Article

Development of Essential Competences for the Success of Inclusive Quality Teaching–Learning Processes in Higher Education

Eduardo García-Toledano *[ID], Andrea Gracia-Zomeño *[ID], Ángel Luis González-Olivares [ID] and Ascensión Palomares-Ruiz [ID]

Departamento de Pedagogía, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 02071 Albacete, Spain; aluis.gonzalez@uclm.es (Á.L.G.-O.); ascension.palomares@uclm.es (A.P.-R.)
* Correspondence: eduardo.gtoledano@uclm.es (E.G.-T.); andrea.gracia@uclm.es (A.G.-Z.)

Abstract: Currently, the development of key competences has become a fundamental priority to ensure the success of inclusive quality teaching–learning processes at all levels of education. This research proposes a quantitative observational study that involved 446 Spanish, Chilean and Mexican individuals, using the INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire. Education is fundamental to provide citizens with the skills inside and outside the classroom. For this reason, the research focuses on the teachers' perception of university students' skills to develop Personal, Social and Learning to Learn (PSLL) competence: initiating learning, managing time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning. It was found that women (vs. men), older participants (vs. younger participants) and participants with 16–25 years of experience (vs. those with 0–5 years of experience) perceive that university students have greater knowledge and skills to deploy PSLL. The conclusion highlights the importance of teacher guidance and support, as well as expectations in relation to learners' development of the skills that make up PSLL.

Keywords: higher education; teaching and learning; personal, social and learning to learn competence; quality education; teacher perception

1. Introduction

Today's knowledge society is characterized by globalization, the evolution of information and communication technologies (ICT) and the connection between different cultures. Therefore, there is a need to adapt education systems and change the vision projected towards education to meet the emerging demands of the 21st century [1,2].

Education, in this context, has shifted from an approach focused exclusively on teachers and the transmission of knowledge to one that prioritizes students and, consequently, the comprehensive development of socioemotional and cognitive aspects that favors creativity, adaptation and resilience in an environment of constant change [3,4]. To ensure the implementation of educational methods in which students are the protagonists, teachers must promote the active generation of knowledge, based on the analysis of social challenges and the dynamics of the world itself [5]. Specifically, higher education is required based on the promotion of transversal competences, with the intention of preparing students to assume roles of leadership and individual and shared responsibility in a society that is continuously and constantly evolving [6].

The development of a set of key competences is now a priority for the success of inclusive and quality teaching and learning processes (whatever the level of education), as the demand for knowledge, skills and/or abilities continues to increase steadily in the European Union [7]. The concept of competences implies the ability of a citizen or a group of citizens to use their acquired knowledge, skills and attitudes to face and solve a challenging

situation [8]. At the same time, several values are necessary for inclusive environments, such as empathy, respect, tolerance, generosity and visible social engagement [9].

According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the education systems of any Member State (including Spain, Mexico, Chile, among others) have to deploy key competences, ensuring possibilities for students to learn and maintain them. According to the conceptual framework for competence assessment proposed by UNESCO, three categories of competences can be considered: potential to act + academic/technical content (know-how), potential to act + context (key competences) and potential to act + academic/technical content + situation (situational competences). Know-how competences include cognitive, gestural and technical competences (in vocational training and technical training). In terms of generic competences, the following competences stand out: organizational competences, socio-emotional competences, psycho-emotional competences and functional competences. In the field of situational competences, there are terminal competences and integration situations [10].

Furthermore, the European Commission states that "promoting the development of competences is one of the objectives of the approach towards a European Education Area" [11] (p. 1). The Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for a Democratic Culture sets out the following key competences: multilingual competence, literacy competence, mathematical competence and competence in science, technology and engineering, digital competence, citizenship competence, entrepreneurial competence, competence in cultural awareness and expression and PSLL competence [11].

According to some research, contextualized in Mexico, Spain and Chile, professional competences integrate different types of knowledge and are divided into five types: key, generic, specific, professional and occupational. In this context, the aforementioned key or basic competences correspond to knowing how to do, knowing how to be and knowing how to act [12]. Key competences are essential for children, young people and adults to participate fully in a constantly changing society. Education and training are essential to equip citizens with these competences both in and out of the classroom and even in the work market. A huge effort is therefore required to ensure that the various education systems successfully deliver the skills that are essential in today's world. Furthermore, curricula must be made comprehensive, encompassing these competences, to achieve inclusive quality education [7].

Moreover, to successfully achieve the key competences, it is crucial to implement pedagogical strategies that encourage students' participation in the construction of their own knowledge, through practical experiences, social interaction and critical reflection. Direct experimentation and reflective analysis of specific experiences are also important, with the intention of acquiring and applying acquired knowledge effectively [13,14].

In this regard, this article pays special attention to the Personal, Social and Learning to Learn (PSLL) competence, which is composed of three areas: personal, social and learning to learn. According to the European Parliament and Council, PSLL is a skill that enables constructive collaboration, time, information and learning management, as well as the ability to reflect on oneself and maintain resilience [11].

It should be stressed that this article arises from the need to find out teachers' perceptions of the skills that students possess to develop PSLL, managing time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning [15]. Firstly, the ability to initiate learning implies maintaining a proactive attitude towards continuous and lifelong learning, as well as adapting to new challenges autonomously [16]. Secondly, the ability to manage time involves organized planning, as well as prioritization of tasks and responsibilities. Thirdly, the ability to manage information implies a critical evaluation of the reliability of the data obtained and the integration of the same during the learning process. Finally, the ability to manage self-regulated learning involves the development of metacognitive skills in a process of self-reflection and action on one's own learning [17].

The gap in the research lies in the lack of studies that address the perception of university teachers on the development of the four skills (initiating learning, managing

time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning) by students to develop PSLL. Our research aims to fill this gap by applying the INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire, whose last four dimensions (D2, D3, D4 and D5) coincide with these four skills. The research questions that govern our study are as follows: (1) How does the teacher's perception of the skills to develop PSLL in students vary depending on their own gender? (2) Is there a correlation between the age of the teachers and their perception of the students' development of PSLL? (3) How does teachers' perception of students' PSLL skills vary depending on their teaching experience?

The following sections provide a comprehensive description of the materials and methods used. In addition, the results obtained in dimensions D2, D3, D4 and D5 are detailed, considering variables such as age, gender, teaching experience and PSLL training of the participants. First of all, it should be noted that years of teaching experience can have an impact on the choice of pedagogical methods to implement in the classroom. Some studies show that training in PSLL can significantly improve teachers' ability to design learning activities that favor the development of this competence. That is, the teaching experience can have a positive impact on the deployment of the following capabilities: starting to learn, managing time, managing information and/or managing self-regulated learning [18,19]. Secondly, it should be noted that gender can also have an impact on the teacher's perception of students' skills to develop PSLL. Some studies show that women have less confidence in making decisions based on information. Meanwhile, men tend to have less confidence in their ability to innovate or initiate learning, as well as when it comes to taking responsibilities [20]. Teachers' greater or less confidence in their abilities (depending on gender) could influence their perception of students' PSLL development, as well as their expectations.

In addition, an analysis of the key observations identified is carried out, leading to the presentation of several relevant conclusions. Limitations of the study are also addressed, and a prospective view is offered in terms of future research and possible areas of development in the field of study.

2. Materials and Methods

The research proposes a quantitative observational study, which is part of the R + D + i Research Project: incidence of teacher entrepreneurship on the success of a quality inclusive school in Castilla-La Mancha (SBPLY/19/180501/000149). Specifically, this proposal aims to find out the teachers' perception of the skills that students have to develop Personal, Social and Learning to Learn competence: initiating learning, managing time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning.

This study will analyze the dimensions D2 = P23–P28 = initiate learning, D3 = P29–P33 = manage time, D4 = P34–38 = manage information and D5 = P39–P43 = manage self-regulated learning, which are composed of the following items:

- P23 = Awareness of their own capacities (emotional, physical and intellectual).
- P24 = They show an attitude of personal competence.
- P25 = They are able to initiate learning and learn effectively and autonomously.
- P26 = They learn with their goals and needs in mind.
- P27 = They get involved with others in activities.
- P28 = They carry out collaborative and cooperative work.
- P29 = Find out what they waste their time on.
- P30 = Distinguish urgent tasks from important ones.
- P31 = Learn how to manage task load, setting time limits.
- P32 = Avoid postponing obligations and/or tasks.
- P33 = Create routines for effective time management.
- P34 = They search for information in an analytical way.
- P35 = They select information according to different criteria.
- P36 = Organize information for learning according to their interests.
- P37 = Integrates new information with previous knowledge and/or experience.

- P38 = They seek advice and self-criticism.
- P39 = They show awareness of their capabilities and limitations.
- P40 = Transform their personal abilities into academic skills.
- P41 = They are able to regulate cognitive processes, such as attention, memory and comprehension.
- P42 = Learning to regulate emotional responses.
- P43 = They select balanced motivational situations.

The first dimension of the questionnaire constitutes another study, which is also part of the above-mentioned research project.

2.1. Participants

A total of 446 Spanish, Chilean and Mexican individuals participated in the present study. Although the majority of participants were Spanish speakers, participation was not limited to Spanish speakers only. We included people with different mother tongues who were nonetheless proficient in Spanish. This broader approach allowed us to capture the linguistic and cultural diversity of the participants.

Participants were selected by convenience, considering their availability and accessibility, and their acceptance to take part in the study was considered. The number of participants from Mexico and Chile was lower compared to Spain, mainly due to practical constraints related to the availability and accessibility of individuals willing to collaborate in our research.

All participants belonged to the educational sector (regardless of their university of origin), and their participation was anonymous and voluntary. Specifically, the group consisted of 260 women and 186 men. The majority of participants ranged in age from 36 to 45 years and had between 16 and 25 years of teaching experience. In terms of qualifications, these ranged from bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees related to the field of education.

2.2. Variables

The present project made use of the INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire [21], which consisted of 44 items distributed in five different dimensions. The first dimension, called D1 = teacher's perception of learners' overall development of PSLL, consisted of 22 items. Dimension D2 = initiating learning included 6 items, while dimensions D3 = managing time, D4 = managing information and D5 = managing self-regulated learning had 5 items each. However, item 44 of the questionnaire was not aligned with any of the dimensions and asked participants to rank the 4 competences (addressed in D3, D4 and D5) according to the learners' abilities.

Participants rated each item using a Likert scale from 1 to 5 to express their degree of agreement, thus generating 43 ordinal variables. To measure the dependent variables, participants' individual ordinal scores were summed and divided by the corresponding number of items in each dimension to standardize the results. Thus, the dependent variables S1–S22t, S23–S28t, S29–S33t, S34–S38t and S39–S43t were obtained, corresponding to dimensions D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5, respectively. In addition, the total dependent variable S1–S43t was created by summing the individual ordinal scores of the 43 questionnaire items and dividing by 43 to standardize them.

On the other hand, the independent variables included: nationality (Chilean, Spanish and Mexican); age (under 25 years, 26–35 years, 36–45 years, 46–55 years and over 56 years); sex (male, female and other); qualification (bachelor, master and other); teaching experience (0–5 years, 6–15 years, 16–25 years and over 26 years); employment status (permanent contract, temporary contract and other); position held in the university center (director, deputy director, secretary and teacher); training in active methodologies (during university studies, during work experience, in other contexts and never); training in PSLL (during university studies, during work experience, in other contexts and never). Each of these independent variables was categorized politically with different response options.

2.3. Instrument

To carry out this project, the INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire was used, focused on highlighting the importance of educational innovation and reflecting on the perception of teachers in relation to the development of Personal, Social and Learning to Learn competence among university students, and designed specifically for this research [21].

In order to ensure the validity of the questionnaire, it was evaluated by 17 experts, which made it possible to calculate a Lawshe Content Validity Index (CVI), suggesting a CVI of 0.51 using 14 experts. The results obtained according to the CVI for each of the dimensions analyzed in this article were 0.93 for D2 and D3, 0.99 for D4 and 0.97 for D5. This indicated the adequacy of the initial items without the need to eliminate any of them [22]. The most relevant qualitative impressions of the experts were considered, and modifications were made to some words in the questionnaire to improve its quality.

The Fleiss Kappa Coefficient was also calculated. The instrument overall obtained an agreement of 0.28 acceptable, in which the Fleiss kappa coefficient stood out with respect to the relevance criterion, whose agreement was 0.34. [21].

In addition, a validation of the questionnaire was carried out through an exploratory factor analysis. The results of the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) test showed a value of 0.917, indicating the suitability of the sample for factor analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity revealed a significance level of 0.000, indicating an adequate suitability for factor analysis. However, the component matrix revealed some correlations between items in two or more factors, and the factor structure obtained did not coincide with the initial dimensional structure before (42 items) and after the expert assessment (44 items) [23,24].

By calculating reliability, we attempted to analyze the stability of the results for future administrations of the questionnaire, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α). The results showed a high level of consistency for the first dimension (0.919) and the total number of items (0.995), exceeding the acceptable limit of 0.70 for reliable consistency [25].

2.4. Procedure

The INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire was created in the period between March and May 2022, and once validated, it was administered through the survey management software Google Forms 0.8 from June to July 2022. During administration, no time limit was imposed, although most respondents took between 15 and 20 min to complete. Anonymity and confidentiality of participants' data were maintained throughout.

To assess the presence of statistically significant differences in the items and dimensions of the questionnaire, an ANOVA test for independent samples was conducted for each of the independent variables. F-statistic values, *p*-significance level and effect size measured by eta squared were calculated using the Multivariate General Linear Model analysis of IBM SPSS Statistics 26 software. Post hoc tests were performed assuming unequal variances through Tamhane's T2, Dunnett's T3, Games–Howell and Dunnett's C statistics, all of which provided similar results that were used to determine the direction in the ANOVA tables corresponding to the seven factors analyzed. Furthermore, due to the non-conformity of the sampling distribution with the normal distribution, which violated the assumptions of parametric methods, we opted to employ statistical techniques of null models through the Monte Carlo simulation method, using the bootstrap procedure [26,27].

3. Results

The results are presented in accordance with the general objective of the present research. Table 1 reflects the descriptive statistics obtained for the 6 items corresponding to D2 = initiate learning, the 5 items corresponding to D3 = manage time, the 5 items corresponding to D4 = manage information and the 5 items corresponding to D5 = manage self-regulated learning. In addition, the table shows that the mean score for the dimensions analyzed was as follows: D2 = initiate learning (M = 3.426), D3 = manage time (M = 2.296), D4 = manage information (M = 3.338) and D5 = manage self-regulated learning (M = 3.271).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the items corresponding to D2, D3, D4 and D5 after the application of the questionnaire.

Dimension	Item	Scale (*n*)	95% Lower	95% Upper	SD	95% Lower	95% Upper
D2 = Initiate learning	P23	3.393	3.294	3.492	1.072	1.006	1.131
	P24	3.398	3.299	3.490	1.038	0.974	1.096
	P25	3.301	3.211	3.393	0.984	0.929	1.035
	P26	3.362	3.272	3.456	0.994	0.928	1.051
	P27	3.472	3.389	3.551	0.861	0.795	0.924
	P28	3.629	3.528	3.721	1.111	1.036	1.176
	S23–28	3.426	3.360	3.491	0.733	0.672	0.787
D3 = Manage time	P29	3.130	3.045	3.225	0.996	0.939	1.046
	P30	3.103	3.007	3.198	0.967	0.908	1.018
	P31	2.879	2.782	2.964	0.951	0.881	1.011
	P32	2.881	2.796	2.973	0.985	0.918	1.045
	P33	2.984	2.901	3.076	0.950	0.884	1.013
	S29–33	2.996	2.930	3.058	0.701	0.654	0.747
D4 = Manage information	P34	3.187	3.101	3.288	1.013	0.952	1.069
	P35	3.180	3.081	3.281	1.102	1.037	1.162
	P36	3.557	3.472	3.640	0.908	0.833	0.969
	P37	3.519	3.436	3.602	0.874	0.824	0.919
	P38	3.249	3.169	3.335	0.951	0.890	1.006
	S34–38	3.338	3.270	3.405	0.734	0.675	0.787
D5 = Manage self-regulated learning	P39	3.308	3.218	3.396	0.957	0.896	1.014
	P40	3.339	3.258	3.425	0.935	0.867	1.001
	P41	3.342	3.256	3.422	0.923	0.864	0.977
	P42	3.211	3.128	3.292	0.933	0.871	0.993
	P43	3.153	3.054	3.240	1.035	0.976	1.091
	S39–43	3.271	3.204	3.336	0.722	0.666	0.775

Source: own elaboration.

The following sections analyze the results affecting D2, D3, D4 and D5, with respect to the following independent variables: age, sex, teaching experience and PSLL training.

3.1. Incidence Analysis by Age in D2, D3, D4 and D5

Table 2 presents the distribution of the sample by age group: J = 25 years or less, A = 26–35 years, M = 36–45 years, E = 46–55 years and R = over 56 years.

As reflected in Table 2, the distribution of the sample by age group is uneven; the percentages of age groups A = 26–35 years (11.21%), M = 36–45 years (46.41%) and E = 46–55 years (31.84%) are of the same order of magnitude, while the percentages of groups J = 25 years or less (3.36%) and R = over 56 years (7.17%) are of a lower order of magnitude. An ANOVA for independent samples was conducted to examine possible statistical differences related to the age group in the questionnaire. The corresponding findings are detailed in Table 3.

Table 2. Count of the participants by age group.

Dim	Item	J = 25 Years or Less					A = 26–35 Years					M = 36–45 Years					E = 46–55 Years					R = Over 56 Years				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
D2	P23	3	0	2	10	0	7	9	10	17	7	15	41	41	96	14	4	11	37	71	19	1	5	4	16	6
	P24	3	0	1	11	0	7	8	6	23	6	7	42	46	87	25	3	20	33	77	9	3	4	8	13	4
	P25	1	1	3	8	2	3	9	22	12	4	5	42	71	69	20	6	20	44	59	13	1	6	9	13	3
	P26	1	1	7	5	1	7	8	14	14	7	6	28	66	84	23	6	20	34	73	9	2	5	14	11	0
	P27	1	0	8	5	1	5	2	26	13	4	4	14	71	99	19	4	4	71	46	17	0	3	15	10	4
	P28	1	0	4	7	3	9	3	19	7	12	10	10	54	74	59	9	3	64	33	33	1	2	12	10	7
D3	P29	1	0	10	4	0	5	19	14	11	1	6	53	70	59	19	4	28	48	49	13	1	9	11	9	2
	P30	0	3	9	3	0	5	19	11	14	1	15	51	67	68	6	1	26	41	66	8	0	8	11	11	2
	P31	2	0	12	1	0	12	7	23	4	4	17	47	107	27	9	10	22	68	32	10	1	7	19	5	0
	P32	1	3	9	1	1	11	3	29	6	1	19	39	90	45	14	13	37	65	22	5	1	5	19	5	2
	P33	2	1	7	2	3	11	11	23	4	1	13	48	99	38	9	4	19	73	30	16	0	6	19	7	0
D4	P34	3	0	4	8	0	7	14	12	12	5	10	34	85	69	9	8	27	37	59	11	1	4	7	16	4
	P35	5	1	1	8	0	11	8	11	19	1	20	38	39	102	8	10	23	32	66	11	0	9	6	16	1
	P36	3	1	2	9	0	6	4	14	23	3	5	11	55	116	20	3	18	31	76	14	0	4	7	19	2
	P37	0	4	3	5	3	1	6	26	11	6	1	17	89	72	28	0	11	58	45	28	0	4	15	12	1
	P38	2	0	7	5	1	6	8	21	10	5	7	30	74	86	10	4	31	35	64	8	1	3	20	5	3
D5	P39	3	1	6	4	1	5	7	20	13	5	8	18	71	98	12	6	29	38	63	6	1	6	8	15	2
	P40	3	0	2	9	1	7	6	23	9	5	6	15	77	89	20	6	15	58	59	4	2	4	14	10	2
	P41	2	2	6	4	1	4	18	10	9	9	6	23	79	83	16	4	10	53	71	4	1	4	11	15	1
	P42	2	2	3	5	3	7	9	20	12	2	7	22	59	114	5	8	29	56	46	3	1	6	16	9	0
	P43	3	1	1	10	0	9	10	18	11	2	14	34	62	85	12	11	22	50	54	5	2	5	6	18	1

Source: own elaboration.

Table 3. ANOVA for independent samples by age group.

Age	J = 25 Years or Less				A = 26–35 Years				M = 36–45 Years				E = 46–55 Years				R = Over 56 Years							
Item	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	F	p	Stage 2	Direction
P23	3.27	1.223	2.59	3.94	3.16	1.283	2.80	3.52	3.26	1.078	3.11	3.40	3.63	0.911	3.48	3.78	3.66	1.066	3.27	4.04	3.864	0.004	0.034	M < E
P24	3.33	1.234	2.65	4.02	3.26	1.275	2.90	3.62	3.39	1.046	3.25	3.53	3.49	0.889	3.34	3.63	3.34	1.153	2.93	3.76	0.509	0.729	0.005	
P25	3.60	1.056	3.02	4.18	3.10	0.995	2.82	3.38	3.28	0.974	3.14	3.41	3.37	0.979	3.21	3.54	3.34	1.004	2.98	3.71	1.112	0.350	0.010	
P26	3.27	0.961	2.73	3.80	3.12	1.256	2.76	3.48	3.43	0.958	3.30	3.57	3.42	0.955	3.26	3.57	3.06	0.878	2.75	3.38	1.901	0.109	0.017	
P27	3.33	0.900	2.84	3.83	3.18	1.004	2.89	3.47	3.56	0.828	3.44	3.67	3.48	0.848	3.34	3.62	3.47	0.842	3.17	3.77	2.034	0.089	0.018	
P28	3.73	1.033	3.16	4.31	3.20	1.370	2.81	3.59	3.78	1.064	3.64	3.93	3.55	1.069	3.37	3.73	3.63	1.008	3.26	3.99	3.135	0.015	0.028	A < M
P29	3.13	0.743	2.72	3.54	2.68	0.999	2.40	2.96	3.15	1.003	3.02	3.29	3.27	0.976	3.11	3.44	3.06	0.982	2.71	3.42	3.444	0.009	0.030	A < E.M
P30	3.00	0.655	2.64	3.36	2.74	1.046	2.44	3.04	3.00	0.993	2.86	3.13	3.38	0.873	3.24	3.53	3.22	0.906	2.89	3.55	5.713	0.000	0.049	A.M < E
P31	2.80	0.775	2.37	3.23	2.62	1.176	2.29	2.95	2.83	0.913	2.70	2.95	3.07	0.972	2.91	3.23	2.88	0.707	2.62	3.13	2.563	0.038	0.023	A < E
P32	2.87	0.915	2.36	3.37	2.66	1.022	2.37	2.95	2.98	1.024	2.84	3.12	2.78	0.939	2.63	2.94	3.06	0.840	2.76	3.37	1.804	0.127	0.016	
P33	3.20	1.265	2.50	3.90	2.46	0.994	2.18	2.74	2.91	0.915	2.79	3.04	3.25	0.924	3.09	3.40	3.03	0.647	2.80	3.26	7.413	0.000	0.063	A < E < M
P34	3.13	1.187	2.48	3.79	2.88	1.223	2.53	3.23	3.16	0.918	3.03	3.29	3.27	1.038	3.10	3.44	3.56	0.982	3.21	3.92	2.542	0.039	0.023	A < R
P35	2.80	1.424	2.01	3.59	2.82	1.224	2.47	3.17	3.19	1.089	3.04	3.34	3.32	1.061	3.14	3.49	3.28	0.924	2.95	3.61	2.421	0.048	0.021	A.E
P36	3.13	1.246	2.44	3.82	3.26	1.103	2.95	3.57	3.65	0.821	3.54	3.76	3.56	0.911	3.41	3.71	3.59	0.798	3.31	3.88	2.788	0.026	0.025	A.M
P37	3.47	1.125	2.84	4.09	3.30	0.909	3.04	3.56	3.53	0.846	3.41	3.64	3.63	0.887	3.49	3.78	3.31	0.738	3.05	3.58	1.879	0.113	0.017	
P38	3.20	1.082	2.60	3.80	3.00	1.125	2.68	3.32	3.30	0.896	3.18	3.42	3.29	0.964	3.13	3.45	3.19	0.859	2.88	3.50	1.110	0.351	0.010	
P39	2.93	1.223	2.26	3.61	3.12	1.100	2.81	3.43	3.43	0.877	3.30	3.55	3.24	0.967	3.08	3.40	3.34	0.971	2.99	3.69	2.046	0.087	0.018	
P40	3.33	1.291	2.62	4.05	2.98	1.134	2.66	3.30	3.49	0.875	3.37	3.61	3.28	0.854	3.14	3.42	3.19	0.965	2.84	3.54	3.680	0.006	0.032	A < M
P41	3.00	1.134	2.37	3.63	3.02	1.270	2.66	3.38	3.39	0.890	3.26	3.51	3.43	0.785	3.30	3.56	3.34	0.865	3.03	3.66	2.513	0.041	0.022	A.E
P42	3.33	1.345	2.59	4.08	2.86	1.069	2.56	3.16	3.43	0.844	3.31	3.54	3.05	0.917	2.90	3.20	3.03	0.782	2.75	3.31	6.219	0.000	0.053	A.E < M
P43	3.20	1.265	2.50	3.90	2.74	1.121	2.42	3.06	3.23	1.015	3.09	3.37	3.14	0.986	2.98	3.30	3.34	1.004	2.98	3.71	2.581	0.037	0.023	A < M
S23–28	3.42	0.77	3.41	3.43	3.17	0.87	3.16	3.18	3.45	0.70	3.45	3.45	3.49	0.70	3.49	3.49	3.42	0.74	3.41	3.42	1.859	0.117	0.017	
S29–33	3.00	0.47	2.99	3.01	2.63	0.79	2.63	2.64	2.97	0.68	2.97	2.98	3.15	0.68	3.15	3.15	3.05	0.66	3.04	3.06	5.385	0.000	0.047	A < M.E
S34–38	3.15	0.96	3.13	3.16	3.05	0.85	3.04	3.06	3.37	0.63	3.36	3.37	3.41	0.79	3.41	3.42	3.39	0.67	3.38	3.39	2.685	0.031	0.024	A < E
S39–43	3.16	0.99	3.14	3.18	2.94	0.82	2.94	2.95	3.39	0.67	3.39	3.39	3.23	0.68	3.22	3.23	3.25	0.74	3.24	3.26	4.352	0.002	0.038	A < M
S1–43	3.18	0.78	3.17	3.20	3.01	0.61	3.01	3.02	3.31	0.50	3.30	3.31	3.37	0.57	3.36	3.37	3.33	0.59	3.33	3.34	4.068	0.003	0.036	A < M.E

Source: own elaboration.

Significant statistical differences are evident in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–S43 and in items P23, P28, P29, P30, P31, P33, P34, P35, P36, P40, P41, P42 and P43. Although as the effect size measured in the ANOVA test by eta squared is less than 0.06, it must be considered as weak in the overall average of the questionnaire, in all dimensions and in all items except P33 = create routines for effective time management which, as eta squared is greater than 0.06, can be understood as a medium effect.

The post hoc tests point out that the mean of age group A = 26–35 years is lower than that of age group M = 36–45 years, which, in turn, is lower than age group E = 46–55 years, and finally, age group R = over 56 years shows the lowest mean in all dimensions, i.e., the means in all dimensions increase as the age of the respondents increases. Therefore, it could be inferred that as the age of the participants increases, the participants perceive that the learners have more competences to develop PSLL. That is, they have more abilities to initiate learning, manage time, manage information and manage self-regulated learning.

3.2. Incidence Analysis by Sex in D2, D3, D4 and D5

Table 4 presents the distribution of the sample by sex: H = male and M = female.

Table 4. Count of the sample participants by sex.

	Sex	H = Male					M = Female				
Dim	Item	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	P23	18	23	49	77	19	12	43	45	133	27
	P24	18	39	38	76	15	5	35	56	135	29
D2	P25	10	47	61	50	18	6	31	88	111	24
	P26	12	35	70	62	7	10	27	65	125	33
	P27	9	10	86	68	13	5	13	105	105	32
	P28	17	9	64	55	41	13	9	89	76	73
	P29	11	46	74	40	15	6	63	79	92	20
	P30	5	53	60	63	5	16	54	79	99	12
D3	P31	22	46	91	22	5	20	37	138	47	18
	P32	15	28	98	40	5	30	59	114	39	18
	P33	13	44	93	24	12	17	41	128	57	17
	P34	17	28	67	66	8	12	51	78	98	21
	P35	23	25	47	82	9	23	54	42	129	12
D4	P36	12	15	49	93	17	5	23	60	150	22
	P37	1	27	85	47	26	1	15	106	98	40
	P38	12	40	66	55	13	8	32	91	115	14
	P39	12	32	74	57	11	11	29	69	136	15
	P40	15	26	86	52	7	9	14	88	124	25
D5	P41	11	36	63	66	10	6	21	96	116	21
	P42	12	37	63	66	8	13	31	91	120	5
	P43	21	43	56	61	5	18	29	81	117	15

Source: own elaboration.

As shown in Table 4, the gender distribution of the sample is similar, and the percentage of H = male (41.7%) is of the same order of magnitude as the percentage of M = female (58.3%). An ANOVA for independent samples was carried out to examine possible statistical differences related to the sex of the participants in the questionnaire. The corresponding findings are detailed in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA for independent samples by sex.

| | **H = Male** | | | | **M = Female** | | | | | | | |
Item	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	F	p	Stage 2	Direction
P23	3.30	1.11	3.30	3.31	3.46	1.03	3.46	3.47	2.441	0.119	0.005	
P24	3.17	1.14	3.16	3.17	3.57	0.92	3.57	3.57	16.830	0.000	0.037	H < M
P25	3.10	1.06	3.10	3.11	3.45	0.90	3.44	3.45	13.652	0.000	0.030	H < M
P26	3.09	0.96	3.09	3.10	3.55	0.97	3.55	3.56	24.768	0.000	0.053	H < M
P27	3.35	0.88	3.35	3.36	3.56	0.84	3.56	3.56	6.298	0.012	0.014	H < M
P28	3.51	1.16	3.50	3.51	3.72	1.06	3.72	3.72	4.055	0.045	0.009	H < M
P29	3.01	1.01	3.01	3.02	3.22	0.97	3.22	3.22	4.794	0.029	0.011	H < M
P30	3.05	0.91	3.05	3.06	3.14	1.00	3.14	3.15	0.909	0.341	0.002	
P31	2.69	0.92	2.68	2.69	3.02	0.95	3.02	3.03	13.713	0.000	0.030	H < M
P32	2.96	0.89	2.95	2.96	2.83	1.04	2.83	2.83	1.783	0.182	0.004	
P33	2.88	0.94	2.88	2.89	3.06	0.95	3.06	3.07	3.907	0.049	0.009	H < M
P34	3.11	1.02	3.10	3.11	3.25	1.01	3.25	3.25	2.140	0.144	0.005	
P35	3.16	1.11	3.15	3.16	3.20	1.10	3.20	3.21	0.204	0.652	0.000	
P36	3.47	0.99	3.47	3.48	3.62	0.84	3.62	3.62	2.826	0.093	0.006	
P37	3.38	0.91	3.37	3.38	3.62	0.83	3.62	3.62	8.530	0.004	0.019	H < M
P38	3.09	1.02	3.09	3.10	3.37	0.88	3.36	3.37	9.179	0.003	0.020	H < M
P39	3.12	0.98	3.12	3.13	3.44	0.92	3.44	3.45	12.335	0.000	0.027	H < M
P40	3.05	0.94	3.05	3.06	3.55	0.87	3.54	3.55	32.252	0.000	0.068	H < M
P41	3.15	0.99	3.15	3.16	3.48	0.84	3.48	3.48	14.318	0.000	0.031	H < M
P42	3.11	0.99	3.11	3.12	3.28	0.88	3.28	3.28	3.541	0.061	0.008	
P43	2.92	1.05	2.92	2.93	3.32	0.98	3.31	3.32	16.004	0.000	0.035	H < M
S23–28	3.25	0.77	3.25	3.26	3.55	0.68	3.55	3.55	18.684	0.000	0.040	H < M
S29–33	2.92	0.67	2.92	2.92	3.06	0.71	3.05	3.06	4.164	0.042	0.009	H < M
S34–38	3.24	0.80	3.24	3.24	3.41	0.67	3.41	3.41	5.926	0.015	0.013	H < M
S39–43	3.07	0.78	3.07	3.08	3.41	0.64	3.41	3.42	25.378	0.000	0.054	H < M
S1–43	3.17	0.61	3.17	3.18	3.37	0.51	3.37	3.38	13.892	0.000	0.030	H < M

Source: own elaboration.

Statistical differences are evident in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–43 and in items P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P31, P33, P37, P38, P39, P40, P41 and P43. Although the effect size measured in the ANOVA test by eta squared is less than 0.06, it must be considered weak in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–S43 and in all items except P40 = transform their personal abilities into academic skills which, as eta squared is greater than 0.06, can be understood as having a medium effect.

The post hoc tests show that the mean for males is below the mean for females in D2, D3, D4 and D5 and, therefore, in all items corresponding to the above dimensions. It could be inferred that women perceive students to have more competences in initiating learning, managing time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning compared to men.

3.3. Incidence Analysis by Teaching Experience in D2, D3, D4 and D5

Table 6 presents the distribution of the sample by teaching experience: P = 0–5 years, S = 6–15 years, T = 16–25 years and C = more than 25 years.

Table 6. Count by teaching experience of the sample of participants.

	Experience	P = 0–5 Years					S = 6–15 Years					T = 16–25 Years					C = More than 25 Years				
Dim	**Item**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
D2	P23	10	13	10	20	6	3	14	12	47	3	14	31	56	126	28	3	8	16	17	9
	P24	11	3	5	32	8	3	18	21	33	4	5	40	58	124	28	4	13	10	22	4
	P25	4	7	21	22	5	1	21	24	24	9	8	42	84	98	23	3	8	20	17	5
	P26	7	5	16	16	15	2	18	25	27	7	9	33	73	123	17	4	6	21	21	1
	P27	5	1	24	25	4	3	6	39	25	6	5	13	105	105	27	1	3	23	18	8
	P28	10	1	16	13	19	2	7	31	22	17	14	8	82	85	66	4	2	24	11	12
D3	P29	8	14	20	14	3	1	26	24	25	3	5	48	97	81	24	3	21	12	12	5
	P30	9	16	20	13	1	4	19	27	25	4	7	56	74	109	9	1	16	18	15	3
	P31	19	3	32	3	2	3	16	39	14	7	18	51	130	43	13	2	13	28	9	1
	P32	15	7	23	11	3	4	8	41	19	7	23	55	125	41	11	3	17	23	8	2
	P33	16	12	21	5	5	3	20	32	20	4	8	43	140	47	17	3	10	28	9	3
D4	P34	13	13	15	16	2	1	15	21	39	3	14	42	95	84	20	1	9	14	25	4
	P35	20	8	8	23	0	3	10	11	52	3	21	48	54	116	16	2	13	16	20	2
	P36	10	5	14	27	3	1	4	23	46	5	5	25	51	145	29	1	4	21	25	2
	P37	1	15	15	20	8	0	2	37	30	10	1	20	112	80	42	0	5	27	15	6
	P38	10	5	21	15	8	2	10	34	28	5	6	43	82	112	12	2	14	20	15	2
D5	P39	8	4	23	15	9	1	11	25	38	4	12	39	74	118	12	2	7	21	22	1
	P40	12	1	14	22	10	1	11	35	29	3	9	20	102	107	17	2	8	23	18	2
	P41	8	9	20	11	11	0	17	23	33	6	7	27	93	115	13	2	4	23	23	1
	P42	8	6	15	25	5	1	15	25	36	2	14	38	89	108	6	2	9	25	17	0
	P43	15	5	14	23	2	4	19	20	33	3	17	40	85	99	14	3	8	18	23	1

Source: own elaboration.

Table 6 shows that the distribution of the sample by teaching experience is similar, and the percentages of the teaching experience group P = 0–5 years (13.23%), S = 16–25 years (57.17%), T = 6–15 years (17.71%) and C = more than 25 years (11.88%) are of the same order of magnitude. An ANOVA for independent samples was conducted to examine possible statistical differences related to the teaching experience of the participants in the questionnaire. The corresponding findings are detailed in Table 7.

Statistical differences are evident in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–S43 and in dimensions D3 and D4, except in dimensions D2 = S23–28 = initiate learning and D5 = S39–43 = manage self-regulated learning. Statistically significant differences also appear in items P23, P24, P29, P30, P31, P32, P33, P34, P35 and P36; although as the effect size measured in the ANOVA test by eta squared is less than 0.06, it can be understood as weak in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–S43. The post hoc tests show that the mean of the teaching experience group P = 0–5 years is below the teaching experience group T = 16–25 years in the dimensions D3 = S29–33 = manage time and D4 = S34–38= manage information and in the overall mean of the questionnaire S1–S43.

It could be inferred that participants with experience between 16 and 25 years (vs. participants with experience between 0 and 5 years) perceive learners as having greater competences to manage time and information. There are no differences according to age in relation to the abilities and/or competences to manage self-regulated learning and to initiate learning.

Table 7. ANOVA for independent samples by teaching experience.

Item	P = 0–5 Years				S = 6–15 Years				T = 16–25 Years				C = More than 25 Years				F	p	Stage 2	Direction
	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U				
P23	2.983	1.282	2.973	2.993	3.418	0.949	3.411	3.424	3.482	1.021	3.478	3.486	3.396	1.105	3.387	3.406	3.546	0.015	0.024	P < T
P24	3.390	1.315	3.379	3.400	3.215	0.977	3.208	3.222	3.510	0.949	3.506	3.513	3.170	1.111	3.160	3.179	2.677	0.047	0.018	S.T
P25	3.288	1.009	3.280	3.296	3.241	1.009	3.233	3.248	3.337	0.960	3.334	3.341	3.245	1.008	3.237	3.254	0.274	0.844	0.002	
P26	3.458	1.280	3.447	3.468	3.241	0.984	3.234	3.247	3.416	0.920	3.412	3.419	3.170	0.926	3.162	3.178	1.491	0.216	0.010	
P27	3.373	0.955	3.365	3.381	3.316	0.865	3.310	3.322	3.533	0.825	3.530	3.537	3.547	0.881	3.540	3.555	1.685	0.170	0.011	
P28	3.508	1.395	3.497	3.520	3.570	1.002	3.563	3.577	3.710	1.056	3.706	3.714	3.472	1.109	3.462	3.481	1.114	0.343	0.008	
P29	2.831	1.092	2.822	2.839	3.038	0.920	3.032	3.044	3.278	0.940	3.275	3.282	2.906	1.103	2.896	2.915	4.915	0.002	0.032	P < T
P30	2.678	1.032	2.670	2.686	3.076	0.978	3.069	3.083	3.224	0.921	3.220	3.227	3.057	0.940	3.049	3.065	5.333	0.001	0.035	P < T
P31	2.424	1.092	2.415	2.433	3.076	0.938	3.069	3.082	2.929	0.922	2.926	2.933	2.887	0.793	2.880	2.894	6.020	0.001	0.039	P < T.S
P32	2.661	1.188	2.651	2.671	3.215	0.923	3.209	3.222	2.851	0.942	2.847	2.855	2.792	0.898	2.785	2.800	4.326	0.005	0.029	P.T < S
P33	2.508	1.213	2.499	2.518	3.025	0.927	3.019	3.032	3.086	0.859	3.083	3.090	2.981	0.901	2.973	2.989	6.164	0.000	0.040	P < C.S.T
P34	2.678	1.185	2.668	2.688	3.354	0.872	3.348	3.361	3.212	0.991	3.208	3.216	3.415	0.920	3.407	3.423	6.860	0.000	0.044	P < T.S.C
P35	2.576	1.305	2.566	2.587	3.532	0.898	3.525	3.538	3.227	1.082	3.223	3.232	3.132	0.952	3.124	3.140	9.216	0.000	0.059	P < C.T.S
P36	3.136	1.185	3.126	3.145	3.633	0.732	3.628	3.638	3.659	0.875	3.655	3.662	3.434	0.765	3.427	3.440	6.025	0.000	0.039	P < S.T
P37	3.322	1.049	3.314	3.330	3.608	0.736	3.602	3.613	3.557	0.870	3.553	3.560	3.415	0.811	3.408	3.422	1.689	0.169	0.011	
P38	3.102	1.245	3.092	3.112	3.304	0.862	3.298	3.310	3.318	0.888	3.314	3.321	3.019	0.921	3.011	3.027	2.053	0.106	0.014	
P39	3.220	1.194	3.211	3.230	3.418	0.836	3.412	3.424	3.310	0.947	3.306	3.313	3.245	0.845	3.238	3.252	0.586	0.625	0.004	
P40	3.288	1.341	3.277	3.299	3.278	0.795	3.273	3.284	3.404	0.862	3.401	3.407	3.189	0.870	3.181	3.196	1.037	0.376	0.007	
P41	3.136	1.268	3.125	3.146	3.354	0.901	3.348	3.361	3.392	0.847	3.389	3.395	3.321	0.796	3.314	3.328	1.253	0.290	0.008	
P42	3.220	1.165	3.211	3.230	3.291	0.844	3.285	3.297	3.212	0.917	3.208	3.215	3.075	0.797	3.069	3.082	0.569	0.636	0.004	
P43	2.864	1.268	2.854	2.875	3.152	0.995	3.145	3.159	3.208	0.994	3.204	3.212	3.208	0.919	3.200	3.215	1.831	0.141	0.012	
S23–28	3.333	0.885	3.326	3.340	3.333	0.736	3.328	3.338	3.498	0.677	3.495	3.501	3.333	0.754	3.327	3.340	1.849	0.137	0.012	
S29–33	2.620	0.827	2.614	2.627	3.086	0.730	3.081	3.091	3.074	0.631	3.071	3.076	2.925	0.682	2.919	2.930	7.612	0.000	0.049	P < T.S
S34–38	2.963	0.957	2.955	2.970	3.486	0.582	3.482	3.490	3.395	0.699	3.392	3.397	3.283	0.666	3.277	3.289	7.092	0.000	0.046	P < T.S
S39–43	3.146	0.944	3.138	3.153	3.299	0.718	3.294	3.304	3.305	0.650	3.303	3.308	3.208	0.741	3.201	3.214	0.957	0.413	0.006	
S1–43	3.062	0.744	3.056	3.068	3.313	0.558	3.309	3.317	3.352	0.491	3.350	3.354	3.214	0.585	3.209	3.219	4.750	0.003	0.031	P < T

Source: own elaboration.

3.4. Incidence Analysis by PSLL Training in D2, D3, D4 and D5

Table 8 presents the distribution of the sample according to PSLL training: N = No; L = Yes. During my work experience; U = Yes. During my university studies and O = Yes. Other.

Table 8. Count by PSLL training of the sample of participants.

Dim	PSLL Training Item	N = No					L = Yes. During My Work Experience					U = Yes. During My University Studies					O = Yes. Other				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
D3	P23	6	3	9	28	5	13	51	77	172	37	9	11	8	10	3	2	1	0	0	1
	P24	5	3	11	25	7	7	68	73	169	33	9	2	9	17	4	2	1	1	0	0
	P25	1	6	15	20	9	9	68	119	124	30	5	4	15	15	2	1	0	0	2	1
	P26	2	3	15	29	2	11	54	109	151	25	8	5	8	7	13	1	0	3	0	0
	P27	2	1	23	18	7	4	19	153	137	37	7	3	13	17	1	1	0	2	1	0
	P28	2	0	20	17	12	15	18	122	106	89	11	0	10	8	12	2	0	1	0	1
D4	P29	2	10	21	15	3	4	91	116	112	27	10	8	14	5	4	1	0	2	0	1
	P30	0	11	17	21	2	13	82	104	136	15	8	12	18	3	0	0	2	0	2	0
	P31	2	8	32	5	4	19	72	182	59	18	20	2	14	4	1	1	1	1	1	0
	P32	2	11	26	11	1	24	72	176	58	20	18	4	9	9	1	1	0	1	1	1
	P33	3	7	26	8	7	9	70	181	70	20	16	8	13	2	2	2	0	1	1	0
D5	P34	2	7	18	21	3	14	63	118	129	26	13	9	8	11	0	0	0	1	3	0
	P35	4	8	9	26	4	21	65	76	172	16	20	5	4	12	0	1	1	0	1	1
	P36	3	3	10	33	2	3	28	91	196	32	10	6	8	13	4	1	1	0	1	1
	P37	0	4	22	16	9	2	23	162	112	51	0	13	7	16	5	0	2	0	1	1
	P38	3	8	20	18	2	6	59	126	142	17	10	4	10	10	7	1	1	1	0	1

Table 8. *Cont.*

	PSLL Training	N = No					L = Yes. During My Work Experience					U = Yes. During My University Studies					O = Yes. Other				
Dim	**Item**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	P39	3	4	15	27	2	9	53	112	159	17	9	4	14	7	7	2	0	2	0	0
	P40	4	2	21	22	2	5	38	145	140	22	13	0	6	14	8	2	0	2	0	0
D5	P41	2	5	20	23	1	4	49	125	153	19	9	3	13	5	11	2	0	1	1	0
	P42	2	4	24	18	3	12	59	120	154	5	9	5	8	14	5	2	0	2	0	0
	P43	4	6	18	23	0	18	62	108	144	18	15	4	9	11	2	2	0	2	0	0

Source: own elaboration.

Table 8 shows that the distribution of the sample by PSLL training is unequal, and the percentages of the group L = Yes. During my work experience (78.48%) are of the same order of magnitude as the percentage of the group N = No (11.43%), one order of magnitude higher than the group U = Yes. During my university studies (9.19%) and two orders of magnitude higher than the group O = Yes. Other (0.9%). An ANOVA for independent samples was conducted to examine possible statistical differences related to the PSLL training of the participants in the questionnaire. The corresponding findings are detailed in Table 9.

Statistical differences are evident in the overall average of the questionnaire S1–S43 and in the questionnaire items P23, P24, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31, P32, P33, P34, P35, P36, P39, P40, P41, P42 and P43, although the effect size measured in the ANOVA test by eta squared is less than 0.06, indicated as weak in dimensions D2 = S23–28 = initiate learning and D5 = S39–43 = manage self-regulated learning and in items P23, P24, P27, P28, P29, P30, P32, P39, P40, P41, P42 and P43. In the overall average of the questionnaire S1–43 and in the dimensions D3= S29–33 = manage time and D4= S34–38 = manage information, as well as in items P31, P33, P34, P35 and P36, eta squared is higher than 0.06; therefore, it must be understood as a medium effect.

The post hoc tests show that the mean of the group U = Yes. During my university studies is below the groups L = Yes. During my work experience and N = No in D2, D3, D4 and D5, as well as in the overall mean of the questionnaire S1–S43.

It could be inferred that participants with PSLL experiences during their work experience and those who have never received PSLL training (vs. participants who have received PSLL training during their university studies) perceive students as having greater knowledge, skills and abilities to initiate learning, manage time, manage information and manage self-regulated learning.

Table 9. ANOVA for independent samples by PSLL training.

| | N = No | | | | L = Yes. During My Work Experience | | | | U = Yes. During My University Studies | | | | O = Yes. Other | | | | | | | |
Item	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	M	SD	L	U	F	p	Stage 2	Direction
P23	3.451	1.126	3.441	3.461	3.483	0.988	3.480	3.486	2.683	1.258	2.671	2.695	2.250	1.640	2.199	2.301	8.839	0.000	0.057	U < N.L
P24	3.510	1.109	3.500	3.519	3.437	0.971	3.434	3.440	3.122	1.310	3.109	3.135	1.750	0.829	1.724	1.776	4.792	0.003	0.032	O < L.N
P25	3.588	0.974	3.580	3.597	3.280	0.957	3.277	3.283	3.122	1.064	3.112	3.132	3.500	1.500	3.454	3.546	2.026	0.110	0.014	
P26	3.510	0.825	3.503	3.517	3.357	0.933	3.354	3.360	3.293	1.502	3.278	3.307	2.500	0.866	2.473	2.527	1.455	0.226	0.010	
P27	3.529	0.893	3.522	3.537	3.526	0.799	3.523	3.528	3.049	1.125	3.038	3.060	2.750	1.090	2.716	2.784	4.872	0.002	0.032	U < L.N
P28	3.725	0.951	3.717	3.734	3.674	1.043	3.671	3.678	3.244	1.543	3.229	3.259	2.500	1.659	2.449	2.551	3.403	0.018	0.023	U.L
P29	3.137	0.929	3.129	3.145	3.191	0.947	3.188	3.195	2.634	1.245	2.622	2.646	3.000	1.414	2.956	3.044	3.932	0.009	0.026	U < L
P30	3.275	0.842	3.267	3.282	3.166	0.957	3.163	3.169	2.390	0.880	2.382	2.399	3.000	1.000	2.969	3.031	8.918	0.000	0.057	U < L.N
P31	3.020	0.852	3.012	3.027	2.957	0.892	2.954	2.960	2.122	1.193	2.110	2.133	2.500	1.118	2.465	2.535	10.585	0.000	0.067	U < L.N
P32	2.961	0.816	2.954	2.968	2.937	0.933	2.934	2.940	2.293	1.292	2.280	2.305	3.250	1.479	3.204	3.296	5.727	0.001	0.037	U < L.N
P33	3.176	1.023	3.168	3.185	3.063	0.853	3.060	3.066	2.171	1.146	2.160	2.182	2.250	1.299	2.210	2.290	13.325	0.000	0.083	U < L.N
P34	3.314	0.918	3.306	3.322	3.257	0.969	3.254	3.260	2.415	1.189	2.403	2.426	3.750	0.433	3.737	3.763	9.671	0.000	0.062	U < L.N
P35	3.353	1.081	3.344	3.362	3.277	1.012	3.274	3.280	2.195	1.311	2.182	2.208	3.000	1.581	2.951	3.049	13.225	0.000	0.082	U < L.N
P36	3.549	0.893	3.541	3.557	3.646	0.789	3.643	3.648	2.878	1.347	2.865	2.891	3.000	1.581	2.951	3.049	9.833	0.000	0.063	U < L.N
P37	3.588	0.867	3.581	3.596	3.534	0.840	3.532	3.537	3.317	1.046	3.307	3.327	3.250	1.299	3.210	3.290	1.000	0.393	0.007	
P38	3.157	0.937	3.149	3.165	3.300	0.864	3.297	3.303	3.000	1.414	2.986	3.014	2.750	1.479	2.704	2.796	1.811	0.144	0.012	
P39	3.412	0.911	3.404	3.420	3.349	0.884	3.346	3.351	2.976	1.352	2.963	2.989	2.000	1.000	1.969	2.031	4.664	0.003	0.031	O < L.N
P40	3.314	0.918	3.306	3.322	3.389	0.816	3.386	3.391	3.098	1.543	3.083	3.112	2.000	1.000	1.969	2.031	4.077	0.007	0.027	O < L.N
P41	3.314	0.828	3.307	3.321	3.383	0.833	3.380	3.386	3.146	1.458	3.132	3.160	2.250	1.299	2.210	2.290	2.761	0.042	0.018	O.L
P42	3.314	0.852	3.306	3.321	3.231	0.866	3.229	3.234	3.024	1.352	3.011	3.037	2.000	1.000	1.969	2.031	3.108	0.026	0.021	O < N
P43	3.176	0.923	3.168	3.184	3.234	0.972	3.231	3.238	2.537	1.345	2.524	2.550	2.000	1.000	1.969	2.031	7.568	0.000	0.049	U < N.L
S23–28	3.552	0.752	3.546	3.559	3.460	0.670	3.457	3.462	3.085	0.980	3.076	3.095	2.542	1.076	2.508	2.575	5.826	0.001	0.038	O.U < L.N
S29–33	3.114	0.606	3.108	3.119	3.063	0.642	3.061	3.065	2.322	0.870	2.314	2.330	2.800	1.010	2.769	2.831	15.640	0.000	0.096	U < L.N
S34–38	3.392	0.686	3.386	3.398	3.403	0.659	3.401	3.405	2.761	1.023	2.751	2.771	3.150	1.152	3.114	3.186	10.119	0.000	0.064	U < L.N
S39–43	3.306	0.649	3.300	3.312	3.317	0.633	3.315	3.319	2.956	1.154	2.945	2.967	2.050	1.053	2.017	2.083	7.226	0.000	0.047	O.U < N.L
S1–43	3.345	0.574	3.340	3.350	3.335	0.496	3.333	3.337	2.898	0.808	2.891	2.906	2.709	0.901	2.681	2.737	9.432	0.000	0.060	U < L.N

Source: own elaboration.

4. Discussion

The findings obtained in dimensions D2, D3, D4 and D5 provide essential information about how university teachers perceive their students' Personal, Social and Learning to Learn skills. Specifically, they focus on skills such as the ability to initiate learning, manage time, manage information and self-regulate the learning process, as essential aspects for academic success and the comprehensive training of students in a constantly evolving educational environment [21].

The evaluation of the PSLL provides valuable information for the design and implementation of innovative educational proposals that strengthen the aforementioned skills. The adaptation and continuous renewal of the educational methodologies to be implemented, as well as the development of each and every one of the key competences, contribute to the training of active citizens and, therefore, to the preparation of teachers and students for the challenges of the knowledge society [28]. This requires explicit recognition of the key competences in the field of education, as well as an adaptive approach to improving teaching–learning processes [29].

In our specific case, there is a demand for explicit recognition of the key competences (including the PSLL) in the field of higher education. At the legislative level, Royal Decree 1393/2007 alludes to the competences model, allowing the vision of the axes of learning to be broadened, although it does not make explicit reference to the set of skills proposed at the community level. Specifically, the proposal for key competences is based on Royal Decree 1027/2011, of 15 July, establishing the Spanish Qualifications Framework for Higher Education, which sets out the fundamental skills for each level of studies. However, the design of training proposals falls to the universities themselves [29,30].

Through the support provided by the research project that underpins this article, we have discovered that PSLL is a multidimensional competence that constitutes a fundamental axis for facilitating lifelong learning. It not only facilitates the acquisition of new learning but also has a decisive influence on the didactic methodologies implemented both in the classroom and in the teaching–learning process itself. This multidimensional approach to PSLL generates new opportunities and challenges, thus redefining the educational landscape and highlighting its importance in the holistic education of learners and in the overall development of citizens [31].

Furthermore, the results obtained are in line with studies that highlight the importance of initiating learning, fostering a proactive attitude towards lifelong learning and adapting to new challenges, as well as the need to adapt pedagogical approaches with the intention of optimizing the development of PSLL in diverse university contexts [32,33].

Through the evaluation of the four skills that make up the last four dimensions of the INNOVAPRENDE questionnaire, and thanks to the literature review, it has been verified that time management is a fundamental competence in the academic world and even in the world of work, as the individual manages to carry out his or her tasks and objectives efficiently [34]. University institutions are therefore required to integrate programs that support students in managing time efficiently and effectively into their educational offerings [35].

There is also support for the idea that reasonable skills in seeking, selecting and organizing information in today's society are crucial. In the context of PSLL, it is relevant to understand how learners or citizens seek and use information. Therefore, "it is necessary to promote the creation of learning environments, where the construction of knowledge is achieved in a flexible and autonomous way" [36] (p. 36).

At the same time, self-regulation of learning is fundamental to managing and controlling a series of objectives and/or strategies in the deployment of the teaching–learning process [37]. This skill is fundamental in higher education in order to improve students' academic performance [38].

Finally, it should be noted that the teacher's perception of the students' deployment of PSLL skills plays an important role in the teaching–learning process. The teacher's beliefs and perceptions about students' skills may affect the way in which students develop them.

It could be inferred that if teachers perceive that students have strong skills in initiating learning, managing time, managing information and managing self-regulated learning, they are more likely to adapt their pedagogical approaches to foster and enhance these skills. These expectations may also motivate students to work harder to develop these skills [39,40].

The variation in student abilities based on teachers' expectations and training reflects the importance of teachers' perception of their students' abilities. For example, teachers with more teaching experience (and typically older) are more aware of the importance of promoting the development of key competencies, including PSLL [41,42]. This reflects the need to introduce teaching methodological changes, as well as include basic training, along with specific guidelines to guide especially those teachers with fewer years of experience [43].

Furthermore, according to the results of some studies, female teachers (compared to male teachers) have a greater belief in possessing key and/or professional competencies. Therefore, their perception of students' abilities can be influenced by this belief [44]. Generally, women have a better attitude towards the teaching profession, which is reflected in their expectations [45].

5. Conclusions

This research has provided valuable insights into teachers' perceptions of the development of Personal, Social and Learning to Learn competence skills by university students. The importance of the guidance and support offered by teachers and the expectations they have in relation to the development of PSLL skills by their students is noteworthy. These elements are essential for students to develop the skills to initiate learning autonomously, as well as to efficiently manage aspects related to time, information and self-regulated learning [46]. Furthermore, it should be noted that the findings suggest several ways in which teacher perception can influence their own practice, whether in the design of pedagogical strategies, in the level of expectations, in interaction and feedback and in the treatment of diversity in the classrooms.

It is important to remember that the theoretical basis of the PSLL comes from two fundamental lines in the scientific literature: the strategic learning construct (SL) and the self-regulated learning construct (SRL) [47–49]. Furthermore, it is essential to highlight that PSLL is a key competence in the knowledge society, which, beyond the four skills mentioned throughout the article, must include aspects such as resilience, stress management, empathy, lifelong learning and conflict resolution [50]. PSLL provides a set of skills to manipulate new information-based work tools. These skills enable individuals to adapt quickly to changing environments and also allow them to enhance their ability to apply knowledge efficiently and critically in a variety of work and social situations [51].

In conclusion, we emphasize the following findings:

- In relation to the age factor, it is observed that as the age of the participants increases, so does the perception that the students possess greater competences to develop PSLL. The means in all dimensions are consistently higher in the older age groups. Specifically, age group A = 26–35 years has lower means than group M = 36–45 years, which, in turn, is below group E = 46–55 years, and the latter is overtaken by group R = over 56 years.
- In relation to the gender factor, females perceive students to have more competence in initiating learning, time management, information management and self-regulated learning compared to males. The mean of males is consistently lower than that of females in dimensions D2, D3, D4 and D5, covering all items corresponding to these dimensions.
- In relation to the teaching experience factor, it was found that participants with 16 to 25 years of experience, compared to those with 0 to 5 years of experience, believe that students have greater competences in managing time and information. There are no significant differences with respect to the abilities to manage self-regulated learning

and to initiate learning. The mean of the teaching experience group P = 0–5 years is lower than the group T = 16–25 years in dimensions D3 (manage time) and D4 (manage information), as well as in the overall mean of the questionnaire S1–S43.

- In relation to the PSLL training factor, it is observed that participants with experience in PSLL during their work experience and those who have never received training in this competence (compared to those who have received it during their university studies) perceive that students have greater knowledge, skills and abilities to initiate learning, manage time, information and self-regulated learning. The mean of the group U = Yes. During my university studies is lower than the groups L = Yes. During my work experience and N = No in D2, D3, D4 and D5, as well as in the overall mean of the questionnaire S1–S43.

By identifying, for example, that teachers with more years of teaching experience (and generally older) tend to have more positive perceptions, the importance of implementing specific mentoring and professional development programs to support less experienced teachers is suggested, thus improving their expectations and support for students [52,53]. Implementation of training programs that address differences in perception could also be explored, fostering a more equitable and accurate understanding of student competencies at all levels of experience.

Finally, it is important to note that the present research has certain limitations that must be acknowledged. One weakness identified lies in the non-normal distribution of participants, which prompted the use of null model statistical techniques using the bootstrap procedure. This approach, although robust, may raise considerations about the generalizability of the results. For future research, we suggest the use of stratified probability sampling, which would homogenize the variables and improve the external validity of the study. In addition, studies could be designed that go beyond the perception of teachers in relation to the skills of initiating learning, managing time, handling information and regulating the learning of university students. These studies could be extrapolated to a variety of educational contexts, ranging from early childhood to secondary education. This would broaden the teacher's view of students' PSLL development across different educational levels.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable. This research, due to its particular characteristics, did not need to be approved by ethical or review institutions. In this specific case, no intervention was carried out on a vulnerable population and no physical, psychological or other risk was created for the respondents. The recipients of the questionnaires are over 18 years of age. Furthermore, prior to completing the online questionnaire, each participant was given informed consent, in which they are informed in detail of the identity and contact details of the researcher, the object and purpose of the research, the institution and project in which the study is framed, the strictly confidential treatment of the information collected, which at no time allows, directly or indirectly, the identification of any of the participants, as no personal data.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Due to the anonymity and confidentiality of the data obtained, the authors have not reported any of the data obtained, the purpose of which is exclusively the development of this research.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Coronel, I.C. Conectivismo, rompiendo paradigmas en la educación universitaria. Una mirada desde la sociedad del conocimiento. *Rev. Arbitr. CIEG* **2022**, *54*, 159–168. Available online: https://revista.grupocieg.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Ed.54159-168-Coronel-Isabel.pdf (accessed on 10 September 2023).
2. Poc, J.; Rodríguez, A. Aprendizaje Basado en Ambientes o Ambientes de Aprendizaje. In *Investigación y Transferencias de las Ciencias Sociales Frente a un Mundo en Crisis*; Bermúdez, M., Chaves, A., Eds.; Editorial Dykinson: Madrid, Spain, 2022; pp. 437–454.
3. Arteaga-Alcívar, Y.; Guaña-Moya, J.; Begnini-Domínguez, L.; Cabrera-Córdova, M.F.; Sánchez-Cali, F.; Moya-Carrera, Y. Integración de la tecnología con la educación. *Rev. Ibérica Sist. Tecnol. Informação* **2022**, *54*, 182–193. Available online: https://media.proquest.com/media/hms/PFT/1/ladZR?_s=g2YKiyGIebwg50iFTUXsFJPbF1k= (accessed on 20 August 2023).
4. Suárez, X.; Castro, N. Competencias socioemocionales y resiliencia de estudiantes de escuelas vulnerables y su relación con el rendimiento académico. *Rev. Psicol.* **2022**, *40*, 879–904. [CrossRef]
5. Posso, R.J.; Cóndor, M.G.; Mora, L.M.; Segundo, R. Aprendizaje Basado en Retos: Una Mirada Desde la Educación Superior. *Podium Rev. Cienc. Tecnol. Cult. Física* **2023**, *18*, e1486. Available online: http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1996-24522023000200014&lng=es&nrm=iso (accessed on 15 August 2023).
6. Saldaña, H.M. La práctica de liderazgo en institución universitaria. *Rev. Enducinade* **2022**, *12*, 4–13.
7. European Commission. *Comunicación de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo, al Consejo, al Comité Económico y Social Europeo y al Comité de las Regiones*; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2017. Available online: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ES/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017DC0673 (accessed on 15 September 2023).
8. Eslava, Mª.D.; De León, C.; González, I. La formación en competencias transversales para trabajar en entornos educativos inclusivos. *Rev. Nac. E Int. Educ. Inclusiva* **2015**, *8*, 58–76. Available online: http://hdl.handle.net/10396/14467 (accessed on 10 September 2023).
9. Mejía-Caguana, D.R.; Esteves-Fajardo, Z.I.; Mateo-Ortega, R.A. Estrategias de atención inclusiva: Competencias básicas y valores necesarios para entornos educativos en educación universitaria. *Rev. Electrónica Cienc. Educ. Humanidades Artes Y Bellas Artes* **2023**, *6*, 4–20. [CrossRef]
10. Roegiers, X. *Un Cadre Conceptuel pour l'Évaluation des Compétences*; Bureau International d'Education: Genève, Switzerland, 2016. Available online: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245195_fre (accessed on 8 December 2023).
11. Council of the European Union. *Recomendación del Consejo de 22 de Mayo de 2018 Relativa a las Competencias Clave Para el Aprendizaje Permanente*; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2018. Available online: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ES/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604(01)&from=SV (accessed on 25 August 2023).
12. Leyva, O.; Ganga, F.; Hernández, A.A.; Fernández, J.T. *La Formación por Competencias en la Educación Superior: Alcances y Limitaciones desde Referentes de México, España y Chile*; Tirant Humanidades: Barcelona, Spain, 2018.
13. López, F. El enfoque del currículo por competencias. Un Análisis de la LOMLOE—El Enfoque Curricular Basado en Competencias. Un Análisis de la LOMLOE. *Rev. Española De Pedagog.* **2022**, *80*, 55–68. Available online: https://www.jstor.org/stable/48645738 (accessed on 5 August 2023).
14. García, L.; López, R. Convivir en la escuela. Una propuesta para su aprendizaje por competencias. *Rev. De Educ.* **2009**, *356*, 531–555.
15. Sala, A.; Punie, Y.; Garkov, V.; Cabrera, M. *LifeComp: The European Framework for Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Key Competence*; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2020. Available online: https://op.europa.eu/es/publication-detail/-/publication/7d9c9dcd-bf31-11ea-901b-01aa75ed71a1/language-en# (accessed on 20 September 2023).
16. Peñalva, L.P.; Ramírez, H.T. Barreras Para el Aprendizaje Organizacional. Estudio de Caso Método. *Prod. Económica* **2007**, *28*, 1–29. Available online: https://publicaciones.xoc.uam.mx/MuestraDocumento.php?Host=6&IdRec=5224&TipRec=3 (accessed on 7 September 2023).
17. Gargallo, B.; Pérez-Pérez, C.; Garcia-Garcia, F.J.; Giménez, J.A.; Portillo, N. La competencia aprender a aprender en la universidad: Propuesta de modelo teórico. *Educ. XXI* **2020**, *23*, 19–44. [CrossRef]
18. Blanco-Figueredo, L.L.; Arias-Ortega, K.E. Enfoques, bases epistémicas y éticas de la formación del pensamiento pedagógico intercultural en contextos indígenas. *Form. Univ.* **2022**, *15*, 71–82. [CrossRef]
19. González, J.; Berríos, A.; Bastías, L. La educación intercultural en Chile. Estrategias pedagógicas en profesores jefes. *Palimpsesto* **2023**, *13*, 97–116. [CrossRef]
20. Espíritu, R.; González, R.F.; Alcaraz, E. Desarrollo de competencias emprendedoras: Un análisis explicativo con estudiantes universitarios. *Cuad. De Estud. Empres.* **2012**, *22*, 29–53. [CrossRef]

21. Palomares-Ruiz, A.; Gracia-Zomeño, A.; Cebrián-Martínez, A.; López-Parra, E. Diseño y validación de un instrumento de evaluación de los procesos de enseñanza-aprendizaje en el desarrollo de la competencia aprender a aprender "INNOVAPRENDE". *Contextos Educ.* **2022**, *31*, 201–202. [CrossRef]

22. Lawshe, C.H. A quantitative approach to content validity. *Pers. Psychol.* **1975**, *28*, 563–575. [CrossRef]

23. Pérez, E.R.; Medrano, L.A. Análisis factorial exploratorio: Bases conceptuales y metodológicas. *Rev. Argent. Cienc. Comport.* **2010**, *2*, 58–66.

24. Martínez, C.M.; Sepúlveda, M.A.R. Introducción al Análisis Factorial Exploratorio. *Rev. Colomb. Psiquiatr.* **2012**, *41*, 197–207. [CrossRef]

25. Kerlinger, F.N.; Lee, H.B.; Pineda, L.E.; Mora Magaña, I. *Investigación del Comportamiento*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2002.

26. Pelea, L.P. ¿Cómo proceder ante el incumplimiento de las premisas de los métodos paramétricos? o ¿Cómo trabajar con variables biológicas no normales? *Rev. Jard. Bot. Nac.* **2018**, *39*, 1–12.

27. García-Toledano, E.; Gracia-Zomeño, A.; Farinho, P.; Marujo, L.M.C. Analyzing Teachers' Perception of the Development of Lifelong Learning as Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Competence in University Students. *Educ. Sci.* **2023**, *13*, 1086. [CrossRef]

28. Morales, J.A.; Barroso, J. Retos Educativos y Oportunidades en la Sociedad del Conocimiento. In *Redes Educativas: La Educación en la Sociedad del Conocimiento*; Morales, J.A., Barroso, J., Eds.; Universidad de Sevilla: Sevilla, Spain, 2012; pp. 1–15.

29. Gabarda, V.; Cuevas, N.; Colomo, E.; Cívico, A. Competencias clave, competencia digital y formación del profesorado: Percepción de los estudiantes de Pedagogía. *Profr. Rev. Currículum Form. Profr.* **2022**, *26*, 7–27. [CrossRef]

30. Gabarda, V.; Marín, D.; Romero, M.M. La competencia digital en la formación inicial docente. Percepción de los estudiantes de Magisterio de la Universidad de Valencia. *Ens. Rev. Fac. Educ. Albacete* **2020**, *35*, 1–16. [CrossRef]

31. Jornet, J.M.; García-Bellido, R.; González-Such, J. Evaluar la Competencia Aprender a Aprender: Una Propuesta Metodológica. *Profesorado* **2012**, *16*, 103–123. Available online: http://hdl.handle.net/10481/23009 (accessed on 10 September 2023).

32. Feo, R.J. Desde el Aprendizaje Estratégico hacia la formación docente. *Rev. Gac. Pedagog.* **2012**, *33*, 102–124. [CrossRef]

33. Chong-Baque, P.G.; Marcillo-García, C.E. Estrategias pedagógicas innovadoras en entornos virtuales de aprendizaje. *Dom. Cienc.* **2020**, *6*, 56–77.

34. Pérez, B.K. *Importancia de la Gestión del Tiempo Como Estrategia Fundamental Para el Éxito de Estudiantes de Contaduría Pública y Profesionales Titulados*; Repositorio Universidad Autónoma de Bucargamanga: Bucaramanga, Colombia, 2022. Available online: https://repository.unab.edu.co/bitstream/handle/20.500.12749/18465/2022_Tesis_Belkys_Perez?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed on 26 October 2023).

35. Durán-Aponte, E. Competencia manejo del tiempo de la formación de profesionales de la administración. *Rev. Venez. Gerenc.* **2012**, *17*, 291–306. [CrossRef]

36. Uribe, A. La alfabetización informacional en la universidad. Descripción y categorización según los niveles de integración de ALFIN. Caso Universidad de Antioquia. *Rev. Interam. Bibl.* **2010**, *33*, 31–83.

37. Cohen, M.T. The Importance of Self-Regulation for College Student Learning. *Coll. Stud. J.* **2012**, *46*, 892–902. Available online: https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A312618227/AONE?u=googlescholar&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=31484924 (accessed on 11 September 2023).

38. Sáez, F.M.; Díaz, A.E.; Panadero, E.; Bruna, D.V. Revisión Sistemática sobre Competencias de Autorregulación del Aprendizaje en Estudiantes Universitarios y Programas Intracurriculares para su Promoción. *Form. Univ.* **2018**, *11*, 83–98. [CrossRef]

39. De Juan, J.; González, C. El efecto Pigmalión o el buen samaritano de la educación. *Páginas* **2021**, *263*, 64–73. Available online: http://hdl.handle.net/10612/13745 (accessed on 2 October 2023).

40. Máñez, I.; Fernández, E. El efecto Pigmalión y cómo mitigar su influencia en las aulas. *Cienc. Cognitiva* **2020**, *14*, 43–45.

41. Zabalza, M.A. Las competencias en la formación del profesorado: De la teoría a las propuestas prácticas. *Tend. Pedagógicas* **2012**, *20*, 5–32.

42. Muñoz-Chavarría, Y.; Mantilla-Vivas, A.M.; Vizuete-Gaibor, L.L. Formación y desarrollo de la competencia aprender a aprender desde el proceso docente educativo de las ciencias básicas. *Dom. Cien.* **2016**, *2*, 255–273.

43. Ramírez, A. La formación del profesorado de Educación Primaria ante las competencias básicas. *Rev. Electrónica Interuniv. Form. Profr.* **2015**, *18*, 199–214. [CrossRef]

44. Köksal, N. Competencies in teacher education: Preservice teachers' perceptions about competencies and their attitudes. *Educ. Res. Rev.* **2013**, *8*, 270–276.

45. Çakır, Ö.; Kan, A.; Sünbül, Ö. The evaluation of the teaching certificate program and the master's program without thesis with respect to students' attitudes and self-efficacy. *J. Educ.* **2006**, *2*, 36–47.

46. Pérez-Perez, C.; García, F.J.; Vázuez, V.; García, E.; Riquelme, V. La competencia "aprender a aprender" en los grados universitarios. *Aula Abierta* **2020**, *49*, 309–315. [CrossRef]

47. Weinstein, C.E. *Learning and Study Strategies Inventory*; H & H Publishing: Clearwater, FL, USA, 1987.

48. Boekaerts, M. Self-Regulation and Effort Investment. In *Handbook of Child Psychology: Child Psychology in Practice*; Sigel, E., Renninger, K.A., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2006; pp. 345–377.

49. Riquelme, V.; Gargallo, B.; Sahuquillo, P.; López-Francés, I. La competencia aprender a aprender en la universidad. La perspectiva de los emprendedores. *Rev. Docencia Univ.* **2022**, *20*, 9–30. [CrossRef]

50. Gargallo-López, B.; Suárez-Rodríguez, J.; Pérez-Pérez, C.; Almerich-Cerveró, G.; García-García, F.J. El cuestionario CECAPEU. Un instrumento para evaluar la competencia aprender a aprender en estudiantes universitarios. *RELIEVE Rev. Electrónica Investig. Evaluación Educ.* **2021**, *27*, 1–28. [CrossRef]

51. Griffin, P.; Care, E. *Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills. Methods and Approach*; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2015.

52. Goricho, S.; Salas, M.; Araos, M.J.; Rojas-Murphy, A.; Jara-Chandía, G. Prácticas de mentoría para la inducción de docentes principiantes: Análisis de cuatro casos chilenos al inicio del proceso. *Calid. En La Educ.* **2020**, *52*, 12–48. [CrossRef]

53. Marcelo, C.; Vaillant, D. Políticas y programas de inducción en la docencia en Latinoamérica. *Cad. Pesqui.* **2017**, *47*, 1224–1249. [CrossRef]