Journal of Education and e-Learning Research
Vol. 13, No. 1, 48-54, 2026
ISSN(E) 2410-9991 / ISSN(P) 2518-0169
DOI: 10.20448/jeelr.v13i1.8214

Challenges in pedagogy education: A quantitative study of lecturer and student perspectives at Vietnamese pedagogical universities

Linh Thuy Le[1]
Thanh Thi Nguyen[2] ✉
Hang Thi Thuy Vu[3]
Linh Thi Kim Ha[4]


(✉ Corresponding Author)

[1,4]*Thai Nguyen University of Education, Thai Nguyen University, Thai Nguyen Province, Vietnam.*
[1]*Email: linhlt@tnue.edu.vn*
[4]*Email: linhhtk@tnue.edu.vn*
[2]*Hong Duc University, Thanh Hoa Province, Vietnam.*
[2]*Email: nguyenthithanhtlh@gmail.com*
[3]*University of Education, Vietnam National University Hanoi, Hanoi, Vietnam.*
[3]*Email: hangvuthithuy@vnu.edu.vn*

Abstract

Pedagogy is a fundamental component of teacher education in Vietnam. However, both lecturers and students report persistent obstacles such as low student engagement, limited access to authentic practicum settings, and constrained resources. To examine the difficulties experienced by lecturers and students in pedagogy education at five Vietnamese pedagogical universities, as well as to identify systemic and instructional barriers along with actionable recommendations, a cross-sectional quantitative survey was conducted among 50 lecturers and 500 students using structured questionnaires. The survey items covered curriculum scope and pacing, teaching methods, student motivation, resource availability, and assessment practices. Descriptive statistics summarized the responses. Most lecturers identified insufficient student motivation as a significant challenge and noted the absence of practical teaching contexts. More than half of the students considered the pedagogy content overly dense for the allotted time and reported weak learning strategies. Additional issues included unclear assessment criteria, shortages of instructional materials, and variability in lecturers' pedagogical capacity. Both individual and structural constraints such as limited student engagement, inadequate instructional support, curriculum overload, and scarce practice opportunities, hamper pedagogy education. Addressing these challenges requires curriculum streamlining, stronger school–university partnerships to expand practicum experiences, investment in teaching resources, adoption of student-centered pedagogies, and targeted support for student learning and faculty development.

Keywords: Curriculum design, Instructional quality, Learning difficulties, Pedagogy, Students, Teacher education.

Citation | Le, L. T., Nguyen, T. T., Vu, H. T. T., & Ha, L. T. K. (2026). Challenges in pedagogy education: A quantitative study of lecturer and student perspectives at Vietnamese pedagogical universities. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research, 13*(1), 48-54. 10.20448/jeelr.v13i1.8214
History:
Received: 17 June 2025
Revised: 12 December 2025
Accepted: 26 January 2026
Published: 20 February 2026

Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

Funding: This research did not receive any financial support.
Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was approved by the Education and Research Council of Thai Nguyen University, under protocol number (963/2008/QĐ-ĐHTN-SĐH), dated October 30, 2008. Informed verbal consent was obtained from all participants, and all data were anonymized to protect participant confidentiality.
Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.
Disclosure of AI Use: The authors used OpenAI's ChatGPT to refine grammar and enhance fluency in the Introduction and Discussion sections. All outputs were reviewed, validated, and revised by the authors to ensure accuracy and originality.

Contents

Contribution of this paper to the literature

This study advances the literature by providing empirical evidence on systemic and instructional barriers in Vietnamese pedagogy education. By integrating lecturer–student perspectives across five universities, it identifies curriculum overload, limited practicum access, and motivational deficits, offering context-specific, actionable recommendations to strengthen teacher preparation in resource-constrained settings.

1. Introduction

The cultivation of proficient and versatile educators has always been a fundamental component in the advancement of a nation's educational framework. In Vietnam, educational reform is vigorously promoted under the National Education Development Strategy 2021–2030, with teacher education recognized as a strategic priority. Pedagogical universities and faculties of education bear the essential responsibility of training future educators to meet the demands of a rapidly evolving socio-economic environment, the increasing need for digital proficiency, and the transition toward learner-centered educational frameworks (Oguntoye, 2024; Upadhyaya, 2024). At the core of this preparation is pedagogy an academic discipline that offers theoretical frameworks and underpins students' professional identities and teaching philosophies.

Pedagogy, a fundamental component of teacher training programs, provides students with an understanding of teaching and learning theories, curriculum development, lesson planning, classroom management, learner psychology, and educational ethics. Nonetheless, despite its significance, pedagogy is frequently seen by both instructors and students as challenging to teach and understand proficiently (Nguyen, 2017). In Vietnam, numerous students pursuing education majors encounter difficulties in pedagogy courses owing to the abstract nature of the topic, insufficient exposure to practical teaching contexts, and conventional teaching methods that prioritize rote memorization over active learning. These issues illustrate a pervasive problem in Vietnamese higher education, wherein the curriculum implementation at teacher training institutions remains predominantly theoretical and inadequately aligned with the practicalities of classroom instruction.

The literature on teacher education in Vietnam identifies several systemic barriers that impact the quality of pedagogical instruction. Students face challenges such as insufficient autonomous learning abilities, diminished academic motivation, and uncertainty regarding learning objectives and professional applicability (Cook & Artino Jr, 2016; Hung, 2011; Phuong et al., 2020). Students frequently gain admission to pedagogical colleges through low-competition pathways, resulting in insufficient academic readiness and a lack of internal motivation to engage with abstract educational theories. Many individuals express confusion regarding the relationship between pedagogical theory and practical teaching, especially when there are limited opportunities for field experience, practice teaching, or observation of exemplary classes (Bullock, 2004; Le, 2013). These experiences corroborate Korthagen (2010) assertion that student teachers most effectively acquire pedagogical knowledge when it is intimately connected to practice via organized reflection, observation, and mentoring.

Instructors also face numerous obstacles in providing effective pedagogical education. Some individuals lack expertise in active or competency-based pedagogical methods and persist in utilizing traditional lecture formats that restrict student interaction (Alkhurayyif, 2023; Le, Wolfe, & Steinberg, 2014). Others are impeded by institutional constraints, such as antiquated curricula, ambiguous assessment criteria, insufficient teaching resources, and overcrowded classrooms that hinder individualized instruction. Despite the emphasis on competency-based education (CBE) in recent Vietnamese educational policies, numerous instructors report feeling unprepared or unsupported in its practical implementation (Dias-Lacy & Guirguis, 2017; Le, 2011). Furthermore, a disparity persists between curricular objectives and assessment frameworks: whereas the curriculum seeks to cultivate professional competencies, assessments frequently remain summative, emphasizing memory over applied comprehension (Carr & Harris, 2001; Nhat, 2021).

A significant challenge in pedagogy education is the disjunction between theory and practice. Theoretical instruction occurs in formal classroom environments, but opportunities for practical application are constrained by brief practicum durations and insufficient connections between pedagogical universities and practice schools (Vick, 2006; White & Forgasz, 2016). This disconnection is especially concerning given that the new general education curriculum (Ministry of Education and Training (MOET), 2018) prioritizes experiential and project-based learning, necessitating teachers to employ methodologies in which they may have had minimal exposure or practice. In the absence of explicit opportunities to observe authentic classroom dynamics, formulate context-specific lesson plans, and receive feedback from mentor teachers, pre-service educators may graduate underprepared to navigate the many social and instructional challenges of modern classrooms.

Assessment methods in pedagogy courses exacerbate learning challenges. Students often indicate that evaluation criteria lack clarity, assessment assignments are redundant, and feedback is insufficient (Arter & McTighe, 2001; Sadler, 2009). In turn, lecturers frequently have difficulties in creating formative exams that effectively reflect students' pedagogical reasoning or advancement. According to Sadler (1983) and Chung, Chen, and Olson (2021) and Earl and Katz (2008), evaluations should be explicitly connected to learning objectives, designed to facilitate self-monitoring, and administered promptly to encourage reflection and revision. In several Vietnamese teacher education programs, elevated student-to-teacher ratios and inadequate technical resources hinder the establishment of more individualized and constructive feedback systems.

Given these numerous hurdles, empirical studies are required to comprehensively investigate the difficulties encountered by both students and lecturers in the field of Pedagogy education. Current research predominantly emphasizes either student involvement or instructional quality, seldom examining the perceptions and experiences of both groups within the same teaching-learning process. This study investigates the common and distinct issues faced by lecturers and students engaged in Pedagogy education at five prominent pedagogical institutes in Vietnam. The study aims to identify specific barriers, including curricular design, instructional methodology, and student motivation, to enhance teacher training programs, support curriculum reform initiatives, and ultimately strengthen the preparation of future educators in Vietnam.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

This study involved 550 individuals, including instructors and students from pedagogical institutes across Vietnam. The sample consisted of 50 lecturers and 500 students, all engaged in teaching or studying within Education programs. Participants were selected from five prominent institutions to ensure geographic and institutional diversity. Data were specifically collected from 10 lecturers and 100 students at the following institutions: University of Education – Thai Nguyen University, Xuan Hoa University of Education, Faculty of Education – Can Tho University, Faculty of Education – Hong Duc University – Thanh Hoa, and Vinh University of Education – Vinh University. The student participants were enrolled in Education programs, while the lecturers were involved in teaching courses related to Education. The participant selection aimed to provide a comprehensive and representative overview of viewpoints within Vietnam's educational system, covering the northern, central, and southern regions.

2.2. Measurement

The data for this study were collected through two structured questionnaires designed for distinct participant roles: one for university teaching personnel and another for university students who had pursued education studies. The questionnaires were developed following a review of relevant literature and expert consultation to ensure content validity and relevance to pedagogical instruction. The lecturer questionnaire focused on several critical areas, including teaching experience, curriculum design and implementation, assessments of student readiness, evaluation techniques, and opinions regarding the effectiveness of existing educational programs. It also covered aspects related to the use of educational technologies, professional development opportunities, and institutional support for faculty. The student questionnaire aimed to assess students' perceptions of the quality of their educational experience, including their interest in coursework, instructional methods used by lecturers, accessibility of practical training, and overall satisfaction with the program. Additional items examined students' self-assessed preparedness for teaching practice, challenges faced during their studies, and perceptions of support from instructors and peers. The questionnaires employed a combination of Likert-scale items, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended responses to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. The Likert-scale items ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), enabling a comprehensive analysis of attitudes and perceptions. The collected data were systematically coded and analyzed using statistical techniques, including descriptive statistics to summarize participant responses and inferential statistics to identify significant patterns and relationships. This methodology ensured that the results were reliable and meaningful in representing the current state of pedagogical education at the participating institutions.

2.3. Procedures

The research was conducted in multiple phases to ensure a methodical and reliable data collection process. Initially, two distinct questionnaires were developed one for university lecturers in education faculties and another for students enrolled in education programs. A panel of experts in educational research reviewed these instruments to confirm their content validity, clarity, and consistency with the study's objectives.

After completing the questionnaires, the researchers contacted the administrations of five pedagogical universities to obtain approval and coordinate the dissemination of survey forms. Once institutional approval was secured, the researchers administered the lecturer and student questionnaires at the following institutions: University of Education – Thai Nguyen University, Xuan Hoa University of Education, Faculty of Education – Can Tho University, Faculty of Education – Hong Duc University – Thanh Hoa, and Vinh University of Education – Vinh University.

Data collection occurred in person during designated sessions at each university. Before distributing the surveys, participants received an overview of the study's objectives, guidance for completing the forms, and assurances of anonymity and voluntary participation. All participants provided informed consent.

Participants were allotted ample time to independently complete the surveys, while research team members were present on-site to address any inquiries. Upon completion, the surveys were gathered and securely stored for analysis.

The finalized survey responses were subsequently assembled, coded, and input into a statistical software tool for analysis. Mathematical statistical approaches were employed to examine the data, utilizing both descriptive and inferential techniques to discern significant trends, patterns, and discrepancies in views between lecturers and students. The comprehensive study method complied with ethical guidelines for studies involving human participants.

2.4. Data Analysis

Upon gathering the completed questionnaires from both instructors and students, all responses were meticulously coded and entered into a statistical database to ensure accuracy and consistency in data processing. The data analysis employed statistical methods to generate both descriptive and inferential insights into participants' perceptions and experiences in pedagogical education. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the participants. All analyses were conducted in accordance with the research objectives and ethical standards, ensuring that the conclusions drawn were valid, reliable, and based on data collected from the participating educational institutions.

3. Results

The survey findings indicated various challenges faced by lecturers in teaching pedagogy at five pedagogical universities. These challenges illustrate both student-related problems and systemic constraints within educational institutions, highlighting the complexity of providing effective pedagogical instruction in teacher training programs.

Table 1. Difficulties faced by lecturers when teaching pedagogy.

Lecturers' difficulties	*Frequency (n)*	*Percentage (%)*
1. Students are neither active nor self-motivated in their studies.	45	90
2. Students lack the skills to self-study and to organize their learning process in Pedagogy effectively.	34	68
3. The pedagogical capacity of lecturers in teaching pedagogy to promote students' abilities is still limited.	15	30
4. Documents, textbooks, and teaching aids are lacking.	33	66
5. Teachers lack the skills to analyze content and programs effectively and to clearly define teaching objectives.	8	16
6. The criteria for evaluating students' learning outcomes are unclear and not specific.	21	42
7. The content of pedagogy teaching is rich and diverse, but the time spent on pedagogy in teacher training schools is limited.	28	56
8. Lecturers and students lack a practical, comprehensive environment to effectively implement teaching plans.	43	86
Total	*50*	*100*

As shown in Table 1, the main difficulty cited was the lack of student engagement and self-motivation in their studies, with 90% of lecturers (n = 45) recognizing this concern. This research indicates a prevalent apprehension regarding student engagement and intrinsic motivation, both of which are essential for success in self-directed learning contexts characteristic of higher education. In relation to this issue, 86% of professors (n = 43) reported that both lecturers and students lack a practical environment for executing teaching plans. This underscores a notable disparity between theoretical understanding and practical implementation, with limited opportunities for experiential learning in actual educational settings. This absence may impede students' ability to apply pedagogical principles in teaching practice and similarly restrict lecturers from demonstrating real-time instructional tactics. A frequently mentioned challenge was the deficiency of students' self-study and self-organization skills in the Pedagogy learning process, as indicated by 68% of lecturers (n = 34). This highlights the need for enhanced organized support in cultivating students' autonomous learning skills, which are vital for future educators responsible for classroom management and lesson plan development. Furthermore, 66% of lecturers (n = 33) reported a lack of documents, textbooks, and teaching aids, suggesting that many faculties may lack sufficient resources to facilitate effective pedagogical instruction. This constraint could hinder content dissemination and the development of dynamic pedagogical approaches that depend on diverse instructional resources. A significant percentage of lecturers (56%, n = 28) agreed that although the content of Pedagogy is extensive and varied, the time allocated for Pedagogy in teacher training programs is inadequate. This indicates that curriculum design may not fully align with the requirements for developing proficient future educators, especially considering the extensive content necessary in this domain. Some challenges were reported less frequently but remain significant. For example, 42% of lecturers (n = 21) perceived the criteria for assessing students' learning outcomes as ambiguous or nonspecific, which may lead to inconsistencies in evaluation and confusing expectations for students. Additionally, 30% of lecturers (n = 15) acknowledged that their pedagogical proficiency in teaching Pedagogy to enhance student capacity remains insufficient, highlighting the need for targeted professional development and support. Ultimately, only 16% of lecturers (n = 8) indicated challenges in analyzing curriculum content, designing programs, and articulating teaching objectives, suggesting that while these skills are generally well-developed among participants, there is room for improvement in instructional planning abilities.

These data indicate that student preparedness, resource availability, institutional support, and professional capability are fundamental elements affecting the efficacy of pedagogy instruction. Addressing these issues requires a multifaceted strategy, including curriculum reform, increased investment in educational resources, greater access to practical teaching situations, and enhanced training for both students and instructors.

The results of the student survey indicate a complex array of challenges faced by students in managing their learning activities within Pedagogy courses. These challenges highlight significant issues related to motivation, learning methodologies, curriculum development, pedagogical approaches, and resource accessibility.

Table 2. Difficulties faced by students when organizing learning activities in pedagogy.

Student's difficulties	*Frequency (n)*	*Percentage (%)*
1. Students themselves are not actively studying, lack motivation, and have little interest in learning.	275	55.6
2. Students do not have a general learning method or a specific learning method for pedagogy.	280	56.0
3. Students lack materials and tools to support teaching and learning activities.	113	22.6
4. The content of the Education subject is too lengthy and complex, but the time allocated to the subject is insufficient.	293	58.6
5. Lecturers lack effective measures to manage students' self-study effectively.	218	43.6
6. Lecturers apply and combine inappropriate teaching methods.	63	12.6
7. The content, methods, and forms of assessment used by lecturers do not motivate students.	130	26.0
8. The lecturer does not provide criteria for evaluating students' learning outcomes.	130	26.0
Total	*500*	*100*

As shown in Table 2, a majority of students, 55.6% (n = 275), indicated that they are not engaged in active study and exhibit a deficiency in motivation and interest in learning. The absence of intrinsic drive constitutes a significant obstacle to successful learning and engagement in the subject. Motivation is acknowledged as a pivotal element in academic achievement, and these findings suggest that a considerable percentage of pedagogical education students find it challenging to sustain the enthusiasm required for profound learning. Directly related to motivational

challenges, 56.0% of students (n = 280) reported lacking a general learning approach or specialized skills for studying pedagogy. This indicates a deficiency in students' self-regulated learning abilities and their capacity to modify study strategies to meet the specific requirements of educational content. The lack of efficient learning methods might hinder students' ability to understand complex theories, apply concepts practically, and engage critically with course materials. Concerns regarding the curriculum were also significant. A majority of students, 58.6% (n = 293), indicated that the material of the education subject is excessively lengthy and challenging, while the time allocated for the subject is inadequate. This signifies a discrepancy between the scope and depth of curricular content and the available instructional time. The excessive amount of material presented within limited timeframes may overwhelm students, leading to superficial understanding instead of mastery. These curricular difficulties may increase stress and reduce students' ability to engage meaningfully with the content. Regarding instructional support, 43.6% of students (n = 218) perceived that lecturers fail to employ appropriate strategies for managing students' self-study effectively. Effective self-study management includes time management, study planning, and progress monitoring—areas in which students clearly perceive a lack of support. This deficiency hampers students' ability to organize their learning efficiently and achieve academic success. Material resources also present issues. Approximately 22.6% of students (n = 113) indicated a lack of teaching and learning resources and tools, which impairs their capacity to fully engage with course content and practical exercises. Insufficient learning resources can diminish educational quality and hinder the acquisition of essential skills, especially in pedagogy, which relies on diverse instructional media and practical experience. Several students expressed concerns regarding pedagogical approaches. Specifically, 12.6% (n = 63) perceived that lecturers employ unsuitable or inadequate pedagogical techniques. Ineffective teaching methods can reduce student involvement and understanding, particularly when instructional techniques do not align with students' learning needs or neglect active, student-centered approaches. Assessment methodologies were another area of concern. Approximately 26.0% of students (n = 130) reported that the material, methodologies, and assessment formats used by lecturers fail to motivate them. Additionally, the same percentage indicated that instructors do not provide clear criteria for evaluating students' learning outcomes. These findings suggest that assessment practices lack transparency and relevance, which can undermine student motivation and create ambiguity regarding expectations and performance standards.

Collectively, these data demonstrate a multifaceted interaction of student-related, instructional, and curricular elements that obstruct successful learning organization in Pedagogy courses. Confronting these problems necessitates a holistic strategy, encompassing the cultivation of student motivation, provision of effective learning methodologies, revision of curricular material and pacing, enhancement of pedagogical practices, and augmentation of the clarity and motivational efficacy of assessments.

4. Discussion

This study elucidates a variety of interconnected issues encountered by both lecturers and students in pedagogy instruction at pedagogical universities. These findings align with extensive research on teacher education, which identifies motivation, learning strategies, curriculum design, instructional resources, assessment, and the capacity of teacher educators as critical factors affecting the efficacy of teacher training programs.

A prominent challenge is the issue of student motivation and involvement. Instructors observe that students demonstrate insufficient active engagement and intrinsic motivation in their educational pursuits, a view supported by students who report minimal interest and passion for their studies. Motivation is a fundamental element in educational psychology, essential for fostering sustained learning efforts and academic success (Alexander & Winne, 2012; Osborne & Jones, 2011; Salkind, 2008). Inadequate motivation may lead pupils to choose superficial learning strategies, thereby diminishing the depth and quality of their comprehension. Furthermore, motivation is intricately linked to self-regulated learning behaviors, including goal setting, strategic planning, and self-monitoring, which are crucial for success in higher education, especially in professional domains such as education, where independent learning and reflection are highly valued (Kadri, 2019; Zhao & Wang, 2025).

Alongside motivational hurdles, both instructors and students recognize deficiencies in students' learning strategies and organizational abilities. The absence of effective study strategies among students and their challenges in managing learning activities indicate a deficiency in metacognitive and self-regulatory skills. These skills are essential for mastering complex, theory-based fields like Pedagogy, where students must synthesize conceptual understanding with practical implementation (Demagny-Warmoes, Duchadeau, Quindroit, & Colson, 2025; Sohdi, 2025). The literature emphasizes the importance of explicitly developing these abilities within teacher education curricula, as students often enter programs inadequately prepared for the demands of autonomous and reflective learning (Saroyan & Frenay, 2023).

The research additionally uncovers systemic limitations pertaining to curriculum development and educational resources. Instructors regard the Pedagogy curriculum as comprehensive and content-rich; however, it is constrained by limited instructional time, a sentiment mirrored by students who consider the material challenging and dense relative to the designated study periods (Casey, 2011). This curricular overload may result in cognitive strain and diminish opportunities for substantive engagement with the material, thereby compromising learning outcomes (Gkintoni, Antonopoulou, Sortwell, & Halkiopoulos, 2025). These findings emphasize the necessity of curriculum evaluation and reform to align subject difficulty with teaching duration, facilitating enhanced understanding and practical skill acquisition.

The scarcity of educational resources, tools, and actual teaching situations exacerbates these challenges. The deficiency of adequate instructional resources and practical environments impedes lecturers' capacity to provide effective teaching and students' ability to integrate theory with practice. This difficulty aligns with research indicating that effective teacher education significantly depends on access to diverse teaching resources and genuine practice opportunities, which are crucial for developing proficient educators (Darling-Hammond, 2016; Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017).

Assessment practices represent a domain requiring enhancement. Both lecturers and students articulate concerns regarding the clarity and motivational efficacy of evaluation criteria. Effective assessment measures learning outcomes while simultaneously motivating students and guiding their learning processes (Dörnyei, 2000; Suskie, 2018). The identified absence of clear, explicit evaluation criteria and inadequately compelling assessment formats

indicates a disconnect between assessment and learning objectives as well as student requirements. Enhancing assessment processes through the provision of explicit standards and constructive feedback can elevate student motivation and the quality of learning.

A significant discovery pertains to the educational competencies of lecturers themselves. Some lecturers recognize difficulties in facilitating student development, accurately assessing course content, and delineating instructional objectives. This highlights a vital, yet often neglected, aspect of teacher education: the professional development of teacher educators. Effective instruction in teacher education requires the continuous improvement of educators' pedagogical skills, subject matter knowledge, and ability to promote student-centered learning (Dole, Bloom, & Kowalske, 2016; Hoidn & Reusser, 2020). Facilitating lecturers with specialized training and professional development opportunities is crucial to guarantee exemplary pedagogical instruction that exemplifies best practices for prospective educators.

The data collectively illustrate a multifaceted ecosystem of elements influencing pedagogy, teaching, and learning. Student-level challenges, such as motivation and learning skills, combine with institutional issues, including curricular requirements, resource availability, assessment techniques, and lecturer proficiency. Resolving these interrelated difficulties requires a thorough and systematic strategy. Curricular reform must strive to balance subject richness with instructional duration and incorporate explicit instruction in learning methodologies. Investment in educational resources and the establishment of practical teaching environments are essential to enhance the learning experience. Improving assessment processes to be clear, formative, and motivating can further facilitate student learning. Concurrent professional development for educators can enhance their pedagogical effectiveness and promote student capabilities (Heller, Daehler, Wong, Shinohara, & Miratrix, 2012; Kunter et al., 2013).

The results of this study include significant *implications* for enhancing pedagogy education at pedagogical universities. These implications pertain to curriculum designers, educational administrators, instructors, and policymakers engaged in teacher training and educational reform. The deficiency in student motivation and constrained self-directed learning abilities indicates an immediate necessity for educational programs to incorporate explicit instruction in learning strategies and self-regulated learning within the curriculum. Students should be instructed to cultivate competencies in goal-setting, time management, reflection, and critical analysis. Incorporating these qualities not only improves their academic performance in pedagogy courses but also equips them to develop similar skills in their future classrooms as educators. Secondly, to address issues of content saturation and limited instructional time, institutions must evaluate and amend the framework and scope of pedagogy courses. This involves optimizing theoretical material, emphasizing essential skills, and integrating experiential learning components. A curriculum that combines conceptual depth with practical application will more effectively meet learners' needs and prepare them for real-world teaching environments. Third, the lack of instructional resources and practical teaching contexts necessitates that universities invest in teaching aids, modern educational materials, and collaborations with schools for student teaching opportunities. Establishing or enhancing teaching laboratories, simulated classrooms, or mentorship programs with experienced educators would provide students with essential practical experience and increase the relevance of pedagogy training. Educational ministries and higher education institutions must recognize the systemic nature of these challenges and commit to comprehensive reforms at multiple levels. This includes allocating funds for educational resources, incentivizing teaching innovation, revising teacher education standards, and promoting collaboration between institutions and schools to ensure coherent and contextually relevant teacher preparation.

This study offers valuable insights into the challenges faced by both lecturers and students in the pedagogy teaching and learning process within pedagogical universities. However, several limitations must be acknowledged. The research primarily relied on self-reported data collected through questionnaires. While this method is effective for gathering information from a large number of participants, it is susceptible to response bias. Participants may have provided socially desirable answers or may not have thoroughly reflected on their teaching and learning experiences, which could affect the accuracy and depth of the findings. Additionally, the study focused exclusively on specific educational universities and faculties within designated regions, which may limit the generalizability of the results. Variations in educational settings, resources, and institutional policies across different universities or regions could mean that the issues identified do not fully represent the circumstances across all teacher education institutions nationwide. Furthermore, the research employed a quantitative survey approach, excluding qualitative methods such as interviews or classroom observations. Although quantitative data helped identify common patterns and concerns, it did not allow for an in-depth exploration of the underlying causes or contextual factors influencing these issues. A mixed-methods approach could have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges. The study also did not examine the potential impact of external factors, such as institutional regulations, cultural expectations, or technological infrastructure, which may significantly influence teaching and learning in pedagogy. These broader contextual elements could offer important insights into the difficulties encountered by educators and students. Lastly, the cross-sectional design of the study captured data at a single point in time, which limits the ability to observe changes or improvements over time. Longitudinal research would be beneficial for tracking developments and identifying long-term patterns, including the effects of new policies, training programs, or student support initiatives.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the difficulties encountered by lecturers and students in the instruction and acquisition of pedagogy in pedagogical universities. The findings indicated that inadequate student motivation, deficient self-study abilities, scarcity of teaching resources, ambiguous assessment criteria, and insufficient practical environments constitute substantial obstacles to effective pedagogy education. Instructors also indicated challenges related to curriculum development, teaching strategies, and their own educational proficiency. These challenges are interconnected and highlight the necessity for systemic enhancements in teacher education programs. Addressing these issues through curricular reforms, resource augmentation, and professional development can improve the quality of pedagogical instruction. Enhancing pedagogy education is essential for preparing competent and thoughtful future educators.

References

Alexander, P. A., & Winne, P. H. (2012). *Handbook of educational psychology*: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874790.

Alkhurayyif, Y. (2023). Students' perceptions of competency-based learning environment during COVID-19: A mixed-methods approach. *Frontiers in Computer Science, 5*, 1204566. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2023.1204566

Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bullock, D. (2004). Moving from theory to practice: An examination of the factors that preservice teachers encounter as the attempt to gain experience teaching with technology during field placement experiences. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 12*(2), 211-237.

Carr, J. F., & Harris, D. E. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Casey, M. (2011). Perceived efficacy and preparedness of beginning teachers to differentiate instruction. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Johnson & Wales University, Providence, RI.

Chung, H. Q., Chen, V., & Olson, C. B. (2021). The impact of self-assessment, planning and goal setting, and reflection before and after revision on student self-efficacy and writing performance. *Reading and Writing, 34*(7), 1885-1913. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10186-x

Cook, D. A., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2016). Motivation to learn: An overview of contemporary theories. *Medical Education, 50*(10), 997-1014. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13074

Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). Research on teaching and teacher education and its influences on policy and practice. *Educational Researcher, 45*(2), 83-91. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16639597

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Demagny-Warmoes, A., Duchadeau, M., Quindroit, P., & Colson, S. (2025). Pedagogical strategies for teaching conceptual models and nursing theories in undergraduate students: A scoping review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16888

Dias-Lacy, S. L., & Guirguis, R. V. (2017). Challenges for new teachers and ways of coping with them. *Journal of Education and Learning, 6*(3), 265-272. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n3p265

Dole, S., Bloom, L., & Kowalske, K. (2016). Transforming pedagogy: Changing perspectives from teacher-centered to learner-centered. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 10*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1538

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation. *British journal of educational psychology, 70*(4), 519-538. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709900158281

Earl, L., & Katz, S. (2008). Getting to the core of learning: Using assessment for self-monitoring and self-regulation. In Unlocking assessment. In (pp. 104-118). London, UK: David Fulton

Gkintoni, E., Antonopoulou, H., Sortwell, A., & Halkiopoulos, C. (2025). Challenging cognitive load theory: The role of educational neuroscience and artificial intelligence in redefining learning efficacy. *Brain Sciences, 15*(2), 203. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci15020203

Heller, J. I., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49*(3), 333-362. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21004

Hoidn, S., & Reusser, K. (2020). Foundations of student-centered learning and teaching. In the Routledge international handbook of student-centered learning and teaching in higher education. In (pp. 17-46). Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Hung, W. (2011). Theory to reality: A few issues in implementing problem-based learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 59*, 529-552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-011-9198-1

Kadri, N. (2019). Implementing student self-assessment to promote self-regulated learning in academic writing within the LMD: Case study: Third year LMD students at the Department of English at the University of Bejaia. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Université Mouloud Mammeri, Tizi-Ouzou, Algeria.

Korthagen, F. A. (2010). How teacher education can make a difference. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*(4), 407-423.

Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T., & Hachfeld, A. (2013). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 805-820. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032583

Le, C., Wolfe, R. E., & Steinberg, A. (2014). *The past and the promise: Today's competency education movement*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

Le, T. L. (2013). Teachers as moral guides: A case study of Vietnamese pre service teachers of English in contemporary Vietnam. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

Le, V. C. (2011). Form-Focused instruction: A case study of Vietnamese teachers' beliefs and practices. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). (2018). *General education curriculum 2018*. Hanoi, Vietnam: Ministry of Education and Training.

Nguyen, H. (2017). Authentic assessment in pedagogy-related modules in teacher education: Vietnamese student teachers' perspective. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

Nhat, N. (2021). A case study of the flipped classroom approach for translation studies in Vietnam. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

Oguntoye, L. A. (2024). Teachers' perceptions of teacher leadership and teacher digital pedagogy in a digital learning environment: A qualitative descriptive study. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Trident University International, Cypress, CA, USA.

Osborne, J. W., & Jones, B. D. (2011). Identification with academics and motivation to achieve in school: How the structure of the self influences academic outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review, 23*, 131-158. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9151-1

Phuong, N. T. A., Trang, H. T. T., Duc, T. N. M., Nguyet, T. T., Hang, T. T., Thao, N. T. T., & Huy, N. V. Q. (2020). Exploring learning strategies of nursing students at Hue university of medicine and pharmacy, Vietnam. *Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 7*(2), 74-85. https://doi.org/10.24313/jpbl.2020.00276

Sadler, D. R. (1983). Evaluation and the improvement of academic learning. *The Journal of Higher Education, 54*(1), 60-79. https://doi.org/10.2307/1981645

Sadler, D. R. (2009). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education, 34*(2), 159-179. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801956059

Salkind, N. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of educational psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Saroyan, A., & Frenay, M. (2023). *Building teaching capacities in higher education: A comprehensive international model*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Sohdi, R. (2025). A design-based approach to bridging the gap between university learning and classroom pedagogy in Initial teacher education. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*(34). https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi34.1376

Suskie, L. (2018). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Upadhyaya, H. (2024). *Digital education and economic transformation: Bridging the gap*. New Delhi, India: Meadow Publication.

Vick, M. (2006). "It's a difficult matter": Historical perspectives on the enduring problem of the practicum in teacher preparation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(2), 181-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660600720579

White, S., & Forgasz, R. (2016). he practicum: The place of experience? In International handbook of teacher education. In (Vol. 1, pp. 231-266). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer

Zhao, C., & Wang, Y. (2025). A comprehensive assessment of self-leadership among students in China's ethnic regions: Insights and implications for higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 50*(3), 615-637. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2349662