



Characteristics of university teaching in institutions in Spain, Mexico and Venezuela¹

Características de la enseñanza universitaria en instituciones de España, México y Venezuela

DOUGLAS IZARRA VIELMA²

Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador, Venezuela

izarravielma@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7629-2244>

ANA HIRSCH-ADLER

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

anaha007@yahoo.com.mx

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4290-4270>

Abstract:

The complexity of university teaching requires the development of studies that allow contrasting the experiences of teachers in different settings, so this work compares the characteristics of the training of students in three universities, one in Spain, one in Mexico and one in Venezuela. A non-experimental design research was carried out with a descriptive level using the Questionnaire "Indicators of Teaching Excellence at the University of Granada". The results demonstrate the importance attributed in teaching to the following features: knowledge of the subject, planning, communication, didactics, evaluation, and reflection as mechanisms for permanent innovation. The relevance of evaluation and motivation were found

Resumen:

La complejidad de la enseñanza universitaria requiere el desarrollo de estudios que permitan contrastar las experiencias de los profesores en diferentes escenarios, por lo que en este trabajo se comparan las características de la formación de estudiantes en tres universidades, una en España, una en México y una en Venezuela. Se realizó una investigación de diseño no experimental con un nivel descriptivo utilizando el Cuestionario "Indicadores de Excelencia Docente en la Universidad de Granada". Los resultados demuestran la importancia que se atribuye en la docencia a los siguientes rasgos: conocimiento de la materia, planificación, comunicación, didáctica, evaluación, y reflexión como mecanismos para la innovación permanente. Se

1 Como referenciar este artículo (How to reference this article):

Izarra Vielma, D. & Hirsch-Adler, A. (2022). Characteristics of university teaching in institutions in Spain, Mexico and Venezuela. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 40(3), 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.6018/educatio.494441>

2 Dirección para correspondencia (Correspondence address):

Douglas Izarra Vielma. Extensión Académica San Cristóbal. Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador. Carrera 1 # 1. 49 Barrio Sucre parte baja. San Cristóbal, Edo. Táchira (Venezuela).

as coincident elements in the three institutions, that demonstrates a shared vision of context-independent teaching. To conclude, the centrality of the ethical dimension stands out, the vision of this activity as a quality service prevails in which improvisation must be avoided and an innovative action must be deployed and also permanent communication and fair evaluation.

Key words:

Universities; teaching; motivation; evaluation; ethics.

encontraron como elementos coincidentes en las tres instituciones la relevancia de la evaluación y la motivación, cuestión que demuestra una visión compartida de la enseñanza independiente del contexto. Para concluir destaca la centralidad de la dimensión ética, prevalece la visión de esta actividad como un servicio de calidad en el que se debe evitar la improvisación y desplegar una acción innovadora, mantener la comunicación permanente y evaluar de forma justa.

Palabras clave:

Universidades; enseñanza; motivación; evaluación; ética.

Résumé:

La complexité de l'enseignement universitaire demande le développement d'études pour contraster les expériences des enseignants dans différents contextes. Cet article compare les caractéristiques de la formation des étudiants dans trois universités, une en Espagne, une au Mexique et une au Venezuela. La conception de la recherche était non expérimentale, descriptive, et on a utilisé le questionnaire: «Indicateurs de l'excellence de l'enseignement à l'Université de Grenade». Les résultats ont montré l'importance que les enseignants donnent aux traits suivants: connaissance de la matière, planification, communication, didactique, évaluation et réflexion comme mécanismes d'innovation continue. On trouve aussi que la pertinence de l'évaluation et la motivation sont deux caractéristiques qui coïncident dans les trois établissements, c'est-à-dire qu'il existe une vision partagée de l'enseignement. En conclusion, nous soulignons l'importance de la dimension éthique ; l'idée qui prévaut ici est celle de voir cette activité comme un service de qualité qui doit éviter l'improvisation, être une action innovante ainsi que maintenir une communication constante et évaluer équitablement.

Mots-clés:

Les universités; enseignement; évaluation de l'apprentissage; éthique.

Fecha de recepción: 01-10-2021

Fecha de aceptación: 09-02-2022

Introduction: University teaching as a research objective

University teaching is a complex matter that requires the understanding of the main characteristics that define it. We consider that it is relevant, from the perception of academics, to analyze how this activity manifests itself in different contexts. We also think that the process we employed and the results we obtained may be useful for making decisions about their professional development.

This is a relevant issue in this historical moment marked by its great dynamism. For example, Lion and Maggio (2019) explain that there are multiple challenges in the political, social, cultural, pedagogical, communicational and cognitive situations. They point out that “a complex multidimensional issue is constituted in which a central feature has been the modification in the forms of production, circulation and distribution of knowledge” (p. 13). This fact has profound implications in the training procedures that are being implemented in higher education institutions, since they have been forced to transform their actions at all levels, and especially in the substantive functions of teaching, research and extension.

In the context of the growing transformation of the universities and particularly on the role of teaching, González-Losada and Triviño-García (2018), specify that it is necessary to carry out various actions that allow instructors to participate in the development of innovative pedagogical proposals that are able to impact the work they do with their students. However, any initiative related to their preparation requires aspects that they consider essential to ensure that teaching is not limited to purely technical issues, but rather includes an ethical dimension.

According to Chávez and Treviño (2019), an important line of research in progress is also related to the role of teachers, with the intention that the research results may contribute to understand these fundamental actors and identify their strengths and weaknesses. They conclude that their functions have changed in recent years, and that, therefore, while some can adapt well, others are facing difficulties of different kinds. This situation reveals the need to analyze university teaching using the experiences of the interested parties themselves.

Based on the above, the present investigation established the following objective: “Identify the principal characteristics of university teaching in institutions in three different countries: Spain, Mexico and Venezuela”. Using the outcomes obtained in each of the aforementioned contexts, a comparison was made that focuses on their properties (Piovani and Krawczyk, 2017), which implies taking into consideration the set of attributes from which teaching is understood, specifically in higher education. For this reason, we located the dimensions and indicators that this educators value most. Data was collected directly from two institutions in different contexts: a federal public university in the Central Region of Mexico, and a public university in Venezuela.

The work from Fernández Cruz and Romero (2010), from the University of Granada (UGR), was taken into consideration as an example, to ensure the homogeneity of the information collected. In addition, the main results at the UGR served as the basis for comparison.

Teachers' tasks are changing and include different actions. To make their situation even more complex, they are subjected to strong scrutiny by institutional authorities and different national and international agencies that review their performance. On this, Andrade-Abarca, Ramón-Jaramillo and Loaiza-Aguirre (2018) state that "the teaching evaluation processes are unavoidable and are practices used in most universities" (p. 260).

Teaching is the centre of our interest, its development implies considering a set of key dimensions. In the research of Fernández Cruz and Romero (2010), they are the following: "Vision of Higher Education Teaching"; "Perception of the Students' Educational Needs"; "Knowledge of the context"; "Planning and Organization of the Subject", "Development of Teaching", "Communicative Capacity", "Individual Support for Learning"; "Evaluation", "Educational Innovation and Teaching Improvement"; and "Professional Self – Evaluation" (García- Ramirez, 2012). On this basis, Fernández Cruz and Romero (2010) established 100 indicators of teacher excellence in their own university.

We believe that when an educator teaches, at the same time, he employs measures linked, among others, with communication, didactics, evaluation and even with professional ethics (although the latter is not explicitly mentioned in the aforementioned article by Fernández Cruz and Romero, 2010). Several recent publications assume facets of university teaching as an object of study. Some focus their interest on a single issue (for example, communication or teaching), others offer complex models in which they incorporate more elements in the analysis of this activity. For the work that we present, we considered the publications of: Aguilera (2019), Andrade-Abarca, Ramón-Jaramillo and Loaiza-Aguirre (2018), Barrio and Barrio (2018), Casado, et al. (2018), González-Losada and Triviño-García (2018), Laudadío and Mazzitelli (2018), Paricio (2018), Rivadeneira (2017) and Villarroel and Bruna (2017).

Professional ethics is one of the themes that we took into account. In relation to that, Casado, et al. (2018) affirmed that in reference to that specific applied ethics:

it is necessary to consider the same conditions that are used for scientific research and include other more specific ones due to the fact that it is a relational activity in a necessarily heterogeneous context, given the wide diversity of statutes and roles that preceptors have (p. 69).

The ethical element involves considering multiple aspects, a question that confirms the complexity of analyzing university education. This proposal is also present in the models created by other researchers. For example, Paricio (2018) gives an account of a “Professional Development Framework for University Teachers”. The author explains that, to be able to develop good teaching in higher education institutions, it is necessary to change the idea that it is achieved from the accumulation of merits. He describes four levels of progression through 15 dimensions associated with three domains: curriculum, teacher performance and reflection about the goals.

González-Losada and Triviño-García (2018), emphasize the importance of good didactics. The following are among the most used strategies: practices through ICTs, magisterial presentation, use of audiovisual media and direct questions. In the process, diversity of operations of both traditional and innovative character is amalgamated. The need for teachers to use didactic skills is described by Rivadeneira (2017), who stipulate that they must be present in planning, supervision and evaluation. In affinity with the subject of didactics, the article by Barrio and Barrio (2018) focuses on the communication process. They keep in view that knowledge is of transcendental importance and also to be able to transmit it, attract the attention of their students’ and stimulate their way of thinking.

Evaluation is addressed in the report prepared by Andrade-Abarca, Ramón-Jaramillo and Loaiza-Aguirre (2018), who state that all educational systems seek to collect information on various issues, inside and outside the classroom. This process can be carried out autonomously and independently by the academics themselves, since from a training approach it is possible to diagnose their own weaknesses and improve their own work in the context of their professional advance. The authors found “strong associations between the dimension of interaction with students and their personal attitude, content, evaluations and tasks” (p. 270). The importance of bonding with students is ratified by the findings of other investigations, for example, Villarroel and Bruna (2017) that

found out that in the didactic relationship, students especially value closeness, empathy, flexibility and humility. In addition, they recognize the importance of participation.

Teaching at the university requires a proper articulation among the different actors who promote it. In the words of Laudadío and Mazzitelli (2018): "Teaching requires a close relationship between the professor and the students, which needs adequate clarification and reflection for its improvement" (p. 153). In this context, tutorials are also accepted as part of what they do. In this sense, Aguilera (2019) informs that, in any of its forms, this is an inherent activity of preceptors, it is even stated that all of them are tutors and must adjust to the qualities of the alumni and the dynamics of their pedagogical operation.

The review carried out confirms the complexity of teaching at the university. The multiple factors that must be considered for its analysis show the convenience of having data collection instruments that contemplate a diversity of dimensions and indicators, as is with the questionnaire prepared by Fernández Cruz and Romero (2010).

Methodology

According to the classification by Palella and Martins (2010), a non-experimental design exploration was carried out with a descriptive level. For their part, Hernández, Fernández and Baptista (2014) expressed that in those types of studies the purpose is "to specify important properties and characteristics of any phenomenon that is analyzed and describe trends in a group or population" (p. 92). To identify the characteristics of university teaching we used the: "Questionnaire for the Selection of Indicators for the Evaluation of University Teaching Excellence", from the University of Granada, which was designed by Fernández Cruz and Romero (2010) and translated by García-Ramírez (2012). It has ten dimensions (presented previously) and each of them has 10 indicators, so that in total it has 100 items.

For its application in the Mexican and Venezuelan universities, approval was requested and obtained from the authors. The postgraduate academics of these institutions were presented with the instrument and were provided with the necessary instructions to answer it. The participants gave each item a rating among four response options: 4. Very relevant,

3. Relevant, 2. Not very relevant, and 1. Irrelevant. With this base, the average of each of the propositions was obtained; the maximum number of which is 4.

In the case of the University of Granada the instrument was applied to 3,003 professors and in the other two universities a stratified sample was obtained, which was made up of 399 graduate academics in Mexico (2016) and 88 in Venezuela (2017). Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of the information. The standard deviation and the statistical average were calculated. This procedure was established in a similar way in the three institutions. For the purposes of this report, once the institutional data had been consolidated, the best valued item of each of the ten dimensions was identified and they were organized from highest to lowest. In this way, a list was drawn up with the ten main indicators for each university (see Table 1).

Table 1

Indicators with the highest averages in the three universities

Granada University (Spain)	A Mexican University	A Venezuelan University
“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.79). Dimension: Evaluation	“Have expert knowledge of content (3.97). Dimension: Vision of higher education teaching	“Be concern about self-improvement in teaching” (3.92). Dimension: Educational Innovation and Teaching Improvement
“Be concern about self-improvement in teaching” (3.78). Dimension: Educational Innovation and Teaching Improvement	“Be conscious of the necessity of updating knowledge” (3.88). Dimension: Educational Innovation and Teaching Improvement	“Be concerned about human relationships and creating a good environment in class” (3.87). Dimension: Knowledge of the context
“Consider the planning as well as the act of teaching essential (3.73). Dimension: Vision of higher education teaching	“Make sure to have been understood by the students (3.87). Dimension: Communicative capacity	Stimulate the students to explore, inquire, build meanings, tell stories, link ideas, use information sources, find alternatives and solve problems (3.86). Dimension: Development of teaching

Granada University (Spain)	A Mexican University	A Venezuelan University
“Be concerned with offering quality teaching though the university may not recognize it” (3.73). Dimension: Knowledge of the context	“Get involved and transmit passion and interest for the profession to the students, promoting commitment with the subject” (3.86). Dimension: Development of teaching	“Consider the planning as well as the act of teaching essential (3.86). Dimension: Vision of higher education teaching
“Know and take into account students’ attitudes towards the subject” (3.70) Dimension: Perceptions of the students’ educational needs	“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.84). Dimension: Evaluation	“Know and take into account students’ attitudes towards the subject” (3.83) Dimension: Perceptions of the students’ educational needs
“Plan courses linking theoretical and practical content” (3.65). Dimension: Planning and organization of the subject	“Know and take into account students’ attitudes towards the subject” (3.82) Dimension: Perceptions of the students’ educational needs	“Create an atmosphere of warmth and fluent communication so the students enjoy the class (3.83). Dimension: Communicative Capacity
“Make sure to have been understood by the students (3.63). Dimension: Communicative Capacity	“Be concerned with offering quality teaching though the university may not recognize it” (3.82). Dimension: Knowledge of the context	“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.78). Dimension: Evaluation
“Link the new information with the contents already taught, making references to topic subjects or fields of study” (3.49). Dimension: Development of teaching	“Update the curriculum of the course (s) yearly (3.77). Dimension: Planning and organization of the subject	“Plan courses linking theoretical and practical content” (3.77). Dimension: Planning and organization of the subject
“Know yourself as a professor, being conscious of weaknesses and strengths (3.49). Dimension: Professional Self-Evaluation	“Establish a self evaluation system and reflect the results in the teaching plan” (3.74) Dimension: Professional self – evaluation	“Establish a self evaluation system and reflect the results in the teaching plan” (3.77) Dimension: Professional self - evaluation

Granada University (Spain)	A Mexican University	A Venezuelan University
“Carefully fulfil the tutorial timetable (3.41). Dimension: Individual support for learning	“Consider tutorials as an excellent resource to complete your work in class” (3.44). Dimension: Individual support for learning	“Encourage student attendance to complete your dance in tutorials” (3.71). Dimension: Individual support for learning

Results

a) Dimensions of university teaching

Identifying the dimensions that obtained the highest and the lowest averages in each of the three institutions, allowed us to have a better understanding of how the work done by university professors is valued. In the Spanish university the highest scores were obtained in: “Planning and Organization of the Subject”, “Development of Teaching” and “Knowledge of the Context”. The first two reveal a concern for didactic actions, both before its realization (preparation) and at the time of direct activity with the students. The third includes indicators that “allude to issues related to the framework in which teachers carry out their activity” (Fernández Cruz and Romero, 2010, p. 94).

In the Mexican university (Hirsch, 2019), the following results were obtained: first, there is “Development of Teaching”, followed by “Communicative Capacity” and “Individual Support for Learning”. In this case, the centrality of the didactic actions is complemented by the importance of the teacher adequately managing the exchange of information with his pupils.


In The Venezuelan institution, “Communicative Capacity” appears as the highest average, followed by “Development of Teaching”, and “Educational Innovation and Teaching Improvement”. They refer to the way in which this educators value the permanent enrichment of their task, through the search for new strategies that are useful for the learners. As can be seen in the three universities, the “Development of Teaching” appears as a very significant dimension. It is also evident that they coincide with giving importance to “Communicative Capacity”. The interest in didactics is also central.

In relation to the differences, we can mention that while in the Spanish

university the knowledge of the conditions in which teaching is developed is valued, in the Mexican the needs of the students were prioritized, and in the Venezuelan, innovation appears with a bigger appreciation. The coincidences and divergences are represented in figure1.

Figure 1

Dimensions best valued in each university



On the other hand, we found certain homogeneity in the dimensions with the lowest average. “Individual Support for Learning” was the less valued in the three institutions. There is also a coincidence with “Professional Self – Evaluation”, which is the second with the lowest data in Spain and in Mexico. It may seem contradictory that, on one side, the academics surveyed recognized the importance of: didactic activity, good communication, and training needs, and at the same time they placed as the least relevant the assistance of their students. This may be due to a vision that assumes the autonomy of the students and their ability to regulate their own learning.

It also highlights the little importance given to self-evaluation, an issue that may be linked to some conditions of the professional practice, for example, the huge amount of work that academics perform in the substantive functions and in other tasks and for which they are permanently evaluated. This circumstance leaves scarce time for the improvement of the practice. The most notable difference in the least appreciated dimensions appears in that of Venezuela, in which “Vision of Higher

Education Teaching” is the second with the lowest score. This outcome may be linked to the crisis situation that exists in that Latin American country. According to Ramírez (2021) the situation of the universities in that nation is critical due to the disappearance of official incentive programs for researchers, in addition to the inability of the Councils for Scientific, Humanistic and Technological Development to offer financing for research.

b) Main indicators

In relation to the ten dimensions of the questionnaire, we selected only the indicators that obtained the highest averages in each of them. The principal results from the University of Granada are about the following issues: centrality of didactic actions in the direct work with students, motivation, and the need to carry out adequate planning that allows the articulation between theory and practice. These characteristics are related to a vision of work about the compliance with norms (in this case specifically about schedules). Of greater interest is the theme of evaluation assumed from an ethical perspective. As proposed by Sanz and López (2016), these proceedings should be understood as a dialogical-communicative relationship between teacher and students, where not only technical, conceptual or procedural aspects are important, but also the ethical and emotional angles.

In line with the above, the proposal to provide a good service to society also stands out (Hortal, 2002), expressed by: “Be concerned with offering quality teaching though the university may not recognize it” (Dimension: “Knowledge of the Context). The idea may also be directly linked to the way in which academics undertake their efforts, since usually in evaluation systems the greatest weight falls on research and not on teaching.

In the Mexican university, deep knowledge of the subject was the most relevant issue “Have expert’s knowledge of content” (Dimension: “Vision of Higher Education Teaching”). It is the highest average of the three institutions; therefore, the centrality of the cognitive process is evident, ratified in the concern for knowledge updating (for both the teachers and the subjects). This outcome coincides with Schulman (2005), who exposes the importance of properly managing content as a requirement to expand good teaching. Dealing with students is also a central

element, either through motivation, commitment to the subject or the mentoring relationship. On this, Rivera (2019) emphasizes the importance of proposing innovative activities that promote interaction.

The responses of the Venezuelan academics stand out for the centrality of the didactic actions, which is manifested in the concern for their own training and the process of a permanent enrichment of their job. These two issues allow them to address other related activities, such as assessment and planning; all based on the class activity and the direct contact with the learners, achieving a suitable class climate and a permanent motivation aimed to solving problems.

The importance that the professors of this institution give to teaching and its constant transformation has been identified in previous research, for example, from Escobar (2016) who studied “Didactic Content Knowledge”. The author found that “Reflection represents a fundamental aspect in the continuous training of the teacher, an action that empowers [it] by [promoting] the understanding of the didactic content” (p. 345).

As it can be seen in each of the studied contexts, it is possible to identify particular characteristics and common elements (See Table 2).

Table 2

Common indicators between the three universities

Common Results		
Spain-México	Spain-Venezuela	México-Venezuela
“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.79), (3.84).	“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.79), (3.77).	“Be concerned about motivating and maintaining students’ interest in the subject” (3.82), (3.83).
“Be concerned about self improvement in teaching” (3.73), (3.82).	“Consider the planning as well as the act of teaching essential” (3.73), (3.86).	“Evaluate according to previously set criteria” (3.84), (3.77).
“Be concerned about motivating and maintaining students’ interest in the subject” (3.70), (3.82)	“Be concerned about motivating and maintaining students’ interest in the subject” (3.70), (3.83).	“Establish a self evaluation system and reflect the results in the teaching plan” (3.74), (3.73).
“Make sure to have been understood by the students” (3.63), (3.87).	“Plan courses linking theoretical and practical content” (3.65), (3.77).	
Common results in the three universities		
1. “Evaluate according to previously set criteria”		
2. “Be concerned about motivating and maintaining students’ interest in the subject”		

a) When comparing what was obtained in the University of Granada and in the Mexican university, we found that there are differences in six of the propositions most selected by the academics of both institutions. On the other hand, there are four common indicators: "Evaluate according to previously set criteria", "Be concerned with offering quality teaching though the university may not recognize it", "Know and take into account students' attitudes towards the subject" and "Make sure to have been understood by the students". They refer to the relationship between the one who teaches and the one who learns, on two levels: motivation and didactic communication. It also appears a vision of evaluation as a space for dialogue and the idea of providing a good service to society (represented by the alumni).

b) When we do the same between the University of Granada and the Venezuelan institution, we found a similar scenario, because four of the ten main indicators coincide. They are: "Evaluate according to previously set criteria", "Consider the planning as well as the act of teaching essential", "Know and take into account students' attitudes towards the subject" and "Plan courses linking theoretical and practical content". In addition to the importance of the elements indicated above, the planning of didactic activities emerges as an essential element of the teaching undertaking.

c) When comparing the data from the two Latin American universities, we found only three coincidences that show an additional element to those already mentioned: "Know and take into account students' attitudes towards the subject", "Evaluate according to previously set criteria" and "Be concerned about self improvement in teaching".

d) Finally, when reviewing the common aspects in the three institutions, only two were found: "Evaluate according to previously set criteria" (Dimension: Evaluation) and "Know and take into account students attitudes towards the subject" (Dimension: "Perceptions of the Students Educational Needs"). These issues are related to two important facets of the teaching endeavour: verification of learning and the motivation of students towards learning the contents in the context of their professional training.

Discussion and conclusions

Teaching at the university is a complex field of study in which there are multiple intersections. Some of them are about the preparation of students, and the promotion of professional competencies and the various functions that the professors must fulfill and for which they are constantly evaluated.

Despite the fact that this circumstance described is common, in each scenario the teachers surveyed gave answers in a different way, privileging some dimensions and indicators more than others. We found that planning, knowledge, didactics and reflection appear in at least two of the institutions in which we applied the questionnaire. We think that the diversity of these elements reveals certain peculiarities of the academic culture of each university.

It is important to acknowledge that some of the elements that were identified may be contradictory and may indicate some tensions in the teachers' work, specifically those related to the direct attention to the alumni and to self-evaluation, that appear with low averages. The exception is in the answers of the Venezuelan university, because the highest indicator is: "Be concerned about self-improvement in teaching" with is part of the Dimension: "Educational Innovation and Teacher Improvement".

The outcomes in the three scenarios indicate that the dimension "Perception of the Student's Educational Needs" is also one with a low value. However, one of the indicators in that same dimension: "Be concerned about motivating and maintaining student's interest in the subject" was highly valued. It is related with: motivation, being understood, communication and tutoring. There is a fundamental interest in their students' learning.

The research also manifest that there are ideas considered pertinent regardless of the context, such as evaluation. We consider that this dimension may be indirectly related to an ethical issue as it is linked to the principle of justice. The principal indicator is: "Evaluate according to previously set criteria".

The significance of evaluation and motivation suggest that the university professors care about the results of their efforts and also in maintaining the interest of the learners. It goes beyond the idea that the work that the university teachers do in the higher education system is limited to the

transmission of knowledge through repetitive practices. It is a complex task that requires adequate planning and in-depth knowledge of the situations encountered.

In conclusion, studying university teaching in diverse contexts allows us to identify the essential characteristics that may relate to the academic culture of each institution, based on the significant elements that the professors themselves recognize. It is essential to be attentive to the transformation processes, especially in relation to the permanent review of the practice itself. It is convenient to reiterate the relevance of the ethical dimension that underlies the results in the three mentioned contexts. Although university professors face pressures of various kinds to maintain high productivity in research and even in adverse contexts, they continue to maintain a vision of their labor as a service in which improvisation should be avoided. Finally, in the light of the results presented, we consider necessary that the higher education institutions develop policies that allow academics to reconcile the multiple tasks they perform, design evaluation processes in which both teaching and the generation of knowledge are valued in equal conditions and that have an impact on their professional development.

We consider that there is a close relationship between the training of university students and two of the applied ethics: professional ethics and the ethics of scientific research, which they have the opportunity to learn and practice during their career. This preparation cannot be separated from the cognitive aspects, since it implies, for example, the knowledge of fundamental principles recognized by a large number of authors, such as Respect for Autonomy, Beneficence, Nonmaleficence and Justice (Beauchamp and Childress, 2019); meaningful values, such as honesty, responsibility, and respect; the opportunity to take social responsibility through the professions and the need to avoid ethical misconducts that are increasingly frequent and that put the prestige of academic institutions at risk. It is clear that the role of academics is essential in this enormous task.

References

- Aguilera, J.L. (2019). La tutoría universitaria como práctica docente: fundamentos y métodos para el desarrollo de planes de acción tutorial en la universidad. *Pro-Posições*, 30 (e20170038), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-6248-2017-0038>
- Andrade-Abarca, P.S., Jaramillo, L.N., y Loaiza-Aguirre, M.I. (2017). Aplicación del SEEQ

- como instrumento para evaluar la actividad docente universitaria. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 36(1), 259-275. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.36.1.260741>
- Barrio, J., y Barrio, A. (2018). Análisis de la habilidad comunicativa docente y pautas de actuación. Atraer la atención hablando: un reto para la enseñanza universitaria. *INFAD Revista de Psicología*, 1(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.17060/ijodaep.2018.n1.v1.1160>
- Beauchamp, T. & Childress, J. (2019). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics* [Eighth Edition] New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Casado, M., Martínez, M., y Patrão, M.do Céu (Coords.) (2018). Declaración sobre ética e integridad en la docencia universitaria. *FEM: Revista de la Fundación Educación Médica*, 21(2), 65-74. http://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2014-98322018000200003&lng=es&tlng=es
- Chávez, G., y Treviño, M.C. (2019). La excelencia en la enseñanza universitaria visión del profesorado en una institución del norte de México. *Praxis Sociológica*, 24, 185-200. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7051713>
- Escobar, N. (2016). El conocimiento didáctico del contenido en la formación continua del docente de pregrado. En D. Izarra Vielma (Coord.). *Investigación, Pedagogía y Conocimiento* (320-348). Instituto de Mejoramiento Profesional del Magisterio.
- Fernández Cruz, M. y Romero López, A. (2010). Indicadores de excelencia docente en la Universidad de Granada. *Revista Portuguesa de Pedagogía*, 44(1), 83-117. http://dx.doi.org/10.14195/1647-8614_44-1_4
- García-Ramírez, J.M. (2012), La comunicación, clave de la excelencia visible en la Educación Superior, *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 3, pp. 25-36. <http://www.ugr.es/djett/index.php>.
- González-Losada S., y Triviño-García, M.A. (2018). Las estrategias didácticas en la práctica docente universitaria. *Profesorado. Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*, 22(2), 371-388. <https://doi.org/10.30827/profesorado.v22i2.7728>
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C. y Baptista, P. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación*. McGraw Hill.
- Hirsch, A. (2019). Un estudio sobre el profesorado de posgrado de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. *Práxis Sociológica*, 24.47-60. www.praxissociologica.es.
- Hortal, A. (2002). Ética general de las profesiones. Desclée de Brouwer.
- Laudadío, J. y Mazzitelli, C. (2018). Adaptación y validación del Cuestionario de Relación Docente en el Nivel Superior. *Interdisciplinaria*, 35(1), 153-170. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=18058784009>
- Lion, C. y Maggio, M. (2019). Desafíos para la enseñanza universitaria en los escenarios digitales contemporáneos. Aportes desde la investigación. *Cuadernos de Investigación Educativa*, 10(1), 13-25. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18861/cied.2019.10.1.2878>
- Palella, S. y Martins, F. (2010). *Metodología de la investigación cuantitativa*. Feduepel.
- Paricio, J. (2018). *Marco de Desarrollo Profesional del Profesorado Universitario. Planteamiento general y dimensiones*. Redu.
- Piovani, J. y Krawczyk, N. (2017). Los Estudios Comparativos: algunas notas históricas, epistemológicas y metodológicas. *Educação & Realidade*, 42(3), 821-840. <https://www.redalyc.org/jatsRepo/3172/317253008002/html/index.html>

- Izarra Vielma, D. & Hirsch-Adler, A. (2022). Characteristics of university teaching in institutions in Spain, Mexico and Venezuela. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 40(3), 161-178.
- Ramírez, T. (2021). Investigación y papers en Venezuela (I) Auge y caída hasta nuevo aviso. *Politika UCAB Revista del CEPYG*. <https://politikaucab.net/2021/04/20/investigacion-y-papers-en-venezuela-i-auge-y-caida-hasta-nuevo-aviso/>
- Rivadeneira, E. (2017). Competencias didácticas-pedagógicas del docente, en la transformación del estudiante universitario. *Revista Científica Electrónica de Ciencias Humanas*. 37(13), 41-55. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/709/70952383003.pdf>
- Rivera, A. (2019). La práctica pedagógica y el aprendizaje basado en problemas. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 10(1). 8–11. https://jett.labosfor.com/pdf_1419_48b65f4c7fce91baea8a050d16f58a8a.html
- Sanz, R, y López, E. (2016). El componente ético de la evaluación educativa. Rasgos del docente. En D. Izarra Vielma (Coord.). *Experiencias y perspectivas en ética profesional y responsabilidad social universitaria en Iberoamérica* (30-46). Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador.
- Shulman, L. (2005) Conocimiento y Enseñanza: Fundamentos de la Nueva Reforma. Profesorado. *Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*, 9(2), 1-30. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=56790202>
- Villarroel, V., y Bruna, D. (2017). Pedagogical Competencies of University Teachers: A Case Study, Which Incorporates the Perspective of Chilean Teachers and Students. *Formación universitaria*, 10(4), 75-96. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50062017000400008>

