



Article

Outside Training of Spanish University Students of Education for the Didactic Application of Cinema: Formal, Non-Formal, and Informal Perspectives

Alejandro Lorenzo-Lledó , Asunción Lledó, Gonzalo Lorenzo and Alba Gilabert-Cerdá 

Department of Development Psychology and Teaching, Faculty of Education, University of Alicante, 03690 San Vicente del Raspeig, Spain; asuncion.lledo@ua.es (A.L.); glledo@ua.es (G.L.); alba.gilabert@ua.es (A.G.-C.)

* Correspondence: alejandro.lorenzo@ua.es

Abstract: Nowadays, audiovisual media play a central role in access to information and in personal relationships. Among the audiovisual media is cinema, which due to its heterogeneous nature, can fulfill diverse educational functions. The objective of this study was to learn about the training that future teachers in Spain receive outside of their teaching degree for the didactic use of cinema. In addition, we sought to understand the influence of training on perceptions regarding the educational potential of cinema and the predisposition to its use. Using a quantitative approach, information was collected from 4659 students from 58 Spanish universities. The questionnaire used covered perceptions about the potentialities of cinema as a didactic resource in pre-school and primary classrooms (PECID). The results showed that 95.1% of the students had not received training. In addition, we found a significant influence of training on their perceptions of the educational possibilities of cinema. Furthermore, we found an influence on their predisposition to use training in their future teaching practice. Overall, it is necessary to implement training actions to fill the gaps detected in favor of a quality education with active learning and linked to society.

Keywords: cinema; audiovisual media; preservice teacher training; university education; didactic resource; formal education; non-formal education; informal education



Citation: Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Lledó, A.; Lorenzo, G.; Gilabert-Cerdá, A. Outside Training of Spanish University Students of Education for the Didactic Application of Cinema: Formal, Non-Formal, and Informal Perspectives. *Educ. Sci.* **2022**, *12*, 38. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12010038>

Academic Editors: José Gómez Galán, Jose Ángel Martínez-López, Cristina Lázaro-Pérez and João Piedade

Received: 13 September 2021

Accepted: 22 December 2021

Published: 8 January 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Nowadays, audiovisual media play a central role in access to information and can influence personal relationships and the vision of reality. As such, audiovisual media are part of people's daily life and, therefore, new training needs arise. Thus, media and audiovisual literacy contribute to the practice of citizenship, to community work, to the generation and interchange of knowledge, and to social change. As such, media and audiovisual literacy are essential factors in the social integration of at-risk groups [1].

Among the audiovisual media is cinema, which has more than 125 years of history, is a central part of life with fascinating stories, and can be considered the diary of humanity [2]. Cinema is characterized by having a heterogeneous nature and can be considered as art, technique, mass media, historical document, expressive language, or technological resource. This allows it to fulfill diverse educational functions based on the proposed learning objectives. Along these lines, a distinction is made between educating with cinema and educating in cinema [3]. In the first case, cinema is integrated into the classroom as a didactic aid. In the second case, it is used as a creative process and to teach the development of a critical view, forming responsible spectators using images and sounds. The educational possibilities of cinema offer teachers great didactic alternatives. These include reinforcing content, enhancing creativity, introducing students to the audiovisual world, or working on visual and cultural manifestations [4]. In this way, film is a resource that can be used to promote humanism and improve many skills and competencies for students. These

skills and competencies will be needed in the workplace [5]. However, it is essential that the didactic application of cinema be approached from the perspective of innovation, promoting a more participatory, open, interdisciplinary, and personalized methodology. In this manner, new relationships are created between teachers and students and amongst the students themselves. More importantly, this enriches the teaching–learning process. Only in this sense can cinema fully meet the educational objectives. The present study advocates an integrative and holistic view of film in education, on the one hand as a didactic resource (backup and support) for learning strategies, and on the other hand as an audiovisual medium. In this regard, knowledge of the cinematographic language should be investigated to develop a critical vision and an understanding of how to create cinematographic works by incorporating different digital tools and technologies.

For the use of didactic resources, teacher training should be considered. For these reasons, teacher training is the first stage in which the foundations of a professional mindset are laid, providing a set of tools to develop meaningful learning in the classroom [6]. In this regard, it is the gateway to professional development [7]. At the same time, it should provide the skills and tools necessary for teachers to face the transformations of a changing and dynamic society [8].

Additionally, the need for professional knowledge to be built from practice and not only from theory has been acknowledged; it is a question of connecting initial training more closely with the reality of education and prioritizing the correct integration of disciplinary, didactic, and psychopedagogical contents [9,10]. For these purposes, future teachers should work on problem-solving skills, critical thinking, the development of interpersonal and collaborative skills as opposed to memorization, and passive transmission of knowledge [11].

Today, student training is no longer confined to formal educational institutions. In this sense, the emergence of new training environments and the greater presence of the media and electronic networks mean that schools are no longer the only institutions where people acquire training [12]. Therefore, to address the training of the individual, it is appropriate to adopt a holistic approach and attend to different training modalities. The author of [13] distinguishes between informal learning, formal learning, and non-formal learning. Informal learning is the result of daily activities related to work, family life, or leisure, and there is no predefined organization, structuring of objectives, duration, or training resources. Formal learning takes place in organized and structured environments, such as educational centers, and is explicitly designated as formal training. Finally, non-formal learning is learning derived from planned activities, but not specifically designated as training programs. Both formal and non-formal learning presuppose intentionality on the part of the learner [13].

Likewise, the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) [14] addresses the concepts of formal education, non-formal education, informal learning, and incidental learning. Firstly, formal education is the institutionalized and intentional education organized by public entities and accredited private organizations that constitute the formal education system of various countries. Secondly, non-formal education, as with formal education, is a form of institutionalized education, which is instructed and organized by an education provider. This represents an alternative or complement to the formal education of individuals within the lifelong learning process. In this sense, it is usually administered in the form of courses, seminars, and workshops. Thirdly, informal learning is an intentional or deliberate—although not institutionalized—mode of learning. Consequently, this form of learning is less structured and organized than those corresponding to formal and non-formal education. In the same way, it may include learning activities carried out at home, in the workplace, in the community, or as part of daily activities. Lastly, unplanned learning includes various forms of learning that are not organized or that involve communication activities that are not designed for the purpose of producing learning. An example of it would be a television broadcast that does not constitute an educational program [14].

Changes that have taken place in training facilities have had repercussions on university education, which over the years has undergone an evolution in its conception. The authors of [15] state that with the European curriculum vitae the fields of formal, non-formal, and informal education have acquired a new prominence and are more closely intertwined. These authors indicate that in the 1970s and 1980s, the emphasis was on formal education. With this, education had a disciplinary character, a methodology of face-to-face classes, a strong separation between teacher and student, as well as differentiated spaces and times. In the 1990s, non-formal education began taking on a greater role in university education, with less classroom attendance and greater contextualization of learning. In this way, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) assists in developing aspects that had hitherto been relegated to the realm of informal education, together with the already existing elements of formal and non-formal education [15]. As a consequence, the university training of students is composed of multiple scenarios, in addition to the classroom. It incorporates the full range of synchronous and asynchronous curricular resources and spaces, such as the library, digital portals, and various activities [16]. One of these more recent manifestations is Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC), which have generated a remarkable level of student satisfaction [17].

The diversity of possible educational scenarios is an opportunity for individuals to increase their training. Nevertheless, in the case of film in education, the shortcomings remain significant. In this sense, [18] noted in Spain the insufficient and scattered training dispensed in the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film. In view of this situation, the initiative that arose within the Spanish Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences with the publication of the *Framework Document on Cinema and Education* [19] is noteworthy. This initiative proposes the need for an audiovisual literacy plan, based on a series of objectives and action itineraries, to integrate audiovisual education at different levels of non-university education. On the other hand, beyond formal education, it is important to note the efforts of the National Agency for Educational Technology and Teacher Development (INTEF), which provides resources and has offered online courses on cinema as a teaching resource and audiovisual literacy. In addition, there are 59 film and education platforms and associations, which develop resources, advice, and training plans [19]. It is also remarkable the emergence of numerous festivals specialized in films for children and made by children and young people, along with the initiatives in general festivals to promote audiovisual education and the existence of specialized magazines [19,20]. Furthermore, the pedagogical work of public and private entities should be underlined, with special mention of museums and film libraries [21,22].

Outside Spain, it is worth mentioning the efforts of the British Film Institute (BFI) throughout several works: to define the concept of film literacy [23–26], determine strategies to integrate film into education [27,28], or create dimensions and learning areas for film education [29]. Similarly, [30] conducted a study for the European Commission. In this research, based on the analysis of the use of film in schools, a series of recommendations are proposed for the inclusion of film in the classroom with implications at the educational level.

For its part, it is appropriate to highlight UNESCO's firm commitment to fostering media literacy in society. In this regard, *Media and Information Literacy: Curriculum for teachers* [31] was promulgated. As [32] point out, this is a key international initiative for teacher training in media. The intention is to offer an introductory and flexible curriculum to be used in teacher training at different stages. From this, different media and information literacy program modules are offered. It is important to specify that the modules can be selected, developed, and adapted to meet the needs and abilities of individual teachers. In this respect, as stated in the introductory section of the curriculum, the aim is to "achieve a multiplier effect: from teachers who are media and information literate, whose knowledge they can pass on to their students and eventually to society as a whole" [31] (p. 17). In this way, teachers would be "fulfilling their first role as advocates of informed and rational

citizenship, and secondly, they would be responding to changes in their role as educators as teaching evolves" [31] (p. 17).

UNESCO integrates into the term Media and Information Literacy the aspects of media literacy and information literacy, although starting from their individual meaning. For media literacy, [31] states that it is necessary to: understand the role and functions of the media and its conditions, critically evaluate media content, use the media for self-expression and democratic participation, and have skills to generate content. Equally, it encourages the convergence of the media, including cinema, radio, television, and the Internet, among others. As [33] notes, it is commendable that UNESCO has offered this curriculum as a starting point for teacher education, putting the focus on education, linking teachers' skills development to helping students explore their experiences with media. In the case of cinema, this curriculum can be a reference to develop, as considered, specific teacher training plans at different stages. On the one hand, this can be conducted through formal education or, on the other hand, through initiatives in the field of non-formal education.

With the growing consensus on the need to implement media education, a notable scientific production has been generated that has dealt with the subject from different perspectives. Thus, studies have been developed that have analyzed the state of media education in each country, reviewing policies, tools, and training programs [34–38]. Comparative analyses have also been made of media education activities, initiatives, and projects in the countries of the European Union (EU) and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) [39,40]. Effective media education practices and the integration of media literacy into the curriculum have been reviewed [41–43]. Furthermore, different models for media education have been developed, reviewed, and proposed pedagogical approaches and recommendations for implementation [44–48]. In addition, research has been conducted to design and validate instruments to measure the media competence of teachers [49], future teachers [50], and adolescents [51]. Another line of research has been to identify the level of media competence of pre-service teachers, schoolchildren, and the elderly [52–55]. People's perceptions of the media skills needed and the risks of not having them, as well as the impact of media literacy on the development of digital citizenship, have also been measured [56,57]. Other studies have dealt with teachers' valuation of the application of media literacy and its obstacles [58–61], and the way in which trainee teachers perceive the aims and methods of media literacy [62]. Additionally, experiences and training scenarios for future teachers have been discussed, analyzing strengths and weaknesses [63,64], and audiovisual educational techniques and tools for technology-enhanced learning have been examined [65].

Specifically, in the field of university training of future teachers in Spain, [18] analyzed whether students receive in the Teacher's Degree the academic training in the didactic use of cinema and what activities with cinema are applied by teachers. Meanwhile, studies by [66–68] have dealt with media literacy in Spanish university faculties of education. Furthermore, [19] investigated the presence of cinema training content in the curricula of non-university educational stages. In the context of informal learning, [69] also addressed the cinematographic habits of future teachers in Spain from a socio-educational approach. Nonetheless, there are no studies that, bearing in mind the different training modalities, investigate the training that future teachers receive outside of their undergraduate studies; neither is there any research analyzing the influence of this training. In this connection, there is a research gap that needs to be filled.

Based on the above background, the general objective of this study is to determine the training that future teachers in Spain receive outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film, as well as to understand its influence on their perceptions of the educational potential of film and their predisposition to its use. The following specific objectives underlie the general objective:

1. To analyze the extent to which training is being received outside the Teacher's Degree throughout Spain. Specifically, it is analyzed according to the Autonomous Com-

munity, the type of Teacher's Degree of the student body and the type of university where it is being studied.

2. To determine the means of training employed by prospective teachers outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film and the hours of training received.
3. To detect the perceived competence to use technological tools in the creation of cinematographic proposals.
4. To identify the differences in the perceptions about the educational potentialities of cinema and the predisposition to its use. For this purpose, it is considered whether training has been received outside Teacher's Degree for its didactic application.

2. Materials and Methods

The present study adopted a descriptive non-experimental quantitative approach with a survey design. In this line, Ref. [70] suggest that the survey is characterized, on the one hand, by the absence of manipulation in the collection of information. On the other hand, it is characterized by the importance given to the aspects of the breadth of the sample of subjects forming the study and to the generality of the results. Moreover, this is a comparative-causal study [71], since, in addition to providing descriptive information on the variables quantified, the possible significant differences between the groups compared were analyzed. From another perspective, since the data collection was carried out at a specific time, it is also a cross-sectional study [72].

2.1. Participants

The study presented here was carried out with a sample of 4659 students from all the Spanish autonomous communities and from both public and private universities. A quota sampling technique [73] was used to select the sample. Of the sample, 84.5% ($n = 3939$) were women and 15.5% ($n = 720$) were men. Apart from that, 51.0% ($n = 2378$) were students of the Primary Education Teacher Degree compared to 49.0% ($n = 2281$) of students of the Pre-School Education Teacher Degree. Additionally, 89.8% ($n = 4183$) of the participants belonged to public universities and 10.2% ($n = 476$) to private universities. In terms of age, participants were between 18 and 66 years old, with a mean of 22.2 years ($SD = 3.9$). A total of 42.9% ($n = 1999$) of the students were in the third year, 27.6% ($n = 1286$) in the second year, 23.2% ($n = 1080$) in the fourth year and 6.3% ($n = 294$) in the first year. Regarding territorial distribution, Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentages of participating students according to the autonomous community in which they studied.

Table 1. Participating students by autonomous community [74].

Autonomous Community	Students	
	f	%
Andalusia	1161	24.9
Aragon	69	1.5
Asturias	99	2.1
Balearic Islands	76	1.6
Canary Islands	205	4.4
Cantabria	45	1.0
Castilla-La Mancha	110	2.4
Castile and Leon	171	3.7
Catalonia	642	13.8
Valencian Community	601	12.9
Extremadura	88	1.9
Galicia	251	5.4
Madrid	636	13.7
Murcia	218	4.7
Navarre	71	1.5
Basque Country	156	3.3
La Rioja	60	1.3
Total	4659	100.0

Table 2 shows the number of students participating according to the university to which they belong.

Table 2. Participating sample by university [74].

University	f	%
University of A Coruña	119	2.6
University of Alcalá	166	3.6
Alfonso X el Sabio University	3	0.1
University of Alicante	196	4.2
University of Almería	23	0.5
Nebrija University	19	0.4
Autonomous University of Barcelona	73	1.6
Autonomous University of Madrid	154	3.3
University of Barcelona	64	1.4
University of Burgos	24	0.5
University of Cádiz	155	3.3
Camilo José Cela University	24	0.5
University of Cantabria	41	0.9
CEU Cardenal Herrera University	35	0.8
University of Castilla-La Mancha	110	2.4
Catholic University San Antonio	33	0.7
Catholic University Santa Teresa de Jesús de Ávila	2	0.0
Valencia Catholic University San Vicente Mártir	9	0.2
Complutense University of Madrid	45	1.0
University of Córdoba	224	4.8
University of Deusto	13	0.3
European University of the Atlántico	4	0.1
University of Extremadura	88	1.9
Francisco de Vitoria University	13	0.3
University of Girona	158	3.4
University of Granada	116	2.5
University of Huelva	101	2.2
University of the Islas Baleares	76	1.6
Internacional University of Cataluña	8	0.2
Jaume I University	223	4.8
University of Jaén	25	0.5
University of La Laguna	88	1.9
University of La Rioja	60	1.3
University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria	117	2.5
University of León	27	0.6
University of Lleida	111	2.4
Loyola University Andalucía	30	0.6
Mondragón University	70	1.5
University of Murcia	185	4.0
University of Málaga	186	4.0
University of Navarra	23	0.5
University of Oviedo	99	2.1
University of País Vasco	73	1.6
Comillas Pontifical University	32	0.7
Pontifical University of Salamanca	33	0.7
Public University of Navarra	48	1.0
Ramon Llull University	96	2.1
Rey Juan Carlos University	180	3.9
Rovira i Virgili University	118	2.5
University of Salamanca	54	1.2
San Jorge University	15	0.3
University of Santiago de Compostela	35	0.8
University of e Sevilla	301	6.5
University of Valladolid	31	0.7
University of e Valencia	138	3.0
University of Vic	14	0.3
University of Vigo	97	2.1
University of Zaragoza	54	1.2
Total	4659	100.0

The different number of participants according to the autonomous community is in the line with the fact that the largest population of students corresponds to the territories with the largest number of universities. To determine the representativeness of the sample,

we used the formula $n = K2 p q N / E2 (N - 1) + K2 p q$, which is suitable for the case of finite populations [75]. The Spanish Ministry of Education and Vocational Training reports that the population of students of the Teacher Training Degree in Spain is 118,525. Consequently, the total sample is representative of the chosen population with a sampling error of 1.4% and a confidence level of 95.5%. If we consider the type of Teacher Degree, the student population of the Teacher Degree in Pre-School Education is 44,779 and that of the Teacher Degree in Primary Education is 73,746. The sample is representative of the two Teacher Degrees with a sampling error of 2%. In relation to the type of university, the student population of public universities is 92,045 and that of private universities is 26,480. The sample is representative of public universities and private universities with a sampling error of 1.5% and 4.5%, respectively.

2.2. Instrument

For data collection, the questionnaire *Perceptions about the potentialities of cinema as a didactic resource in pre-school and primary classrooms (PECID)* was designed ad hoc, consisting of 45 items, distributed in two parts. In this direction, the third section of the first part of the PECID questionnaire, with 11 items, focuses on the training received for the use of cinema as a didactic resource. The second part of the questionnaire includes 25 items on a Likert-type scale, with three dimensions, on the perceptions of the potential of film as a teaching resource in pre-school and primary education. The first dimension is composed of nine items and the second and third dimensions of eight items each [74]. There are six response options (1 = totally disagree; 2 = quite disagree; 3 = sometimes disagree; 4 = sometimes agree; 5 = quite agree; 6 = totally agree). As a conclusion of the questionnaire, there is an item about the predisposition to use film in the classroom when students become teachers in the future.

The PECID questionnaire underwent a validation process to obtain content validity, reliability, and construct validity [74]. To obtain content validity, the items were subjected to expert judgment [76,77], applying the content validity coefficient (CVC) of [78]. In this aspect, with reference to the items of the third section of the first part of the questionnaire, only one item had to be eliminated, keeping the items with a CVC higher than 0.80. In this respect, according to [78], good content validity is guaranteed. Regarding the items on perceptions of the potential of film as a teaching resource, three items were eliminated, one from each dimension, and the items with values above 0.80 were also maintained. In terms of reliability, the Likert-type scale on perceptions obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.978, which, according to [79], is a value of excellent reliability. As for construct validity, a constitutive definition [80] was elaborated for the perceptions of the students of the Teacher's Degree on the potential of cinema as a didactic resource in pre-school and primary education. Thus, it was defined as the perceptions concerning the didactic possibilities offered by cinema to develop the teaching-learning processes in the educational stages of pre-school and primary school. This variable was broken down into three dimensions or factors of perceptions [74]:

- (1) The potential of cinema as a didactic resource for the transmission of contents. It is conceptualized as the mediating possibilities of cinema as a communication and symbolic representation support to transmit concepts, attitudes, and values to students.
- (2) The potential of cinema as a didactic resource for expression and communication. It is conceptualized as the mediating possibilities of cinema as a form of representation and projection to develop relationships and exchange of information among students.
- (3) The potential of cinema as a didactic resource for critical analysis. It is conceptualized as the mediating possibilities of cinema to develop in students a conscious and proper analysis of reality.

After performing an exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, three factors were obtained based on the goodness-of-fit indexes obtained: a comparative fit index (CFI) of 0.957, a root mean square (RMSEA) of 0.109, and a standardized root mean square (SRMR) of 0.032. Following [81], this is a model with good fit values. Further, in the confirmatory

analysis, the Cronbach's alpha obtained for the three factors was high: 0.965 for factor 1, 0.963 for factor 2, and 0.961 for factor 3 [74]. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using the Mplus program in version 8 [82].

The results presented in this study are those related to the following items: whether training has been received outside the Teacher's Degree, through which means training was received, how many hours of training, the Degree of competence perceived for the use of technological tools for the development of cinematographic proposals, and the predisposition to use cinema as a didactic resource in the classroom in the future teaching practice. As for the results presented on the differences in perceptions depending on whether training was received outside the Teacher's Degree, the items are grouped according to the three established dimensions.

2.3. Procedure

Data collection was carried out in several phases. Firstly, we proceeded to identify the Spanish universities, both public and private, in the different territories, that offer the Teacher's Degree. For this purpose, data provided by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Vocational Training were used. As a result, it was determined that there are 63 universities in Spain that offer the Teacher's Degree, of which 39 are public and 24 are private. Secondly, we contacted the teaching staff of the universities to inform them of the objectives of the research and to request their collaboration in the dissemination of the questionnaire among their students. Of all the universities, five private universities did not agree to participate in the study. Overall, the data were obtained through the completion of the questionnaire in Spanish by the student body during the 2018/2019 academic year through the Google Forms tool. The students were informed that their participation in the research was voluntary and anonymous, and their consent was obtained. In this line, any personal data that did not respect confidentiality was excluded. Regarding the collected information, it was used exclusively for the purposes of this research.

2.4. Data Analysis

After planning and implementing the data collection process, the data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical program for Windows version 21 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Descriptive statistics were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. For the inferential analysis of the possible significant differences in the variables chosen according to the two groups compared, the *t*-test was chosen, with a significance value of $p < 0.05$. In this case, to examine univariate normality, the distribution of the data was analyzed. For this purpose, the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was performed, whose statistics resulted in a significance of 0.000 for the variable perceptions about the potential of cinema in its three dimensions or factors. This shows that the data do not exhibit a normal distribution criterion. In relation to the skewness and kurtosis values, however, these are less than 2 and 7, respectively, therefore, they can be considered within normality [83].

3. Results

The results are presented below, ordered according to the quantified variables and the proposed objectives.

3.1. Training Received outside the Teacher's Degree in Spain and Depending on the Autonomous Community, the Type of Teacher's Degree and the Ownership of the University

With regard to the results on the training received by students of the Teacher's Degree outside their Degree studies for the didactic use of film in Pre-School and Primary Education classrooms, 95.1% ($n = 4433$) have not received training compared to 4.9% ($n = 226$) of the students who have received training.

If we observe the training received in terms of the autonomous community of the study, Table 3 shows the results.

Table 3. Percentages and frequencies of training received outside the Teacher’s Degree according to autonomous community.

Education Outside the Teacher’s Degree									
AACC	Yes			No			Total		
	f	% AACC	% Spain	f	% AACC	% Spain	f	% AACC	% Spain
Andalusia	47	4.0	1.0	1114	96.0	23.9	1161	100.0	24.9
Aragon	3	4.3	0.1	66	95.7	1.4	69	100.0	1.5
Asturias	6	6.1	0.1	93	93.9	2.0	99	100.0	2.1
Balearic Islands	3	3.9	0.1	73	96.1	1.6	76	100.0	1.6
Canary Islands	15	7.3	0.3	190	92.7	4.1	205	100.0	4.4
Cantabria	2	4.4	0.0	43	95.6	0.9	45	100.0	1.0
Castilla–La Mancha	7	6.4	0.2	103	93.6	2.2	110	100.0	2.4
Castile and Leon	8	4.7	0.2	163	95.3	3.5	171	100.0	3.7
Catalonia	26	4.0	0.6	616	96.0	13.2	642	100.0	13.8
Valencian Community	25	4.2	0.5	576	95.8	12.4	601	100.0	12.9
Extremadura	5	5.7	0.1	83	94.3	1.8	88	100.0	1.9
Galicia	8	3.2	0.2	243	96.8	5.2	251	100.0	5.4
Madrid	48	7.5	1.0	588	92.5	12.6	636	100.0	13.7
Murcia	12	5.5	0.3	206	94.5	4.4	218	100.0	4.7
Navarre	5	7.0	0.1	66	93.0	1.4	71	100.0	1.5
Basque Country	1	0.6	0.0	155	99.4	3.3	156	100.0	3.3
La Rioja	5	8.3	0.1	55	91.7	1.2	60	100.0	1.3
Total							4659		100.0

The results show that the percentage of students in all autonomous communities who received training outside the Teacher’s Degree is very low, not exceeding 8.4% in any of them. Among the autonomous communities with the highest percentages of students with training, La Rioja, Madrid, Canary Islands, and Navarre stand out, with 8.3%, 7.5%, 7.3%, and 7.0%, respectively. Most of the communities have percentages of students with education outside the Degree that range between 3.9% and 6.0%. The Basque Country is detected as the region with the lowest percentage of educated students (0.6%).

In relation to the results on the training received by students outside the Teacher’s Degree according to the Degree studies they are pursuing, Table 4 is presented below.

Table 4. Percentages and frequencies of training received outside the Teacher’s Degree as a function of the type of Teacher’s Degree.

Education Outside the Teacher’s Degree	Teacher’s Degree in Pre-School Education			Teacher’s Degree in Primary Education			Total	
	f	% Pre.	% Spain	f	% Pri.	% Spain	f	% Spain
Yes	107	4.7	2.3	119	5.0	2.6	226	4.9
No	2174	95.3	46.7	2259	95.0	48.5	4433	95.2
Total	2281	100.0	49.0	2378	100.0	51.0	4659	100.0

As can be seen, the percentages of untrained students are very high, whether they belong to the Teacher’s Degree in Pre-School Education or the Teacher’s Degree in Primary Education, being practically the same. Specifically, 95.3% in the case of students in the Teacher’s Degree in Pre-School Education compared to 95.0% in the Teacher’s Degree in Primary Education.

If we observe non-degree education according to the type of university, as can be seen in Table 5, private universities have a slightly higher percentage of students with training outside the Degree (5.5%), in contrast to public universities (4.8%).

Table 5. Percentages and frequencies of training received outside the Teacher's Degree according to university type.

Education Outside the Teacher's Degree	Public University			Private University			Total	
	f	% Pub.	% Spain	f	% Priv.	% Spain	f	%
Yes	200	4.8	4.3	26	5.5	0.6	226	4.9
No	3983	95.2	85.5	450	94.5	9.7	4433	95.2
Total	4183	100.0	89.8	476	100.0	10.2	4659	100.0

3.2. Means of Training outside the Teacher's Degree for the Didactic Use of Film and Hours of Training Received

Table 6 below shows the data, with multiple answers, on the means of training students of the Teacher's Degree outside their Degree studies for the didactic use of cinema. Training means belonging to formal, non-formal, and informal education are contemplated.

Table 6. Means of training students of the Teacher's Degree outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of cinema.

Training Resources Outside the Teacher's Degree	f	%
On-site or online courses or workshops	69	17.6
Conferences	41	10.4
Internet resources	118	29.9
Library and bookstore resources	36	9.1
Media	63	16.0
Master's Degree in Teacher Training	2	0.5
Ecclesiastical Declaration of Academic Competency (DECA)	1	0.3
Higher Technician in Pre-School Education	16	4.1
Postgraduate Programme International Educating Class	1	0.3
Bachelor's Degree in Journalism	3	0.8
At school	3	0.8
Bachelor's Degree in Fine Arts	1	0.3
Baccalaureate	12	3.1
Syllabus of public examination	2	0.5
Bachelor's Degree in Pedagogy	2	0.5
Higher Technician in Physical and Sports Activities Animation	2	0.5
Bachelor's Degree in Audiovisual Communication	4	1.0
Bachelor's Degree in Social Education	2	0.5
Active teachers	1	0.3
Higher Technician in Sociocultural Animation	2	0.5
Other Bachelor's Degree	2	0.5
Bachelor's Degree in Classical Philology	1	0.3
Bachelor's Degree in the Superior School of Dramatic Art	1	0.3
Higher Technician in Audiovisual and Show Project Production	2	0.5
Higher Technician in Photography	1	0.3
Volunteering	1	0.3
Erasmus Mundus Scholarship-European Master in Media	1	0.3
Engineering for Education (EUROMIME)	1	0.3
Bachelor's Degree in Modern Languages	1	0.3
Music conservatory studies	1	0.3
Making off of the films on the DVDs	1	0.3
Pastoral theology education	1	0.3
Total	394	100.0

As can be seen from the results presented, the most frequent means of training in the didactic use of film outside the Teacher's Degree are Internet resources, with 29.9%. Three other relevant means are face-to-face or online courses or workshops, the media, and conferences, used by 17.6%, 16%, and 10.4% of students, respectively. Other, although secondary, means used by students of the Teacher's Degree to train in the didactic use of

film are the resources of libraries and bookshops (9.1%) and higher-level training cycles (5.9%). Among the latter, it is worth mentioning the higher-level training cycle in Pre-School Education, through which 4.1% of students have received training. Likewise, 4.2% of students on the Teacher's Degree have been trained in the didactic use of cinema through other university Degrees they have taken. Some of these are Audiovisual Communication, Journalism, and Pedagogy. Finally, within non-university training, it is noteworthy that 3.9% were trained in compulsory education and the baccalaureate.

Regarding the results on the hours of training received outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film in Pre-School and Primary Education classrooms, 70.3% ($n = 159$) of students have received between one and ten hours of training and 8% ($n = 18$) from eleven to twenty hours.

3.3. Perceived Competence to Use Technological Tools in the Creation of Film Proposals

In Table 7, the results in relation to the competence shown by the future teachers in the use of technological tools in the production of film proposals are presented.

Table 7. Percentages and frequencies of the competence to use technological tools in the creation of film proposals.

Technology Tools	Not Competent		Minimally Competent		Moderately Competent		Quite Competent		Totally Competent		M	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Video camera	115	2.5	675	14.5	1625	34.9	1390	29.8	854	18.3	3.47	1.02
Photo camera	59	1.3	400	8.6	1529	32.8	1887	40.5	784	16.8	3.63	0.90
Mobile phone	89	1.9	396	8.5	999	21.4	1699	36.5	1476	31.7	3.87	1.01
Tablet	181	3.9	728	15.6	1347	28.9	1509	32.4	894	19.2	3.47	1.08
Editing software	491	10.5	1161	24.9	1216	26.1	984	21.1	807	17.3	3.09	1.25
Microphone	476	10.2	1224	26.3	1374	29.5	910	19.5	675	14.5	3.01	1.20
Sound recorder	252	5.4	973	20.9	1556	33.4	1203	25.8	675	14.5	3.23	1.09

M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

As can be observed, 68.2% ($n = 3175$) of students consider themselves to be quite or totally competent in using the mobile phone to make cinematographic works. It should also be noted that the photographic camera and the tablet are devices with which the majority of students perceive themselves to be quite and totally competent, with 57.3% ($n = 2671$) and 51.6% ($n = 2403$), respectively. On the other hand, 36.5% ($n = 1700$) and 35.4% ($n = 1652$) of the students perceive themselves as little or nothing competent in using the microphone and the editing software.

3.4. Differences in Perceptions of the Educational Potential of Film, Taking into Account Whether or Not Training Has Been Received Outside the Teacher's Degree

Table 8 shows the comparison of perceptions between students who have received training outside the Degree and those who have not.

Table 8. Results of the *t*-test for mean difference in perceptions between students who have received training outside the Teacher's Degree in the didactic use of film and those who have not received training.

Variable	Levene Test		Education Outside the Teacher's Degree	No Education Outside the Teacher's Degree	t	P
	F	P	M (SD)	M (SD)		
Dimension 1	2.78	0.095	45.35 (8.24)	43.83 (9.31)	2.41 (46)	0.016
Dimension 2	5.07	0.024	41.02 (7.06)	39.65 (8.47)	2.82 (25)	0.005 ¹
Dimension 3	1.30	0.253	39.45 (7.85)	38.58 (8.40)	1.51 (46)	0.130

Dimension 1: Cinema as a transmitter of content; dimension 2: Cinema as expression and communication; dimension 3: Cinema as critical analysis. M = mean; SD = standard deviation, in parentheses. The degrees of freedom are indicated in parentheses next to the *t* value. ¹ *T*-test for unequal variances.

The results show that students who have received training outside the Teacher's Degree perceive more educational potential in dimensions 1 and 2, with an increased mean of 45.35 and 41.02, respectively.

Regarding the desire to use film as a teaching resource in the classroom when becoming a teacher, 42.2% ($n = 1966$) of the students quite agree to use film, 36.2% ($n = 1685$) totally agree and 13.1% ($n = 612$) sometimes agree. On the other hand, 1% ($n = 45$) sometimes disagree, 4.7% ($n = 221$) quite disagree, and 2.8% ($n = 130$) totally disagree.

Table 9 below presents the results on the differences in the predisposition to the use of film depending on whether the student has received training outside the Teacher's Degree for its didactic application.

Table 9. Results of the *t*-test for the mean difference in the predisposition to the use of film between students who have received training outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film and those who have not received training.

Variable	Levene Test		Education Outside the Teacher's Degree	No Education Outside the Teacher's Degree	t	P
	F	P	M (SD)	M (SD)		
Predisposition for cinema use	0.179	0.673	5.14 (1.16)	4.94 (1.18)	2.45 (46)	0.014

M = mean; SD = standard deviation, in parentheses. The degrees of freedom are indicated in parentheses next to the *t* value.

As can be appreciated, students who have received training are more likely to use film in their future teaching practice with a significance value of 0.014.

4. Discussion

The present study adopted a holistic approach to education and set out to determine the extent to which the future teachers in Spain receive training outside their undergraduate studies for the didactic application of cinema. In this vein, one of the findings was the high percentage of students (95.1%) who have not received specific training in the use of cinema as a didactic resource in the pre-school and primary school classrooms. In tune, other studies have found that future teachers do not have a high mean media literacy [52,54]. If we compare this result with that obtained by [18] for the training within the Teacher's Degree, we find that the percentage is equally high, although slightly lower (88.4%). Along the same lines, [84] found for the media education case that training received outside of the university is lower (38.2%). This fact can be attributed to the highly institutionalized and hierarchically structured nature of formal education that is predominant in the educational world [85]. In this sense, non-formal and informal education have complementary character and certifications of different value. This means that personal and economic factors and intentionality are more present. These factors condition the adoption by the student body of the means of training. On the other hand, the training deficiencies detected have negative consequences. This is because prior teacher training is one of the determining factors for curriculum development in the classroom [86]. In agreement with this, 75.1% of the students of the Teacher's Degree in Spain have stated that they quite agree or totally agree with the need to have more specific training to apply cinema in the classroom [18]. Along the same lines, [52,54,56] reflected the need to make up for deficiencies in media skills with specific literacy policies. However, students, as highlighted by [69], have a weekly habit of consuming films, which can be a way of accessing knowledge of the audiovisual medium. This can also be a stimulus to broaden training through non-formal and informal channels pointed out by several authors [19–22].

If we observe the different territories of Spain, it has been found that training is low in a fairly homogeneous way, although, in some autonomous communities, the percentage is slightly higher. In the case of training within the Teacher's Degree, as detected by [18],

the percentages are higher, but also more disparate, since the autonomous action of the universities has a broader scope among the student body. Likewise, it was found that La Rioja is the community with the most students with training outside the Degree, being at the same time one of the communities with the most training within the Degree [18]. In contrast, the Basque Country is the community with the least training outside the Degree and has the lowest percentage of students with training (3.8%) within the Degree [18]. In addition, it is the community with the lowest mean weekly film viewing in the student body [69]. It is, therefore, a particular case that requires a particularly relevant training intervention.

With respect to training according to the type of Teacher's Degree and the tenure of the university, as was the case with training within the Degree [18], these are no variables that cause notable differences, and the percentages are even more similar. However, the percentage of students in the Primary Education Teacher Degree with training is slightly higher. This fact is consistent, since cinema is an audiovisual medium that is more present in the Primary Education stage curriculum [19] and this is reflected in the preservice teacher training. On the other hand, the percentage of students with training in private universities is slightly higher. In this finding, it is worth bearing in mind that private universities design particular proposals that enhance the institutional brand. By means of market strategies, they seek to consolidate the service and educational offer and increase the added value for the customer and their feeling of loyalty [87]. The results are in line with the findings of another study [52] that found differences depending on the studies and identified greater media literacy in students from private universities.

In relation to the means used for training, it has become clear that they are numerous and diverse, covering formal, non-formal, and informal education. In this way, the means mostly used come from informal education. Among these, Internet resources, the media, library resources, and bookstore resources stand out. This accounts for 55% of the total. This discovery is in line with the majority use of the Internet and media among university students and the possibilities of developing learning through the network [88,89]. In the face of scarce formal training, the presence of media that provide access to information with immediacy and greater fluidity increases [90]. On the other hand, it is found that the main non-formal way is face-to-face or online courses or workshops (17.6%), the most common in the non-formal educational field [91]. Similarly, where more training is obtained in the formal sphere is in the higher-level training cycles, in accordance with its eminently practical nature and oriented to professional performance [91]. With respect to training hours, in accordance with the lower training received outside the Degree, fewer training hours are attended than within the Teacher's Degree. In this sense, 82.3% of the students have received between one and twenty hours of training within the degree [18].

If we consider the perceived competence of students to use technology tools in the creation of cinematographic proposals, competence is moderate. The insufficient training detected is manifested both in the degree of perceived competence and in the tools on which competence is perceived to be greater. These tools are the ones most frequently used in everyday activities but are less specifically cinematic in nature. In this aspect, the mobile phone is the most frequently used device outside the Teacher's Degree [92,93]. In particular, 31.7% of students consider themselves fully competent to use it to make films. In contrast, it is perceived to be less proficient in technologies such as video cameras, editing software, or microphones. The degree of competence detected coincides with the problems identified in future teachers to create new media content, although they have even more difficulties in analyzing media content [54].

As for the influence of training on perceptions, students who have received specific training outside the Teacher's Degree perceive significantly more potential in cinema as a resource for the transmission of content and as a resource for expression and communication. Nevertheless, the differences are not significant with respect to cinema as a resource for critical analysis. It is convenient to interpret this finding based on the contents of the training received and the nature of teaching in a degree program and outside of it. In this

sense, since it is a training that has been received mainly through non-regulated means, consequently, the dimension of more reflective learning is less present. This dimension aims, precisely, to make a critical reading of reality and of the information received through informal channels of communication. In this line, it should be noted that in [94] the authors did not find significant differences in the dimension of cinema as a resource for the transmission of contents according to the training received in the Degree. In contrast, differences were found according to cinematic habits. This reflects that the perceptions of this dimension are influenced to a greater extent by training outside the Degree and the film consumption habits of the students. Regarding the predisposition to use cinema, it was found that students with training are significantly more predisposed to use cinema in their future teaching practice. This finding shows that greater knowledge and handling of film and its educational use contributes to its subsequent application. In contrast, current training deficiencies are reflected in the occasional use of film by non-university teachers [30]. The high predisposition for the use of cinema is in line with the teachers' positive perception of media education to improve teaching tasks and meet educational objectives, even though it is recognized that the application of media is not without obstacles [58–62].

5. Conclusions

The following conclusions—drawn in response to the objectives of the study—are presented below:

1. Training outside the Teacher's Degree for the didactic use of film by future teachers in Spain is very scarce, being quite homogeneous in all territories and slightly higher for students of the Teacher's Degree in Primary Education and private universities.
2. The means of access to training are diverse, the most common being informal education, such as Internet resources or the media, and mostly between one and ten hours of training are received.
3. Students' competence in technological tools for the creation of film proposals is moderate, with the mobile phone being the device with which they perceive themselves to be most competent.
4. Students with training outside the Teacher's Degree perceive significantly greater potential in film as a resource for transmitting content and as a resource for expression and communication. Moreover, they are significantly more willing to use cinema in their future teaching practice.

In assessing the findings, the limitations of the study should be considered. In this respect, the non-participation of five private universities prevented the creation of a larger and more diverse sample of participants, including students from all Spanish universities. Likewise, due to the nature of the instrument used, unreflective or insincere completion of the questionnaire could have led to biased responses.

As far as future lines of research are concerned, it is proposed to progress deeper into the training offered in non-formal and informal education and to qualitatively analyze the specific training contents. This will make it possible to complement the results of this study and enrich the meanings.

The findings in this study make it advisable, at a practical level, to undertake actions to develop the training of students in the didactic use of cinema. To this end, it is essential that public administrations make a firm commitment to promote comprehensive policies that favor training in formal, non-formal, and informal education. These policies should be drawn up both at the national and regional level and with the participation of the different educational and cinematographic collectives. The actions to be undertaken should be based on the recognition of cinema as a fundamental element of culture, society, and individual and collective identity. At the same time, the opportunity of its educational use should be used to promote active citizenship. In the field of formal education, the curricular inclusion of film training content and the use of cinema as a didactic resource from the beginning of schooling to university and professional training should be encouraged. In the case of the Teacher's Degree, it could be integrated through a specific subject or in a transversal

way in different areas of knowledge. The training given should cover the three educational dimensions detected in cinema as a didactic resource: for the transmission of contents, for expression and communication, and for critical analysis [42]. In the field of non-formal education, universities should carry out complementary training actions, preferably with the collaboration of associations, private institutions, and other public institutions. Along these lines, they should organize courses and conferences, screenings of films programmed in cycles, film forums, make it possible to participate in film projects, etc. In the area of informal education, public administrations should effectively promote film production with special cultural value, the visibility of cinematographic diversity, develop policies to help film exhibitors, and maintain quality standards for content in the media.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.L.-L.; methodology, A.L.-L.; software, A.L.-L. and G.L.; validation, A.L.-L.; formal analysis, A.L.-L. and G.L.; investigation, A.L.-L.; resources, A.L.; data curation, A.L.-L. and G.L.; writing—original draft preparation, A.L.-L. and A.L.; writing—review and editing, A.L.-L. and A.G.-C.; visualization, A.L.-L., and A.G.-C.; supervision, A.L.; project administration, A.L.-L. and A.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the teachers who participated in the expert judgement and the teachers from the Spanish universities who collaborated in the dissemination of the PECID questionnaire.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Camarero, E.; Varona, D.; Fedorov, A. Alfabetización mediática y audiovisual para el empoderamiento y el cambio social: Resultados de proyecto nica (1° Fase). *Opción* **2017**, *33*, 160–189.
2. Ambròs-Pallarès, A. Cine, transmedia y educación: Relatos en pantalla. *Rev. D'innovació Recer. En Educ.* **2020**, *13*, 1–18.
3. Amar, V. *Comprender y Disfrutar el Cine. La Gran Pantalla Como Recurso Educativo*, 1st ed.; Grupo Comunicar Ediciones: Huelva, Spain, 2003.
4. Pérez García, Á.; Sacaluga Rodríguez, I.; Moreno Melgarejo, A. The development of the competency of “Cultural awareness and expressions” using movie-induced tourism as a didactic resource. *Educ. Sci.* **2021**, *11*, 315. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Ortiz, M.B.A. Commercial Cinema as a learning tool in medical education, from potential medical students to seniors. *MedEdPublish* **2018**, *7*, 238. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Caena, F. *Initial Teacher Education in Europe: An Overview of Policy Issues*, 1st ed.; European Commission: Brussels, Belgium, 2014.
7. Montero, L. La formación inicial, ¿puerta de entrada al desarrollo profesional? *Educar* **2002**, *30*, 69–89. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Rebolledo, T. La formación inicial del profesorado de educación primaria y secundaria en Alemania, España, Finlandia, Francia y Reino Unido. Estudio comparado. *Rev. Española De Educ. Comp.* **2015**, *25*, 129–148.
9. Soto, E.; Maldonado-Ruiz, G.; Márquez-Román, A.; Peña, N. Reconstruyendo el conocimiento práctico en confinamiento. Una experiencia de enseñanza en la formación inicial de docentes. *RED Rev. De Educ. Distancia* **2021**, *65*, 13.
10. Manso, J.; Garrido-Martos, R. Formación inicial y acceso a la profesión: Qué demandan los docentes. *Rev. De Educ.* **2021**, *393*, 293–319.
11. Darling-Hammond, L.; Oakes, M. *Preparing Teachers for Deeper Learning*, 1st ed.; Harvard Education Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2019.
12. Cabero, J.; Barroso, J. La escuela en la sociedad de la información. La escuela 2.0. In *Nuevos Escenarios Digitales: Las Tecnologías de la Información y la Comunicación Aplicadas a la Formación y Desarrollo Curricular*, 1st ed.; Pirámide: Madrid, Spain, 2013; pp. 21–36.
13. CEDEFOP. *Terminology of European Education and Training Policy*, 1st ed.; Office for Official Publications of the European Communities: Luxembourg, 2008.
14. UNESCO. *International Standard Classification of Education*, 1st ed.; UNESCO: Paris, France, 2011.
15. Fernández, C.; Rodríguez, M.C. Educación formal, no formal e informal en el Espacio Europeo: Nuevas exigencias para los procesos de formación en educación. *Rev. Aula Abierta* **2005**, *85*, 45–56.

16. Gairín, J.; Feixas, M.; Guillamón, C.; Quinquer, D. La tutoría académica en el escenario europeo de la Educación Superior. *Rev. Interuniv. De Form. Del Profr.* **2004**, *18*, 61–77.
17. Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Roig-Vila, R.; Lorenzo, G. Evaluación de los MOOC por estudiantes universitarios desde una perspectiva metodológica. *Publicaciones* **2018**, *48*, 401–414. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Lledó, A.; Lorenzo, G.; Pérez-Vázquez, E. Academic training in Spanish universities for the didactic use of cinema in pre-school and primary education. *J. Technol. Sci. Educ.* **2021**, *11*, 210–226. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Lara, F.; Ruiz, M.; Tarín, M. *Documento Marco Sobre Cine y Educación*, 1st ed.; Academia de las Artes y las Ciencias Cinematográficas de España: Madrid, Spain, 2019.
20. Vallejo, A.; Peirano, M.P. Iniciativas de educación cinematográfica en los festivales de cine de Iberoamérica (2005–2019). *Arte Individuo Y Soc.* **2021**, *33*, 791–818. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Moya, T. Iniciativa de alfabetización cinematográfica: Una cartografía metodológica actual de las entidades dedicadas a la film literacy con públicos no profesionales en España. *Rev. Fuentes* **2017**, *19*, 125–138.
22. Moya, T. Towards a film literacy canon: Identification and multicultural analysis of the contents used in film education with pre-university students in Spain. *Commun. Soc.* **2019**, *32*, 235–248.
23. British Film Institute. *Making Movies Matter*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 1999.
24. British Film Institute. *Reframing Literacy*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2008.
25. British Film Institute. *Film 21 Century Literacy. Re/defining Film Education. Notes Towards a Definition of Film Education*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2012.
26. British Film Institute. *Screening Literacy: Executive Summary*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2012.
27. British Film Institute. *Moving Images in the Classroom*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2000.
28. British Film Institute. *Look Again! A Teaching Guide to Using Film and Television with Three-to Eleven-Year-Olds*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2003.
29. British Film Institute. *A Framework for Film Education*, 1st ed.; British Film Institute: London, UK, 2015.
30. Pérez-Tornero, J.M.; Martínez-Cerdá, J.-F.; Portalés Oliva, M.; Durán Becerra, T.; Peralta García, L.; Julià Cano, A.; Guardans, I.; Comenge, R.; Ros, L.; Pierobon, O.; et al. *Showing Films and Other Audiovisual Content in European Schools. Obstacles and Best Practices*, 1st ed.; European Commission: Brussel, Belgium, 2015.
31. UNESCO. *Media and Information Literacy: Curriculum for Teachers*, 1st ed.; UNESCO: Paris, France, 2011.
32. Pérez-Tornero, J.; Samy, T. La formación de profesores en educación en medios: Currículo y experiencias internacionales. *Comunicar* **2012**, *20*, 10–14. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Wilson, C. Alfabetización mediática e informacional: Proyecciones didácticas. *Comunicar* **2012**, *39*, 15–24. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Cicha, K.; Rutecka, P.; Rizun, M.; Strzelecki, A. Digital and media literacies in the Polish education system—Pre- and post-COVID-19 perspective. *Educ. Sci.* **2021**, *11*, 532. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Dudin, M.N.; Afanasyev, V.V.; Afanaseva, I.V.; Rezakov, R.G. Formation of media education in Russia (from the Middle Ages to the present day). *Amazon. Investig.* **2019**, *8*, 674–687.
36. Jayachandran, J. Media literacy and education in India during times of communication abundance. *J. Creat. Commun.* **2018**, *13*, 73–84. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Palsa, L.; Salomaa, S. Media literacy as a cross-sectoral phenomenon: Media education in Finnish ministerial-level policies. *Cent. Eur. J. Commun.* **2020**, *13*, 162–182. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Sloboda, Z. Considering historical (dis)continuities of media (literacy) education in the Czech Republic for the future approach. *Commun. Today* **2018**, *9*, 4–19.
39. Fedorov, A.V.; Levitskaya, A.A. Comparative analysis of the development of mass media education in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries. *Media Educ.* **2018**, *58*, 39–62.
40. Petranová, D.; Hossová, M.; Velický, P. Current development trends of media literacy in European Union countries. *Commun. Today* **2017**, *8*, 52.
41. McDougall, J.; Zezulkova, M.; Van Driel, B.; Sternadel, D. *Teaching Media Literacy in Europe: Evidence of Effective School Practices in Primary and Secondary Education*, 1st ed.; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2018.
42. Pereira, L.; Jorge, A.; Brites, M.J. Media education competitions: An efficient strategy for digital literacies? *Ital. J. Sociol. Educ.* **2017**, *9*, 77–92.
43. Zhang, L.; Zhang, H.; Wang, K. Media literacy education and curriculum integration: A literature review. *Int. J. Contemp. Educ.* **2020**, *3*, 55–64. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Demidov, A.A.; Syrina, T.A.; Tretyakov, A.L. Development of digital skills and media education system: From the organization of environmental education of preschool children to the ICT competence of teachers. *Media Educ.* **2020**, *60*, 11–23.
45. Fedorov, A.; Levitskaya, A. Mass media literacy education in modern Russia. *Media Educ.* **2018**, *57*, 2.
46. Fedorov, A.V.; Levitskaya, A.A. Synthetic media education model used in Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). *Media Educ.* **2019**, *59*, 30–36.
47. Gómez-Galán, J. Media education in the ICT era: Theoretical structure for innovative teaching styles. *Information* **2020**, *11*, 276. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Reyna, J.; Hanham, J.; Meier, P.C. A framework for digital media literacies for teaching and learning in higher education. *E-Learn. Digit. Media* **2018**, *15*, 176–190. [[CrossRef](#)]

49. Cuervo Sanchez, S.L.; Foronda Rojo, A.; Rodriguez Martinez, A.; Medrano Samaniego, C. Media and information literacy: A measurement instrument for adolescents. *Educ. Rev.* **2021**, *73*, 487–502. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Mateus, J.C.; Hernández-Breña, W. Design, validation, and application of a questionnaire on media education for teachers in training. *NAER J.* **2019**, *8*, 34–41. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Simons, M.; Meeus, W.; T'Sas, J. Measuring media literacy for media education: Development of a questionnaire for teachers' competencies. *J. Media Lit. Educ.* **2017**, *9*, 99–115. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Al-Omari, K.M.; Alomari, M.A.; Qazaqzeh, S.M. The degree of possessing media education skills among classroom student-teachers at yarmouk university. *Multicult. Educ.* **2021**, *7*, 42–51.
53. Carenzio, A.; Ferrari, S.; Rasi, P. Older people's media repertoires, digital competences and media literacies: A case study from Italy. *Educ. Sci.* **2021**, *11*, 584. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Erdem, C.; Eristi, B. Paving the way for media literacy instruction in preservice teacher education: Prospective teachers' levels of media literacy skills. *Int. J. Instr.* **2018**, *11*, 795–810. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Yu, O.A. Media literacy of schoolchildren in a post-transitive society: Study results. *Theor. Pract. Issues J.* **2019**, *8*, 747–762.
56. Rožukalne, A.; Skulte, I.; Stakle, A. Media education in the common interest: Public perceptions of media literacy policy in Latvia. *Cent. Eur. J. Commun.* **2020**, *13*, 202–229. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Park, Y.M.; Chae, J.H.; Kim, S.K.; Kwon, H.S. The effects of media literacy education and its influence on digital citizenship: Focusing on CMF education programs in Korea. *J. Inf. Syst.* **2021**, *30*, 113–135. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Corser, K.; Dezuanni, M.; Notley, T. How news media literacy is taught in Australian classrooms. *Aust. Educ. Res.* **2021**, *48*, 1–17. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
59. Hattani, H.A. Media literacy education in secondary school: Teachers' attitudes. *J. Media Res.-Rev. De Stud. Media* **2019**, *12*, 5–26. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Maraver-López, P.; Caldeiro-Pedreira, M.C.; Pérez-Lisboa, S. Perception of media literacy and training in teachers from Chile. *Univeristas* **2017**, *XV*, 201–218.
61. Nettlefold, J.; Williams, K. News media literacy challenges and opportunities for Australian school students and teachers in the age of platforms. *J. Media Lit. Educ.* **2021**, *13*, 28–40. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Vuojärvi, H.; Purtilo-Nieminen, S.; Rasi, P.; Rivinen, S. Conceptions of adult education teachers-in-training regarding the media literacy education of older people: A phenomenographic study to inform a course design. *J. Media Lit. Educ.* **2021**, *13*, 1–18.
63. Botturi, L. Digital and media literacy in pre-service teacher education. *Nord. J. Digit. Lit.* **2019**, *14*, 147–163. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Ranieri, M.; Bruni, I.; Kupiainen, R. Digital and media literacy in teacher education: Findings and recommendations from the European Project e-MEL. *Ital. J. Educ. Res.* **2018**, *20*, 151–166.
65. Nicolaou, C.; Matsiola, M.; Kalliris, G. Technology-enhanced learning and teaching methodologies through audiovisual media. *Educ. Sci.* **2019**, *9*, 196. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Masanet, M.; Ferrés, J. La enseñanza universitaria española en materia de educación mediática. *Commun. Pap.* **2013**, *2*, 83–90. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. López, L.; Aguaded, M. La docencia sobre alfabetización mediática en las facultades de educación y comunicación. *Comunicar* **2015**, *22*, 187–195.
68. Gozálviz, V.; Masanet, M.J.; Hernando, A.; Bernal-Bravo, C. Relación entre formación universitaria y competencia mediática del profesorado. *Rev. Complut. De Educ.* **2019**, *30*, 1113–1126.
69. Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Lledó, A.; Pérez-Vázquez, E.; Lorenzo, G. Cinematographic habits of future spanish teachers from a socio-educational perspective. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 5361. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. Alaminos, A.; Castejón, J.L. *Elaboración, Análisis e Interpretación de Encuestas, Cuestionarios y Escalas de Opinión*, 1st ed.; Editorial Marfil: Alicante, Spain, 2006.
71. Bisquerra, R. *Metodología De La Investigación Educativa*, 6th ed.; La Muralla: Madrid, Spain, 2014.
72. León, O.G.; Montero, I. *Métodos de Investigación en Psicología y Educación*, 3rd ed.; McGraw-Hill: Madrid, Spain, 2003.
73. Albert, M.J. *La Investigación Educativa. Claves Teóricas*, 1st ed.; McGraw Hill: Madrid, Spain, 2007.
74. Lorenzo-Lledó, A. Design and validation of a questionnaire to measure future Spanish teachers' perceptions of cinema in pre-school and primary education: Towards active and technological learning. *Future Internet* **2020**, *12*, 149. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Aguilar-Barojas, S. Fórmulas para el cálculo de la muestra en investigaciones de salud. *Salud En Tabasco* **2005**, *11*, 333–338.
76. Hyrkäs, K.; Appelqvist-Schmidlechner, K.; Oksa, L. Validating an instrument for clinical supervision using an expert panel. *Int. J. Nurs. Stud.* **2003**, *40*, 619–625. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Barroso, J.; Cabero, J. La utilización del juicio de experto para la evaluación de TIC: El coeficiente de competencia experta. *Bordón Rev. Pedagog.* **2013**, *65*, 25–38.
78. Hernández-Nieto, R.A. *Contributions to Statistical Analysis*, 1st ed.; Universidad de Los Andes: Merida, Venezuela, 2002.
79. George, D.; Mallery, P. *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. 11.0 Update*, 4th ed.; Allyn & Bacon: Boston, MA, USA, 2003.
80. Cardona, M.C. *Introducción a los Métodos de Investigación en Educación*; EOS: Madrid, Spain, 2002.
81. Hu, L.T.; Bentler, P.M. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct. Equ. Model. Multidiscip. J.* **1999**, *6*, 1–55. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Munthén, L.K.; Munthén, B.O. *Mplus User's Guide*, 8th ed.; Munthén & Munthén: Los Angeles, CA, USA, 1998–2017.

83. Hair, J.F.; Anderson, R.E.; Tatham, R.L.; Black, W.C. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 5th ed.; Prentice Hall: New York, NY, USA, 1998.
84. Cabero Almenara, J.; Guerra Liaño, S. La alfabetización y la formación en medios de comunicación en la formación inicial del profesorado. *Educación* **2012**, *14*, 89–115. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Latchem, C. Open and distance non-FORMAL education. In *Open and Distance Non-formal Education in Developing Countries*, 1st ed.; Springer Briefs in Education: Singapore, 2018; pp. 11–17. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Shawer, S.F. Teacher-driven curriculum development at the classroom level: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and teacher training. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2017**, *63*, 296–313. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Sanz, D.; Crissien, T.; García, J.; Patiño, M. Marketing educativo como estrategia de negocio en universidades Privadas. *Desarro. Gerenc. Rev. Fac. Cienc. Económicas Adm. Contab. Univ. Simón Bolívar Colomb.* **2017**, *9*, 160–175.
88. Morales Ramírez, A.; Zacatenco Cruz, J.D.; Luna Luna, M.; García Lozano, R.Z.; Hidalgo Cortés, C. Acceso y actitud del uso de Internet entre jóvenes de educación universitaria. *Rev. Digit. De Investig. En Docencia Univ.* **2020**, *14*, 1174. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Braasch, J.L. Advances in research on internal and external factors that guide adolescents' reading and learning on the Internet. *J. Study Educ. Dev.* **2020**, *43*, 210–241. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Naumis Peña, C. Información en bibliotecas y archivos e Información en Internet. In *La Información Después de Internet: Repensando las Libertades, Amenazas y Derechos*; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México: Mexico City, Mexico, 2021; pp. 21–37.
91. Valdés, M.T. Trayectorias escolares y expectativas del alumnado de Ciclos Formativos de Grado Medio: La elección de la vía profesional en un contexto de desprestigio consolidado. *Rev. Metamorf. Rev. Cent. Reina Sofía Sobre Adolesc. Juv.* **2019**, *10*, 52–76.
92. Nikolopoulou, K.; Gialamas, V.; Lavidas, K. Acceptance of mobile phone by university students for their studies: An investigation applying UTAUT2 model. *Educ. Inf. Technol.* **2020**, *25*, 4139–4155. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Ruiz-Palmero, J.; Colomo-Magaña, E.; Sánchez-Rivas, E.; Linde-Valenzuela, T. Estudio del uso y consumo de dispositivos móviles en universitarios. *Digit. Educ. Rev.* **2021**, *39*, 89–104. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Lledó, A.; Lorenzo, G. Cinema as a transmitter of content: Perceptions of future Spanish teachers for motivating learning. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 5505. [[CrossRef](#)]