

Estilos de aprendizaje en estudiantes de la licenciatura en  
psicología del centro universitario UAEM Temascaltepec,  
2016

*Styles of learning in students of the degree in psychology from the University  
Centre UAEM Temascaltepec, 2016*

*Estilos de aprendizagem nos alunos da licenciatura em psicologia  
Temascaltepec universidade  
UAEM de 2016*

**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.23913/ride.v7i14.271>

**Salvador Bobadilla Beltrán**

Unidad Académica Profesional Tejupilco, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México  
[sbb73@hotmail.com](mailto:sbb73@hotmail.com)

**Daniel Cardoso Jiménez**

Unidad Académica Profesional Tejupilco, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México  
[dcj\\_400@hotmail.com](mailto:dcj_400@hotmail.com)

**Leticia Carreño Saucedo**

Unidad Académica Profesional Tejupilco, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México  
[psicoletty@hotmail.com](mailto:psicoletty@hotmail.com)

**Josué Ociel Márquez Gómez**

Unidad Académica Profesional Tejupilco, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México  
[josuemar12@gmail.com](mailto:josuemar12@gmail.com)

## Resumen

Esta investigación tuvo como objetivo determinar el estilo de aprendizaje que utilizan los estudiantes de la carrera de psicología en función de su grado de preferencia. La población estuvo constituida por un total de 311 estudiantes de la licenciatura en psicología del Centro Universitario UAEM Temascaltepec, Extensión Tejupilco; 68 fueron hombres y 243 mujeres distribuidos en el segundo, cuarto y sexto semestres, de los turnos matutino y vespertino, con edades que oscilan entre los 17 y 23 años.

La información fue recabada mediante el Cuestionario de Estilos de Aprendizaje (CHAEA). El instrumento contiene 80 ítems que se estructuran en cuatro grupos de 20 ítems correspondientes a cada uno de los siguientes estilos de aprendizaje: activo, reflexivo, teórico y pragmático.

La investigación fue descriptiva transeccional y no experimental. La información recabada se procesó con el paquete estadístico SPSS versión 20, calculando la estadística descriptiva y obteniendo la media aritmética por alumno y grupo.

En los resultados del turno matutino en el segundo semestre sobresalió el estilo de aprendizaje activo con una puntuación directa de 10.9 y un grado de preferencia moderada, en tanto que los estilos reflexivo, pragmático y teórico tuvieron una preferencia baja con puntuaciones directas de 13.0, 11.03 y 11.8 respectivamente.

Para el cuarto semestre, el estilo de aprendizaje activo tuvo una preferencia moderada, pues presentó una puntuación directa de 11.52; el estilo de aprendizaje reflexivo presentó una puntuación directa de 12.70, ubicándolo en una preferencia muy baja; finalmente el estilo pragmático y el teórico presentaron un grado de preferencia baja, con puntuaciones directas de 12.23 y 11.85.

En el sexto semestre se pudo observar que el estilo de aprendizaje activo obtuvo una puntuación directa de 10.81 con un grado de preferencia moderada; los estilos reflexivo, pragmático y teórico mostraron un grado de utilización bajo, con puntuaciones directas de 13.36, 10.84 y 11.13.

Para el turno vespertino del segundo semestre el estilo de aprendizaje activo manifestó un grado de preferencia moderado con una puntuación directa de 12.09; mientras los estilos reflexivo, pragmático y teórico tuvieron un grado de preferencia bajo con puntuaciones directas de 11.90, 12.80 y 12.09 respectivamente.

En el cuarto semestre, el estilo de aprendizaje activo obtuvo una puntuación directa de 11.58 y una preferencia moderada, en tanto que los estilos reflexivo, pragmático y teórico se ubicaron en una preferencia baja, ya que presentaron puntuaciones directas de 17.00, 12.47, y 12.11 respectivamente.

Para el sexto semestre se observó que el estilo de aprendizaje activo tuvo preferencia moderada, ya que presentó una puntuación directa de 11.58; el estilo de aprendizaje reflexivo alcanzó una puntuación directa de 12.65, lo cual hace referencia a una preferencia muy baja; y los estilos pragmático y teórico manifestaron una preferencia baja con puntuaciones directas de 11.86 y 11.51.

**Palabras clave:** estilos de aprendizaje, estudiantes, CHAEA, licenciatura en psicología, grados de utilización.

### Abstract

This research aimed to determine the style of learning using the students of Psychology on the basis of their degree of preference. The population consisted of a total of 311 students in the Bachelor's degree in psychology from the University Centre UAEM Temascaltepec, Tejupilco Extension; 68 were men and 243 women distributed in the second, fourth and sixth semesters, in the morning and evening, shifts with ages ranging between 17 and 23 years old.

The data were gathered through the Honey-Alonso Learning Styles Questionnaire (CHAEA by its name in Spanish). The instrument contains 80 items that are structured in four groups of 20 items for each of the following styles of learning: active, thoughtful, theoretical and pragmatic.

The research was descriptive transactional and non-experimental. The information collected is processed with the statistical package SPSS version 20, calculating descriptive statistics and getting the arithmetic mean by student and group.

On the results of the morning shift in the second half stood out the style of active learning with a direct score of 10.9 and a degree of preference of moderate, while thoughtful,

pragmatic and theoretical styles had a low preference with direct scores of 13.0, 11.03 and 11.8 respectively.

For the fourth semester, active learning style had a moderate preference, because it presented a direct score of 11.52; reflective learning style presented a direct score of 12.70, placing it in a very low preference; Finally the theoretical and pragmatic style showed a degree of low preference, with direct scores of 12.23 and 11.85.

In the sixth semester saw that active learning style obtained a direct score of 10.81 with a degree of moderate preference; thoughtful, pragmatic and theoretical styles showed a degree of use bass, with direct scores of 13.36, 10.84 and 11.13.

For the evening shift of the second half active learning style expressed a degree of preference moderately with a direct score of 12.09; while thoughtful, pragmatic and theoretical styles had a degree of preference with direct scores low 11.90, 12.80 and 12.09 respectively.

In the fourth semester, active learning style obtained a direct score of 11.58 and a moderate preference, while thoughtful, pragmatic and theoretical styles were placed in a lower preference, since they showed direct scores of 17.00, 12.47, and 12.11 respectively

For the sixth semester, it was observed that active learning style was moderate preference, as I present a direct score of 11.58; reflective learning style reached a direct score of 12.65, which refers to a very low preference; and theoretical and pragmatic styles demonstrated a low preference with direct scores of 11.86 and 11.51.

**Key words:** learning styles, students, CHAEA, Bachelor's degree in psychology, degree of use.

## Resumo

Esta pesquisa teve como objetivo determinar o estilo de aprendizagem utilizado por estudantes de psicologia de acordo com seu grau de preferência. A população foi composta por um total de 311 alunos da licenciatura em psicologia pela Universidade Centro Temascaltepec UAEM, Extensão Tejupilco; 68 eram homens e 243 mulheres distribuídas nos segundo, quarto e sexto semestres, os turnos da manhã e da noite, com idades variando entre 17 e 23 anos.

A informação foi recolhida através de estilos de aprendizagem Questionnaire (CHAEA). O instrumento contém 80 itens que são divididos em quatro grupos de 20 itens correspondentes a cada um dos seguintes estilos de aprendizagem: ativo, reflexivo, teórico e pragmático.

A pesquisa Transeccional foi descritiva e não experimental. As informações coletadas foram processadas com SPSS versão 20, as estatísticas descritivas de calcular e obter a média aritmética pelo grupo de alunos.

Nos resultados do turno da manhã na segunda metade destacou estilo de aprendizagem activa com uma pontuação bruta de 10,9 e um grau de preferência moderada, enquanto os estilos pensativo, pragmáticas e teóricas tinha uma preferência baixa, com escores brutos de 13,0, 11,03 e 11,8, respectivamente.

Para o quarto trimestre, o estilo de aprendizagem activa tinha uma preferência moderada, uma vez que apresentou uma contagem direta de 11,52; estilo de aprendizagem reflexivo apresentou uma pontuação direta de 12,70, colocando-o em uma preferência muito baixo; finalmente, o estilo pragmático e teórico apresentado um baixo grau de preferência, com as pontuações diretas de 12,23 e 11,85.

No sexto semestre verificou-se que o estilo de aprendizagem activa obteve uma pontuação bruta de 10,81, com um grau de preferência moderada; os estilos pensativo, pragmáticas e teóricas mostraram um baixo nível de utilização, com pontuações diretas de 13,36, 10,84 e 11,13.

Para o turno da tarde do estilo ativo de aprendizagem segundo semestre mostrou um grau moderado de preferência com uma pontuação bruta de 12,09; enquanto estilos pensativo, pragmáticas e teóricas tinha um baixo grau de preferência com as contagens diretas de 11,90, 12,80 e 12,09, respectivamente.

No quarto trimestre, o estilo de aprendizagem activa obteve uma pontuação bruta de 11,58 e uma preferência moderada, enquanto os estilos pensativo, pragmáticas e teóricas foram colocados em uma preferência baixo, porque eles tiveram pontuações diretas de 17,00, 12,47 e 12,11 respectivamente.

Para o sexto semestre notou-se que preferência de estilo de aprendizagem activa foi moderada, como eu apresentar uma pontuação direta de 11,58; estilo de aprendizagem

reflexivo obteve um escore bruto de 12,65, que se refere a uma preferência muito baixo; e estilos preferência pragmática e teórica expressa baixos escores brutos de 11,86 e 11,51.

**Palavras-chave:** estilos de aprendizagem, estudantes, CHAEA, curso de psicologia, grau de utilização.

**Fecha Recepción:** Julio 2016

**Fecha Aceptación:** Enero 2017

---

## Introduction

According to Gutierrez (et al., 2011), currently learning styles can represent a very important contribution for different areas of knowledge, for example, didactic, pedagogical and psychological. Some teachers know the preferences of their students in terms of learning styles to customize possible courses that teach.

In the tradition of educational and instructional psychology, different styles of learning-oriented research provide valuable information of how occurs, human learning, which can help improve the educational practice in the different formal levels of education (Alonso, Gallego and Honey, 1997).

Penalty and Martin (2005) define learning styles as the subjective processes of uptake, incorporation, retention, and use of the information which the individual receives in its continuous exchange with the environment. Zabalza (2000) sees learning as a process in which three dimensions are involved: the theoretical itself, the tasks and actions of the student, and the tasks and activities of teachers, in other words, the set of factors that can intervene on it.

Learning styles are viewed as a process of change that occurs in the body, behavior, cognitivo-cognoscitivas capabilities, motivation and emotions, as result of the action or experience of the individual, the association between stimuli and responses, and the appropriation of the socio-cultural context and on knowledge organizations.

It is worth mentioning that people perceive and acquire knowledge, have ideas, and act differently; in addition, people have preferences towards certain cognitive strategies that help them to give meaning to the new information. *Learning styles* refers to these preferred

strategies that are, more specifically, forms of collecting, interpreting, organizing and thinking about new information (Alonso, Gallego y Honey, 1997).

In addition, learning is essentially a change produced by the experience, but they differentiate between learning as product (that highlights the end result or the outcome of the learning experience), learning as a process (that highlights what happens in the course of the learning experience to subsequently obtain a product of lessons learned) and learning as a function (that enhances certain critical aspects of learning, like motivation, retention and transfer, which presumably allows changes in behaviour in human learning) (Martínez-Otero; 2009).

Factors that influence students' academic performance, also called determinants of academic achievement, are difficult to identify, since such factors or variables often form a complex and strongly constituted network, and it is difficult to narrow or delimit them to assign Effects clearly discernible to each of them.

There is a great difficulty in putting into practice the adaptation of teaching to the learning styles of students. Not only must we take into account the learning style of the students but also the teaching style of the teachers. Theories of learning styles should have serious repercussions on teaching styles. It is a question of the teacher taking into account the learning styles of the students, from the first "draft" of the educational design until the last moment of the class and evaluation.

## **Method**

### **Context of research**

The present investigation was carried out with students of University Center Temascaltepec UAEM, Extension Tejupilco, specifically in the psychology race of the morning and afternoon shifts. The population consisted of a total of 311 students, of whom 68 were men and 243 women, distributed in the second, fourth and sixth semesters of both shifts, with ages varying between 17 and 23 years.

**Instrument**

In this research, the Learning Styles Questionnaire (Alonso-Honey, 1992) was used, which consists of 80 items, brief and dichotomous, stating that if it is agreed, it will be answered with a positive (+) sign or in disagreement with a negative sign (-). These 80 items are structured into four groups of 20 items corresponding to each of the four learning styles: active, reflective, theoretical and pragmatic. The items are randomly distributed. The score is summative for each of the groups of 20 items, considering a direct score, so that through the scale table can identify the degree of preference of any of the learning styles.

**Process**

Authorization was first granted to H.H. Governmental and Academic Councils of UAEM Temascaltepec University Center, in order to be able to develop the research and thus be able to enter the classrooms and carry out the application of the Learning Styles Questionnaire (CHAEA), respecting the date and time authorized by the authority Educational

Subsequently the objective of the research was announced to the teachers and students, and their valuable collaboration and participation in the application of the instrument was requested.

Each group of students was then explained in detail to how they should answer the answer sheet, using the CHAEA question book before starting the application.

Once the CHAEA was applied, the scores were corrected and scored according to the direct scores and their corresponding scale, recording all the grades, which allowed determining the profile that corresponds to the degree of preference of each student.

Finally, the collected and organized information of the students was analyzed with the statistical package SPSS.

**Literature review****Classification of learning styles according to alonso and honey**

Active Style: animators, improvisers, discoverers, risky and spontaneous.

They emphasize concrete experience. They are fully involved in new experiences. Open-minded, not skeptical, enthusiastic. People in a group are involved in the affairs of others.

They grow to the challenges of new experiences. They are also characterized by being entertainers, improvisers, discoverers, risky and spontaneous. People belonging to this style of learning prefer to solve problems, compete in teams, conduct discussions, make presentations. For their part, they have difficulty exposing subjects with a lot of theoretical load, paying attention to details, working alone, repeating the same activity, being passive, listening to lectures, explaining, sitting for a long time.

**Reflexive style:** weighted, conscientious, receptive, analytical and exhaustive.

They emphasize reflective observation. They collect data and analyze it carefully. They examine the different alternatives before acting. They watch and listen, they do not act until they are sure. They are characterized by being thoughtful, conscientious, receptive, analytical and exhaustive. People belonging to this style of learning prefer to observe and reflect, to carry their own rhythm of work, to have time to assimilate, to hear the points of view of others, to make detailed and detailed analyzes. It is difficult for them to occupy the forefront, to act as leaders, to preside over meetings or debates, to participate in meetings without planning, to express ideas spontaneously, to be pressed for time, to be forced to change from one activity to another, not to have enough data to draw conclusions.

**Theoretical Style:** Methodical, logical, objective, critical and structured.

They contemplate abstract conceptualization. They adapt and integrate the observations of logical and complex theories. They are perfectionists. They integrate facts into coherent theories. Analyze and synthesize. They seek objective rationality by fleeing from the subjective and ambiguous. They are characterized by being methodical, logical, objective, critical and structured. People of this style prefer to feel in clear and structured situations, participate in questions and answers, read or hear about ideas and concepts based on rationality and logic, analyze a complete situation. They find it difficult to be forced to do something without a clear purpose, to have to participate in situations where emotions and feelings predominate, to participate in the discussion of open problems.

**Pragmatic style: experimenters, practical, direct, effective and realistic.**

They consider the importance in active experimentation. Apply ideas in a practical way. They like to act quickly. They discover positive aspects of new ideas and try to experience them.

They tend to be impatient when there are people who theorize too much. They are characterized by being experimental, practical, direct, effective and realistic. People of this style of learning prefer to use immediately applicable techniques, to perceive many examples and anecdotes, to experiment and to practice techniques with advice of an expert, to receive precise indications. They find it difficult to learn things that do not have immediate applicability, to work without clear instructions, to check that there are obstacles that impede application.

**Results**

According to the CHAEA questionnaire that was applied to the students of the degree in Psychology of the University Center UAEM Temascaltepec Extension Tejupilco, the following results were obtained in turn:

**Morning shift**

In the second semester it was observed that the active learning style had a minimum of 7.0, a maximum of 15.0, with a direct score of 10.9, so the degree of preference is moderate; The reflexive style presented a minimum of 8.0, a maximum of 18.0, and a direct score of 13.0, being placed in the low preference degree; Similarly, the pragmatic style had a low preference degree, since it had a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 18 and its direct score was 11.03; The theoretical learning style with a minimum of 6.0 and a maximum of 17.0 presented a low preference, while his direct score was 11.8.

For the fourth semester, the active learning style was preferably moderate, as it presented a direct score of 11.52, a minimum of 7.0 and a maximum of 17.0; The reflexive learning style showed a minimum of 5.0 and a maximum of 19.0 and a direct score of 12.70, being placed in a very low preference; The pragmatic style presented a minimum of 8.0 and a

maximum of 18.0 and obtained a direct score of 12.23, so this style was preferably low; The theoretical learning style obtained a minimum of 5.0 and a maximum of 16.0 and a direct score of 11.85, being placed in a low preference.

Finally, in the sixth semester it was observed that the active learning style had a minimum of 7.0, a maximum of 15.0 and a direct score of 10.81, so that the degree of preference was moderate; The reflexive style presented a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 18.0 with a direct score of 13.36, being located in the degree of low preference; Similarly, the pragmatic style had a low preference degree, since it had a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 15.0, its direct score was 10.84; The theoretical learning style presented a minimum of 5.0 and a maximum of 16.0, with a low preference, since its direct score was 11.13.

### **Afternoon shift**

For the second semester it was observed that the active learning style obtained a minimum of 7.0, a maximum of 17.0 and a direct score of 12.09 with a moderate degree of preference; The reflexive style presented a minimum of 5.0 and a maximum of 19.0, in addition its direct score was of 11.90 and it was placed in the degree of preference very low; With respect to the pragmatic learning style there was a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 18, besides having a direct score of 12.80, this gave rise to the low degree of preference; Finally, the theoretical style showed a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 16, also presented a direct score of 12.09, so it belongs to the degree of low preference.

In the fourth semester the active learning style had a minimum of 7.0 and a maximum of 17.0, presented a direct score of 11.58 with a moderate degree of preference; The reflexive style was placed in the low preference, since it presented a direct score of 13.2, having a minimum of 6.00 and a maximum of 18.00; As for the pragmatic style a minimum of 8.00 and a maximum of 17.00 with a direct score of 12.47 and a low preference was found; The theoretical learning style had a minimum of 6.00 and a maximum of 16.00, presented a direct score of 12.11 and a low degree of preference.

Finally, in the sixth semester it was observed that the active learning style had a moderate preference, since it presented a direct score of 11.58, a minimum of 7.0 and a maximum of 17.0; The reflexive learning style obtained a minimum of 6.0 and a maximum of 18.0 with a direct score of 12.65, being placed in a very low preference; In the pragmatic style a direct score of 11.86 was found, a low preference, a minimum of 8.0 and a maximum of 17.0; Finally, the theoretical learning style showed a minimum of 5.0 and a maximum of 16.0, a direct score of 11.51, being placed in a low preference.

## **Discussion**

"Learning styles are the cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive interactions and respond to their learning environments" (Keefe, cited in Alonso, Gallego and Honey, 1994). These traits are evidenced in the way the subjects formalize the schemes of interpretation and its relation with the contents and information. In addition, they are involved with affective traits such as the motivations and expectations that influence learning and the physiological traits associated with the biotype and biorhythms of the student.

The results obtained in this research indicate that the learning style most used is the active one, with a moderate preference, which is similar to that reported by Camarero, Del Buey and Herrero (2000), who carried out previous research on Learning styles and strategies in college students, finding that students with higher academic achievement use active style in a much more moderate and limited way."

In the research conducted by Bahamian, Vianchá, Alarcón and Bohórquez (2013) on learning styles and strategies related to academic achievement in university students, it was found that preferences in the use of learning styles, according to the results Obtained by the application of the CHAEA, show that most participants do not use a single style or mode of learning. Thus, it is possible to identify combinations between different styles, not agreeing with these authors because the results found in this research show that students have more preference for some of the styles.

In the research conducted by Bahamian, Viancha, Alarcón and Bohórquez (2013) on the pure styles presented in the students, it was identified that 24.4% use the theoretical style

and 19.6% the active style, results different from those found in the present Research, where the predominant style is the active. Perhaps this difference is due to our research being carried out with the students of the psychology course of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, while the aforementioned researchers carried out their research considering all the careers that are taught in the university.

In another study carried out in university students in distance education, and considering the learning styles and academic performance carried out by Blumen, Rivero, and Guerrero (2011), it was reported that undergraduate students in distance education from two private universities of Lima, tend to use theoretical and active learning styles more frequently than reflective and pragmatic styles. These results are similar to those found in this research, since the styles that predominated most were active and reflective, although the latter differs from that reported by Blumen, Rivero, and Guerrero (2011).

Likewise, the results of this research show that students who are in the second semester of the psychology course use active style with a moderate preference, data that do not coincide with those reported in the research carried out by Pujol (2003), nor with the Of Peinado (2007), who studied the learning styles in a sample of students of the Simón Bolívar University, whose results suggest that the predominant style of learning in engineering students is the theoretical one. Nor do the results coincide with the findings of Camarero, Del Buey and Herrero (2000) and Alonso, Honey and Gallego (1997) investigations, who reported that students in engineering careers showed a preference for the pragmatic style. These differences and the findings of this research suggest that the learning style is not related to what was expected in his career, which could be attributed to the fact that students are starting their university studies and have not studied subjects of their professional studies.

## **Conclusions**

- Students are free to choose their own learning style according to their preference.
- The style of learning that each student has is not merely characteristic of the career he studies.
- According to the degree of progress in university studies is the development of each of the learning styles.
- The context also determines the preference of some of the learning styles.
- The more advanced students have not developed significantly the pragmatic style, which refers to the practical application and does not agree with the subjects of this semester.
- Styles are not better or worse, good or bad, but neutral. Each style has its own value and its own effectiveness to carry out activities.
- Learning styles according to circumstances may vary as they are not absolute. There are no completely pure styles, one learning style can be used more frequently than another, however, having different experiences will be used different learning styles.

## Bibliography

- Alonso, C. (1992). Análisis y Diagnóstico de los Estilos de Aprendizaje en Estudiantes Universitarios. Tomo II. Madrid: Colección Tesis Doctorales. Editorial de la Universidad Complutense.
- Alonso, C. (1992). Estilos de aprendizaje: análisis y diagnóstico en estudiantes universitarios. Madrid: Editorial Universidad Complutense.
- Alonso C., Gallego, D. y Honey, P. (1997). Los Estilos de Aprendizaje. Bilbao, España: Mensajero.
- Alonso C. y Gallego D. (2004). Estilos de aprendizaje: teoría y práctica. Madrid: UNED.
- Alonso C., Gallego, D. y Honey, P. (1995). Los estilos de aprendizaje. Procedimientos de diagnóstico y mejora. Bilbao: Ediciones Mensajero.
- Alonso C., Gallego, D. (2000). Aprendizaje y Ordenador. Madrid: Dykinson.
- Alonso C., Gallego, D., Honey, P. (1994). Los Estilos de Aprendizaje. Procedimientos de diagnóstico y mejora. Bilbao: Ediciones Mensajero. Universidad de Deusto.
- Bahamón M., Vianchá M., Alarcón I., Bohórquez C. (2012). Estilos y estrategias de aprendizaje: una revisión empírica y conceptual de los últimos diez años. *Pensamiento Psicológico* 10: 1129-1144.
- Bahamón, M. (2010). Relaciones existentes entre sistema de mediación del aprendizaje, autorregulación del aprendizaje y logro académico en estudiantes de pregrado de una universidad de Pereira. *Revista Psicología Científica*, 12(22). Recuperado de <http://www.psicologiacientifica.com/relaciones-sistema-de-mediacion-aprendizaje-autorregulacion-logro-academico>.
- Blumen S., Rivero C. y Guerrero D. (2011). Universitarios en educación a distancia: estilos de aprendizaje y rendimiento académico. *Revista de Psicología*, 29(2), 225-243.
- Camarero F., Martín F. y Herrero J. (2000). Estilos y estrategias de aprendizaje en estudiantes universitarios. *Psicothema*, 12 (4), 615-622.
- Camarero S. F., Martín D. y Herrero D. (2000). Estilos y estrategias de aprendizaje en estudiantes universitarios. Universidad de Oviedo, España. *Revista Psicothema*, vol. 12, núm. 3.
- Gutiérrez T., García C, Vivas M, Santizo R., Alonso G. y Arranz D. (abril de 2011). Estudio comparativo de los estilos de aprendizaje del alumnado que inicia sus

- estudios universitarios en diversas facultades de Venezuela, México y España. *Estilos de Aprendizaje*, 7, 1-27.
- Martínez-Otero (2009). Investigación y reflexión sobre condicionantes del fracaso escolar. *Revista Latinoamericana de estudios educativos*, 39 (1-2), pp. 11-38.
- Peinado, S. (2007). Efectos de los estilos de aprendizaje y la autoeficacia computacional sobre desempeño en foro electrónico. Universidad Simón Bolívar: Caracas.
- Peña R. y Martín (2005). Evaluación de alumnos de educación superior con bajo rendimiento académico y propuesta de un programa de tutorías, Tesis de licenciatura en Psicología, FES Iztacala, UNAM.
- Pujol, I. (2003). El efecto de la conducta de búsqueda de información precisa en hipertexto de dos variables personales: Estilos de Aprendizaje y uso de estrategias metacognitivas en estudiantes universitarios. Caracas: Venezuela.
- Zabalza, M. (2000). El papel de los departamentos universitarios en la mejora de la calidad de la docencia. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*.