respond to what others say. This interpretation directly informed the three-stage framework developed in the next section.

5. A Needs-Informed Three-Stage Pedagogical Framework

The proposed framework organizes instructional support around three interconnected phases: preparation before speaking and listening, practice and interaction, and consolidation or transfer after practice. The three phases are not intended as a rigid lesson template. They function as a pedagogical logic that helps teachers align particular techniques with the communicative problems those techniques are best suited to address. In this sense, the framework responds to the needs identified in the survey: difficulty generating and organizing ideas, insufficient opportunities for oral practice, passive listening, and limited quality of response.

5.1. Preparation: generating and organizing ideas

Before students can participate effectively in oral communication, they need access to relevant content and a manageable way of organizing it. Two techniques from the original study are particularly useful at this stage. Brainstorming enables students to activate prior knowledge, personal experience, and information previously encountered, generating multiple ideas before they are expected to defend or evaluate them. This is especially useful for discussion tasks, where students need a pool of possible viewpoints, reasons, and solutions. Mind mapping, by contrast, helps students transform available information into an organized speaking plan. By recording keywords and arranging them into main and supporting ideas, students gain a structural scaffold without having to write and memorize a complete text.

The pedagogical distinction between the two techniques is important. Brainstorming responds primarily to the problem of insufficient content, whereas mind mapping responds to the problem of disorganized content. Both can be used flexibly across task types, but their strongest functions correspond to two needs visible in the survey: students' difficulty arranging ideas coherently and the need to reduce dependence on fully scripted speech.

5.2. Practice and interaction: increasing speaking time and making listening purposeful

Preparation becomes competence only when students are given opportunities to perform. In large primary classes, whole-class presentation cannot provide sufficient speaking time for every student, and passive observation does not guarantee listening development. The inside-outside circle technique addresses this problem by organizing repeated speaking-listening exchanges with changing partners. Students present similar content several times, listen to multiple peers, receive questions or brief comments, and adjust their own delivery across rounds. Repetition is therefore used not as mechanical rehearsal but as an opportunity for progressive refinement.

For discussion-oriented tasks, fishbowl organization gives listening a visible and assessable function. A small group discusses an issue while surrounding students observe according to explicit criteria. The outer group may be asked to identify a clear opinion, a persuasive reason, a respectful response, or an unanswered question. When roles are exchanged, students experience both participation and observation. This structure supports the development of reasoning, turn-taking, attention to others' contributions, and constructive

response, all of which are central to spoken interaction but may remain invisible in conventional group work.

5.3. Consolidation and transfer: synthesizing what was heard and extending communication

Post-practice activities help students use the outcomes of speaking and listening rather than allowing interaction to end when the discussion or presentation finishes. The original study proposed the activity “Three Things We Know” as a concise form of synthesis. After discussion, groups identify three important ideas, messages, reasons, or actions and present them to the class. To complete the task, students must recall what was said, distinguish central from peripheral information, negotiate a group decision, and communicate the resulting synthesis succinctly. Listening is thereby connected to a subsequent communicative purpose.

The original study also proposed a teacher-mediated simulated dialogue using ChatGPT voice interaction as an optional transfer activity for presentation-oriented lessons. In this arrangement, one or more students interact orally with the system while classmates listen for important information and formulate follow-up questions. The pedagogical value lies not in treating AI-generated information as authoritative but in creating an additional communicative situation in which students must listen selectively and sustain a question-response sequence. Teacher mediation remains essential, and students should be explicitly reminded that AI output needs to be considered critically rather than accepted mechanically.

Across the three phases, the central developmental sequence can be summarized conceptually as preparation, performance and interaction, followed by consolidation and transfer. This sequencing aligns instructional support with the communicative process itself: students first construct something meaningful to say, then use oral language with real listeners, and finally process, evaluate, and extend what emerged from the interaction.

6. Classroom Illustrations

6.1. Presentation-oriented application: Local Products

The Grade 5 lesson Local Products requires students to introduce a distinctive product associated with a locality. Because the task is presentation-oriented, it illustrates how mind mapping and repeated paired interaction can be combined across the preparation and practice phases. The teacher first helps students interpret the communicative demand: they are not simply naming a product but introducing it to listeners in a way that makes its local association and distinctive value understandable. Students may choose a food, musical instrument, traditional costume, handicraft, or another locally characteristic product.

During preparation, each student places the selected product at the center of a mind map and develops several main branches. In the original lesson design, these branches included the locality associated with the product, its distinctive characteristics, the way it is used or enjoyed, its value or significance, and the speaker’s personal impression. Supporting branches are recorded as keywords or short phrases rather than complete sentences. This distinction is pedagogically important because the map functions as a speaking scaffold, not as a written script to be read aloud. Students review the map individually or with a partner, checking whether the main ideas are sufficiently clear, relevant, and non-repetitive.

During practice, the teacher organizes several small inside-outside circles or equivalent facing-pair arrangements adapted to the available classroom space. Each student presents the local product to a partner

using the mind map as support. The listener has an explicit task: identify key information and then ask one question or offer one concise comment. After a short round, students change partners and repeat the presentation. Across successive rounds, speakers have opportunities to improve sequencing, clarity, word choice, voice, and confidence, while listeners repeatedly practise extracting information and responding appropriately.

This organization directly responds to the classroom constraints identified by the participating teachers. Instead of requiring every student to wait for a turn to address the whole class, simultaneous interactions distribute speaking time across the room. At the same time, the repeated nature of the activity creates a form of formative rehearsal: students are able to notice what is unclear, incorporate questions from peers, and refine the next version of the presentation.

6.2. Discussion-oriented application: Wildlife Conservation

The lesson Wildlife Conservation provides an example of how brainstorming, fishbowl discussion, and post-discussion synthesis can be combined to develop discussion-oriented competence. In the preparation phase, the teacher introduces the issue through textbook images or other relevant visual prompts and invites students to consider the current situation of wildlife, reasons why conservation is necessary, and actions that individuals or communities can take. Students first generate short ideas individually and then share them within groups.

The collected ideas are subsequently grouped into broader categories such as current problems, reasons for conservation, and possible actions. The purpose of this phase is not to settle the issue but to provide students with a common pool of content from which they can build arguments. Examples emerging from the original lesson design included endangered species, illegal hunting and trading, habitat loss, ecological balance, forest protection, wildlife rescue, public awareness, and reporting illegal behavior. The categorization process helps students move from isolated thoughts toward material that can support reasoned oral interaction.

In the practice phase, an inner group discusses questions such as why wildlife should be protected and what students or communities can do to contribute. Students are encouraged to support opinions with reasons or examples rather than simply state preferences. The outer group listens according to defined purposes, for example identifying one clear opinion, one convincing reason, one respectful response, or one point requiring clarification. Students in the inner group are expected to listen before responding, explain agreement or disagreement, and use language that maintains respectful interaction.

After the discussion, outer-group students offer observations, questions, and additional ideas, and the inner group may clarify or revise its contributions. If classroom conditions permit, roles can be exchanged. The value of this arrangement lies in integrating oral production with listening and metacommunicative observation. Students learn not only what to say about wildlife conservation but also how to attend to another speaker, connect a response to a previous contribution, and provide reasons in a constructive manner.

In the consolidation phase, each group completes the “Three Things We Know” activity. Drawing on the preceding discussion, students select three central ideas or actions and present them concisely. A group might, for example, identify ecological balance, the threat of extinction, and biodiversity as three reasons for conservation; another might identify avoiding wildlife trade, refusing products made from protected species,

and protecting habitats as key actions. Because the task requires students to retrieve, prioritize, negotiate, and restate information, it turns listening into a resource for subsequent speaking rather than an end in itself.

7. Discussion

The needs analysis suggests that the challenges of Grade 5 speaking and listening are distributed across the communicative process rather than concentrated in speech production alone. Students may have difficulty before speaking because ideas are insufficiently generated or organized; during communication because opportunities to speak are limited; and while listening because no clear purpose or follow-up response is required. The proposed framework therefore treats oral competence as a sequence of interdependent actions rather than as a single classroom performance.

The particularly low proportion of students reaching Level 3 for organizing ideas reinforces the importance of pre-task scaffolding. Asking students to speak without first supporting idea selection and organization may disadvantage learners who possess relevant experiences but cannot yet convert them into coherent oral discourse. Mind mapping and brainstorming serve different but complementary functions in this respect. They externalize the invisible planning processes that more proficient speakers may perform internally, making those processes accessible to learners who still require structured support.

The findings also draw attention to participation as a pedagogical resource. Teachers reported that class size and limited time prevented every student from presenting to the whole class. If oral competence develops through use, then a lesson structure that provides only a few students with extended speaking turns creates an inherent constraint. Techniques that distribute students into simultaneous interactions offer a practical response. Inside-outside circle practice is particularly relevant because it transforms one prepared presentation into several communicative encounters. Each encounter provides a different listener and therefore a new opportunity for clarification, adjustment, and feedback.

Listening deserves equivalent instructional attention. The 42.0% of students at Level 1 for identifying main content while listening suggests that listening cannot be assumed to develop simply because students are physically present during peer speech. Purposeful listening requires an explicit task and a meaningful consequence. When students must ask a question, identify a reason, record a key point, or evaluate how a peer responded, attention becomes goal-directed. The fishbowl technique makes this process especially visible because observers have a defined communicative role rather than functioning as a silent audience.

The contrast between relatively stronger group participation and weaker response to different viewpoints is also instructive. Participation is a necessary but insufficient condition for spoken interaction. Students can be active in a group while still speaking in parallel rather than building on one another's ideas. High-quality interaction requires listening before responding, relating a new contribution to what has already been said, providing reasons, and maintaining respect when viewpoints differ. The framework therefore treats response and reasoning as explicit learning targets rather than incidental by-products of group work.

From a broader competency perspective, the three-stage sequence reflects the movement from preparation to situated performance and then to reflection or transfer. This is consistent with the view that competence is demonstrated through effective action in context rather than through possession of knowledge alone (OECD, 2005; Mulder et al., 2007). In the context of Vietnamese language education, the framework

also aligns with curriculum requirements that integrate speaking, listening, and spoken interaction rather than treating them as unrelated classroom skills.

The framework should nevertheless be understood as a practice-oriented pedagogical proposal rather than as a universally validated intervention model. The present article draws on a descriptive needs analysis and on instructional measures developed in the original study. Its contribution lies in making the relationship between identified classroom needs and particular forms of instructional support explicit. Further research is required to determine the magnitude and durability of learning gains associated with the framework under different classroom conditions.

8. Pedagogical Implications

Several implications follow from the analysis. First, speaking and listening lessons should be designed around communicative participation rather than public presentation alone. A successful lesson is not necessarily one in which a few students deliver polished performances; it is one in which most students have meaningful opportunities to prepare, speak, listen, and respond. Second, listening tasks should specify what students are listening for and what they will do with the information. Instructions such as listening for the speaker's main point, recording one important detail, formulating a follow-up question, or identifying a convincing reason make the listener's role explicit and observable.

Third, temporary scaffolds such as mind maps, keywords, guiding questions, idea banks, and response prompts can enable wider participation without turning oral work into memorized written language. Such scaffolds should support students' speech rather than replace it and can gradually be reduced as learners become more independent. Finally, active-learning techniques should be selected according to pedagogical function. Their value lies not in novelty but in the specific communicative problem they solve: brainstorming generates possibilities, mind mapping organizes content, repeated paired interaction expands speaking time, fishbowl discussion structures listening and response, and synthesis activities help students identify and articulate central information.

9. Limitations and Future Research

The findings should be interpreted within the scope of the original study. The needs analysis involved 231 students and 15 teachers from three primary schools in one Vietnamese province; therefore, the results should not be generalized to all Grade 5 classrooms in Vietnam. The student data reported here are primarily self-assessment data and describe perceived competence rather than standardized speaking and listening proficiency. Teacher reports are likewise descriptive and were obtained from a relatively small sample.

The framework was constructed from the theoretical analysis, curriculum requirements, classroom needs, and pedagogical measures developed in the original research. Future studies could evaluate the framework with larger and more diverse samples, employ validated analytic rubrics for speaking, listening, and spoken interaction, and examine change over longer periods. Additional research could also compare the contribution of individual techniques, investigate whether particular combinations are more effective for presentation or discussion tasks, and examine how teacher mediation affects students' transfer of oral communication strategies across topics and contexts.

10. Conclusion

Developing speaking and listening competence in Grade 5 requires more than increasing the number of oral questions or asking students to make occasional presentations. It requires a coherent instructional process in which students are supported to generate and organize ideas, given sufficient opportunities to speak and listen, expected to respond to others, and encouraged to consolidate and transfer what they have learned. The needs analysis conducted in selected primary schools in Thai Nguyen Province identified particular difficulties in oral presentation, idea organization, identifying main information while listening, and constructive response. It also showed that teachers' use of interactive instructional techniques was concentrated on a relatively narrow set of familiar practices.

In response, the study proposes a three-stage framework consisting of preparation, practice and interaction, and post-practice consolidation or transfer. Brainstorming and mind mapping provide cognitive and linguistic preparation; inside-outside circle and fishbowl structures increase opportunities for meaningful speaking, purposeful listening, reasoning, and feedback; and synthesis or transfer activities extend the value of oral interaction beyond the immediate speaking turn. The classroom illustrations demonstrate how the framework can be adapted to the two major task types found in Grade 5 Vietnamese speaking and listening lessons. More broadly, the framework suggests that oral language competence develops most productively when classroom instruction gives every learner repeated reasons and opportunities to prepare, speak, listen, interact, reflect, and refine communication.

References

- Bui, M. H., & Tran, T. H. L. (Eds.). (2024a). Vietnamese 5: Connecting knowledge with life, Vol. 1. Vietnam Education Publishing House.
- Bui, M. H., & Tran, T. H. L. (Eds.). (2024b). Vietnamese 5: Connecting knowledge with life, Vol. 2. Vietnam Education Publishing House.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2018a). *General education curriculum*. Issued together with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT, December 26, 2018.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2018b). *General education curriculum: Literature/Vietnamese language*. Issued together with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT, December 26, 2018.
- Mulder, M., Weigel, T., & Collins, K. (2007). The concept of competence in the development of vocational education and training in selected EU member states: A critical analysis. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 59(1), 67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820601145630>
- OECD. (2005). *The definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Phan, P. D., & Dang, K. N. (2011). *Hoạt động giao tiếp với dạy học tiếng Việt ở tiểu học* [Communicative activities and Vietnamese language teaching at primary school]. University of Education Publishing House.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.