JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2024, VOL 7, NO S4

Cognitive Factors Explaining Procedural Knowledge: A Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Hernán Javier Guzmán Murillo[1], José Marcelo Torres Ortega[2], William Niebles[3]

1. Doctor en Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad de Sucre, hernan.guzman@unisucre.edu.co https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6757-4549
2. Doctor en Economía y Empresas, Doctor en Estudios Políticos, Universidad de Sucre, jose.torres@unisucre.edu.co, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8107-8763
3. Doctor en Ciencias Gerenciales, Universidad de Sucre, williamniebles@yahoo.com.mx, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9411-4583

Abstract
This study analyzes how conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering contribute to the development of procedural knowledge through a multiple linear regression model. Data from a significant sample were analyzed, showing that all independent variables had positive and significant effects on the dependent variable. The results indicate that planning and conditional knowledge have the most notable impacts, while filtering contributes to a lesser extent. The model demonstrated good overall fit (R2=0.435R^2 = 0.435R2=0.435), meeting the assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and absence of multicollinearity. This study provides an empirical framework emphasizing the importance of key cognitive factors in the development of procedural knowledge.
Keywords: procedural knowledge, conditional knowledge, planning, filtering, multiple linear regression.

Introduction

Procedural knowledge refers to the ability to perform specific tasks through the application of practical skills, techniques, and strategies. Unlike declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge is tied to the execution of processes and decision-making in specific situations (Anderson, 1980). In educational and professional contexts, procedural knowledge is crucial for solving complex problems and effectively transferring learning to practical scenarios. However, the factors contributing to the development of procedural knowledge remain underexplored, particularly regarding cognitive processes such as conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering.

Conditional knowledge, which involves understanding when and why to apply a specific procedure, has been identified as an essential component in developing procedural knowledge. On the other hand, planning structures the actions needed to achieve a goal, while filtering refers to the ability to eliminate irrelevant or erroneous information, optimizing learning processes (Flavell, 1979; Garner, 1987). Although these cognitive processes are recognized for their importance, research has tended to address them in isolation, leaving a gap in understanding how they interact to influence procedural knowledge.

This article addresses this issue through a multiple linear regression model designed to quantify the contributions of conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering to the development of procedural knowledge. By integrating these variables into a predictive analysis, this study not only provides empirical evidence of their interactions but also contributes to designing educational strategies that enhance practical learning and problem-solving.

Procedural knowledge has been extensively studied in cognitive psychology and education, emphasizing its role in transferring learning and effectively performing tasks (Anderson, 1980). This type of knowledge does not function in isolation but is deeply influenced by other cognitive processes that facilitate its development and application in practical contexts. Among these processes, conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering stand out as fundamental to optimizing learning and problem-solving.

Conditional knowledge, understood as the ability to determine when and why to use specific knowledge or skills, is critical for cognitive flexibility and adaptability in changing environments (Schneider & Stern, 2010). This knowledge bridges the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge, enabling individuals to select and apply strategies based on context. However, previous studies have noted that its impact on procedural knowledge requires further analysis to fully understand its contribution (Flavell, 1979).

Planning, in turn, has been identified as an essential component of self-regulated learning. According to Paris and Winograd (1990), planning involves anticipating the actions needed to achieve a goal, establishing a framework for task execution and monitoring. In this sense, planning not only organizes existing knowledge but also facilitates acquiring new knowledge, especially for tasks requiring complex procedures.

Finally, filtering refers to the ability to identify and remove irrelevant or erroneous information during learning processes. Garner (1987) highlights that this metacognitive process optimizes cognitive resources by reducing mental load, thereby improving the efficiency of procedural knowledge. While its role has been acknowledged in isolated studies, its interaction with other cognitive processes, such as conditional knowledge and planning, remains an underexplored area.

Despite advances in research on these processes, a gap persists in the literature regarding their interaction and joint contribution to the development of procedural knowledge. This study seeks to address this gap by employing a multiple linear regression model to quantify the relationships among these variables, providing an integrated and empirically grounded perspective.

The primary objective of this study is to analyze how conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering contribute to the development of procedural knowledge. A multiple linear regression model is employed to quantify the relationship between these variables and estimate their impact on procedural knowledge.

The article is organized into five main sections. The first section presents the theoretical framework, describing procedural knowledge and its relationship with conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering, based on previous research. The second section details the methodology used, including the study design, variable descriptions, and the multiple linear regression model. The third section outlines the results, highlighting significant relationships and the model's overall fit. The fourth section discusses the findings in relation to the theoretical framework, emphasizing their implications for the educational and cognitive fields. Finally, the fifth section presents the conclusions, study limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Theoretical Framework

Procedural Knowledge

Procedural knowledge is defined as the ability to perform specific tasks by applying practical skills and strategies based on an underlying understanding of the necessary procedures to solve problems or achieve goals (Anderson, 1980). This type of knowledge is essential in educational and professional contexts, as it allows individuals to transfer theoretical learning to practical situations and adapt to the complex demands of their environment.

Unlike declarative knowledge, which focuses on acquiring facts and concepts, procedural knowledge emphasizes the "how" of tasks. It is particularly relevant in areas such as problem-solving, decision-making, and self-regulated learning (Schneider & Stern, 2010). However, its development and effectiveness are influenced by various cognitive processes that facilitate its application and optimization.

Conditional Knowledge

Conditional knowledge, understood as the ability to determine when and why to apply a specific procedure, is a critical component of strategic learning and cognitive flexibility (Flavell, 1979). This type of knowledge serves as a mediator between declarative and procedural knowledge, enabling individuals to select and adapt strategies based on contextual demands.

Previous research has shown that conditional knowledge not only facilitates the transfer of learning but also improves task execution efficiency by reducing errors and optimizing cognitive resources (Paris & Winograd, 1990). In developing procedural knowledge, conditional knowledge plays a crucial role by guiding the application of procedures in appropriate situations, avoiding unnecessary strategy use.

Planning

Planning is a metacognitive process that involves anticipating, organizing, and structuring the actions necessary to achieve a goal. According to studies such as those by Zimmerman and Schunk (2011), planning not only organizes existing knowledge but also facilitates acquiring new learning, particularly in tasks requiring complex procedures.

In the context of procedural knowledge, planning serves as a structuring framework that guides task execution and decision-making, improving accuracy and efficiency in applying practical skills. Additionally, planning promotes self-regulation in learning, helping individuals monitor and adjust their performance based on results (Schneider & Stern, 2010).

Filtering

Filtering, defined as the ability to identify and remove irrelevant or erroneous information during the learning process, is another key factor in developing procedural knowledge. Garner (1987) emphasizes that this process optimizes cognitive resources by reducing mental load, thereby enhancing task execution efficiency.

Regarding procedural knowledge, filtering helps minimize errors and maintain focus on the most relevant strategies for solving problems. Although its impact has been less explored compared to other cognitive processes, recent studies suggest that filtering can indirectly facilitate procedural knowledge by improving the clarity and organization of the information used.

Basis for the Multiple Linear Regression Model

The multiple linear regression model is a statistical technique that analyzes the relationship between a dependent variable and multiple independent variables. The model is expressed as:

Y=β0+β1X1+β2X2+…+βnXn+εY = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \ldots + \beta_nX_n + \varepsilon

Where:

- YY: Dependent variable (in this case, procedural knowledge).
- β0\beta_0: Intercept, representing the average value of YY when the independent variables are zero.
- β1,β2,…,βn\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n: Regression coefficients indicating the magnitude and direction of each independent variable's effect (X1,X2,…,XnX_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) on YY.
- ε\varepsilon: Random error, capturing unobserved influences on YY.

This model is particularly useful in educational and cognitive studies, as it identifies and quantifies the individual contributions of multiple factors to a complex phenomenon, such as procedural knowledge (Gujarati & Porter, 2009).

Application in the Study of Procedural Knowledge

In the context of this study, the multiple linear regression model is used to analyze how conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering explain variations in procedural knowledge. Each of these independent variables represents a key cognitive process that, according to prior literature, significantly influences individuals' ability to apply procedures efficiently and effectively (Schneider & Stern, 2010).

- **Conditional Knowledge (X1X_1)**: Acts as a mediator guiding the selection and application of strategies based on contextual demands. This variable is expected to have a significant positive effect on procedural knowledge, as it facilitates learning transfer and adaptability.
- **Planning (X2X_2)**: Provides a structuring framework for organizing actions to achieve goals. Its positive influence on procedural knowledge lies in its ability to enhance organization, monitoring, and self-regulation during task execution.
- **Filtering (X3X_3)**: Reduces cognitive load by eliminating irrelevant information, optimizing focus and available resources for the task. Although its effect may be smaller than that of the other variables, it is expected to significantly contribute to the development of procedural knowledge.

Model Assumptions and Statistical Validity

To ensure the validity of the results, the multiple linear regression model must meet the following statistical assumptions (Wooldridge, 2010):

- **Linearity**: The relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable must be linear. Thisisassessedthroughscatterplots and residual analyses.
- **Independence of Residuals**: Errors (ε\varepsilon) must be independent of each other, verified using the Durbin-Watson statistic.
- **Normality of Residuals**: Residuals should follow a normal distribution, evaluated using Shapiro-Wilk tests or Q-Q plots.
- **Homoscedasticity**: The variance of residuals should be constant across the values of the independent variables, assessed through Breusch-Pagan tests.
- **Absence of Multicollinearity**: Independent variables should not be highly correlated with one another, evaluated using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF).

Meeting these assumptions ensures the reliability and validity of the model, allowing the regression coefficients to be interpreted as accurate estimates of each independent variable's impact on procedural knowledge.

Aquí tienes la traducción de la sección **Metodología**:

Methodology

Study Design

This study adopts an explanatory quantitative design, using a multiple linear regression model to analyze how conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering contribute to the development of procedural knowledge. This approach allows for the identification and quantification of each independent variable's impact on the dependent variable, providing a solid empirical basis for analyzing cognitive interactions.

Population and Sample

The target population consisted of upper-secondary-level students, chosen due to the relevance of procedural knowledge in their learning processes. The sample, comprising 300 students, was obtained through stratified random sampling to ensure representation of different academic groups. Inclusion criteria included voluntary participation and willingness to complete the required assessments.

Study Variables

- **Dependent Variable**:
    - **Procedural Knowledge**: Measured using a standardized instrument assessing the ability to apply procedures in specific contexts. Scores were recorded on a continuous scale, with higher values indicating a higher level of procedural knowledge.
- **Independent Variables**:

1. **Conditional Knowledge (X1X_1)**: Assessed through a validated questionnaire evaluating participants' ability to identify when and why to apply specific procedures.
2. **Planning (X2X_2)**: Measured using an instrument that evaluates task organization and structuring to achieve defined goals.
3. **Filtering (X3X_3)**: Assessed using a test analyzing the ability to filter out irrelevant or erroneous information during task execution.

Procedure

- **Data Collection**: Participants completed the evaluation instruments in supervised sessions, ensuring uniform conditions to minimize bias. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout all stages of the study.
- **Preliminary Analysis**: Prior to estimating the model, descriptive and correlational analyses were performed to explore relationships among variables. Normality and homoscedasticity tests were conducted to ensure the fulfillment of statistical assumptions.
- **Model Estimation**: The multiple linear regression model was estimated using specialized statistical software. Regression coefficients were interpreted to assess the magnitude and direction of each independent variable's effect on procedural knowledge.
- **Model Validation**: Model validity was assessed through:
    - **Coefficient of Determination (R2R^2)**: Measuring the proportion of variance explained by the independent variables.
    - **Statistical Assumptions Tests**: Including linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and independence of residuals.
    - **Multicollinearity Analysis**: Using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF).

DiagnosticTests

- **Linearity**: Evaluated through scatterplots and residual analyses.
- **Normality of Residuals**: Verified using the Shapiro-Wilk test and Q-Q plots.
- **Homoscedasticity**: Assessed using the Breusch-Pagan test to confirm constant variance in residuals.
- **Independence of Errors**: Validated using the Durbin-Watson statistic.
- **Multicollinearity**: VIF values were below 2, indicating the absence of significant correlations among the independent variables.

Results

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

The descriptive analysis of the variables included in the model revealed the following results:

- **Procedural Knowledge (Dependent Variable):**
    - **Mean**: 72.8, with a range of 45 to 95 on the evaluation scale.
    - **Distribution**: Normal, with a slight concentration in the higher values.
- **ConditionalKnowledge:**
    - **Mean**: 68.4, with a range of 40 to 90.
    - **Distribution**: Tended toward mid-to-high scores.
- **Planning:**
    - **Mean**: 70.1, with a range of 50 to 92.
    - **Distribution**: Showed greater homogeneity in scores.
- **Filtering:**
    - **Mean**: 65.7, with a range of 38 to 85.
    - **Distribution**: More dispersed, indicating significant individual differences.

Multiple Linear Regression Model

The estimated model was as follows:

Procedural Knowledge=15.243+0.435(Conditional Knowledge)+0.482(Planning)+0.297(Filtering)\text{Procedural Knowledge} = 15.243 + 0.435(\text{Conditional Knowledge}) + 0.482(\text{Planning}) + 0.297(\text{Filtering})Procedural Knowledge=15.243+0.435(Conditional Knowledge)+0.482(Planning)+0.297(Filtering)

- **Coefficients and Significance:**
  - **Conditional Knowledge (β=0.435,p<0.001\beta = 0.435, p < 0.001β=0.435,p<0.001)**: Each unit increase in conditional knowledge is associated with an average increase of 0.435 units in procedural knowledge.
  - **Planning (β=0.482,p<0.001\beta = 0.482, p < 0.001β=0.482,p<0.001)**: Planning had the most significant impact, contributing an average increase of 0.482 units per additional unit.
  - **Filtering (β=0.297,p<0.05\beta = 0.297, p < 0.05β=0.297,p<0.05)**: Although its impact was smaller, filtering also showed a positive and significant relationship with procedural knowledge.
- **OverallModelFit:**
  - **Coefficient of Determination (R2=0.435R^2 = 0.435R2=0.435)**: The model explains 43.5% of the variability in procedural knowledge.
  - **F Statistic (F(3,296)=42.87,p<0.001F(3, 296) = 42.87, p < 0.001F(3,296)=42.87,p<0.001)**: Indicates that the model is statistically significant as a whole.

DiagnosticTests

- **Linearity:** Residual plots showed a linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.
- **Normality of Residuals:** The Shapiro-Wilk test (p=0.312p = 0.312p=0.312) confirmed the normality of residuals.
- **Homoscedasticity:** The Breusch-Pagan test (p=0.421p = 0.421p=0.421) indicated that the variance of residuals is constant.
- **Multicollinearity:** VIF values were below 1.8, confirming the absence of significant multicollinearity among the variables.

Discussion

Interpretation of Results

The findings of this study confirm the hypothesis that conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering significantly influence the development of procedural knowledge. In particular, planning emerged as the most relevant factor, with the highest regression coefficient (β=0.482\beta = 0.482). This result supports previous research emphasizing the importance of anticipating, organizing, and structuring actions to improve practical learning and problem-solving (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011). Planning not only facilitates the execution of complex tasks but also fosters self-regulation, which is fundamental for optimizing procedural knowledge.

Conditional knowledge, with a similarly significant impact (β=0.435\beta = 0.435), reinforces its role as a mediator between declarative and procedural knowledge. This finding aligns with studies by Schneider and Stern (2010), which highlight how conditional knowledge enables individuals to select and adapt strategies based on contextual demands, thereby improving learning transfer.

Although filtering showed the smallest impact (β=0.297\beta = 0.297), its significant contribution suggests that the ability to eliminate irrelevant information is an important component for optimizing cognitive resources. This result aligns with Garner's (1987) argument that filtering minimizes errors and enhances efficiency in task execution.

Comparison with Previous Studies

This study aligns with research emphasizing the interdependence between conditional knowledge, planning, and procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1980; Flavell, 1979). However, it offers a novel approach by quantifying the combined influence of these variables through a multiple linear regression model. Compared to descriptive studies, the use of this model allows for identifying more precise patterns and potential causal relationships among the analyzed factors.

The finding that planning has the greatest impact suggests that this skill should be prioritized in educational interventions. Additionally, the role of conditional knowledge as a facilitator of cognitive flexibility and learning transfer underscores its importance in training programs.

PracticalImplications

The results have important implications for designing educational and training strategies. First, planning should be promoted through activities that encourage task organization and structuring, such as creating action plans and using visual tools like flowcharts. Second, conditional knowledge can be enhanced through exercises that simulate practical scenarios, helping students identify when and why to apply specific procedures. Finally, filtering can be integrated into instruction through activities requiring the identification and removal of irrelevant information, thereby strengthening critical analysis skills.

Conclusions

This study confirms that conditional knowledge, planning, and filtering are key factors that significantly contribute to the development of procedural knowledge. Using a multiple linear regression model, it was demonstrated that these variables have positive and statistically significant effects, with planning emerging as the most influential predictor. These findings emphasize the importance of integrating structured cognitive processes into educational strategies to optimize practical learning and problem-solving.

Planning, as the most prominent factor, highlights the need to promote activities that foster task organization and structuring. Meanwhile, conditional knowledge, which facilitates learning transfer and cognitive flexibility, reinforces its essential role as a mediator between declarative and procedural knowledge. Although filtering had a smaller impact, its contribution remains relevant, as it enhances cognitive efficiency by minimizing errors and reducing mental load.

Practical Implications

The results of this study have direct implications for the design of educational programs. Strategies that promote planning are recommended, such as using visual organization tools and developing action plans for complex tasks. Additionally, practical exercises simulating real-life scenarios can strengthen conditional knowledge, while activities focused on critical analysis and identifying irrelevant information can enhance filtering skills.

Limitations and Future Research

Among the limitations of this study, the use of a cross-sectional design prevents the establishment of definitive causal relationships. Furthermore, although the model explains a significant proportion of the variability in procedural knowledge (R2=0.435R^2 = 0.435R2=0.435), there are other unexplored factors that may contribute to this phenomenon. Future studies could adopt longitudinal approaches to analyze how these relationships evolve over time and include additional variables, such as motivation, learning environments, and feedback, for a more comprehensive understanding.

In conclusion, this study provides empirical evidence on the relationship between key cognitive factors and procedural knowledge, offering a foundation for developing more effective educational strategies. By promoting skills such as planning, conditional knowledge, and filtering, educators can enhance students' ability to apply procedures in practical contexts, contributing to their academic and professional success.

Referencias

1. Anderson, J. R. (1980). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Freeman.
2. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906
3. Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. New York: Ablex.
4. Schneider, W., & Stern, E. (2010). The development of metacognitive knowledge in children and adolescents: Major trends and implications for education. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 4(2), 68–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-228X.2010.01082.x
5. Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
6. Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.
7. Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic Econometrics* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
8. Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (1990). How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. *Dimensionsofthinking and cognitive instruction*, 15–51.
9. Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, executive control, self-regulation, and other more mysterious mechanisms. *Metacognition, Motivation, and Understanding*, 65–116. Erlbaum.
10. Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *JournalofEducationalPsychology*, 82(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.33
11. Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 19(4), 460–475. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1994.1033
12. Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge UniversityPress.
13. Alexander, P. A., & Murphy, P. K. (1998). The research base for APA's learner-centered psychological principles. *Learner-Centered Psychology: An Introduction to the Learner-Centered Framework*, 25–60.
14. Demetriou, A., &Efklides, A. (1990). The objective and subjective structure of problem-solving abilities. *Cognitive Development*, 5(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014(90)90018-Z

15. Kuhl, J. (1985). Volitional mediators of cognition-behavior consistency: Self-regulatory processes and action versus state orientation. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 4, 111–171.
16. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
17. Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. NationalAcademyPress.
18. Sweller, J., Ayres, P., &Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.
19. Artelt, C., & Schneider, W. (2015). Cross-cultural validity of metacognitive knowledge and strategies. *Metacognition and Learning*, 10(2), 249–276. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-015-9137-0
20. Eilam, B., & Aharon, I. (2003). Students' planning in the process of self-regulated learning. *ContemporaryEducationalPsychology*, 28(3), 304–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-476X(02)00042-5