# Design and validity of a questionnaire to identify beliefs, conceptions, and didactic models of university teachers

**Milgian Martínez**
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras (UNAH), mdiximar@uma.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5715-0320

**Wilson Sucari**
Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, wsucari@unap.edu.pe
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5874-0966

**Nelly Rocha**
Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, nmrocha@unap.edu.pe
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3418-5712

**Yolanda Lujano**
Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, ylujano@unap.edu.pe
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7178-3346

**Zoraida Ramos-Pineda**
Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, znramos@unap.edu.pe
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5360-2131

## Abstract

The objective of the article was to design and validate, through expert judgment and piloting, a questionnaire to identify the beliefs, conceptions, and didactic models of university professors. Data processing and analysis were performed with the Maxqda and SPSS software packages, from which content and construct validity were obtained. In general, it was found that the initial version of the questionnaire had aspects of form and content that required adjustments, and after carrying out the pilot tests, the questionnaire was adjusted until a final version with 47 items was obtained. The results show that the instrument has an acceptable confidence interval of 0.713 according to Cronbach's alpha so thatit can be applied for the purpose for which it was designed.

**Keywords:** validity, belief, conception, didactic model

## Resumen

El objetivo del artículo fue diseñar y validar por juicio de expertos y pilotaje, de un cuestionario para identificar creencias, concepciones y modelos didácticos del profesorado universitario. El procesamiento y análisis de los datos se realizó mediante los paquetes informáticos Maxqda y SPSS a partir de los cuales se obtuvo la validez de contenido y de constructo. En general se encontró que la versión inicial del cuestionario contaba con aspectos de forma y contenido que ameritaban ajustes y, luego de realizar las pruebas piloto, se ajustó el cuestionario hasta obtener una versión final con 47 ítems. Los resultados muestran que el instrumento cuenta con un intervalo de confianza aceptable de 0.713 según el alfa de Cronbach, por lo que puede ser aplicado para su propósito que fue diseñado.

**Palabras clave:** validez, creencia, concepción, modelo didáctico

**DOI Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.9.NQ44188** **Neuro Quantology 2022; 20(9):1633-1645**

## Introduction

Understanding how teachers think is important to know how this affects the way they act, what teaching means to them, what perceptions, conceptions, and beliefs they have of their students, how they develop their pedagogical practice, and what works for them in the classroom, what isn't working, and how they could act differently.

Teachers have a network of concepts, representations, and beliefs on which they base their intervention projects and purposes, and from which they structure their personal didactic models (Mayorga & Madrid, 2010; García & Porlán, 2017; Gorodokin, 2017).

In this sense, for teachers to carry out a reflective practice, they must thoroughly analyze what they experience in their classes, and based on this, ask themselves what they could improve. According to the literature, these mental processes evolve satisfactorily in teachers as they advance in their professional careers (Schommer, 2004; Chrysostomou & Philippou, 2010; Barnes et al., 2020).

Authors such as Gil and Rico (2003), Cortez et al. (2013), Vizcaino et al. (2013), and Solís (2018), have identified in their different studies, categories in common regarding what university teachers think about didactic planning or teaching guide, contents, methodology, evaluation and the role of the teacher; for this purpose, they have used in their research Likert-type scales with between 5 and 9 response options.

In this context, the objective of the research stage referred to in this article is to characterize the didactic perspective of the teaching staff of the National Autonomous University of Honduras (UNAH). For this purpose, a questionnaire was designed -in addition to other instruments- to identify the beliefs, conceptions, and didactic models of the teachers; the instrument was submitted for validation by five experts, as well as through two pilot tests.

The questions to be answered were: What categories of analysis should be considered to identify the beliefs, conceptions, and didactic models of university teachers? What are the evaluations of the experts and teachers who participated in the two pilot tests on the structure and items of the proposed questionnaire? What modifications does the instrument require according to the evaluations of the experts and the reliability index resulting from the pilot tests?

In that order of ideas, the literature indicates that the validity of the instruments can be, fundamentally, content and construct validity, to have a design that is quite adjusted to the research objectives (Barrera et al., 2015; Martínez, 2019; Pedrosa et al., 2014; Puerta and Marín, 2015; Urrutia et al., 2014).

## Materials and Methods

A questionnaire was prepared which, in its first version, had 58 items, which were subjected to validation by expert judgment and then to two pilot tests to validate it by application; along these lines, the approach used for the validation of the instrument was qualitative, with a descriptive scope.

### *Questionnaire design*

For the design of the questionnaire, the approaches of Schommer (2004) on the assessment of aspects such as stability, structure, and source of knowledge, as well as speed and ability to learn, were reviewed. The Pedagogical Opinions Questionnaire of Pérez Gómez and Gimeno (1992) was also examined and considered, particularly in the following areas: objectives, programming, selection and organization of content, teaching methods and resources, evaluation systems and functions, the student, the teacher, the nature of knowledge, and classroom organization.

Likewise, some items were contrasted from the reflective thinking questionnaire by Dunn & Musolino (2011), the questionnaire designed by Kember et al. (2010) to assess the level of reflective thinking of teachers, and the reflective thinking tendency scale of current and future teachers, designed by Semerci (2007), which considers seven factors: continuous and intentional thinking, open-mindedness, effective and questioning teaching, responsibility for teaching and science, foresight and sincerity, research and professional appearance.

In the same way, the design of the questionnaire took into account what was indicated by García and Porlán (2017) and by Mayorga and Madrid (2010) on formalized, ideal, and personal didactic models.

### *Content validity by expert judgment*

To determine the content validity of the instrument, the expert judgment technique was applied, which Cabero and Llorente (2013) indicate can be performed from different approaches: by individual aggregation, through the Delphi method, by nominal group technique, or through the interaction between experts by a consensus method. For the research from which this article derives, we opted for content validation through individual aggregation expert judgment, which, according to the authors, "consists of obtaining the information individually from each of them, without them being in contact with each other" (p. 17).

In this vein, Juárez and Tobón (2018) point out three important aspects to take into account when performing content validation through expert judgment: the expert concept itself, the determination of the degree of knowledge in the area or construct, and the necessary number of them to assess the instruments. In addition, the authors stress the importance of using scales that allow both quantitative and qualitative assessment, to determine the items to be retained or discarded, based on certain criteria and, after the experts' judgment has been complemented by a construct validation.

For their part, Galicia et al. (2017) emphasize that the analysis of the items that make up an instrument depends on the researcher's objectives, from which the support of expert judges is requested. According to the authors, it is also important to consider aspects such as: the number of dimensions or variables to be measured, the clarity of the criteria for the assessment, the definition of the objective of the instruments, their length, and the consideration of the time available to the experts for the review.

Along these lines, according to Dorantes et al. (2016), some criteria to consider when selecting experts are: a good reputation among the community, availability, and motivation to participate, and impartiality. Once the experts have been selected, a formal invitation is made to explain and contextualize the objectives of the test or validation, of the instrument as such, and the research; likewise, the instrument and other support resources are shared.



From this scenario, to select the experts, e-mails were sent to eight specialists in the field of education with recognized academic trajectories, achieving a positive response from five of them, belonging to the universities of Cadiz, Malaga, Barcelona, Granada, and the University of Costa Rica, who had no connection whatsoever.

As support for the review of the content of the questionnaire, a document was prepared and sent to each expert with a rating scale for each item based on four criteria, as shown in Table 1. Likewise, to facilitate the qualitative assessments, spaces were established for each of the five items, in which the experts could freely comment on or propose suggestions, modifications, or proposed adjustments.

Table 1. Descriptors to be considered for review of the questionnaire items by the experts

| Scale | Command | Descriptors |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The item is correctly formulated | This option can be checked if the item is clear, its content is well written, the purpose of the item is understood, its structure is coherent about the response scale (agreement/disagreement or frequency) and its sequence makes sense concerning the rest of the items. |
| 2 | The item needs some form adjustments | The content of the item is important, the purpose of the item is understood, its structure is coherent about the response scale (agreement/disagreement or frequency) and its sequence makes sense concerning the rest of the items, but how it is written should be improved. |
| 3 | The item needs some content adjustments | The content of the item is important; however, its purpose, structure about the response scale (agreement/ disagreement or frequency), or its sequence, present some aspects for improvement. |
| 4 | The item should be removed | This option can be checked if it is considered that the item does not meet any of the above criteria. |

Source: Own elaboration

Once the experts' evaluations were available, the arithmetic mean was calculated for each item, to categorize them according to the following intervals: 1.00 to 1.4 for correctly formulated items; 1.5 to 2.4 for items with some need for adjustments in form; 2.5 to 3.4 for items with some need for adjustments in content; and 3.5 to 4.00 for items with suggestions for elimination. The following is an example of the comments made by the experts, in particular, on items with some needs for improvement in the form:

*I do not see clearly the intention of items 12 and 15 (Exp-B); in the final part, instead of saying "educational options", say "educational options and methodologies" (Exp-D); it would be necessary to establish more specifically what is meant by "educational options" if they are related to time, space, methods, materials... (Exp-E).*

The qualitative assessments of the experts were analyzed using Maxqda software, in which 11 codes were established in an emergent manner that is, not predefined, to focus on the experts' comments and not pigeonholing them into previously specified categories.

*Construct validity through pilot tests*

Nineteen teachers participated in the construct validity, considered as invited to participate, which denotes an acceptance of the subjects, in line with what Martínez (2012) states something essential and of ethical connotations, which contributes rigorousness to the research process. For the selection of participants, a purposive type of sampling was used, based on the researcher's judgment, aiming to choose characteristic and diverse cases to ensure maximum variability within the primary data, as proposed by Black (2010) and Saunders et al. (2012).

The subjects were distributed in two groups: the first was made up of 10 teachers (one per department) and the second of 9 (from 6 different departments), seeking a certain representativeness, as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Samples with which the pilot tests were carried out to validate the questionnaire construct

| Sample | Department | Number of teachers |
|---|---|---|
| First pilot test | Letters | 1 |
| | Philosophy | 1 |
| | Architecture | 1 |
| | Internal Medicine | 1 |
| | Surgery | 1 |
| | Business Administration | 1 |
| | Economics | 1 |
| | Preventive and Social Dentistry | 1 |
| | Private law | 1 |
| | Bioanalysis in Immunology | 1 |
| | **Total** | **10** |
| Second pilot test | Civil Engineering | 2 |
| | Social Work | 2 |
| | Letters | 2 |
| | Sociology | 1 |
| | Business Administration | 1 |
| | Biomedical Sciences and Imaging | 1 |
| | **Total** | **9** |

Source: Own elaboration

It was decided to work with a relatively small group of participants, given that the aim was to prioritize the quality of the information, based on the research interests. For the selection of participants, the following criteria were taken into account: that the teachers had a permanent agreement or position, with teaching experience at the UNAH of between 2 and 5 years, that they had basic pedagogical-didactic training, and that they were willing to participate in the research process.

Since this stage of the research was carried out during the third quarter of the year 2021, at which time the UNAH was still developing fully online classes due to Covid-19, the application of the pilot tests was carried out using the Google Forms tool.

The data collected were processed using the SPSS software package, from which the reliability index or Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

**Results and Discussion**

After calculating the arithmetic mean of each of the 58 items, it was determined in which pre-established interval for each value of the scale the data were found, and it was found that 19 items (33%) were correctly formulated, 32 items (55%) merited some adjustments of form, 7 items (12%) merited some adjustments of content, and no item should be eliminated.

Although 19 of the 58 test items were correctly formulated from the point of view of most experts, it is necessary to pay attention to the wording of the items, since although the substance or main idea is understood, in some cases the form in which the items are presented is unclear, ambiguous, or repetitive; even some conceptual flaws and even aspects that are too generic, ontological and/or epistemological could be identified.



About qualitative evaluations of the experts, 94 relevant comments were found, of which 55, that is, more than half, had to do with improving some terms or expressions since they raised aspects that were not very objective, suggestions for wording, poor correspondence concerning the response options or scale of opinion, among other aspects.

Of the remaining 39 comments, 10 pointed out a lack of uniformity in terms of some expressions or statements, another 10 were linked to a lack of clarity in the presentation of ideas, and the other evaluations focused on pointing out that the items included aspects of a general nature, as well as little contrast between one approach and another, some conceptual flaws, the need to complement the items with aspects of gender, the length of the test, and some incomplete expressions. (See table 3)

Table 3. Code frequencies based on comments made by experts

| Category | Code | Frequency |
|---|---|---|
| Improve some terms or expressions | MTE | 55 |
| Lack of uniformity in the wording | UNI | 10 |
| Ambiguity and lack of clarity in the ideas presented. | PCL | 10 |
| Repetition of the same ideas in several items. | REP | 5 |
| General aspects are included | GEN | 4 |
| Little contrast between one approach and another | CON | 3 |
| Some conceptual flaws | FAC | 2 |
| Complement wording with the feminine gender | FEM | 2 |
| Very extensive test (questionnaire) | EXT | 1 |
| Some incomplete expressions | EIN | 1 |
| Discussion and reflection are encouraged | PDR | 1 |

Source: Own elaboration

It should be noted that, to better structure the analysis, 5 categories were established -which were not explicitly included in the instrument as such-: Planning, Contents, Methodology, Evaluation, and Role of the teacher, from which an overall average was calculated based on the quantitative evaluations provided by the experts, and the comments made were organized as part of the qualitative evaluations for each item that made up these categories.

Regarding the *"Planning"* category, it was found that the experts identified 5 of the 7 items as needing some adjustments related to the wording and presentation of the ideas. For some items, the experts found that the content of the items was very similar to that of others; they also pointed out that the scale used to answer some items was not adequate, or that two propositions were included for the same item, which could be counterproductive by making it difficult for the subjects to choose the answer to the instrument.[a]

Based on the assessments described above, the main criterion for making the adjustments was that at least two of the experts recommended omitting or making modifications to the content of the items, taking into account their arguments to justify these appraisals.

From this point, the coding was done in Maxqda and the frequencies of codes were established by the emerging categories of analysis, which served as input for us to make some decisions in this regard, redefining the items: although several were eliminated, others were incorporated, leaving the "Planning" category made up of 6 items, 3 of them with a wording oriented more towards the transmissive, and 3 oriented towards the alternative, as stipulated in the adjusted version of the instrument, which would later be subjected to piloting.[b]

About the *"Contents"* category, 6 of the 12 items received positive evaluations from the experts, while two of the items required content adjustments and the remaining 4 required form adjustments, mainly regarding the wording of the ideas, the inclusion of ontological elements, the content presented similarly manner to other items, or the absence of elements that would allow for greater clarity.[a]

Based on the above, and after reviewing and coding the experts' arguments in Maxqda, the adjusted version of the questionnaire for this category was made up of 3 items oriented toward transmissive didactic conceptions and models and 4 towards alternative didactic conceptions and models.[b]

Similarly, for the "Methodology" category, it was generally observed that only 2 of the 17 items required, from the experts' point of view, substantial adjustments about the content of the items, while 9 required modifications of form and the remaining 6 did not require major changes.[a]

Among the adjustments pointed out by the experts, we found, mainly, some recommendations on how to restate the ideas as well as some conceptual errors and lack of clarity about the purpose of some items; it was also found that some items presented similar content concerning others. Along these lines, after codifying the evaluations made by the experts and considering some other details, the adjusted version of the questionnaire established 4 items oriented towards transmissive didactic conceptions and models and 8 towards alternative didactic conceptions and models.[b]

The version submitted to expert judgment for the *"Evaluation"* category of the instrument consisted of 10 items, most of which, in general, require improvement in terms of form and only one of which merits substantial changes in terms of content, while the remaining item was positively evaluated.[a]

As part of the adjustments pointed out by the experts, it was noted that some of the items should be written homogeneously since they are presented both in the first person and in the form of expression, therefore, for some of them alternative wording is proposed; in the same way, the need to clarify the context is raised,

[a]Due to the extensive of the tables containing the evaluations made by the experts for each of the items of the different dimensions, the tables have been published under CC-BY-4.0 license and are available at the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17284499

[b]The table with the resulting items for this category, after having been validated by the experts, is available at the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17283941.v2

while in other items there is confusion. In this sense, after weighing the experts' evaluations, and after some considerations by the researcher, of the 12 items of the adjusted version of the instrument for the category "Evaluation", 5 were oriented towards the transmissive conceptions and didactic models, and the remaining 7 towards the alternative.[b]

Finally, about the category *"Teacher's role"*, 4 of the 12 items were evaluated positively by the experts, while of the remaining items, 6 needed improvement in terms of wording and 2 required adjustments in terms of the idea they put forward.[a]

According to the experts, some items in this category presented ontological aspects, whose evaluation is difficult to carry based on a scale with 4 response options, such as the one proposed in the instrument:

*I believe that items requesting a pronouncement on epistemological, ontological or philosophical aspects of a general nature should be avoided since a pronouncement based on 4 grades is very complex (without being able to qualify) and I do not believe that it is very useful for the research. (Exp-A).*

They also identified that the wording of the items required improvements in terms of allowing visualization of the exclusion of some ideas concerning others and that only one proposition should be presented, to allow an objective assessment; it was also necessary to clarify some aspects and uniformly present manner, also considering gender issues.

After reviewing the experts' evaluations, and considering some other aspects on the part of the researcher, the adjusted version of the items of the category "Teacher's role" was made up of 5 items oriented to transmissive didactic conceptions and models and 5 others oriented to alternative conceptions and models.[b]

Once the content of the initial version of the questionnaire was validated based on the judgment of the experts, which had 58 items, the corresponding adjustments were made, limiting the instrument to 47 items in its second version, to be submitted to the first pilot test with 10 UNAH teachers from different fields of knowledge (see Table 2).

To carry out the pilot test, the version of the questionnaire in Microsoft Word was adapted and reviewed by the experts, transferring its design to the Google Forms tool, to maintain the biosecurity measures dictated by the UNAH. Table 4 shows the summary of the results obtained in the application of the first pilot test.

Table 4. Summary of results of the pilot test, according to dimensions.

| **Dimension** | **Averages according to the response scale** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **(1) Totally disagree** | **(2) Disagree** | **(3) Agree** | **(4) Totally agree** |
| Didactic planning | 0.83 | 2.17 | 3.67 | 3.33 |
| Content | 2.14 | 1.43 | 1.86 | 4.57 |
| Methodology | 1.42 | 1.83 | 3.33 | 3.42 |
| Evaluation | 1.08 | 2.17 | 3.08 | 3.67 |
| Teacher's role | 1.20 | 1.20 | 3.00 | 4.60 |

Source: Own elaboration

According to the type of items (more oriented towards traditional conceptions and models, or more oriented towards alternative conceptions and models), a more traditional orientation was found in 21 of the 47 items of the version of the questionnaire submitted for validation by application.[c]

[c] The table with all the items that were drafted with an orientation towards traditional didactic conceptions and models after the first pilot test, is available from the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17283941.v2

In addition to the descriptive statistics calculations, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was also calculated using Cronbach's Alpha or Reliability Index, obtaining a value of 0.724, considered acceptable at a statistical level; however, upon reviewing the variance of each of the items, it was identified that item No. 5 ("More than a grade, I am interested in providing my students with feedback based on their skills, attitudes and learning processes, and thus generate opportunities for reflection") presented a value of 0. 5 ("More than the grade, I am interested in providing my students with feedback based on their skills, attitudes and learning processes, and thus generate opportunities for reflection") had a value of 0, so it was omitted from the reliability analysis since it indicates the presence of bias or some condition that caused the 10 subjects in the sample to mark the same response option ("Totally agree")[d].

Along these lines, an individual review of each of the items showed good levels of internal consistency, identifying that if items 4, 8, 13, 25, 36, and 37 were omitted, reliability would drop below the acceptable value of 0.7.[d]

To make adjustments to the second version of the instrument, it was established as a criterion that the items should have a variance of less than 0.200 since this was an indicator that only 2 subjects or less responded differently than the rest. Taking this into consideration, items 5, 16, 26, and 46 were eliminated, since their omission did not have a significant impact on the internal consistency of the instrument, leaving after this adjustment a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.713, which places the instrument within acceptable reliability. In addition, it was found that these items had low variance and that their content was present in other items that were statistically better positioned.

One of the teachers who participated in the first pilot test, when responding to the instrument, commented that although the wording of the items was clear, perhaps a scale with 5 response options could work better since from his point of view, it could generate a more standardized and objective value curve, which was taken into account when redesigning the questionnaire:

*Actually, in the wording, it is clear that the values of 4 items should be 5 to manage a more standardized and objective value curve (Doc. 8).*

Another of the teachers mentioned that, although some items evaluate what they consider, for example, debates, they do not ask whether this strategy is used, which was ruled out due to the purposes of the instrument, which are to assess the conceptions and didactic models that teachers consider in their teaching practices.

*Question 28 evaluates what I consider concerning the debates, not whether I apply them. I think you can say that you consider it important and still not use the strategy. It is more representative to know if it is used (Doc. 2).*

From this context, the redesigned questionnaire consisted of 43 items, a version that was sent by Google Forms to 24 teachers, belonging to the departments of Social Work, Medical Sciences, Letters, Sociology, Journalism, Business Administration, Philosophy, Architecture, History, Civil Engineering, Nursing, Pharmaceutical Chemical Control, and Dentistry, to have a representative sample; however, only 9 of them responded, which constituted the final sample for the second pilot test (see Table 2).

In closing, it is important to note that after the analysis of the internal consistency of the redesigned instrument, a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.640 was found, 0.084 points below the version applied in the first pilot test (which was 0.724) and 0.073 points below the version of the instrument adjusted after the first pilot test (which was 0.713); in terms of variance, no values below 0.2 were found in this second pilot test.[e]

According to the reliability index, although some of the items were eliminated from the third version of the instrument -which had a scale of 5 response options-, the internal consistency of the questionnaire would not reach a value higher than 0.658, and even if item No. 6 were eliminated in this version, the internal

[d] The table with the internal consistency calculations for each of the items of the second version of the questionnaire (subjected to the first pilot test), is available from the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20485638

[e] The table with the internal consistency calculations for each of the items of the third version of the questionnaire (subjected to the second pilot test), is available from the following link: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20485650.v1

consistency would be reduced to 0.55, this being the item with the highest reliability; therefore, it was found that the most consistent version of the questionnaire is the second one.[f]

## References

Barnes, N.; Fives, H.; Mabrouk-Hattab, S. y SaizdeLaMora, K. (2020). Teachers' Epistemic Cognition in Situ: Evidence from Classroom Assessment. *Contemporary Educational Psychology,* 60.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101837

Barrera, L.; Carrillo, G.; Chaparro, L.; Sánchez, B.; Vargas, E. & Patricia, S. (2015). Validez de Constructo y Confiabilidad del Instrumento Calidad de Vida Versión Familiar en Español. *Enfermería Global,* 37:227-238.

https://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/eg/v14n37/administracion4.pdf

Black, K. (2010). *Business Statistics for Contemporary Decision Marking.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 6ª ed. https://fac.ksu.edu.sa/sites/default/files/business-statistics-for-contemporary-decision-making-by-ken-black_0.pdf

Cabero, J. y Llorente, M. (2013). La Aplicación del Juicio de Experto como Técnica de Evaluación de las Tecnologías de la Información y la Comunicación (TIC). *Revista de Tecnología de Información y Comunicación en Educación, 7*(2), 11-22. http://servicio.bc.uc.edu.ve/educacion/eduweb/v7n2/art01.pdf

Cortez, K.; Fuentes, V.; Villablanca, I. y Guzmán, C. (2013). Creencias Docentes de Profesores Ejemplares y su Incidencia en las Prácticas Pedagógicas. *Estudios Pedagógicos, 39*(2), 97-113.

http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052013000200007

Chrysostomou, M. y Philippou, G. (2010). Teachers' Epistemological Beliefs and Efficacy Beliefs About Mathematics. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science,* 9, 1509-1515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.357

Dorantes, J.; Hernández, J. y Tobón, S. (2016). Juicio de Expertos para la Validación de un Instrumento de Medición del Síndrome de Burnout en la Docencia. *Ra Ximhai, 12*(6), 327-346.
https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/461/46148194023.pdf

Dunn, L. y Musolino, G. (2011). Assessing Reflective Thinking and Approaches to Learning. *Journal of Allied Health, 40*(3), 128-136.

https://www.proquest.com/docview/918116202/fulltextPDF/FBA6F285AD094CF9PQ/1?accountid=14568&forcedol=true

Galicia, L.; Balderrama, J. y Navarro, R. (2017). Validez de Contenido por Juicio de Expertos: Propuesta de una Herramienta Virtual. *Apertura, 9*(2), 42-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.32870/Ap.v9n2.993

García. F. y Porlán, R. (2017). Los Principios Didácticos y el Modelo Didáctico Personal. En Porlán, R. (Coord.). *Enseñanza Universitaria: Cómo Mejorarla.* Madrid: Ediciones Morata, pp. 78-88.

Gil, F. y Rico, L. (2003). Concepciones y Creencias del Profesorado de Secundaria sobre Enseñanza y Aprendizaje de las Matemáticas. *Enseñanza de las Ciencias, 21*(1), 27-47. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38990723.pdf

Gorodokin, I. (2017). La Formación Docente y su Relación con la Epistemología. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación.

https://rieoei.org/historico/deloslectores/1164Gorodokin.pdf

Juárez, L. y Tobón, S. (2018). Análisis de los Elementos Implícitos en la Validación de Contenido de un Instrumento de Investigación. *Revista Espacios, 39*(53). https://www.revistaespacios.com/cited2017/cited2017-23.pdf

Kember, D.; Leung, D.; Jones, A.; Yuen, A.; McKay, J.; Sinclair, K.; Tse, H.; Webb, C.; Yuet, F.; Wong, M. y Yeung, E. (2010). Development of a

[f] The final version of the questionnaire, product of the validation of the content by expert judgment, and of the construct through the application of the two pilot tests, is available at the following link: http://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20496636

Questionnaire to Measure the Level of Reflective Thinking. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* *25*(4), 381-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/713611442

Martínez-Salgado, C. (2012). El Muestreo en Investigación Cualitativa: Principios Básicos y Algunas Controversias. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 17*(3):613-619. https://www.scielo.br/pdf/csc/v17n3/v17n3a06.pdf

Martínez, J. (2019). El Proceso de Elaboración y Validación de un Instrumento de Medición Documental. *Acción y Reflexión Educativa,* 44.

http://portal.amelica.org/ameli/jatsRepo/226/226955004/index.html

Mayorga, M. y Madrid, D. (2010). Modelos Didácticos y Estrategias de Enseñanza en el Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior. *Tendencias Pedagógicas, 1*(15), 91-111. https://repositorio.uam.es/bitstream/handle/10486/4619/30616_2010_15_04.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Pedrosa, I.; Suárez, J. & García, E. (2014). Evidencias sobre la Validez de Contenido: Avances Teóricos y Métodos para su Estimación. *Acción Psicológica,* *10*(2):3-20. https://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/acp/v10n2/02monografico2.pdf

Pérez Gomez, A. y Gimeno, J. (1992). El Pensamiento Pedagógico de los Profesores: Un Estudio Empírico sobre la Incidencia de los Cursos de Aptitud Pedagógica (CAP) y de la Experiencia Profesional en el Pensamiento de los Profesores. *Investigación en la Escuela,* 17, 51-72.

https://idus.us.es/bitstream/handle/11441/59498/El%20pensamiento%20pedag%C3%B3gico%20de%20los%20profesores.pdf?sequence=1

Puerta, L. & Marín, E. (2015). *Análisis de Validez de Contenido de un Instrumento de Transferencia de Tecnología Universidad-Industria de Baja California, México.* XX Congreso Internacional de Contaduría, Administración e Informática. https://investigacion.fca.unam.mx/docs/memorias/2015/2.02.pdf

Robles, P. y Del Carmen, M. (2015). La Validación Por Juicio de Expertos: Dos Investigaciones Cualitativas en Lingüística Aplicada. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada,* 18.

1642

https://www.nebrija.com/revista-linguistica/files/articulosPDF/articulo_55002aca89c37.pdf

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students.* Pearson Education Limited, 6a ed.

Schommer, M. (2004). Explaining the Epistemological Belief System: Introducing the Embedded Systemic Model and Coordinated Research Approach. *Educational Psychologist, 39*(1). https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3901_3

Semerci, C. (2007). Developing a Reflective Thinking Tendency Scale for Teachers and Student Teachers. Educational Sciences: *Theory & Practice,* *7*(3), 1369-1376. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297888539_Developing_A_Reflective_Thinking_Tendency_Scale_for_Teachers_and_Student_Teachers

Solís, C. (2018). *Creencias de los Docentes Universitarios sobre el Proceso de Enseñanza-aprendizaje.* [Tesis de doctorado] Universidad de Piura. https://pirhua.udep.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/11042/3493/MAE_EDUC_TyGE-L_001.pdf

Urrutia, M.; Barrios, S.; Gutiérrez, M. & Mayorga, M. (2014). Métodos Óptimos para Determinar Validez de Contenido. *Educación Médica Superior, 28*(3):547-558. http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/ems/v28n3/ems14314.pdf

Vizcaino, A.; Cadalso, A. y Manzano, M. (2013). Adaptación de un Cuestionario para evaluar las Creencias Epistemológicas sobre la Matemática de Profesores de Secundaria Básica. *Revista Complutense de Educación, 26*(2), 255-273. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_RCED.2015.v26.n2.42981

**TEST DE IDENTIFICACIÓN DE LAS CREENCIAS, CONCEPCIONES Y PRINCIPIOS DIDÁCTICOS DE LOS PROFESORES PRINCIPIANTES**



| Ítems | Escala | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Totalmente en | En | De acuerdo | Totalmente de acuerdo |
| 1. Trato de mantener al pie de la letra la programación didáctica (guía docente), por tanto, me intranquiliza el hecho de tener que cambiar, ajustar o modificar algunas actividades por situaciones imprevistas. | | | | |
| 2. Al seleccionar los contenidos, prefiero trabajar con un solo texto (libro) de referencia, o máximo dos, para evitar confundir a mis estudiantes. | | | | |
| 3.No permito perder el tiempo de la clase con debates, pues son poco provechosos o productivos. | | | | |
| 4.En el desarrollo de la clase, solicito a mis estudiantes que desarrollen esquemas, cuadros sinópticos, mapas conceptuales u otros como estrategia para desarrollar en ellos la capacidad de síntesis. | | | | |
| 5.Más que la calificación, me interesa brindar a mis estudiantes una retroalimentación en función de sus destrezas, actitudes y procesos de aprendizaje, y generar de esta forma oportunidades de reflexión. | | | | |
| 6. Al evaluar el aprendizaje de mis estudiantes, prefiero aplicar pruebas objetivas de opción múltiple, completación, emparejamiento y selección múltiple, entre otros. | | | | |
| 7.Considero que mi rol principal es seleccionar y organizar los contenidos para procurar presentarlos de la forma más estructurada posible. | | | | |
| 8.Siempre estoy dispuesto a planificar procesos de tutoría, tanto individual como colectiva, para los estudiantes que lo requieran. | | | | |
| 9.Considero el criterio de flexibilidad en cuanto tiempo cuando diseño la programación didáctica (guía docente) de mis clases, por cualquier incidencia o ajuste necesario durante el periodo académico. | | | | |
| 10. Considero que los contenidos deben organizarse tomando en cuenta diferentes fuentes (libros, artículos, resultados de investigaciones, tesis, etc.). | | | | |
| 11. El método de Aprendizaje Basado en Problemas es el que más aplico en el desarrollo de mis clases, porque es el que más aporta en la capacidad de indagación. | | | | |
| 12. Utilizo la investigación como estrategia transversal de enseñanza y aprendizaje. | | | | |
| 13. Cuando evalúo, intento aplicar diferentes métodos, como los casos, problemas y proyectos, en función de las evidencias que pretendo valorar. | | | | |
| 14. Al aplicar exámenes o pruebas a los estudiantes, me interesa que recuerden los contenidos de la manera más fiel posible. | | | | |
| 15. Mis estudiantes me consideran un docente próximo a ellos. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. Considero que mi tarea principal como profesor es guiar y orientar el aprendizaje de mis estudiantes. | | | | |
| 17. En mi planificación didáctica (guía docente), el componente más importante son los contenidos. | | | | |
| 18. Según mi experiencia y percepción, a medida que avanza el periodo académico, puedo realizar ajustes a los contenidos en función de los conocimientos previos, necesidades e intereses de los estudiantes. | | | | |
| 19. Brindo especial importancia a estrategias como el análisis de casos y la elaboración de proyectos para que los estudiantes construyan y reconstruyan sus aprendizajes. | | | | |
| 20. Prefiero impartir mis clases de manera magistral (expositiva), para que los estudiantes puedan asimilar la información de manera ordenada. | | | | |
| 21. Los errores que cometen mis estudiantes en las actividades de la clase los penalizo en sus calificaciones. | | | | |
| 22. En las clases que atiendo, la evaluación no solo aporta información para que los estudiantes mejoren su aprendizaje, sino que también me ayudan a reflexionar sobre mi actuación como docente. | | | | |
| 23. Percibo a mis estudiantes como recipientes en los cuales debo depositar mis experiencias, conocimientos y saberes disciplinares. | | | | |
| 24. Al diseñar mi programación didáctica (guía docente), el primer elemento que tomo en cuenta son los objetivos o resultados de aprendizaje. | | | | |
| 25. Soy de la idea que una vez que decido los contenidos, éstos no deben recibir ningún ajuste, a pesar de las circunstancias o incidencias del periodo académico. | | | | |
| 26. Al seleccionar y estructurar los contenidos, busco un equilibrio entre lo conceptual, lo procedimental y lo actitudinal. | | | | |
| 27. Establezco actividades, de manera equilibrada, para promover aprendizajes a nivel conceptual, procedimental y actitudinal. | | | | |
| 28. Considero que los debates al inicio de las sesiones de clase aportan a la activación de los conocimientos previos de mis estudiantes. | | | | |
| 29. La valoración del 80% del rendimiento de mis estudiantes lo realizo a partir de pruebas objetivas, ya que se me facilita realizar la calificación. | | | | |
| 30. En mis clases, tiene mayor importancia la evaluación con propósitos formativos antes que la sumativa. | | | | |
| 31. Cuando mis estudiantes no se percatan de algo, repito de nuevo la explicación. | | | | |
| 32. Al momento de elaborar mi programación didáctica (guía docente), el referente principal que considero es el saber o conocimiento disciplinar que deben manejar los estudiantes. | | | | |
| 33. Al abordar los contenidos, prefiero basarme en una sola teoría, en un solo modelo o en un solo enfoque, ya que los planteamientos y los descubrimientos son constantes y universales. | | | | |
| 34. En mis clases combino actividades para desarrollarse tanto de forma individual y como de manera colaborativa. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35. Prefiero que mis estudiantes desarrollen actividades de forma individual. | | | | |
| 36. Para evaluar a mis estudiantes a través del desempeño en tareas, utilizo técnicas como la observación directa, la entrevista, la demostración o simulación, talleres y otras. | | | | |
| 37. En función del nivel de avance o de desempeño de mis estudiantes, realizo ajustes a las actividades y tareas de aprendizaje previamente establecidas. | | | | |
| 38. Mis estudiantes construyen sus propios conocimientos a partir de sus experiencias previas y la mediación que les ofrezco como profesor(a). | | | | |
| 39. Considero que la tutoría es innecesaria a nivel universitario, porque los estudiantes tienen que estar conscientes de lo que quieren, y de las implicaciones que conlleva este nivel educativo. | | | | |
| 40. Cuando elaboro mi programación didáctica (guía docente), prefiero hacerlo de manera individual, aunque otros colegas atiendan la misma asignatura o espacio de aprendizaje. | | | | |
| 41. Procuro que los contenidos de las clases estén acordes con el contexto de los estudiantes. | | | | |
| 42. Incorporo actividades verosímiles o auténticas para que los estudiantes tengan un acercamiento al campo laboral. | | | | |
| 43. Priorizo la clase magistral o expositiva y la investigación documental por parte de mis estudiantes, las demás actividades me representan una sobrecarga de trabajo debido a la masificación en la matrícula. | | | | |
| 44. Al observar aspectos de mejora en las tareas o trabajos que entregan mis estudiantes, les brindo una segunda y tercera oportunidad para que realicen los ajustes correspondientes. | | | | |
| 45. Cuando evalúo, solo tomo en cuenta lo conceptual y procedimental, ya que la parte de actitudes y valores es muy subjetiva. | | | | |
| 46. Considero que como profesor puedo mejorar a través de la reflexión y análisis sobre mi práctica docente, tanto individual como de manera colaborativa. | | | | |
| 47. Valoro más la formación y capacitación en el área disciplinar que, respecto al área pedagógica, ya que a enseñar se aprende enseñando. | | | | |



**DIMENSIONES DEL TEST DE IDENTIFICACIÓN DE LAS CREENCIAS, CONCEPCIONES Y PRINCIPIOS DIDÁCTICOS DE LOS PROFESORES PRINCIPIANTES**

| DIMENSIONES | ÍTEMS |
|---|---|
| Planificación | 1, 9, 17, 24, 32, 40, |
| Contenido | 2, 10, 18, 25, 26, 33, 41 |
| Metodología | 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 27, 18, 34, 35, 42, 43 |
| Evaluación | 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 29, 30, 36, 37, 44, 45 |
| Rol del docente | 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, 31, 38, 39, 46, 47 |