



Suscríbete a DeepL Pro para poder traducir archivos de mayor tamaño.
Más información disponible en www.DeepL.com/pro.

The role of digital vs. face-to-face educational context in academic engagement profiles: a comparative study during and after confinement.

The Role of Online vs Face-to-Face Learning Environments in Academic Engagement Profiles: A Comparative Study During and Post Lockdown

Ailed Daniela Marenco-Escuderos*, Dayana Restrepo** and Laura Rambal-Rivaldo***.¹

*University of the North (Colombia)

**Universidad de la Costa (Colombia)

***Universidad Metropolitana (Colombia)

Summary

The aim of this study was to contrast Engagement profiles in Colombian university students in two differential educational contexts, the online education imposed by the confinement, and the face-to-face classroom environment, in order to understand possible differences between the groups. For this purpose, 742 university students were evaluated in two differential educational contexts, the online education imposed during COVID-19 confinement and the face-to-face classroom environment post-confinement. The sample consisted of Colombian university students between 18 and 25 years of age, from middle and low socio-economic backgrounds. The methodological approach was in two steps, the first a pre- and post-test comparison, the second based on a cluster analysis from which four profiles were defined, classified according to the participants' scores on the UWES-S scale (Student Academic Engagement Scale). In the results, multiple comparisons indicated significant differences in the levels of vigour, absorption and between the four engagement profiles: high, medium, in process and low. The results showed that the group of students with a high level of engagement was composed of both students in the

¹ **Correspondence:** Ailed Daniela Marenco-Escuderos, ailedm@uninorte.edu.co, Km 5 via Puerto Colombia (Barranquilla, Colombia). Universidad del Norte, PhD in Psychology.

virtual as well as face-to-face. However, groups composed of students with low-scoring profiles consisted of more students in the online mode of study, pointing to a pattern where virtual schooling imposed during confinement was associated with lower motivation to learn. In the analyses by gender, females had higher levels than males in both learning contexts.

Keywords: Academic engagement; confinement; face-to-face; virtual education; cluster analysis; higher education.

Abstract

The objective of this study was to contrast engagement profiles in Colombian university students in two distinct educational contexts, the online education promoted by the lockdown and the face-to-face classroom environment, in order to understand possible differences between the groups. For this purpose, 742 university students were evaluated in two educational contexts: the online education during the COVID-19 lockdown and the subsequent face-to-face classroom environment. The sample consisted of Colombian university students between 18 and 25 years old, of middle and low socioeconomic level. As to the methodological approach, a pre- and post-test comparison was done first, followed by a cluster analysis which allowed to define four profiles based on participants' scores on the UWES-S scale (Student Academic Engagement Scale). Multiple comparisons showed significant differences in the levels of vigor, absorption, and among the four engagement profiles: high, medium, in process, and low. The results showed that the group of students with higher scores was composed of participants in both virtual and face-to-face modalities. However, the groups with lower scores were made up of students in the online modality mainly, indicating a pattern where virtual schooling imposed during lockdown was associated with lower motivation for learning. In the analyses by gender, females presented higher levels than males in both teaching contexts.

Keywords: Academic engagement; lockdown; face-to-face education; virtual education; cluster analysis; university education.

Introduction

In the context of the health emergency caused by the spread of the COVID-19 virus, nations around the world were forced to transform their dynamics of social interaction, including the way in which the right to education was provided and received. In Colombia, as of 17 March 2020, the Ministry of National Education legislated the suspension of face-to-face classes, and decreed remote work for teachers and students, without any modification of the academic calendar (Colombian Ministry of Education, 2020). Without space for pedagogical accompaniment, students and faculty had to leave the campuses and move their work, daily life, communication and other activities associated with the teaching-learning processes to entirely digital environments (Gourlay, 2021). These measures remained in force until 20 January 2022 when Circular No. 021 decreed the return to presenciality in university campuses (Colombian Ministry of Education, 2022). For four academic semesters, specialised learning in higher education was entirely mediated by the use of information technologies (Ministry of Education of Colombia, 2022).

The forced move to virtuality represented a break in the traditional face-to-face teaching framework. The forced move to virtuality represented a break in the traditional face-to-face teaching framework, mainly in two aspects: the impossibility of physical interaction between teacher/student dyads and between students, and the asynchrony in the development of educational content (Aristovnik et al., 2020; McKee and Ntokos, 2022).

There is consensus in the literature related to how in the face-to-face environment, the teacher can exercise greater control over the learning process of their students, assess in real time the level of understanding of the topics, limit environmental distracters, model collaborative work among peers, and provide varied and multi-modal activities to address the educational needs of the great diversity of learners present in a classroom (De Anda et al., 2021). In particular, peer interactions and socially constructed meanings constitute an important affective dimension for learning, a source of positive emotional experiences that have been found to be related to the strengthening of study skills, greater retention of content, and even protective against cognitive exhaustion or academic burnout, and student dropout (Marenco-Escuderos et al., 2021; Suárez-Colorado and Restrepo Cervantes, 2019).

Unlike face-to-face education, in the online schooling environment, or e-learning, the greatest weight of the learning process falls on the learner. It is the student who manages his/her own time, space and pace of work at his/her own discretion, which requires a type of learner who is particularly autonomous, involved and active in his/her learning (Gómez, et al., 2017; Choez and Alcívar, 2022). In the last five years, research on e-learning has recorded exponential growth in enrolments in entirely digital courses, which reveals the interest of the new generations of learners in the distance learning modality over the physical classroom. Especially during the COVID-19 confinement, such findings identified high rates of improvement in academic performance and study satisfaction among university students enrolled in online courses compared to those who took traditional face-to-face courses prior to confinement (Aristovnik et al., 2020; Bond et al., 2020; Nortvig and Georgsen, 2022).

Although this is a field under exploration, a number of advantages of digital learning environments over face-to-face environments have begun to be identified. For example, the asynchrony of processes gives students more time to elaborate answers related to the work content, to document themselves in order to better argue shared assertions, and to actively participate in discussions with teachers and peers. In addition, the technological components of video and audio provide greater possibilities to review the content developed by the teacher as many times as necessary and thus achieve greater clarity in the mastery of the topics, all of which is possible if students have the necessary technological tools to successfully fulfil their academic commitments (Aristovnik et al., 2020; Forero-Arango et al, 2023).

The influence of the mode of study, whether face-to-face or virtual, on meaningful learning has given rise to numerous scientific debates. Some positions argue the material context (virtual or face-to-face) as a mere setting, and insist that in both modalities in one way or the other there is cross-cutting learning.

The same positions point out that the link with one method or another is due to personal preferences (Molina et al., 2021). These same positions point out how the link with one method or another is due to personal preferences (Molina et al., 2021).

In Colombia, some studies have documented how initially during the first semester of confinement, the transition to virtual education generated stress and emotional discomfort among university students, with a prevalence of emotions of frustration, anguish and despair in the face of the new teaching methodologies that caused up to 17% of students to drop out of their studies at the national level (Colombian Ministry of Education, 2021; Moreno-Correa, 2020). However, for the same period one year later, even during the confinement, the university coverage rate increased by 53.94% representing an exponential growth in re-entry and coverage levels not evidenced since 2018 before the COVID-19 epidemic (Colombian Ministry of Education, 2021). These figures show a panorama of the rapid adaptability of university students to the new online study modalities, as well as their desire for self-improvement and personal development despite the health emergency conditions.

In the specific case of what happened during confinement, beyond the context of instruction, whether virtual or face-to-face, effectiveness in academic competences responded mainly to individual psychological characteristics of motivation and attitudinal disposition towards academic work. In the educational literature, academic engagement is defined as the set of specific attitudes and behaviours that are positive for the fulfilment of schoolwork, such as the number of hours dedicated to studies, meeting deadlines, class attendance, or proactivity in seeking support to solve problems (Alrashidi, et al., 2016; Martínez et al, 2022).

Research around the world has found academic engagement to be correlated with high levels of performance, satisfaction with learning, resilience to difficulties experienced during university semesters, and increased retention in both face-to-face and online education (Álvarez-Pérez et al., 2021; Badoiu et al., 2021; González-García et al., 2018; Guillen et al., 2022; Tortosa et al., 2020).

An important criticism of the research on academic engagement is that the studies have been framed in a single teaching-learning context (virtual or face-to-face) as independent phenomena, leaving gaps with respect to empirical data that can objectively contrast the differences or similarities in academic performance and engagement of university students simultaneously in both educational environments. Only in this way can the role of the study modality on motivation and commitment to learning be discerned (González and García-Hernández, 2020; Moral Pajares et al, 2022).

In response to the aforementioned scientific concerns, this research focused on the identification of Engagement in Colombian university students in two differential educational contexts, online education caused by confinement, and the face-to-face classroom environment, with the aim of generating a

comparison between two different educational contexts that define the learning process. A two-step methodological approach was used: first, pre- and post-test comparisons indicated significant differences in Engagement among students, and then a cluster analysis allowed us to extract academic Engagement profiles and again contrast them according to characteristics such as mode of study and gender, aspects that would show current results on the new adaptations in the learning process that were built around and after the pandemic.

Method

Population and Sample

Through a quantitative, simple cross-sectional associative study, the relationship between the study variables was examined without their manipulation and intervention (Ato, et al., 2013). The sample consisted of 742 students, of which 742 students were prosocially distributed by mode of study (50-50 distribution) in public and private institutions. The representation of female participants in the face-to-face modality was N=221 (59.6 %), and male N=150 (40.4 %); in the virtual modality women N=266 (71.7 %); and men N= 105 (28.3 %). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25 years (M= 21.3; SD= 6.07). Data collection was carried out digitally by an online survey at two different Times (T). The first time (T1) between February and March 2021, during the second peak of the Covid-19 Confinement in Colombia (N= 371), and the second time (T2) in March and April 2022.

Instrument

Academic Engagement: the UWES-S scale (Student Academic Engagement Scale) created by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) was used, which has a theoretical model with adequate fit indicators (CFI=.90; GFI=.91; RMSEA=.09) and satisfactory levels of reliability (α between .75 and .84); the scale has been previously adapted and validated with a Colombian population (Caballero, et al., 2015). With 17 items, the scale assesses three dimensions of academic engagement: vigour (6 items), dedication (5 items) and absorption (6 items). The Vigour dimension refers to the energy levels and efforts a student makes in a class period, e.g., *My tasks as a student make me feel full of energy*. For the present research the dedication scale obtained a moderate reliability $\alpha=.72$; b) dedication: measuring the levels of enthusiasm, pride and motivation to take on academic challenges, e.g. *I am proud to do this degree*. For the present research the dedication scale obtained a strong reliability ($\alpha=.79$); c) Absorption: Comprises 6 items where the degree of satisfaction of the students with their studies is evaluated ($\alpha=.7$), e.g.: *I am happy when I am doing tasks related to my studies*. Students responded to each item on a Likert scale of 7 options, from 0 "never" to 6 "always".

Data collection and analysis procedure

This study was part of an inter-institutional collaborative project of the faculties of psychology and undergraduate studies whose objective was to document the effect of confinement on the psychological adjustment and academic performance of university students in the Colombian Caribbean. After its institutional endorsement through the rector's resolution No. 018 of 16 November 2018, the information was collected with an online questionnaire created with the Google forms® tool, sent by teachers to students on Microsoft Teams® learning platforms, and also distributed through WhatsApp groups with the collaboration of psychology and undergraduate students.

The ethical guidelines of contact, informed consent, anonymity and free withdrawal for research in psychology recommended by the World Medical Association, in the Declaration of Helsinki revised in Taipei in 2016, were followed. All students surveyed declared virtually their free and voluntary participation, without any remuneration and with knowledge of the objectives and scope of the project. The estimated time to complete the test was approximately 17 minutes.

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses allowed us to test the psychometric fit of the UWES-S to the Colombian Caribbean population. Hypothesis testing was approached using Analysis of Variance [ANOVA] to identify differences in Engagement as a function of study mode and gender. Subsequently, a two-step cluster analysis first by a Ward's hierarchical clustering method, and a second clustering by a non-hierarchical method (Tkaczynski, 2017) allowed to classify participants according to their similarities in Engagement indicators. To establish significant differences between groups, multiple comparisons were performed using Tukey, HSD and Games-Howell post-hoc tests (Pardo and Ruiz, 2002). Finally, cross-tabulations allowed us to evaluate the distribution of participants according to gender and study modality. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed in Jamovi (2021, version 1.8). Cluster analyses were performed with the Machine Learning module in JASP (2022, version 0.16.2). Both programs are interfaces for statistical data analysis, which work with the R programming language (R Core Team, 2021).

Results

The cluster analysis was performed in two steps, first a hierarchical analysis by Ward's extraction method, in order to statistically extract the optimal number of response profiles from an unsupervised algorithm (Mlodak, 2021). This analysis showed 4 profiles or clusters of Engagement scores among the total sample of 742 participants. In a second step a new clustering of participants was defined by the "K-means" extraction algorithm, which has shown better clustering ability according to the parameterisation of means as centres. The resulting 4-cluster model proved to be a robust model with sufficient predictive ability for the Engagement variables among university students ($R^2 = .72$).

The composition of the clusters was as follows: a first cluster grouped 215 students with the highest Engagement scores, for which it was dubbed "*Engagement-high*". This group accounted for 18.6 % of the heterogeneity of the total cluster data, and obtained an adequate silhouette score of $b = .42$. A second cluster comprised 280 participants whose scores on the Engagement dimensions were within the upper and lower bounds of the average, thus they were dubbed "*Engagement-medium*" ($n=280$), which explained 34.4 % of total data, and a moderate silhouette score of $b = .23$. The third cluster grouped 179 students with average and low scores on the Engagement dimensions, for which they were dubbed "*Engagement-in-progress*". This cluster accounted for 28.9 % of heterogeneity within the cluster, and obtained an adequate silhouette score of $b = .25$.

Finally, the fourth group was dubbed "*Engagement-low*" since it consisted of 68 subjects with the lowest Engagement scores. This group accounted for 18.7% of the data within the cluster and obtained an adequate silhouette score of $b = .33$. It should be noted that the means or centres of each cluster are standardised, and can be seen in Table 1, and the graphical representation of the profiles found are presented in Figure 1.

Table 1

Distribution of Clusters.

Conglomerate	Engagement high	Engagement half	Engagement in progress	Engagement under
Size	215	280	179	68
Heterogeneity within the conglomerate	.186	.344	.283	.187
Sum of squares Inside	118.439	219.114	180.330	119.217
Vigor Centre	1.033	0.134	-0.822	-1.656
Centre Dedication	0.679	0.289	-0.388	-2.315
Absorption Centre	1.054	0.074	-0.747	-1.670

To find out in more detail the statistical differences between the indicators of absorption, vigour and dedication of the four extracted groups. Levene's test of homoeo- dasticity indicated differences between the variances of the groups for each dimension ($p < .05$), these results allowed us to continue with the Games-Howell post-hoc tests (Pardo and Ruiz, 2002). Table 2 presents the one-to-one comparisons of the extracted Engagement profiles in the university population. F i r s t l y , in the engagement dimension, it was found that the group with "*Engagement-high*" is statistically different from the rest of the groups, in fact, they have the highest levels of engagement in relation to the "*Engagement-medium*", "*Engagement-in-progress*" and "*Engagement-low*" profiles ($p < .001$). Additionally, it was found that the group of

The "Engagement-medium" group has dedication scores that are statistically higher than the "Engagement-in-progress" and "Engagement-low" groups ($p < .001$). On the other hand, it was found that the "Engagement-in-progress" group maintain significantly higher scores than the university students with the "Engagement-low" profile ($p < .001$), who have the lowest levels of dedication.




Figure 1. Clustering of Engagement styles in Colombian university students. Table 2

Games-Howell Post Hoc for differences in Engagement within clusters.

Comparison	Δx^- Vigour	ET. Vigour	Δx^- Dedication	ET. Dedication	Δx^- Absortio	ET.	p
High-Medium	6.02	.29	1.84	.19	6.12	.28	< .001*
Alto-En process	12.38	.35	5.04	.26	11.24	.31	< .001*
High-Low	17.94	.61	14.1	.48	16.99	.62	< .001*
Medium-at process	6.37	.34	3.20	.27	5.12	.31	< .001*
Medium-Low	11.94	.60	12.29	.49	10.87	.62	< .001*
In process- In process- In process- In process- In process- In process-		.63	9.10	.52	5.75	.64	< .001*

Note: 1= High; 2= Medium; 3= In process; 4= Low; Δx^- : Mean Difference; E. T= Standard Error

Secondly, the post-hoc test also showed significant differences between all groups on the Absorption dimension. It was found that the "High Engagement" group is statistically different than the rest of the groups ($p < .001$), as well as the "High Engagement" group ($p < .001$), and the "High Engagement" group ($p < .001$) was statistically different from the "High Engagement" group.

with "Engagement-medium" is statistically different on the absorption dimension from those belonging to the "Engagement-in-progress" and "Engagement-low" groups ($p < .001$), specifically, those students belonging to the "Engagement-medium" group showed higher mean scores on absorption compared to the "Engagement-in-progress" and "Engagement-low" groups. Finally, the "Engagement-in-progress" group presented scores that are statistically higher than the "Engagement-low" group ($p < .001$).

Distribution of Engagement styles by study mode

Cross-tabulations allowed a comparison of the membership of each cluster by mode of study of its members. Data were interpreted based on the Chi-square statistic and corrected residuals, where a score ≥ 1.96 is indicative of statistical differences, highlighting the category with the highest value of positive corrected residuals (Haberman, 1973).

The analysis showed that there are differences in the clusters in relation to study mode ($\chi^2 = 16.415$; $p < .000$). The cross-tabulation showed no statistical differences in the cluster with high Engagement in relation to the modality of study. However, there was a difference in the proportion in the rest of the clusters. Firstly, there are differences in the proportions in the group with "Intermediate Engagement" (corrected residual 3.2), with a higher proportion of students studying face-to-face (58%). Secondly, differences in the proportions were found in the Engagement group "In progress" (corrected residual 2.0), where 56% of the group consisted of students who were taking classes virtually. Finally, the group with "Low" Engagement is mostly distributed with students in the virtual modality (66 %, corrected residual = 2.8), as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Cluster membership by mode of study.

Conglomerate		Study Mode		
		Face-to-face (N=371)	Online (N=371)	Total (N=472)
High	Count	109	106	
	% within the group	51	49	215
	Corrected waste	.2	-.22	
Medium	Count	161	119	
	% within the group	58	42	280
	Corrected waste	3.2*	-3.2	
In progress	Count	78	101	
	% within the group	44	56	179
	Corrected waste	-2.0	2.0*	

Conglomerate		Study Mode		
		Face-to-face (N=371)	Online (N=371)	Total (N=472)
	Count	23	45	
Unde	% within group	34	66	68
r	Corrected	residuals-2.8	2.8*	

Note. *Statistically significant differences, residual ≥ 1.9

Gender differences in the composition of Engagement profiles

The t-student test showed gender differences in each of the dimensions of academic engagement: vigour ($t_{(740)} = -3.38$, $p < .000$), dedication ($t_{(740)} = -4.88$, $p < .000$), and absorption ($t_{(740)} = -3.09$, $p < .01$). The table presents the differences in scores between males and females in the three dimensions of the Engagement. As shown in the table, the significantly higher scores among women compared to men in all dimensions of Engagement. In Table 4 we can see how dedication is most important, followed by absorption and finally vigour.

Table 4

Differences in academic engagement according to gender.

	Group	M	DE	T	p
Vigour	Man	22	7.09	-5.58	< .001
	Woman	23.8	6.41		
Dedication	Man	24.3	5.33	-4.88	< .001
	Woman	26.1	4.31		
Absorption	Man	23.1	6.41	-3.09	.002
	Woman	24.6	6.11		

On the other hand, taking into account that significant differences were found according to gender, the same comparison was made, but separating the participants according to their mode of study, the data showed that in the face-to-face mode of study there are no gender differences in the dimensions of vigour and absorption of Engagement, however, women obtained significantly higher scores in the dimension of dedication ($p = .000$).

In the virtual study modality, statistical differences were found between men and women in the three dimensions of Engagement: women obtained significantly higher scores in vigour, dedication and absorption ($p < .001$ in all the dimensions indicated). Table 5 shows the complete results of the comparison of the groups by modality in relation to the manifestations of Engagement.

Table 5

Differences in academic engagement according to gender and mode of study.

Modality	Dimension Engagement	Group	M	DE	F	p
On-site	Vigour	Man	23.42	6.18	3.737	.054
		Woman	24.66	5.93		
	Dedication	Man	24.68	5.15	16.117	.000*
		Woman	26.51	3.641		
	Absorption	Man	24.17	5.81	1.704	.193
		Woman	24.97	5.75		
Virtual	Vigour	Man	19.75	7.91	15.418	.000*
		Woman	23.15	6.70		
	Dedication	Man	23.68	5.60	11.785	.001*
		Woman	25.79	4.77		
	Absorption	Man	21.21	6.94	14.509	.000*
		Woman	24.28	6.38		

Discussion and Conclusions

Face-to-face university education and the new online mode of study represent two learning contexts that differ mainly in the physical-material channels in which instruction is transmitted (the physical classroom or digital technological channels). In both modes of study, students' academic performance is determined by a complex interplay of the learner's own personal motivational factors, the type of academic activities, and the characteristics of the contexts in which instruction occurs.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, for four academic semesters, between 2020 and 2021, by Colombian health regulations, university instruction was offered exclusively in the virtual modality by all educational institutions in the country. For students enrolled in pre-service academic programmes, this change in the teaching context imposed great challenges, but also opportunities to adjust their attitudes and study habits to the new multimodal, fully online environments.

The scientific literature in education has been clear in demonstrating that both digital and face-to-face environments are favourable contexts for learning, locating the differences in performance in students' academic engagement. Engagement thus stands out as the motivational dimension that informs commitment to one's own education and is positioned as a necessary condition for adaptation to any specialised university learning context (Badoiu et al., 2021).

The aim of this study was to contrast different academic engagement profiles of Colombian university students enrolled in different educational contexts (virtual and face-to-face study modalities), in order to understand possible differences between the groups. We opted for an approach

subject-centred analytics: 721 students were classified according to their scores in the dimensions of vigour, dedication and absorption of Engagement by means of a cluster analysis. The results indicated four profiles, the first called "*Engagement-high*" because its participants had the highest scores on vigour, absorption and dedication to studies; a second profile of "*Engagement-medium*", with average scores on all three dimensions assessed; a third profile called "*Engagement-in-progress*" with slightly below average scores; and a final, also the least numerous group made up of participants who scored significantly lower on all three dimensions of the construct.

A cross-table analysis revealed the proportion of participants enrolled in virtual and face-to-face study modes in each group. It was found that the high Engagement profile is exhibited by an equal proportion of virtual and face-to-face students. This finding supports those theses that have suggested academic engagement and motivation to learn as independent of the material context in which learning occurs (De Juan, 2019). Rather, it is the psychological resources related to motivation, vigour, absorption in studies, as well as positive behaviours and habits towards schoolwork that account for personal investments in learning (Badoiu et al., 2021). The results of effectiveness and efficiency in academic adherence operate through the autonomy of the student and the commitment he or she exercises, even in spite of the different vicissitudes that certain circumstances may offer (Marenco-Escuderos et al., 2021).

It is important to discuss that the results also evidenced notable differences in the Engagement of students in virtual and face-to-face study modes. Specifically, it was found that the profiles with the lowest scores in vigour, dedication and absorption ("*in process*" and "*low engagement*" profiles) were exhibited by students enrolled in the virtual modality. Taking into consideration the health emergency conditions associated with the population in virtual mode, it is possible that the lower scores in Engagement among students in virtual mode are due to physical and/or emotional health affectations, perhaps due to negative situations and personal difficulties that may have interfered with the achievement and complete dedication to academic duties during confinement (Valero et al., 2021).

Other possible theories that could explain the low engagement profiles among online students are related to the relational elements that support the willingness to carry out academic activities, or the drastic change in study habits and the lack of habituation of some students towards autonomous learning (Palacios-Garay et al., 2020). From these explanations, low engagement profiles represent students with learning dynamics that do not favour virtual contexts, but on the contrary affect their academic performance. On this point, previous research has shown that, although for some students technology increases the perception of personal control and direction in the learning process, it has also been observed that for many students virtual environments are impersonal and difficult to operate (Aris-tovnik et al., 2020; McKee and Ntokos, 2022; Molina et al., 2021). It could be concluded that,

In the particular case of the present study, the virtuality forced by confinement negatively affected the willingness to learn among many university students, perhaps because they required more social interaction and affective support from a tangible educational community than in a face-to-face context.

Finally, with respect to gender differences, different research has considered gender as a determinant of the level of student engagement within a normative face-to-face setting, with women consistently showing higher engagement over time (Díaz et al., 2020; Moreta et al., 2018; Sánchez-Cañizares et al., 2007). However, research in e-learning environments rarely points to gender differences in academic performance or engagement (Seppälä et al., 2009; Liébana-Presa et al., 2018). Gender undoubtedly remains a phenomenon of interest in educational research, its relationships, effects, and variations across virtual and face-to-face study contexts (Guillen et al., 2021). In the present research, gender differences in Engagement were found in both study contexts. Females consistently scored higher than males in both virtual and face-to-face study settings.

Little research on learning in virtual contexts points to gender differences in the engagement of university students. The present study shows the existence of important gender differences in the vigour, dedication and absorption to studies. Colombian female university students show greater commitment to learning, and are willing to adopt healthy study habits (dedicating more time to exploring academic subjects, completing assignments and handing in assignments on time, looking for complementary sources to learn more about the content, among other positive attitudes and behaviours towards learning).

The current results contribute to scientific evidence of a statistical trend in favour of the female gender, supported by other data such as the higher enrolment of women in university studies in the country (SNIES, 2021), as well as empirical results that feed the discussion on the study modalities and adjustments that university students were able to make due to an unplanned situation, but whose results will accompany the learning process of the next generations.

Funding

The present research was partly funded by Minciencias PhD Grants 785 and 809 to support the training of Colombian researchers.

References

Alrashidi, O., Phan, H.P. and Ngu, B.H. (2016). Academic Engagement: An Overview of Its Definitions, Dimensions, and Major Conceptualisations. *International Education Studies*, 9(12), 41-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n12p41>

- Álvarez-Pérez, P.R., López-Aguilar, D., González-Morales, M.O. and Peña-Vázquez, R. (2021). Academic Engagement and Dropout Intention in Undergraduate University Students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 15210251211063611. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15210251211063611>.
- Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N. and Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(20), 8438. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208438>
- Ato, M., López, J. and Benavente, A. (2013). A classification system for research designs in psychology. *Annals of Psychology*, 29(3), 1038-1059. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.29.3.178511>.
- Badoiu, G., Escrig Tena, A.B., Segarra-Ciprés, M., García-Juan, B. and Salvador-Gómez, A. (2021, February). Gamification tools: effects on students' meaningful learning, engagement and stress. In *Proceedings INNODOCT/20. International Conference on Innovation, Documentation and Education* (pp. 487-494). Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València. <https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/161914>
- Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O. and Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, 17(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8>
- Caballero, C., González, O. and Palacio, J. (2015). Relationship of Engagement with depression, anxiety and academic performance in university students. *Salud Uninorte*, 31(1), 59-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14482/sun.30.1.4309>
- Choez, J. S. M. and Alcívar, M. V. Z. (2022). Educación virtual: un análisis en tiempos de pandemia: Virtual learning: an analysis during the pandemic. *Revista RELEP-Educación y Pedagogía en Latinoamérica*, 4(1), 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.46990/relep.2022.4.1.550>
- De Juan González, P. (2019). Experimental comparative study between a virtual and a face-to-face environment in an English subject. *Porta Linguarum* 32, 119-134. <https://doi.org/10.30827/pl.v0i32.13703>
- De Anda, A.B.B., González, C.Á., Herrera, A.M.B., Cadena, M.D.J.C. and Valenzuela, R.G. (2021). Multimodal teaching-learning model. Considerations for improving teaching practice post pandemic. *Ixaya. Revista Universitaria de Desarrollo Social*, 11(20), 48-70. <http://revistaixaya.cucsh.udg.mx/index.php/ixa/article/view/7646>
- Díaz Rosillo, A., Lescano López, G.S. and Paz Palacios, W.R. (2020). Relationship between universal values and academic commitment in Army and Navy cadets of Peru. *Revista Científica General José María Córdova*, 18(31), 495-521. <https://doi.org/10.21830/19006586.609>
- Forero-Arango, X., Segura-Jiménez, H. and Sánchez-Áviliz, C. R. (2023). Use of strategies supported by ICT and virtuality: an opportunity to explore the possibilities of the digital environment. *Revista Latinoamericana de Tecnología Educativa-RELATEC*, 22(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.17398/1695-288X.22.1.57>
- González Ramírez, T. and García-Hernández, A. (2020). Study of student and classroom factors involved in Engagement and academic performance in Discrete Mathematics. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 31(2), 195-206. <https://idus.us.es/handle/11441/126949>

- González-García, G., Becerril Carbajal, M.L. and Fonseca Munguía, A. (2018). The Engagement as a factor in the formation and development of entrepreneurial culture in university students. *IE Revista de Investigación Educativa de la REDIECH*, 9(17), 103-118. <https://bit.ly/3ySsToL>
- Gómez, A.D., Rolán, L.X.M. and Mirón, S.G. (2017). Engagement research in e-learning. In *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Educación Mediática y Competencia Digital: 15, 16 y 17 de junio de 2017*. María Zambrano Campus of Segovia. University of Valladolid (pp. 1815-1825). University of Valladolid.
- Gourlay, L. (2021). There is no 'virtual learning': The materiality of digital education. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 10(1), 57-66. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2021.1.649>
- Guillen, F.G.F. and Chaparro, J.B. (2021). Bayesian analysis of academic engagement in psychology students: gender and age differences. *Revista de investigación en psicología*, 24(1), 5-18. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v24i1.20210>
- Guillén, M. E., Tirado, D. M. and Sánchez, A. R. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 on university students and competences in education for sustainable development: Emotional intelligence, resilience, and engagement. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 380, 135057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.135057>
- Haberman, S.J. (1973). The Analysis of Residuals in Cross-Classified Tables. *Biometrics*, 29(1), 205. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529686>
- JASP Team (2022). JASP (Version 0.16.2). [Computer software]. <https://jasp-stats.org/>
- Marenco-Escuderos, A., Restrepo, D. and Rambal-Rivaldo, L. (2021). Resilience profiles associated with social support and Engagement for overcoming academic obstacles in undergraduate education. *Journal of systemics, cybernetics and informatics*, 19(8), 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.19.08.139>
- Martínez, B. M. T., del Carmen Pérez-Fuentes, M. and Jurado, M. D. M. M. M. (2022). Research on Student Academic Engagement: A Systematic Review on Influencing Factors and Assessment Instruments. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación-e Avaliação Psicológica*, 1(62), 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.21865/RIDEP62.1.08>
- McKee, C. and Ntokos, K. (2022). Online microlearning and student Engagement in computer games higher education. *Research in Learning Technology*, 30. <https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v30.2680>
- Ministry of Education of Colombia (2020). *CIRCULAR No. 021*. <https://bit.ly/3JQX2v0>
- Ministry of Education of Colombia. (2021). *Resolution 2157 of 20 December 2021*. <https://bit.ly/3JVGJx6>
- Colombian Ministry of Education (2022). The Ministry of National Education makes available the statistical information on higher education to 2021. <https://bit.ly/3yRgzVJ>
- Młodak, A. (2021). k-means, Ward, and probabilistic distance-based clustering methods with contiguity constraint. *Journal of Classification*, 38(2), 313-352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00357-020-09370-5>
- Molina, O.E., Cancell, D.R.F. and Hernández, A.G. (2021). Engagement in virtual education: experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Texto Livre*, 14 (2). <https://doi.org/10.35699/1983-3652.2021.33936>

- Moral Pajares, E..., Pedrosa Ortega, C., Gallego Valero, L., Martínez Alcalá, C. and Barreda Tarrazona, R.. (2022). Motivation in university students: life goals and learning attitudes. *HUMAN REVIEW. International Humanities Review / Revista Internacional De Humanidades*, 13(4), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.37467/revhuman.v11.4060>
- Moreno-Correa, S.M. (2020). Educational innovation in the times of Coronavi- rus. *Salutem Scientia Spiritus*, 6(1), 14-26. <https://bit.ly/3LDxv9Y>
- Moreta Herrera, R., Durán Rodríguez, T. and Villegas Villacrés, N. (2018). Emotional Regulation and Performance as Predictors of Academic Procrastination in University Students. *Revista de psicología y educación*, 13(2), 155-166. <https://redined.educacion.gob.es/xmlui/handle/11162/220387>
- Nortvig, A.M. and Georgsen, M. (2022). The paradoxes of remote emer- gency teaching. *JETT*, 13(1), 193-202. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47750/jett.2022.13.01.022>
- Liébana-Presa, C., Fernández-Martínez, M., Vázquez-Casares, A.M., López-Alonso, A.I. and Rodríguez-Borrego, M. (2018). Burnout and Engagement in university nursing students. *Enfermería Global*, 17(50), 131-152. <https://dx.doi.org/10.6018/eglobal.17.2.268831>.
- Palacios-Garay, J., Belito Hilario, F., Bernaola Peña, P.G. and Capcha Carrillo, T. (2020). Procrastination and stress in academic engagement in university students. *Revista Multi-Ensayos*, 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.5377/multiensayos.v0i0.9336>
- Pardo, A. and Ruiz, M.A. (2002). One-factor analysis of variance: The one-factor ANOVA procedure. *SPSS 11: A Guide to Data Analysis*, 251-256.
- R Core Team (2021). *R: A Language and environment for statistical computing*. (Version 4.0) [Computer software]. <https://cran.r-project.org/>
- Sánchez-Cañizares, S., García, F. J. F. and Ruiz, C. A. (2007). Job satisfaction from a gender perspective: an empirical analysis using logit and probit models. In *Conocimiento, innovación y emprendedores: camino al futuro* (p. 243). University of La Rioja.
- Schaufeli, W.B. and Bakker, A.B. (2003). UWES: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *The Journal of Occupational Health Psychology Unit*, 1(1), 1-58. <https://bit.ly/3TBY8hc>
- Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A. and Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 10(4), 459-481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9100-y>
- National Higher Education Information System, SNIES. (2021). Bases con- solidated Enrolled students 2021. <http://bit.ly/3z7maXX>
- Suárez-Colorado, Y. and Restrepo, D. (2019). Personal resources in academic work. "Self-Efficacy: a tool for the intervention of burnout in university students (Printed content generation document No. 9). Ediciones Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. <https://bit.ly/3lu8SSk>
- The Jamovi project (2021). *Jamovi* (Version 1.8) [Computer Software]. <https://www.jamovi.org>.
- Tkaczynski, A. (2017). Segmentation using two-step cluster analysis. In *Segmentation in social marketing* (pp. 109-125). Springer, Singapore.
- Tortosa, B.M., Pérez-Fuentes, M., Molero, M., Soriano, J. G., Oropesa, N. F., Simón, M.,

adolescents. *European Journal of Child Development, Education and Psychopathology*, 8(1), 111-122. <https://doi.org/10.30552/ejpad.v8i1.136>

Valero Ancco, V.N., Calderón Quino, K.M., Pari Orihuela, M. and Arpasi Mamani, U. (2021). Socioeconomic factors and academic engagement in university students in SARS-CoV-2 pandemic contexts. *Horizons. Revista De Investigación En Ciencias De La Educación*, 5(20), 1238-1248. <https://doi.org/10.33996/revistahorizontes.v5i20.273>



Suscríbete a DeepL Pro para poder traducir archivos de mayor tamaño.
Más información disponible en www.DeepL.com/pro.

Date of receipt: 1 November 2022. Revision date:

12 January 2023.

Date of acceptance: 28 March 2023.