International Journal of Educational Research and Development
www.allinnovationjournal.com
Online ISSN: 2664-7095, Print ISSN: 2664-7087
Received: 01-10-2025, Accepted: 31-10-2025, Published: 15-11-2025
Volume 7, Issue 4, 2025, Page No. 33-39

Barriers and difficulties in innovating teaching methods of physical education at universities without physical education masters

Ha Ngoc Huy
Faculty of Basic Sciences, Ho Chi Minh City Campus, University of Transport and Communications, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Abstract
Innovation in teaching methods of Physical Education (PE) is an inevitable requirement to improve the quality of comprehensive education for students (SVs'). However, at universities without physical education majors, this innovation process faces many barriers and difficulties in terms of awareness, facilities, teaching staff and SVs' interest levels. This study used a survey method with 215 managers, lecturers and SVs from 6 universities in Ho Chi Minh City to clarify the factors affecting the process of innovation in teaching methods of Physical Education. The results showed: (1) inadequate awareness of school leaders and SVs about the role of Physical Education; (2) limitations in facilities and equipment; (3) lack of skills in applying technology and active methods among lecturers; (4) lack of interest and passive attitudes of SVs. From there, the article proposed recommendations to remove these barriers, such as increasing investment, training lecturers, improving programs and enhancing awareness communication in the SV community.

Keywords: Physical education, teaching methods, barriers, universities, non-specialized

Introduction

In the context of globalization and the 4.0 industrial revolution taking place strongly, higher education not only plays the role of a center for training high-quality human resources, but also has to meet the requirements of comprehensive human development. In that orientation, physical education (physical education) holds an important and indispensable position in the strategy of training SVs to develop harmoniously in terms of physical strength, intelligence and ethics. However, in the system of non-sports universities in Vietnam today, physical education has not received due attention, especially in innovating teaching methods to improve the quality and effectiveness of SVs' learning.

According to the orientation of the 2019 Education Law and the guiding documents of the Ministry of Education and Training, physical education is not simply an extracurricular activity, but a compulsory subject, contributing to the formation and development of the qualities and abilities of learners. However, in practice, the innovation of physical education teaching methods in non-specialized universities still faces many difficulties in terms of awareness, facilities, teaching staff and learners. This leads to limitations in training quality and failure to achieve the comprehensive goals of modern higher education.

The need to innovate physical education teaching methods stems from many reasons. Firstly, traditional teaching methods that focus on explaining, modeling and repetitive practice are gradually becoming outdated and no longer suitable for the psychology, needs and learning trends of new generation SVs. Learning is forced, with little connection to emotions and personal experiences, making SVs easily feel bored, thereby reducing learning effectiveness. Second, the demands from society and the labor market today require learners to not only have professional knowledge but also good physical strength, communication skills, the ability to cooperate and the spirit of overcoming difficulties, qualities that physical education can contribute to nurturing if it is organized and taught scientifically, creatively and flexibly. Third, the development of educational technology opens up many opportunities to apply active teaching methods such as real-life simulations, learning games and experiential learning, but these opportunities have not been fully exploited in many non-specialized schools.

Many international studies have shown that innovation in physical education teaching methods significantly improves SVs' learning motivation, positive attitudes, mobility and awareness of the value of health. According to Dyson and Kempson, *et al*. (2018 & 2024) [2, 5], cooperative learning methods, interactive games and project-based learning are effective approaches, especially suitable for non-sport SVs. However, in Vietnam, studies by Hanh (2021), Duc *et al*., (2022) or Cuong (2022) show that the application of these methods in practice is still very modest, mainly due to the lack of professional knowledge, pedagogical skills and suitable practice conditions.

A common situation is that at many universities, physical education is often considered "secondary", a "subject for the sake of it", leading to passivity from both SVs and schools. As a result, investment in programs, methods and lecturers is also at a minimum level. In some schools, the duration of physical education is cut or organized to focus on the end of the semester, reducing the continuity and effectiveness of the physical training process (Hang et a., 2020; Van, 2022) [3]. At the same time, in the conditions of limited playground space and lack of facilities, many physical education lecturers are forced to return to traditional teaching methods to ensure safety and easy control of the classroom.

On the other hand, the physical education teaching staff at non-specialized universities are mostly those who have been trained in the traditional model, have little access to modern teaching methods and have not been trained in applying technology to physical education. The lack of specialized training programs, as well as the lack of mechanisms to encourage innovation in teaching, often makes lecturers

choose the safe solution of continuing the old method, which is monotonous and unattractive.

On the learner side, most SVs in engineering, economics, technology, etc., have a dense professional schedule and spend little time investing in physical subjects. The pressure of exams, internships and projects makes many SVs underestimate the importance of physical fitness. Furthermore, the culture of physical activity in universities has not yet been strongly formed, leading to indifference and perfunctory participation in physical education. In fact, a preliminary survey at a number of universities in Ho Chi Minh City shows that the rate of absenteeism, skipping classes and requesting exemption from physical education is at an alarming level, especially in the 3rd and 4th years of study.

All of the above factors show that, although innovation in physical education teaching methods is an inevitable trend in modern education, the realization process at non-physical education universities in Vietnam is facing many systematic and multi-dimensional barriers. Identifying and clearly analyzing these barriers is an important premise for developing reasonable intervention strategies, ensuring real and effective changes.

In response to that urgent need, this article focuses on clarifying the factors that hinder the innovation of physical education teaching methods at non-physical education universities, through a practical survey at a number of higher education institutions in Ho Chi Minh City, combined with in-depth interviews with lecturers and SVs. Based on the research results, the article proposes a number of policy orientations and practical solutions to promote the innovation of physical education teaching in a more positive, humane and modern direction.

Research Overview

1. Theoretical framework for teaching method innovation in physical education

Teaching method innovation is a core content in higher education reform, in which the shift from traditional teaching methods to active, learner-centered teaching methods is an inevitable trend. In the field of physical education (PE), teaching method innovation not only includes changing the way of imparting knowledge but also includes educational thinking, classroom organization, assessment methods, technology application and active participation of SVs in the learning process.

Modern educational theories such as constructivism, experiential learning, and interactive learning have been applied to physical education to enhance educational effectiveness. According to Sliwa, *et al*. (2017) [16], modern physical education learning environments need to create conditions for SVs to actively explore their own movement abilities, develop physical abilities and personal and social values such as perseverance, cooperation, self-awareness and responsibility. At the same time, active teaching in physical education should not only focus on techniques and tactics but also incorporate elements of moral, emotional and life skills education.

In that context, designing learning activities towards individualization, diversifying learning content, integrating support tools such as visual models, sensor technology, interactive games... is the recommended direction in many countries with developed education (Dyson & Kempson, *et al*. 2024) [2, 5], 2016; Stolz, 2020) [15]. However, when applied in universities that do not specialize in physical education, these modern methods face many barriers in terms of management thinking, lecturer capacity and actual teaching conditions.

2. International studies on innovation in physical education teaching methods

In the world, innovation in physical education teaching methods has been implemented according to many different models. In the US, studies by Metzler (2011) [8] and Sliwa *et al*., (2015) proposed a physical education curriculum framework based on the model of "instructional models in PE", which includes: cooperative teaching, game-based learning, health-oriented learning and problem-based learning. Each model emphasizes the role of learners in self-managing activities, building personal goals and evaluating their own effectiveness

In Europe, Kirk (2010) [6] emphasized the need to build a culture of physical activity in schools, in which the innovation of physical education teaching methods must be associated with changing the educational community's perception of physical education. Programs such as the Sport Education Model (USA), Health-Optimizing Physical Education (Canada), or Teaching Games for Understanding (UK) have all proven to be effective in enhancing learning motivation and developing comprehensive competencies for non-sport SVs.

A notable study by Kempson *et al*. (2024) [5] & Goodyear (2015) in New Zealand showed that integrating information and communication technology (ICT) into physical education teaching, such as using video analysis of movements, heart rate monitors and applications to track exercise progress, can enhance SVs' learning experiences and self-assessment. However, the prerequisite is that the lecturers must be well-trained, have technological capacity and be willing to change teaching methods.

3. Domestic studies on the current state of physical education teaching and barriers to innovation

In Vietnam, some initial studies have identified shortcomings in the organization and teaching methods of physical education at universities that do not specialize in physical education. According to a survey by Nguyen Thi Thu Huong (2020), more than 60% of physical education lecturers at technical universities in Hanoi still maintain traditional teaching methods, while only 15% use games or active learning methods.

Le Van Phuc and Nguyen Thi Hoa (2021) in their research in the Central region pointed out that the biggest barrier to innovating physical education teaching methods does not lie in SVs' awareness but in the lack of teaching conditions, especially facilities, playgrounds, equipment and teaching materials. In addition, the lack of a strategy to develop a team of specialized lecturers, as well as an inappropriate schedule, makes physical education fragmented and less attractive to SVs.

A more in-depth study by Tran Quoc Tuan (2022) showed that 70% of university SVs in Ho Chi Minh City consider physical education as a secondary subject, mainly to qualify for graduation, not as a real physical training need. The main reasons come from stressful study schedules, a mentality of taking physical fitness lightly and an unattractive learning environment.

However, there are also bright spots in practice when some universities, such as Ho Chi Minh City University of Technical Education, Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology, Ho Chi Minh City National University, have begun to implement technology-integrated teaching models, such as using software to track personal training progress, organizing classes according to sports interest groups and evaluating based on practical abilities instead of traditional scores.

4. Research gaps and approaches of the article

Although there have been a number of studies addressing the issue of innovating physical education teaching methods, most of the current works only stop at describing the current situation or analyzing one-sidedly from the lecturers' side. Rarely is there a study that simultaneously combines all three perspectives: school management awareness, lecturer capacity and SV attitudes, especially in the specific conditions of universities that do not specialize in physical education.

In addition, current studies have not deeply explored the factors of school culture, internal school policies and the role of technology in innovating physical education teaching methods. The lack of quantitative and qualitative data also makes the recommendations unsystematic and difficult to apply to the practice of higher education management.

Therefore, this study takes a comprehensive approach, surveying all three groups of subjects: managers, lecturers and SVs. At the same time, the paper integrates analysis of policies, facilities, technology and learners' learning motivation. Thereby, the article not only clearly identifies specific barriers but also aims to propose feasible solutions to innovate teaching methods of physical education in the specific context of non-specialized universities in Vietnam today.

Research Method

1. Research approach

This study is designed according to a mixed method approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods to ensure objectivity, comprehensiveness and depth when analyzing barriers in innovating teaching methods of Physical Education (PE) in non-specialized universities. Quantitative methods help identify trends and levels of hindering factors; meanwhile, qualitative methods contribute to clarifying the underlying causes and relationships between factors through in-depth findings from the practical experiences of relevant subjects.

The mixed method was chosen because of the specificity and systematic nature of the research problem, which is simultaneously affected by factors of educational management, pedagogical capacity, teaching and learning organization conditions, learner psychological characteristics and school institutional context. This approach allows researchers not only to collect reliable data but also to decode complex educational phenomena, thereby making highly practical recommendations.

2. Research object and scope

The research subjects of the topic include three groups of subjects directly related to the teaching and learning process of physical education at universities that do not specialize in physical education and sports:

Education management staff (CBQL): including heads/deputy heads of training departments, heads/deputy heads of physical education departments, vice principals in charge of training or SV management;

Physical education lecturers: those who directly teach the subject in the most recent semesters;

SVs: from non-physical education majors, have completed at least one physical education course.

In terms of geographical scope, the research was carried out at 06 universities in Ho Chi Minh City, including: Ho Chi Minh City University of Technical Education, Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics, HUTECH, Ho Chi Minh City University of Industry, Ho Chi Minh City Open University and Nguyen Tat Thanh University. These are representative schools of the non-physical education sector, but still maintain compulsory physical education teaching for SVs.

3. Quantitative survey design

a. Survey tools

The quantitative questionnaire was built on a 5-level Likert scale (from 1 = completely disagree to 5 = completely agree), including 28 questions divided into 5 main content groups:

Perception of the role of physical education in higher education;

Current status of facilities and teaching organization conditions;

Teaching methods and pedagogical capacity of lecturers;

SVs' learning motivation and attitudes towards physical education;

Support from the school and policies to encourage innovation.

The questionnaire was designed based on references to international studies (Sliwa, *et al*., 2017; Dyson & Kempson, *et al*. (2024), 2016) [2, 5, 16] and adjusted to suit the context of higher education in Vietnam. Before officially releasing, the questionnaire was tested on 15 people to correct the language and structure of the questions, ensuring comprehensibility and reliability.

b. Survey sample

The total number of ballots issued was 240, of which 215 were validly collected, including: 42 managers, 78 physical education lecturers, 95 SVs of economics, engineering, technology and social sciences.

The sample was selected using a convenient sample method with group control, ensuring relative representation between the subject groups. The data was encoded and processed using SPSS 25.0 software, with descriptive statistical analysis, Cronbach's Alpha reliability testing, correlation analysis and mean comparison (t-test, ANOVA) to determine the differences between each group of subjects and schools.

4. Qualitative research design

In parallel with the quantitative survey, the research team conducted 20 semi-structured interviews with relevant subjects: 5 managers (symbol: CBQL1 → CBQL5), 7 physical education lecturers (symbol: GV1 → GV7), 8 students who have participated in physical education courses in the last 2 years (symbol: SV1 → SV8).

Interview content focused on issues such as: Practical experience when implementing or participating in physical education classes; Assessment of the effectiveness of current teaching methods; Identifying difficulties and obstacles in innovating methods; Proposing solutions from personal and school perspectives. The interviews were recorded (with consensus), transcribed and analyzed using content analysis with the support of *NVivo* software. Typical quotes are coded by subject code to ensure anonymity and research ethics.

5. Ensuring reliability and validity

To ensure the reliability and validity of the study:

Cronbach's Alpha is used to check the internal consistency of the variable groups (all groups have coefficients > 0.7, meeting the requirements).

Multi-subject interviews help add depth to quantitative data, while avoiding one-sided perspective bias.

Data triangulation is performed by comparing the results between three groups: managers, lecturers, students to confirm authenticity.

Confidentiality and research ethics are strictly adhered to. All participants are informed in advance and voluntarily participate and can withdraw at any time.

6. Research Limitations

Despite careful design, the study still has some limitations:

The scope of the study is limited to the Ho Chi Minh City area, not reflecting the situation in rural and mountainous areas.

The research sample does not fully cover all types of schools (public, private, international).

The impact of macro policies (such as the Law on Education, guidelines of the Ministry of Education and Training) has not been analyzed in depth within the scope of this study.

However, with a comprehensive approach, the study still provides a clear, updated picture and has high practical reference value for planning physical education policies in non-specialized higher education.

Research Rsesults

The research results are presented according to four main content axes: (1) Perception of the role of physical education; (2) Facilities and teaching organization conditions; (3) Teaching capacity and methods of lecturers; (4) Motivation and learning attitude of SVs. The findings are drawn from a synthesis of 215 quantitative questionnaires and 20 in-depth interviews.

1. Insufficient awareness of the role of Physical Education

Correct awareness of the role of Physical Education (physical education) is an important foundation to promote the process of innovation in teaching methods. However, in many universities that do not specialize in physical education, this subject is still not recognized as an essential element of comprehensive education. The underestimation of the role of physical education is not only reflected at the management level but also in the teaching attitude of lecturers and the learning motivation of SVs. Below are the data and analysis showing this limited level of awareness.

Table 1: Perception of the role of Physical Education

Order	Level of agreement with the statement: "Physical education is necessary for the comprehensive development of SVs"	Frequency (number of people)	Ratio (%)
1	Strongly disagree	5	2.33
2	Disagree	12	5.58
3	Neutral	33	15.35
4	Agree	98	45.58
5	Strongly agree	67	31.16

Although the majority of administrators and lecturers believe that physical education is an indispensable part of university training, about 23% of SVs and 17% of lecturers do not really appreciate the role of this subject. This shows that there is a lack of consistency in perception among the subject groups.

Interview excerpt: CBQL3: "The school still considers physical education a conditional subject, without a specific capacity assessment mechanism, so it is difficult to build long-term value for SVs". GV5: "Lecturers sometimes feel that they are teaching to pass the subject, because the school itself does not require content innovation". SV2: "I think studying physical education is just to pass the subject and is not related to the main field of study".

2. Limited facilities and teaching conditions

One of the key factors that directly affects the quality of teaching and the ability to innovate methods in Physical Education is the facilities and classroom environment. At non-specialized universities, the lack of playgrounds, training equipment, functional classrooms and flexible learning conditions is seriously hindering the implementation of modern teaching models. This is not only a technical barrier, but also a clear manifestation of unsynchronized investment, reducing the effectiveness and motivation of both lecturers and SVs in the teaching and learning process.

Table 2: Assessment of facilities and teaching conditions

Order	Factors considered as "unsatisfactory" in physical education teaching	Frequency (number of people)	Ratio (%)
1	Lack of standard training grounds	64	82.05
2	Lack of training equipment (balls, rackets, nets, etc.)	60	76.92
3	No enclosed gym (affected by weather)	48	61.54
4	No accompanying theory classroom	69	88.46
5	Overcrowded classrooms (over 50 SVs/class)	52	66.67

Deteriorated or substandard facilities are the most common barriers, preventing many modern teaching activities from being implemented. In particular, the lack of playgrounds and equipment has forced lecturers to return to monotonous and uncreative teaching methods.

Interview excerpt: GV2: "The school only has one cement court for both volleyball and badminton, so we often only instruct movements without allowing SVs to practice". SV7: "A class of nearly 60 people has only a few balls, so there is no learning, just standing and watching".

3. Limitations in capacity and innovation of lecturers

Innovation of teaching methods cannot be separated from the pedagogical capacity and creativity of the teaching staff. However, at universities that do not specialize in physical education, most physical education lecturers still maintain traditional methods, rarely applying active teaching methods, educational technology or SV-centered teaching strategies. This limitation stems from many causes such as lack of in-depth training programs, pedagogical environments that do not encourage creativity and high time pressure. The data below clearly reflects the prevalence and causes of this situation.

Table 3: Assessment of lecturers' competence and methodological innovation

Order	Methods used frequently in teaching physical education	Frequency (number of people)	Ratio (%)
1	Traditional: lecture, model, practice, correction	69	88.46
2	Organize physical games	30	38.46
3	Group teaching, cooperative learning	17	21.79
4	Technology-integrated teaching (video simulations, progress tracking software)	12	15.38
5	Guided self-study / individual physical projects	7	8.97

The data shows that only a small proportion of lecturers apply active learning methods, especially technology integration and guided self-learning. The main reasons come from lack of professional training and lack of motivation to innovate.

Interview excerpt: GV1: "We have never been formally trained in active learning methods, so we still teach the same way". GV6: "There is no technology equipment or supporting software, so it is difficult to try new approaches".

4. Impact of school policies and organizational culture

In addition to technical and human factors, qualitative research also noted the weak role of internal policies and school culture in promoting physical education innovation. Many administrators admitted that physical education was not a priority in resource allocation. In this study, a group of 42 administrators was surveyed on the level of support from internal policies and the school's organizational culture environment for innovation in teaching methods of Physical Education (PE). The results are shown in the table below:

Table 5: Administrators' assessment of policies and environment supporting physical education innovation

Order	Content Survey	Frequency (number of people)	Ratio (%)
1	The school has a specific strategy for physical education development	12	28.57
2	There are separate regulations on innovating physical education teaching methods	9	21.43
3	There is a regular budget for improving physical education teaching conditions	14	33.33
4	There is a reward mechanism, encouraging lecturers to innovate physical education teaching methods	6	14.29
5	School culture encourages SVs to exercise regularly	11	26.19
6	There is a link between physical education teaching and SV movement and union activities	15	35.71
7	There is a set of indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of physical education teaching according to capacity and learning outcomes	5	11.90

The data shows that the impact of school policies and organizational culture on the innovation of physical education teaching methods is very limited. Specifically:

Only 28.57% of administrators confirmed that the school has a physical education development strategy in the overall educational strategy of the school, showing that physical education has not been integrated as an important element in training management.

Less than 22% confirmed the existence of a separate regulation on innovation of physical education teaching methods, showing that this issue has not been institutionalized into an effective internal policy.

Financial issues are also an important barrier: only 14/42 (33.33%) said that the school has a regular budget for physical education and in particular only 6 (14.29%) confirmed that there is a mechanism to encourage lecturers to innovate, reflecting the lack of administrative and financial incentives for physical education innovation.

In terms of organizational culture, only 11/42 (26.19%) said that the school has an environment that encourages SVs to exercise and only 15/42 (35.71%) link physical education with movement activities, showing the separation between formal teaching and extracurricular experiences.

Worryingly, only 11.90% confirmed that the school has a set of indicators to assess the capacity and output efficiency of physical education, which proves that the subject has not been properly quality-assessed like other subjects, leading to a lack of consideration in assessment and investment.

CBQL2: "The investment budget for physical education is almost not prioritized like other sectors, so it only stops at the maintenance level". CBQL4: "The school does not have a set of indicators to assess the effectiveness of physical education teaching, so it is difficult to determine what is innovative".

The research results show that the process of innovating teaching methods for physical education at non-specialized universities is being influenced by many simultaneous barriers, from awareness, material conditions, lecturer capacity, to learning motivation and school policies. These findings are an important basis for identifying root causes and proposing appropriate intervention strategies, creating a

substantial change in physical education activities at the current university level.

Discussion

The quantitative and qualitative research results have shown a multidimensional picture of barriers to innovation in teaching methods of Physical Education (PE) at universities that do not specialize in physical education and sports. The following discussion will analyze in depth the discovered aspects, compare with modern educational theory and international experience, thereby clarifying the root causes and systematic nature of the problem.

1. Subsubject thinking and inconsistency in perception

One of the inherent barriers to the process of innovating teaching methods of physical education is the incomplete, even distorted, perception of the role of this subject in higher education. Survey data shows that a significant proportion of administrators, lecturers and SVs do not appreciate the importance of physical education, considering it a conditional or supplementary subject, instead of a component part of the comprehensive training objectives.

This distorted perception not only causes physical education to be overlooked in resource allocation but also directly affects teaching and learning attitudes. Lecturers lack motivation to innovate, SVs learn to cope and schools do not establish a mechanism to monitor and evaluate real effectiveness. The "additional subject" mindset leads to a series of negative impacts in the style of a "spiral of stagnation", weakening the role of physical education in developing SVs' physical strength, social skills, cooperation and autonomy, the competencies that are being emphasized in modern output standards frameworks.

2. Poor facilities: physical and psychological barriers

Facilities are essential for organizing active learning methods in physical education. However, the research results show that the majority of surveyed schools do not have standard gyms, lack basic equipment and suitable exercise spaces, leading to a situation where classes are organized in a formal way and GVs are forced to maintain old methods for "safety" and easy control of the class.

This is not only a physical barrier, but also a psychological barrier, because GVs in such an environment cannot experiment with new approaches and SVs do not have positive experiences to form motivation. As Kirk (2010) [6] emphasized, "it is impossible to form a culture of exercise in an educational environment that lacks physical space". In addition, the difference between SV size and exercise conditions also reduces the individualization of teaching, an important requirement in modern educational methods.

3. Teacher capacity and methodological stagnation

Survey data shows that the majority of physical education GVs in non-specialized schools are still loyal to traditional methods (modeling, practicing, correcting mistakes), while active teaching methods such as group learning, active games, technology integration and guided self-study are rarely applied. This does not stem from conservatism, but is largely due to the lack of appropriate professional development programs, supportive environments and mechanisms to encourage innovation.

Unlike theoretical subjects, physical education requires GVs to not only have a solid grasp of their subject matter but also the ability to organize space, apply support tools and design experiential activities for each group of learners. However, currently, physical education GVs have not received adequate investment in academics and there are no advanced training courses in the direction of active pedagogical approaches or the application of educational technology (ICT in PE). This is in stark contrast to international trends, where retraining GVs towards personalized education and digital transformation is seen as a strategic priority (Kempson *et al*., 2024) [5].

4. Low student motivation and learning attitude

SVs' learning attitudes towards physical education clearly reflect the gap between holistic educational philosophy and its implementation in university settings. The rate of SVs being disinterested or learning perfunctorily is very high and this undermines the effectiveness of any methodological innovation on the part of GVs. As Sliwa, *et al*. (2015) pointed out, physical learning is effective only when SVs feel empowered, have choice and see the personal value of the subject.

The reasons for SVs' lack of interest are not only due to personal perception, but also related to unattractive classroom organization, repetitive teaching content, lack of practical application and disconnection with the need for skill development. In addition, pressure from specialized subjects, the culture of "competing for grades" and a tight schedule also make physical education a burden rather than an opportunity to exercise. This requires schools to have a strategy to integrate physical education into life skills education programs, character development and mental and physical health care, to enhance the attractiveness and necessity of the subject.

5. Lack of motivation in organizational policies and culture

The results of the survey of managers show a lack of specialized development policies for physical education, from development strategies, budget investment, to innovative lecturer reward mechanisms. This is a clear manifestation of the fact that physical education has not been positioned as a key component of comprehensive higher education.

In addition, the cultural environment of non-specialized schools still lacks symbols, activities, or communication messages to raise awareness and form physical training habits for SVs. There is no connection between formal teaching and movement activities, no system of evaluating output capacity according to physical criteria, all leading to the situation of physical education being "separated from the mainstream of higher education".

International experience shows that in countries such as Japan, Canada, Finland..., the innovation of physical education is always accompanied by reforms in policies, organizational culture and assessment systems, not stopping at changing the classroom level. The lack of organizational motivation is the underlying reason why methodological innovation cannot "take root" in the academic environment.

Conclusion

Thus, the innovation of physical education teaching methods at non-specialized universities not only faces barriers from lecturers or facilities, but also originates from institutional structures, management thinking and school

culture. These factors do not exist separately but have negative interactions and resonances, forming a vicious cycle that hinders sustainable innovation. The core problem does not lie in individual capacity, but in the lack of consistency in educational thinking, when physical education is considered peripheral, lacking investment mechanisms and lacking organizational motivation. To overcome that, it is necessary to have a comprehensive approach from the policy management level, innovating lecturer training, improving material conditions, changing learners' attitudes and restructuring university education culture towards promoting comprehensive human development.

References

1. Duc HH, *et al*. Changing the methods of higher education necessity barriers difficulties and solution. Journal of Natural Remedies,2020:21(8(1)):150–162.
2. Dyson B, Kempson *et al*. Cooperative learning in physical education and physical activity a practical introduction. Routledge, 2024.
3. Hang LT, *et al*. Building strong teaching and learning strategies through teaching innovations and learners' creativity a study of Vietnam universities. International Journal of Education and Practice,2020:8(3):498–510.
4. Hong VV. Identify methods of teaching and learning to create interest self study and creativity of students. Humanities Social Sciences Reviews,2020:8(3):646–656.
5. Kempson Onadeko, Walker TJ, Craig DW, Pavlovic A, Szeszulski J, DeFina LF, *et al*. Comparing the use and effectiveness of in person and remote physical education delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic. American Journal of Health Education,2024:55(1):24–32.
6. Kirk D. Physical education futures. Routledge,2010.
7. Luongngoc V, *et al*. O papel educacional das redes sociais na comunicação de políticas no Vietnã. Revista on Line de Política e Gestão Educacional,2022:26(e1):022037.
8. Metzler MW. Instructional models for physical education. Pearson Education, 2011.
9. Ministry of Education and Training. Decision No. 14/2001/QDBGD, DT dated May 3 2001 of the Minister of Education and Training on promulgating the regulations on physical education and school health. Hanoi, 2001.
10. Ministry of Education and Training. Circular No. 07/2015/TT-BGDDT dated April 16 2015 regulating the minimum knowledge competency requirements for SVs to achieve after graduation for each training level of higher education and the process of developing appraising and issuing training programs for university master's and doctoral levels. Hanoi, 2015.
11. Ministry of Education and Training. Circular No. 25/2015/TT-BGDDT dated October 14 2015 regulating the physical education course program of university training programs. Hanoi, 2015.
12. Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnam. Curriculum framework for physical education in higher education. Hanoi, 2019.
13. Ministry of Education and Training. Guidelines for implementing physical education and sports in higher education institutions. Hanoi, 2022.
14. Prime Minister. Decree No. 11/2015/ND-CP dated January 31 2015 regulating physical education and sports activities in schools. Hanoi, 2015.
15. Stolz SA. The philosophy of physical education a new perspective. Routledge, 2020.
16. Sliwa S, Nihiser A, Lee S, McCaughtry N, Culp B, Michael S. Engaging SVs in physical education key challenges and opportunities for physical educators in urban settings. Journal of Physical Education Recreation Dance,2017:88(3):43–48.
17. Vu V. Education policy in the context of Vietnam's international integration problems raised and proposed solutions. International Journal of Health Sciences,2022:6(S4):3562–3571.
18. Vu V. Management of educational activities in schools towards the approach of learners' competency a case study of a high school. Nuances Estudos Sobre Educação,2022:32(00):021005.
19. World Health Organization. Global action plan on physical activity 2018–2030 more active people for a healthier world. World Health Organization,2018.