

VOL III

EDUCAÇÃO E ENSINO NA ERA DA INFORMAÇÃO

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
(Organizador)

 EDITORA
ARTEMIS
2024

VOL III

EDUCAÇÃO E ENSINO NA ERA DA INFORMAÇÃO

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
(Organizador)

 EDITORA
ARTEMIS
2024



O conteúdo deste livro está licenciado sob uma Licença de Atribuição Creative Commons Atribuição-Não-Comercial NãoDerivativos 4.0 Internacional (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). Direitos para esta edição cedidos à Editora Artemis pelos autores. Permitido o download da obra e o compartilhamento, desde que sejam atribuídos créditos aos autores, e sem a possibilidade de alterá-la de nenhuma forma ou utilizá-la para fins comerciais.

A responsabilidade pelo conteúdo dos artigos e seus dados, em sua forma, correção e confiabilidade é exclusiva dos autores. A Editora Artemis, em seu compromisso de manter e aperfeiçoar a qualidade e confiabilidade dos trabalhos que publica, conduz a avaliação cega pelos pares de todos manuscritos publicados, com base em critérios de neutralidade e imparcialidade acadêmica.

Editora Chefe	Prof. ^a Dr. ^a Antonella Carvalho de Oliveira
Editora Executiva	M. ^a Viviane Carvalho Mocellin
Direção de Arte	M. ^a Bruna Bejarano
Diagramação	Elisangela Abreu
Organizador	Prof. Dr. Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
Imagem da Capa	Theromb/123RF
Bibliotecário	Maurício Amormino Júnior – CRB6/2422

Conselho Editorial

Prof.^a Dr.^a Ada Esther Portero Ricol, *Universidad Tecnológica de La Habana “José Antonio Echeverría”*, Cuba
Prof. Dr. Adalberto de Paula Paranhos, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Agustín Olmos Cruz, *Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Amanda Ramalho de Freitas Brito, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Ana Clara Monteverde, *Universidad de Buenos Aires*, Argentina
Prof.^a Dr.^a Ana Júlia Viamonte, Instituto Superior de Engenharia do Porto (ISEP), Portugal
Prof. Dr. Ángel Mujica Sánchez, *Universidad Nacional del Altiplano*, Peru
Prof.^a Dr.^a Angela Ester Mallmann Centenaro, Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Begoña Blandón González, *Universidad de Sevilla*, Espanha
Prof.^a Dr.^a Carmen Pimentel, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Catarina Castro, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cirila Cervera Delgado, *Universidad de Guanajuato*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cláudia Neves, Universidade Aberta de Portugal
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cláudia Padovesi Fonseca, Universidade de Brasília-DF, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Cleberton Correia Santos, Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Brasil
Prof. Dr. David García-Martul, *Universidad Rey Juan Carlos de Madrid*, Espanha
Prof.^a Dr.^a Deuzimar Costa Serra, Universidade Estadual do Maranhão, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Dina Maria Martins Ferreira, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Edith Luévano-Hipólito, *Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Eduarda Maria Rocha Teles de Castro Coelho, Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Eduardo Eugênio Spers, Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brasil
Prof. Dr. Eloi Martins Senhoras, Universidade Federal de Roraima, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Elvira Laura Hernández Carballido, *Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo*, México



Prof.ª Dr.ª Emilas Darlene Carmen Lebus, *Universidad Nacional del Nordeste/ Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Argentina*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Erla Mariela Morales Morgado, *Universidad de Salamanca, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Ernesto Cristina, *Universidad de la República, Uruguay*
Prof. Dr. Ernesto Ramírez-Briones, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof. Dr. Fernando Hitt, *Université du Québec à Montréal, Canadá*
Prof. Dr. Gabriel Díaz Cobos, *Universitat de Barcelona, Espanha*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Gabriela Gonçalves, Instituto Superior de Engenharia do Porto (ISEP), Portugal
Prof. Dr. Geoffroy Roger Pointer Malpass, Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Gladys Esther Leoz, *Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Argentina*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Glória Beatriz Álvarez, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Gonçalo Poeta Fernandes, Instituto Politécnico da Guarda, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Gustavo Adolfo Juarez, *Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Guillermo Julián González-Pérez, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof. Dr. Håkan Karlsson, *University of Gothenburg, Suécia*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Iara Lúcia Tescarollo Dias, Universidade São Francisco, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Isabel del Rosario Chiyon Carrasco, *Universidad de Piura, Peru*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Isabel Yohena, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Ivan Amaro, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Iván Ramon Sánchez Soto, *Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Ivânia Maria Carneiro Vieira, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Brasil
Prof. Me. Javier Antonio Albornoz, *University of Miami and Miami Dade College, Estados Unidos*
Prof. Dr. Jesús Montero Martínez, *Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. João Manuel Pereira Ramalho Serrano, Universidade de Évora, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Joaquim Júlio Almeida Júnior, UniFIMES - Centro Universitário de Mineiros, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Jorge Ernesto Bartolucci, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. José Cortez Godinez, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México
Prof. Dr. Juan Carlos Cancino Diaz, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México
Prof. Dr. Juan Carlos Mosquera Feijoo, *Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Juan Diego Parra Valencia, *Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano de Medellín, Colômbia*
Prof. Dr. Juan Manuel Sánchez-Yañez, *Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México*
Prof. Dr. Juan Porras Pulido, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. Júlio César Ribeiro, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Leinig Antonio Perazolli, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Livia do Carmo, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Luciane Spanhol Bordignon, Universidade de Passo Fundo, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Luis Fernando González Beltrán, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. Luis Vicente Amador Muñoz, *Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Espanha*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Macarena Esteban Ibáñez, *Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Manuel Ramiro Rodriguez, *Universidad Santiago de Compostela, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Manuel Simões, Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Márcia de Souza Luz Freitas, Universidade Federal de Itajubá, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Marcos Augusto de Lima Nobre, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Brasil
Prof. Dr. Marcos Vinicius Meiado, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Mar Garrido Román, *Universidad de Granada, Espanha*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Margarida Márcia Fernandes Lima, Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª María Alejandra Arecco, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Aparecida José de Oliveira, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Carmen Pastor, *Universitat Jaume I, Espanha*

Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria da Luz Vale Dias – Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria do Céu Caetano, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria do Socorro Saraiva Pinheiro, Universidade Federal do Maranhão, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª MªGraça Pereira, Universidade do Minho, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Gracinda Carvalho Teixeira, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª María Guadalupe Vega-López, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Lúcia Pato, Instituto Politécnico de Viseu, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maritza González Moreno, *Universidad Tecnológica de La Habana, Cuba*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Mauriceia Silva de Paula Vieira, Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Melchor Gómez Pérez, Universidad del País Vasco, Espanha
Prof.ª Dr.ª Ninfa María Rosas-García, Centro de Biotecnología Genómica-Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México
Prof.ª Dr.ª Odara Horta Boscolo, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Osbaldo Turpo-Gebera, *Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Patrícia Vasconcelos Almeida, Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Paula Arcoverde Cavalcanti, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Rodrigo Marques de Almeida Guerra, Universidade Federal do Pará, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Saulo Cerqueira de Aguiar Soares, Universidade Federal do Piauí, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Sérgio Bitencourt Araújo Barros, Universidade Federal do Piauí, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Sérgio Luiz do Amaral Moretti, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Silvia Inés del Valle Navarro, *Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Solange Kazumi Sakata, Instituto de Pesquisas Energéticas e Nucleares (IPEN)- USP, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Stanislava Kashtanova, *Saint Petersburg State University, Russia*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Susana Álvarez Otero – Universidad de Oviedo, Espanha
Prof.ª Dr.ª Teresa Cardoso, Universidade Aberta de Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Teresa Monteiro Seixas, Universidade do Porto, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Valter Machado da Fonseca, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Vanessa Bordin Viera, Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Vera Lúcia Vasilévski dos Santos Araújo, Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Wilson Noé Garcés Aguilar, *Corporación Universitaria Autónoma del Cauca, Colômbia*
Prof. Dr. Xosé Somoza Medina, *Universidad de León, Espanha*

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação (CIP) (eDOC BRASIL, Belo Horizonte/MG)

E24 Educação e ensino na era da informação [livro eletrônico] : vol. III /
Organizador Luis Fernando González Beltrán. – Curitiba, PR:
Artemis, 2024.

Formato: PDF

Requisitos de sistema: Adobe Acrobat Reader

Modo de acesso: World Wide Web

Inclui bibliografia

Edição bilíngue

ISBN 978-65-81701-32-1

DOI 10.37572/EdArt_291024321

1. Educação. 2. Sociedade da informação. 3. Tecnologias da
informação. I. González Beltrán, Luis Fernando.

CDD 370.7

Elaborado por Maurício Amormino Júnior – CRB6/2422



PRÓLOGO

Los acelerados avances en las tecnologías de información y comunicación cambiaron el mundo en todas sus facetas, y la Educación no fue una excepción. De hecho, generó un alto nivel de expectativas, que no se cumplieron en el corto plazo. La posible razón incluye un uso simplista y literal de las TICs en la enseñanza: no porque los alumnos dediquen mucho tiempo a las redes sociales virtuales esto significa que preferirán una plataforma educativa al laboratorio de toda la vida. Ni que las habilidades digitales que desarrollaron las usarán con fines de aprendizaje. Tampoco es realista pensar que pasar los apuntes del profesor a una pantalla, generarán mayor interés en los estudiantes. Por ello es crucial saber los factores que permitan una mayor motivación y un mayor aprendizaje, las herramientas digitales más efectivas, las formas de su instrumentación, los modelos de aprendizaje y los ámbitos de actuación de las nuevas tecnologías.

Precisamente este tercer volumen de “Educação e Ensino na Era da Informação” intenta dar otro paso hacia las respuestas a estas interrogantes, descifrar como la educación debe enfrentar estos desafíos, y descubrir las mejores formas de aprovechar las numerosas oportunidades que se nos presentan. Las propuestas nos llegan de diversos laboratorios alrededor del mundo, con distintas ópticas que exploran las dimensiones multifacéticas de la enseñanza y el aprendizaje, que intentan reflejar la diversidad de perspectivas sobre cómo la educación puede adaptarse y prosperar en un mundo que cambia rápidamente.

Este volumen integra 15 capítulos en 3 rubros. En el primer apartado se presentan las Tendencias en la Educación por objeto de estudio, con un capítulo sobre las distintas carreras y las estrategias de aprendizaje, seguido de trabajos sobre Odontología; Arquitectura; Ingeniería y Administración. En la segunda sección, La instrumentación de la tecnología y su impacto en el aprendizaje, tenemos investigaciones que prueban las bondades del uso educativo de YouTube; Facebook y WhatsApp; Inteligencia Artificial; la plataforma Moodle; y otras estrategias didácticas como intercambios virtuales y storytelling digital. La última sección, Gestión del Conocimiento, modelos educativos y ámbitos de desarrollo e intercambios sociales, presenta estudios sobre Gestión del conocimiento; modelo educativo basado en competencias profesionales; Metamodelos; Desarrollo Sustentable; y sobre Intercambios sociales indeseables.

En conjunto, el libro incluye investigaciones pero también experiencias y reflexiones sobre prácticas pedagógicas efectivas. A través de temáticas que van desde la neuro tecnología hasta el uso de plataformas digitales, desde la educación sustentable hasta la formación de habilidades interpersonales, este volumen pretende ser un recurso valioso para educadores, administradores e investigadores. Agradecemos a todos los colaboradores que hicieron posible este trabajo y te invitamos a ti, lector, a profundizar en las páginas que siguen.

Dr. Luis Fernando González Beltrán
UNAM, México

SUMÁRIO

TENDENCIAS EN LA EDUCACIÓN POR OBJETO DE ESTUDIO

CAPÍTULO 1.....1

ESTRATEGIAS DE APRENDIZAJE EN LA ERA POSTPANDEMIA: INFLUENCIA DEL GÉNERO, ESTADO CIVIL Y CARRERA PROFESIONAL

Maria Guadalupe Martínez Treviño

Luisa Porfiria Chávez Barrera

Yolanda Velázquez Narváez

Lucía Ruiz Ramos

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243211

CAPÍTULO 2.....6

¿POR QUÉ ES IMPORTANTE QUE LOS EGRESADOS EN ODONTOLOGÍA CURSEN UN POSGRADO?

Christian Starlight Franco-Trejo

Ana Karen González-Álvarez

Luz Patricia Falcon-Reyes

Nubia Maricela Chávez-Lamas

Juan Carlos Medrano-Rodríguez

Jesús Rivas-Gutiérrez

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243212

CAPÍTULO 3.....17

FALERONE ART COLONY – ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN PROJECTS

István Frigyes Váli

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243213

CAPÍTULO 4.....37

DESARROLLO DE COMPETENCIAS EN ALUMNOS DE INGENIERÍA INDUSTRIAL Y DE SISTEMAS TRABAJANDO EN UN RETO INTEGRAL PARA LOS TRES BLOQUES DE UN SEMESTRE SIGUIENDO LA RUTA DE LA CALIDAD CON UN SOLO SOCIO FORMADOR

Jesús Benjamín Rodríguez-García

María Yolanda Burgos-López

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243214

CAPÍTULO 5.....47

PRÁTICA CURRICULAR NO CURSO DE ADMINISTRAÇÃO: PLANO DE ENSINO COMO INSTRUMENTO DE OPERACIONALIZAÇÃO

João Manuel de Sousa Will

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243215

LA INSTRUMENTACIÓN DE LA TECNOLOGÍA Y SU IMPACTO EN EL APRENDIZAJE

CAPÍTULO 6..... 59

THE USE OF YOUTUBE IN FORMAL AND INFORMAL LEARNING CONTEXTS AMONG SLOVENIAN STUDENTS: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TECHNOPHILES AND NON-TECHNOPHILES

Domen Malc

Nataša Gajšt

Dejan Romih

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243216

CAPÍTULO 7..... 80

EL USO DE FACEBOOK Y WHATSAPP EN TIEMPOS DE PANDEMIA POR ESTUDIANTES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR

Susana Romero González

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243217

CAPÍTULO 8.....92

INVESTIGACIÓN DE LA DOCENCIA EN NEUROTECNOEDUCACIÓN INTEGRANDO INTELIGENCIA ARTIFICIAL

Joel Luis Jiménez Galán

Giuseppe Francisco Falcone Treviño

Zaida Leticia Tinajero Mallozzi

Manuel Valentín de la Cruz Narváez

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243218

CAPÍTULO 9..... 151

LA PLATAFORMA MOODLE EN EL ANÁLISIS DE TEXTOS CON ÉNFASIS ESTADÍSTICO EN ESTUDIANTES DE PSICOLOGÍA

Luis Fernando González Beltrán

Olga Rivas García

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_2910243219

CAPÍTULO 10.....159

DIDACTIC STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING INTERSOCIAL COMPETENCES ALIGNED WITH SDGS IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

Pablo Santaolalla-Rueda

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432110

GESTIÓN DEL CONOCIMIENTO, MODELOS EDUCATIVOS Y ÁMBITOS DE DESARROLLO E INTERCAMBIOS SOCIALES

CAPÍTULO 11.....179

GESTIÓN DEL CONOCIMIENTO. ELEMENTOS PARA COMPRENDER SU SIGNIFICADO

Ma. Dolores García Perea

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432111

CAPÍTULO 12192

PERCEPCION SOBRE LA EVALUACION DEL APRENDIZAJE EN EL AREA DE CIENCIAS BASICAS DEL INSTITUTO TECNOLOGICO DE SAN JUAN DEL RIO

Juan Gabriel Rodríguez Ortiz

Jorge Alberto Callejas Ruiz

Ángel Alberto Chacón Mendoza

Rubén Espinoza Castro

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432112

CAPÍTULO 13.....203

EDUCACIÓN EN LIDERAZGO PARA ESTUDIANTES UNIVERSITARIOS: PROPUESTA DE UN META-MODELO

Jorge López González

Salvador Ortiz Montellano

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432113

CAPÍTULO 14.....222

HACIA UNA EDUCACIÓN PARA EL DESARROLLO SOSTENIBLE: DESDE LA FORMACIÓN INTEGRAL, ARMÓNICA Y DE BIEN-ESTAR HUMANO

Mireya Martí Reyes

Cirila Cervera Delgado

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432114

CAPÍTULO 15231

**FACTORES PREDISPONENTES EN EL COMPORTAMIENTO AGRESIVO EN NIÑOS
ENTRE 8 A 10 AÑOS DE UNA INSTITUCIÓN EDUCATIVA DE VALLEDUPAR**

Consuelo González Venera

Yaneth Pérez Pabón

Tulia Leonor López Valera

Rikilda Isabel Rincón Jiménez

Rosa Blanca Martínez Molina

Katerin Torres Hostia

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_29102432115

SOBRE O ORGANIZADOR..... 242

ÍNDICE REMISSIVO243

CAPÍTULO 6

THE USE OF YOUTUBE IN FORMAL AND INFORMAL LEARNING CONTEXTS AMONG SLOVENIAN STUDENTS: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TECHNOPHILES AND NON-TECHNOPHILES

Data de submissão: 26/09/2024

Data de aceite: 11/10/2024

Domen Malc, PhD

University of Maribor

Faculty of Economics and Business

Razlagova ulica 14, 2000

Maribor, Slovenija

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5660-5928>

Nataša Gajšt, PhD

University of Maribor

Faculty of Economics and Business

Razlagova ulica 14, 2000

Maribor, Slovenija

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3268-836X>

Dejan Romih, PhD

University of Maribor

Faculty of Economics and Business

Razlagova ulica 14, 2000

Maribor, Slovenija

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9123-0183>

ABSTRACT: YouTube offers students many opportunities for self-directed learning. In this chapter, we examine the differences between

technophiles and non-technophiles in their use of YouTube in formal and informal learning. To this end, we analysed the responses of about 300 Slovenian students in November 2023. The survey shows that there are differences between technophiles and non-technophiles in their opinion about YouTube as a learning platform, which is what we expected.

KEYWORDS: Learning. Learning platform. Non-native speakers of English. Slovenia. YouTube.

O USO DO YOUTUBE EM CONTEXTOS DE APRENDIZAGEM FORMAL E INFORMAL ENTRE ESTUDANTES ESLOVENOS: DIFERENÇAS ENTRE TECNÓFILOS E NÃO TECNÓFILOS

RESUMO: O YouTube oferece aos estudantes muitas oportunidades de aprendizagem autodirigida. Neste capítulo, examinamos as diferenças entre tecnófilos e não tecnófilos no uso do YouTube em aprendizagem formal e informal. Para isso, analisamos as respostas de cerca de 300 estudantes eslovenos em novembro de 2023. A pesquisa mostra que há diferenças entre tecnófilos e não tecnófilos em relação à opinião sobre o YouTube como plataforma de aprendizagem, o que era esperado.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Aprendizagem. Plataforma de aprendizagem. Falantes não nativos de inglês. Eslovênia. YouTube.

EL USO DE YOUTUBE EN CONTEXTOS DE APRENDIZAJE FORMAL E INFORMAL ENTRE ESTUDIANTES ESLOVENOS: DIFERENCIAS ENTRE TECNÓFILOS Y NO TECNÓFILOS

RESUMEN: YouTube ofrece a los estudiantes muchas oportunidades de aprendizaje autodirigido. En este capítulo, examinamos las diferencias entre tecnófilos y no tecnófilos en su uso de YouTube en el aprendizaje formal e informal. Para ello, analizamos las respuestas de alrededor de 300 estudiantes eslovenos en noviembre de 2023. La encuesta muestra que existen diferencias entre tecnófilos y no tecnófilos en su opinión sobre YouTube como plataforma de aprendizaje, lo cual era lo esperado.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Aprendizaje. Plataforma de aprendizaje. Hablantes no nativos de inglés. Eslovenia. YouTube.

1 INTRODUCTION

With the current widespread Internet use, video and other multimedia content is more easily and globally available than ever. As one of the most popular social media platforms for sharing videos, YouTube hosts millions of videos on a vast range of topics. As such, it has become a significant platform for students to seek additional educational content outside of traditional classroom settings. We argue that it is possible to find educational videos on YouTube for almost any professional or scientific field or any given area of general or specialised interest. It is accessible, easy to use and practically cost-free for the users. A growing body of literature presents the use of video content, including the use of YouTube videos, for learning purposes, be it in formal educational settings or informal educational settings. Today's generations of students, who are considered digital natives, are the ones who are quite used to watching video content daily, also for self-directed learning.

This chapter addresses university students' use of YouTube videos in the context of their self-directed learning (related to their selected study field or any other personal interest) on the case of university students in Slovenia. It seeks to determine the students' perceptions of using YouTube content for their personal educational growth. More specifically, it seeks to give insights into students' opinions about the quality and credibility of videos for educational purposes, their satisfaction with the educational content found on YouTube, the perceived cost and ease of using YouTube as an educational platform, the benefits that watching YouTube videos may have on their intellectual competencies development, the very usefulness of YouTube as a complementary educational tool and as a source of information, and their intentions of using YouTube for self-directed learning also in the future.

It is generally believed that current generations of students are well-versed in the use of technology. However, not everyone is the same, and there are, on the one hand, those who more readily embrace and integrate the use of technology in their daily lives and for study purposes (i.e. the technophiles) and, on the other hand, there are those who do not have such a positive inclination towards the use of modern technology for the mentioned purposes (i.e. the non-technophiles). Based on that, the specific objective of this study is to explore the differences in the use of YouTube videos for the above-stated purposes between these two groups of students.

The continuation of the chapter proceeds as follows. First, we lay out the theoretical framework for our study in a brief literature review, followed by the methodology used in the study. Next, we give the results of our quantitative research, which are then analysed and discussed. The final section includes a discussion of our findings, implications for the field of knowledge, and some recommendations for education practice and further research.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Studies on the use of multimedia, which can also be applied to YouTube videos, focus on various aspects, including blended learning, information processing and memory, skills development, diversity of content, and the variety of learning needs (Fleck et al., 2014). Within the context of formal and informal learning, YouTube videos have become, without doubt, almost an indispensable complementary learning tool. To date, a growing body of literature from around the world has reported on the use of YouTube videos for education purposes, either in a formal setting (e.g. teacher-directed use of YouTube content in class to supplement teaching materials, course assignment work) or in an informal setting (e.g. students' self-directed learning based on their personal interest in educational content on YouTube for either study-related purposes or for the broadening of their knowledge not necessarily related to their formal education). According to researchers, YouTube videos play a vital role in self-directed learning. The content is easy to use and practically available at one's fingertips regardless of the time and place (Liu, 2010), which enables students to organise their learning at their own pace and at their own convenience.

Summarising previous research, Tariq, Khan and Araci (2020) established that YouTube is a user-friendly platform which allows its users to access up-to-date content in a vast array of subjects, ranging from natural sciences to social sciences and arts and humanities. As such, it is a good platform for self-directed learning as it allows its users (students) complete control over the selection of content based on their needs and

preferences in the context of formal and informal education. These findings are supported by a study on why university students use YouTube videos for their learning. It was found that students mainly use YouTube videos because of their individual learning needs, the manageability of the pace of content delivery, the drawbacks related to face-to-face instruction in class, and the overall availability of the content regardless of the time and location (Burhanli & Bangir-Alpan, 2021). Namely, students tend to use YouTube videos as support during exam preparation, to learn about subjects related to their studies, or to learn about subjects outside their professional field.

Regarding the manageability of content use, the technology allows for a number of adjustments, including re-watching and pausing of content, which cannot be done in a face-to-face class situation. Additionally, YouTube videos are seen as a source of additional information, visual explanation and simplicity of explanation, which may sometimes be lacking in a classroom setting. Furthermore, YouTube videos are available “around the clock”, which gives students flexibility, convenience and time efficiency when it comes to their learning (Burhanli & Bangir-Alpan, 2021). Also, video tutorials on YouTube give learners access to information and resources that might not be available locally (Lange, 2019).

Focusing on the benefits of YouTube videos as a source of educational (information) content, it has been found that they come with several benefits. Students resort to YouTube videos for answers to their study-related questions. Also, they see them as an additional tool for learning about their academic subjects, as the visual representation of content makes the subject matter more understandable (Moghavvemi et al., 2018). A study about using YouTube as an information resource for university-level courses established that, overall, students viewed YouTube videos for course activities positively and believed that YouTube videos should be an important tool for supplementing their course activities. It was established that by including YouTube video content in their formal learning context, students become more deeply engaged in the subject, which, in turn, results in better learning (Almobarraz, 2018). A study carried out with the performing arts students showed that students mainly saw the benefits of YouTube videos when it came to the promotion of the field among students, the raised attention and interest of students due to visual elements in the videos, the increased efficiency of learning (DeWitt et al., 2013). Another study on the usefulness of YouTube in academic contexts showed a positive correlation between students’ perceived usefulness of technology for learning and their positive attitude towards the use of YouTube, in particular. The same applied for the ease of use, i.e. students are likely to use YouTube as a source of educational content as it is an easily accessible platform (Maziriri et al., 2020).

Students can watch YouTube videos for their formal learning as well as general purposes. An interesting study into the length spent watching videos for these two purposes on the case of business, communication and education students has shown that students tended to watch videos for general purposes more often than for academic purposes (Mady & Baadel, 2020).

Although YouTube offers a vast array of videos for students to choose from, students nevertheless need to be aware that not all content is of good quality, credible or reliable. This has been proven in several studies, including those related to the use of YouTube videos in medicine or health studies. To illustrate, Aldallal, Yates and Ajrash (2019) established that videos posted on YouTube have no quality assurance, which they demonstrated in the case of oral surgery content. Further, they found that even students who could potentially watch such videos for educational purposes prefer not to do so as the content is not aligned with the information they receive during lectures. A similar observation was made concerning the quality of clinical skills video content on YouTube and the pitfalls related to students' ability, as self-directed and independent learners, to evaluate the video content's accuracy and applicability (Duncan et al., 2013).

The importance of good quality content was also addressed in a study performed on a sample of MBA students, which showed that they highly emphasise content usefulness, accuracy and quality found in YouTube videos when it comes to their academic achievements (Roy, 2023). Therefore, when it comes to self-regulated learning by using YouTube videos, students need to be able to discern between valid and invalid content (Colás-Bravo & Quintero-Rodríguez, 2023). These examples serve as a reminder that users of YouTube video content should view it with caution.

When discussing the aspects of YouTube videos for educational purposes, we should not overlook the emotional side of learning. It has been established that YouTube videos give viewers a sense of entertainment and usefulness (Colás-Bravo & Quintero-Rodríguez, 2023). In addition to that, students are empowered via the autonomy to select the content they wish to watch and engage with at their own pace, which adds to the sense of enjoyment and fun regarding their (formal and informal) learning (Lange, 2019). Having established that independent learning or learner autonomy is another aspect important in the context of our study.

In principle, independent learning and learner autonomy are two interrelated concepts that refer to students being in charge of their learning and the choice of what and when to learn. To be more precise, independent learners take responsibility for their learning, which involves identifying their learning needs, their planning and organising

of learning, their attention to learning and the reflection of learning, and their right to determine what they will learn. Independent learners also have intrinsic motivation, a proactive approach to learning, and the skills to learn independently (Dickinson, 1995; Smith, 2015; Trebbi, 2008).

Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation have proven to be an important element of learner autonomy. To illustrate, a study performed with university students showed that students who are more likely to see the value of learning something, who have self-confidence and who are oriented towards achieving their learning goals show a higher level of autonomy, which is reflected in their readiness ability and responsibility to learn. On the other hand, the increased sense of autonomy in their learning context increases their (intrinsic) motivation to learn (Okumus Ceylan, 2021; Spratt et al., 2002).

Learner autonomy is also linked to student competence (i.e. confidence in their ability to be successful learners) and their ability to make personal choices regarding their learning, which is consequently linked to their levels of academic engagement. A study undertaken with a group of Gen Z students showed a positive correlation between their self-perceived competence and their academic engagement and a positive correlation between their autonomy and their academic engagement (Cliff, 2020).

Our brief literature review underpinning the study presented in this chapter would not be complete without addressing the population our study is based on, i.e. the Gen Z, and their attitude towards the use of modern technology. It is a well-known fact that these students are the true digital natives as they have been engaged with digital technologies from an early age. They are also enthusiastic users of social media (Rue, 2018). Furthermore, due to their familiarity with modern technology, Gen Z students can quickly and easily look for information on social media, including YouTube (Dolot, 2018). They are accustomed to multiple information channels and fast access to and engagement with online content. They also prefer such technological and collaborative experiences which provide clear goals, include authentic materials and increase their motivation (Szymkowiak et al., 2021).

Because of their frequent exposure to multimedia content, Gen Z students prefer visual forms of learning (which they also consider more effective than auditory learning) and have, consequently, increased cognitive abilities in visual learning. Further, they prefer practical experience and personalisation of learning (Cickovska, 2020; Mohr & Mohr, 2017).

Based on the above, we formulated the following research questions for our study:

- RQ1: How do Slovenian students perceive the use of YouTube videos in the context of their formal and informal learning?

- RQ2: To what extent does one's enthusiasm about new technology impact the use of YouTube videos for formal and informal learning?

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Our research sample consisted of 313 respondents. Less than three-quarters of them (73%) were female and the rest (27%) were male students studying at different Slovenian faculties. Their average age was 20.9 years ($SD = 1.79$).

3.2 STUDY DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

To investigate our research questions, we employed a quantitative, questionnaire-based approach to gather the data. We collected the data via an online survey by using the 1KA, an open-source application for online surveys (www.1ka.si). Survey data were collected between 24th November 2023 and 29th November 2023. The survey was structured into eight main sections covering the following sets of items: (1) the perceived quality, breadth, and credibility of educational content on YouTube, (2) the satisfaction with the educational content on YouTube, (3) the perceived benefits of YouTube as an educational platform, (4) the perceived ease of using YouTube for educational purposes, (5) the relevance of YouTube as an educational platform, (6) the perceived benefits of educational content on YouTube for the development of intellectual competencies, (7) the perceived usefulness of YouTube as a complementary educational tool, and (8) the intent of using YouTube for educational purposes in the future. For these items, the participants were asked to respond using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "I totally disagree" to 7 = "I totally agree".

Apart from the above, we collected demographic data on the respondents' gender, age, and area of residence (i.e. urban or rural). As it was essential for our study, we also collected data on the scope of time the participants spent watching YouTube content in general and the time they spent watching YouTube content for educational purposes. Finally, to acquire our main differentiative variable, we asked our respondents whether they identify as technophiles or not.

We received a total of 401 responses. However, 88 surveys had to be discarded due to incomplete information, which gave us 313 valid and fully completed surveys. After performing the necessary data preparation, we proceeded with data analysis. Descriptive statistics analysis was performed for the overall sample and for the two

sub-groups of students (i.e. technophiles and non-technophiles), factor analysis was employed to analyse the latent structure of our items, and independent samples t-tests were carried out to test our hypothesis. We present and discuss the results in the continuation of the chapter.

4 RESULTS

In this section, the results of our study are presented in detail. First, we give our descriptive statistics analysis regarding the sample. Next, we show results per each of the eight sections of the survey as outlined in the Methodology section. Following the descriptive analysis, we present the results of our factor analysis. In the final part, the independent samples t-test results are given.

4.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ANALYSIS

4.1.1 Analysis of the sample

As stated above, the data included responses from 313 students. As regards the respondents' attitude toward the use of technology and, more specifically, the use of YouTube for educational purposes, it was established that 37.4% of them identified themselves as technophiles and as many as 62.6% identified themselves as non-technophiles. On average, our respondents spent 47.8 minutes per day watching YouTube videos ($SD = 51.7$). Regarding the time the respondents spent watching YouTube videos for educational purposes, the mean value obtained from the survey was 17.0 minutes per day ($SD = 23.0$). Table 1 presents our research sample characteristics. Apart from the basic demographic data (i.e. age and gender) of our respondents, our survey showed that 51.1% live in an urban environment and 48.9% come from a rural environment.

Table 1. Sample characteristics.

	<i>f</i>	%	Cumulative %
Gender			
Female	227	72.5	72.5
Male	83	26.5	99.0
Other/No response	3	1.0	100.0
Age ($M = 20.85$; $SD = 1.79$)			
18 – 20	152	48.6	48.6
21 – 23	133	42.5	91.1
24 +	28	8.9	100.0

	<i>f</i>	%	Cumulative %
Residence			
Urban	160	51.1	51.1
Rural	153	48.9	100.0
Technophile			
Yes	117	37.4	37.4
No	196	62.6	100.0
YouTube viewing (in min per day) (<i>M</i> = 47.83; <i>SD</i> = 51.74)			
0 – 30	171	54.6	54.6
31 – 60	75	24.0	78.6
61 – 90	22	7.0	85.6
91 – 120	32	10.2	95.8
121 +	13	4.2	100.0
YouTube viewing educational content (in min per day) (<i>M</i> = 17.03; <i>SD</i> = 23.05)			
0 – 15	208	66.5	66.5
16 – 30	68	21.7	88.2
31 – 45	9	2.9	91.1
46 – 60	18	5.8	96.9
61 +	10	3.2	100.0

In line with our research focus, i.e. the differences between respondents who identify as technophiles and those who do not, we also show our sample characteristics based on this classification (Table 2).

Table 2. Characteristics of the two sub-groups – technophiles and non-technophiles.

	Technophile		Yes		No	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
<i>n</i>	117	37.4	196	62.6		
Gender						
Female	62	27.3	165	72.7		
Male	54	65.1	29	34.9		
Other/No response	1	33.3	2	66.6		
Age						
18 – 20	55	36.2	97	63.8		
21 – 23	47	35.3	86	64.7		
24 +	15	53.6	13	46.4		
Residence						
Urban	65	55.5	95	48.5		

Technophile	Yes		No	
Rural	52	44.5	101	51.5
YouTube viewing (in min per day)				
0 – 30	53	31.0	118	69.0
31 – 60	27	36.0	48	64.0
61 – 90	12	54.5	10	45.5
91 – 120	17	53.1	15	46.9
121 +	8	61.5	5	38.5
YouTube viewing educational content (in min per day)				
0 – 15	60	28.8	148	71.1
16 – 30	28	41.2	40	58.8
31 – 45	6	66.7	3	32.3
46 – 60	15	83.3	3	16.7
61 +	8	80.0	2	20.0

The two sub-groups are similar only when it comes to the average age of respondents (i.e. technophiles = 21.05; non-technophiles = 20.72; $t = 1.57$; $p > 0.05$) and the place of residence ($\chi^2 = 1.47$; $p > 0.05$). Male students more frequently identified themselves as technophiles than female students (65.1% and 27.3%, respectively; $\chi^2 = 37.02$; $p < 0.001$). Technophiles stated to spend significantly more time viewing YouTube videos per day (61.2 min) than those who do not identify as technophiles (39.9 min; $t = 3.25$; $p < 0.001$), which is also true for viewing educational content on YouTube (technophiles = 26.8 min; non-technophiles = 11.2 min; $t = 5.278$; $p < 0.001$).

4.1.2 Analysis of the responses per individual section of the survey

Here, we present the results for each of the eight sections of our survey, as presented in the Methodology section above. For all the items pertaining to each section, we give the sample means and standard deviations alongside the averages for both sub-groups, i.e. the technophiles and the non-technophiles.

Section 1: The perceived quality, breadth, and credibility of educational content on YouTube

Concerning the respondents' perception of the quality, breadth, and credibility of educational content found on YouTube, we give the results for the nine items included in this section in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Comparison of the mean values for perceived quality, breadth, and credibility of educational content on YouTube between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
Educational content on YouTube is good.	5.21	1.23	5.49	5.05
Educational content on YouTube is clearly defined.	4.44	1.34	4.70	4.49
Educational content on YouTube is clearly displayed.	4.63	1.34	4.85	4.49
Educational content on YouTube is clearly presented.	4.82	1.42	4.96	4.74
Educational content on YouTube is informative.	5.40	1.40	5.54	5.32
Educational content on YouTube is varied.	6.00	1.28	6.05	5.96
Educational content on YouTube is understandable.	5.29	1.27	5.42	5.22
Educational content on YouTube is truthful.	4.35	1.13	4.45	4.28
Educational content on YouTube is accurate.	4.29	1.13	4.44	4.21

The comparison of the mean values for perceived quality, breadth, and credibility of educational content on YouTube between technophiles and non-technophiles indicates that technophiles view educational content on YouTube more favourably than non-technophiles. Compared to non-technophiles, technophiles were more likely to agree with the statements that educational content on YouTube is good, clearly defined, clearly displayed, clearly presented, informative, understandable, as well as truthful, and accurate. Based on the results presented in Table 3, technophiles and non-technophiles have almost the same opinions regarding the variety of educational content on YouTube.

Section 2: Students' satisfaction with educational content on YouTube

Turning to our respondents' satisfaction with educational content on YouTube, we established the differences between the two sub-groups of students. Although both technophiles and non-technophiles agreed that the educational content found on YouTube is interesting, technophiles exhibited higher overall satisfaction than non-technophiles. The most notable difference was determined about the trustworthiness of the content since technophiles trusted the educational content much more than non-technophiles (i.e. technophiles = 5.27; non-technophiles = 4.96). A close inspection of the data in Table 4 below also shows that out of all statements in this section, both groups of students find the educational content on YouTube quite interesting ($M = 6.27$). (See Table 4 for a detailed presentation of the results for this set of statements.)

Table 4. Comparison of the mean values for satisfaction with the educational content on YouTube between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
Educational content on YouTube is in line with my needs.	5.58	1.29	5.67	5.52

Educational content on YouTube is in line with my expectations.	5.58	1.20	5.75	5.47
Educational content is in line with my requirements.	5.49	1.20	5.60	5.43
Educational content on YouTube is interesting.	6.27	1.06	6.32	6.23
Educational content on YouTube is trustworthy.	5.08	1.19	5.27	4.96

Section 3: Students' perceived benefits of using YouTube content for educational purposes

Focusing on our respondents' perceived benefits of YouTube content for educational purposes, we found that, overall, technophiles view the use of YouTube for educational purposes as a way of saving time, work, money, and trouble to a greater extent than non-technophiles (see Table 5). Moreover, this set of statements revealed the most significant differences in average values between the opinions of technophiles and non-technophiles regarding the perceived benefits of YouTube as an educational platform.

Table 5. Comparison of the mean values of the perceived benefits of YouTube as an educational platform between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	M	SD	M_{technophiles}	M_{non-technophiles}
Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me time.	5.56	1.38	5.83	5.39
Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me work.	5.42	1.45	5.63	5.30
Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me money.	5.68	1.58	5.96	5.51
Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me the trouble.	5.23	1.49	5.49	5.07

Section 4: Students' opinions regarding the ease of using YouTube for educational purposes

Compared to the differences between the two groups of students regarding their perceived benefits of YouTube use for educational purposes (as presented in Table 5 above), their opinions about the ease of using YouTube in the context of their learning are quite similar. That is, technophiles and non-technophiles agree to a great extent that YouTube is easy to use and does not require much knowledge, experience, or money.

Table 6. Comparison of the mean values of the perceived ease of using YouTube for educational purposes between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	M	SD	M_{technophiles}	M_{non-technophiles}
YouTube is easy to use.	6.79	0.74	6.85	6.76
One doesn't need a lot of knowledge to use YouTube.	6.71	0.84	6.68	6.73

One doesn't need a lot of experience to use YouTube.	6.66	0.84	6.63	6.68
One doesn't need a lot of money to use YouTube.	6.67	0.86	6.68	6.67

Section 5: Students' views regarding the relevance of YouTube as an educational platform

According to our survey results, there are significant differences between the two groups of students regarding their views on the relevance of YouTube as an educational platform. That is, technophiles appear to have a much stronger affinity towards YouTube as a source of knowledge ($M = 5.72$) compared to non-technophiles ($M = 5.02$). Also, they view YouTube as an important source of educational content, experience, and information to a greater extent than non-technophiles. However, both groups of students share similar opinions about YouTube providing them with opportunities for additional knowledge in the sphere of their non-formal education and YouTube being suitable for their additional education. Notably, these two statements received the highest average scores in this set of statements ($M = 6.04$ and $M = 6.03$, respectively).

Table 7. Comparison of the mean values regarding the relevance of YouTube as an educational platform between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
YouTube is suitable for (additional) education.	6.03	1.07	6.15	5.95
YouTube is an important source of information.	5.30	1.37	5.53	5.16
YouTube is an important source of educational content.	5.33	1.30	5.66	5.13
YouTube is an important source of knowledge.	5.28	1.36	5.72	5.02
YouTube is an important source of experience.	5.26	1.37	5.56	5.08
YouTube gives me the opportunity for my (additional) education within the context of formal education.	5.23	1.47	5.36	5.15
YouTube gives me the opportunity for my (additional) education within the context of non-formal education.	6.04	1.14	6.17	5.96

Section 6: Students' views about the benefits of educational content on YouTube for the development of their intellectual competencies

A similar trend continued when we asked our respondents about the perceived benefits of educational content on YouTube for the development of their intellectual competencies. The highest total average was linked to YouTube's benefits for personal proactiveness ($M = 5.77$), and the lowest total average to YouTube's benefits for self-control ($M = 5.09$). In all cases, technophiles evaluated YouTube's benefits more favourably than non-technophiles.

Table 8. Comparison of the perceived benefits of educational content on YouTube for the development of intellectual competencies between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
YouTube allows me to (additionally) educate myself as it encourages my proactiveness.	5.77	1.23	5.99	5.64
YouTube allows me to (additionally) educate myself as it encourages my self-criticism.	5.46	1.34	5.69	5.33
YouTube allows me to (additionally) educate myself as it encourages my self-control.	5.09	1.42	5.44	4.88
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-formation.	5.57	1.34	5.88	5.38
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-responsibility.	5.37	1.37	5.65	5.20
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-understanding.	5.68	1.35	5.84	5.59
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-discovery.	5.52	1.38	5.79	5.36
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-empowerment.	5.23	1.39	5.44	5.10
YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on boosting my self-confidence.	5.22	1.34	5.56	5.02

Section 7: Students' perceived usefulness of YouTube as a complementary educational tool

The discrepancy in the favourability of YouTube as a complementary educational tool between technophiles and non-technophiles was also evident. Technophiles gave higher ratings in all cases, although high levels of agreement were also reported by non-technophiles. See Table 9 for a detailed comparison.

Table 9. Comparison of perceived usefulness of YouTube as a complementary educational tool between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
YouTube enables me to keep up to date with developments in all areas of social sciences.	5.64	1.29	5.81	5.54
YouTube enables me to keep up to date with developments in all areas of the natural sciences.	5.63	1.27	5.83	5.51
Using YouTube for (additional) education increases the effectiveness of my education.	5.54	1.36	5.94	5.31
Using YouTube for (additional) education increases the success of my education.	5.40	1.39	5.68	5.24
Using YouTube for (additional) education increases my joy for learning.	5.62	1.45	5.91	5.44

Section 8: Students' expressed intent to use YouTube for educational purposes in the future

When asked whether they wish to and intend to use YouTube videos for educational purposes in the future, both groups of students agreed that they would continue to do so with almost the same average rate of agreement. However, technophiles were more likely to indicate their intent to use YouTube for educational purposes in the future and more likely to express the desire to do so than non-technophiles.

Table 10. Comparison of the intent of using YouTube for educational purposes in the future, between technophiles and non-technophiles.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> _{technophiles}	<i>M</i> _{non-technophiles}
I wish to keep using YouTube for (additional) education.	5.93	1.39	6.26	5.74
I intend to keep using YouTube for (additional) education.	5.94	1.35	6.22	5.78

All the results, including the reported differences between the technophiles and non-technophiles are purely descriptive. To explore whether the differences are statistically significant, we analysed the data further by adopting a factor analysis and an independent samples t-test. The results of these analyses are given next.

4.2 FACTOR ANALYSIS

In the second step, we conducted a factor analysis to investigate the latent structure of our items. Looking into KMO statistic (0.931) and the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < 0.001$), we established that our data is suitable for factor analysis. We used a principal components method, which, through several iterations, revealed a 7-factor solution with 35 items, which explains 70.9% of cumulative variance. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Results of principal components analysis with Varimax rotation.

Component	Item	α	Comm.	Loadings
Competences	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on boosting my self-confidence.	0.941	0.768	0.811
	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-empowerment.		0.722	0.803
	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-discovery.		0.720	0.796
	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-responsibility.		0.728	0.786
	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-understanding.		0.738	0.779
	YouTube allows me to (additionally) educate myself as it encourages my self-control.		0.738	0.775
	YouTube allows me to (further) educate myself, with a focus on promoting my self-formation.		0.727	0.762
	YouTube allows me to (additionally) educate myself as it encourages my self-criticism.		0.609	0.666
Satisfaction	Educational content on YouTube is interesting.	0.922	0.662	0.745
	Educational content on YouTube is in line with my expectations.		0.689	0.694
	Educational content on YouTube is informative.		0.669	0.692
	Educational content on YouTube is varied.		0.604	0.685
	Educational content on YouTube is in line with my needs.		0.650	0.671
	Educational content on YouTube is understandable.		0.635	0.666
	Educational content on YouTube is good.		0.670	0.654
	Educational content is in line with my requirements.		0.700	0.641
	Educational content on YouTube is clearly presented.		0.693	0.635
	Educational content on YouTube is clearly displayed.		0.695	0.598
Attitudes	YouTube is an important source of knowledge.	0.886	0.805	0.772
	YouTube is an important source of educational content.		0.825	0.757
	YouTube is an important source of information.		0.685	0.701
	YouTube is an important source of experience.		0.650	0.651
Benefits	Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me time.	0.858	0.796	0.772
	Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me time.		0.739	0.733
	Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me the trouble.		0.751	0.728
	Using YouTube for (additional) education saves me money.		0.607	0.686

Ease of use	One doesn't need a lot of knowledge to use YouTube.		0.768	0.859
	One doesn't need a lot of experience to use YouTube.	0.820	0.684	0.810
	YouTube is easy to use.		0.719	0.787
	One doesn't need a lot of money to use YouTube.*		0.521	0.679
Credibility	Educational content on YouTube is accurate.		0.826	0.770
	Educational content on YouTube is truthful.	0.881	0.767	0.755
	Educational content on YouTube is trustworthy.		0.755	0.720
Breadth	YouTube enables me to keep up to date with developments in all areas of the natural sciences.	0.823	0.767	0.732
	YouTube enables me to keep up to date with developments in all areas of social sciences.		0.729	0.695

To corroborate our factor structure, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 29. The results of CFA indicate that our proposed factor structure fits the data well ($\chi^2/df = 2.138$; $CFI = 0.925$; $IFI = 0.926$; $TLI = 0.917$; $RMSEA = 0.060$; $SRMR = 0.052$). The additional inspection of the composite reliability index (CR) showed that all constructs exhibit sufficient reliability ($CR > 0.7$), and satisfactory convergent validity ($AVE > 0.5$). Following the Fornell-Larcker Criterion, we were also able to confirm the discriminant validity of our measurement model, since all values of \sqrt{AVE} exceed the squared inter-correlations between the constructs (Table 12).

Table 12. Composite reliabilities, average variances extracted, and Fornell-Larcker criterion.

	CR	AVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Competencies	0.940	0.663	0.814	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Satisfaction	0.920	0.536	0.581	0.732	-	-	-	-	-
3. Benefits	0.864	0.619	0.585	0.669	0.786	-	-	-	-
4. Ease-of-use	0.844	0.643	0.125	0.366	0.144	0.802	-	-	-
5. Attitudes	0.890	0.672	0.663	0.589	0.566	0.045	0.820	-	-
6. Credibility	0.885	0.721	0.556	0.703	0.570	0.163	0.544	0.849	-
7. Breadth	0.823	0.700	0.623	0.546	0.488	0.138	0.593	0.488	0.837

4.3 INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST

Finally, we carried out an independent samples t-test to answer our second research question. Table 13 displays our results.

Table 13. The results of an independent samples t-test with Cohen's d statistics.

	Technophiles		t-test			Effect size	
	Yes	No	t	p	d	Low 95 %	Up 95 %
Competencies	5.66	5.23	3.24	0.00	0.39	0.147	0.609
Satisfaction	5.56	5.34	1.93	0.05	0.23	-0.004	0.455
Attitudes	5.62	5.10	3.92	0.00	0.46	0.225	0.689
Benefits	5.73	5.32	2.97	0.00	0.34	0.106	0.567
Ease-of-use	6.72	6.72	-0.02	0.98	-0.00	-0.232	0.226
Credibility	4.72	4.48	1.96	0.05	0.23	-0.001	0.459
Breadth	5.82	5.52	2.18	0.03	0.26	0.025	0.484

Results presented in Table 13 show that technophiles and non-technophiles significantly ($p < 0.01$) differ from one another, especially in terms of perceived competencies developed using YouTube as an educational platform when it comes to their attitudes towards the use of YouTube for educational purposes. That is, they differ regarding the perceived benefits and breadth of the educational content available on YouTube. Our results also indicate minor differences between the two groups of students in their perceived satisfaction with the use of YouTube for educational purposes and their perceived credibility of the educational content available on YouTube. However, these differences do not appear statistically significant even at $p < 0.05$. Finally, we found no differences in the perceived ease of use, as both groups find YouTube exceptionally easy to use for educational purposes.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study aligns with the growing body of literature that highlights the significant role of YouTube as an educational tool, both in formal and informal learning contexts. As earlier studies indicate, YouTube provides students with easy access to educational content and facilitates self-directed learning (Liu, 2010; Burhanli & Bangir-Alpan, 2021). This research builds upon prior findings by specifically examining the differences between “technophiles” and “non-technophiles,” expanding on how technology enthusiasm impacts YouTube’s educational use.

The primary aim of this study was to explore the differences in how technophiles and non-technophiles among Slovenian University students use YouTube for learning, both in formal educational settings and for informal self-directed learning. By analysing their opinions on the various aspects of YouTube and its content, this study aimed to shed light on whether one’s attitude toward technology influences the perceived value of YouTube as an educational resource.

The results indicate that students have rather favourable views towards YouTube as an educational platform. They see it as beneficial for the advancement of their competencies, as a means of saving time, money, and effort while learning. It is also very easy to use and it enables access to a broad range of topics and themes. However, we also identified clear differences between the students who identified as technophiles and those who did not. Technophiles spent significantly more time on YouTube for educational purposes and perceived the content as more beneficial and valuable for their development compared to non-technophiles. Notably, technophiles viewed YouTube as a platform that enhances their competencies, such as self-discovery and personal responsibility, more strongly than non-technophiles. While both groups agreed on the ease of using YouTube, reported similar satisfaction with its content, and provided comparable credibility assessments, technophiles consistently reported more positive attitudes toward YouTube and the benefits of its use. We also noticed a slight difference in the perceived credibility and satisfaction with YouTube; however, these results were not statistically significant ($p = 0.05$).

The results of this study further reinforce the role of video-based learning in both formal and informal settings. Previous studies have established that YouTube provides an accessible, flexible, and effective medium for self-directed learning (Liu, 2010; Tariq Khan & Araci, 2020). Consistent with Burhanli & Bangir-Alpan (2021), this research confirms that students frequently turn to YouTube for its many benefits (time, effort, money savings), ease of use, and the ability to meet diverse learning needs. The perceived ease of use for educational purposes, a point of strong agreement among both technophiles and non-technophiles in this study, follows the conclusions of Maziriri et al. (2020), who emphasise that students appreciate the simplicity and accessibility of YouTube as a learning tool. Students in our study also reported high satisfaction with YouTube content's quality and presentation, paralleling the work of DeWitt et al. (2013), where YouTube's visual elements enhanced student engagement and learning efficacy.

The main differences between technophiles and non-technophiles may come from the difference in abilities to filter and select high-quality and more valuable content, a skill highlighted by Colás Bravo & Quintero-Rodriguez (2023) in their discussion on the importance of critical digital literacy.

The study's key strength lies in its quantitative approach, a reliable and valid measurement instrument, applied to a sizable sample of Slovenian university students, which enables generalisability to similar demographics. However, one limitation is the reliance on self-reported data, which may introduce bias, particularly in the categorisation

of students into technophiles and non-technophiles. Another limitation is that the study does not account for variables like the quality of the specific content consumed, student's school performance, or the remaining resources that they might (not) use for learning.

Future research could explore content quality in greater detail, examining how specific video types or channels contribute to learning outcomes. Additionally, longitudinal studies could investigate whether technophiles achieve better academic results due to their more frequent and positive engagement with YouTube as a learning tool. From a policy perspective, educators could focus on developing student's digital literacy skills, ensuring they are equipped to critically evaluate and effectively use digital platforms like YouTube. Incorporating YouTube into formal education, while promoting strategies for discerning credible content, could further enhance its utility as a complementary educational tool.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldallal, S. N., Yates, J. M., & Ajrash, M. (2019). Use of YouTube™ as a self-directed learning resource in oral surgery among undergraduate dental students: a cross-sectional descriptive study. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 57(10), 1049-1052. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2019.09.010>

Almobarraz, A. (2018). Utilization of YouTube as an information resource to support university courses. *The Electronic Library*, 36(1), 71-81.

Burhanli, S., & Bangir-Alpan, G. (2021). Why Do University Students Prefer YouTube to Learn and Study? *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 16(4), 164-177.

Cickovska, E. (2020). Understanding and teaching Gen Z in higher education. *Horizons-International Scientific Journal*, 26(3), 275-290.

Cliff, J. L. (2020). *Generation Z College Students' Self-Perceived Competence, Relatedness, Autonomy and Their Academic Engagement* (Publication Number 28150764) [Ph.D., Grand Canyon University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. United States -- Arizona.

Colás-Bravo, P., & Quintero-Rodríguez, I. (2023). YouTube as a Digital Resource for Sustainable Education. *Sustainability*, 15(7).

DeWitt, D., Alias, N., Siraj, S., Yaakub, M. Y., Ayob, J., & Ishak, R. (2013). The Potential of Youtube for Teaching and Learning in the Performing Arts. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 1118-1126. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.439>

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation a literature review. *System*, 23(2), 165-174.

Dolot, A. (2018). The characteristics of Generation Z. *E-mentor*, 74(2), 44-50.

Duncan, I., Yarwood-Ross, L., & Haigh, C. (2013). YouTube as a source of clinical skills education. *Nurse Education Today*, 33(12), 1576-1580. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2012.12.013>

Fleck, B. K., Beckman, L. M., Sterns, J. L., & Hussey, H. D. (2014). YouTube in the classroom: Helpful tips and student perceptions. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 14(3), 21-37.

- Lange, P. G. (2019). Informal learning on YouTube. *The international encyclopedia of media literacy*, 1-11.
- Liu, Y. (2010). Social media tools as a learning resource. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange (JETDE)*, 3(1), 101-114.
- Mady, M. A., & Baadel, S. (2020). Technology-Enabled Learning (TEL): YouTube as a ubiquitous learning aid. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, 19(01), 1-16.
- Maziriri, E. T., Gapa, P., & Chuchu, T. (2020). Student perceptions towards the use of YouTube as an educational tool for learning and tutorials. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 119-138.
- Moghavvemi, S., Sulaiman, A., Jaafar, N. I., & Kasem, N. (2018). Social media as a complementary learning tool for teaching and learning: The case of youtube. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 16(1), 37-42. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.12.001>
- Mohr, K. A., & Mohr, E. S. (2017). Understanding Generation Z students to promote a contemporary learning environment. *Journal on empowering teaching excellence*, 1(1), 9.
- Okumus Ceylan, N. (2021). The Relationship between Learner Autonomy and Motivation. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 20(4), 150-158.
- Roy, S. K. (2023). YouTube's influential factors for academic achievement: A two-stage approach. *Telematics and Informatics Reports*, 10, 100060. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2023.100060>
- Rue, P. (2018). Make way, millennials, here comes Gen Z. *About Campus*, 23(3), 5-12.
- Smith, S. (2015). Learner autonomy: Origins, approaches, and practical implementation. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2(4), 82-91.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language teaching research*, 6(3), 245-266.
- Szymkowiak, A., Melović, B., Dabić, M., Jeganathan, K., & Kundi, G. S. (2021). Information technology and Gen Z: The role of teachers, the internet, and technology in the education of young people. *Technology in Society*, 65, 101565.
- Tariq, M. U., Khan, S., & Araci, Z. C. (2020). Self-directed learning through YouTube: Challenges, opportunities, and trends in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Mechanical and Production Engineering Research and Development (IJMPERD)*, 10(3), 1949-1965.
- Trebbi, T. (2008). Freedom—a pre-requisite for learner autonomy. *Classroom Innovation and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, Realities and Responses*. John Benjamin Publishing: Amsterdam.

SOBRE O ORGANIZADOR

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán- Doctorado en Psicología. Profesor Asociado de la Facultad de Estudios Superiores Iztacala (FESI) UNAM, Miembro de la Asociación Internacional de Análisis Conductual. (ABAI). de la Sociedad Mexicana de Análisis de la Conducta, del Sistema Mexicano de Investigación en Psicología, y de La Asociación Mexicana de Comportamiento y Salud. Consejero Propietario perteneciente al Consejo Interno de Posgrado para el programa de Psicología 1994-1999. Jefe de Sección Académica de la Carrera de Psicología. ENEPI, UNAM, de 9 de Marzo de 1999 a Febrero 2003. Secretario Académico de la Secretaría General de la Facultad de Psicología 2012. Con 40 años de Docencia en licenciatura en Psicología, en 4 diferentes Planes de estudios, con 18 asignaturas diferentes, y 10 asignaturas diferentes en el Posgrado, en la FESI y la Facultad de Psicología. Cursos en Especialidad en Psicología de la Salud y de Maestría en Psicología de la Salud en CENHIES Pachuca, Hidalgo. Con Tutorías en el Programa Alta Exigencia Académica, PRONABES, Sistema Institucional de Tutorías. Comité Tutorial en el Programa de Maestría en Psicología, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos. En investigación 28 Artículos en revistas especializadas, Coautor de un libro especializado, 12 Capítulos de Libro especializado, Dictaminador de libros y artículos especializados, evaluador de proyectos del CONACYT, con más de 100 Ponencias en Eventos Especializados Nacionales, y más de 20 en Eventos Internacionales, 13 Conferencia en Eventos Académicos, Organizador de 17 eventos y congresos, con Participación en elaboración de planes de estudio, Responsable de Proyectos de Investigación apoyados por DGAPA de la UNAM y por CONACYT. Evaluador de ponencias en el Congreso Internacional de Innovación Educativa del Tecnológico de Monterrey; Revisor de libros del Comité Editorial FESI, UNAM; del Comité editorial Facultad de Psicología, UNAM y del Cuerpo Editorial Artemis Editora. Revisor de las revistas "Itinerario de las miradas: Serie de divulgación de Avances de Investigación". FES Acatlán; "Lecturas de Economía", Universidad de Antioquía, Medellín, Colombia, Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencia Psicológica (PSIENCIA). Buenos Aires, Revista "Advances in Research"; Revista "Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology"; Revista "Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies"; y Revista "Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International".

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3492-1145>

ÍNDICE REMISSIVO

A

Acoso escolar 231, 232, 233, 237, 240

Adaptación post-pandémica 1

Agresión 232, 233, 237, 238, 239, 240

aprendizagem 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59

Aprendizaje 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 37, 38, 39, 45, 60, 80, 81, 82, 84, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 156, 157, 158, 179, 182, 183, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 207, 217, 225, 227, 228, 232, 237

Aprendizaje basado en retos 37, 38, 39

Aprendizaje personalizado 93, 110, 129

Architect training 17

Architecture workshop 17

C

Características y actitudes para utilizarla 179

Competencias 6, 7, 13, 15, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 49, 51, 53, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 106, 108, 110, 122, 125, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136, 137, 146, 147, 148, 151, 158, 183, 190, 192, 193, 194, 200, 201, 203, 205, 208, 209, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 225, 228, 229

Competencias complejas 222, 225, 229

Competencias de ingeniería 37

Competencias profesionales 7, 192, 193, 197, 200, 201

Comunicación docente-alumno 80

COVID-19 1, 2, 80, 81, 82, 90, 91

Crisis sanitaria 80

D

Desarrollo sostenible 121, 122, 123, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230

Desempleo 6, 7, 9, 12, 13

E

Earthquake 17, 23, 24, 25, 28

Educación 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 46, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94,

95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 147, 148, 149, 150, 157, 158, 177, 178, 179, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 234, 238, 239, 240

Educación en liderazgo 203, 204, 205, 216, 217, 221

Educación superior 1, 10, 46, 80, 81, 89, 90, 96, 98, 102, 103, 109, 121, 124, 125, 127, 129, 135, 136, 150, 158, 201, 203, 222, 226, 227, 229, 230

Estadística 45, 151, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158

Estrategias de aprendizaje 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 94

Estudiante universitario 80, 204, 213, 218

Evaluación 39, 44, 92, 94, 97, 98, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 111, 126, 130, 133, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 152, 153, 155, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 203, 205, 206, 213, 214, 218, 219

Expresiones 179, 180, 187, 188, 238

F

Falerone Art Colony 17, 18, 21, 22

Formación integral 222, 225, 228, 229, 239

G

Gestão de sala de aula 47

Gestión del conocimiento 179, 180, 188, 191

I

Inclusive education 159

Innovación pedagógica 93, 97, 98, 122, 123, 138

Instrumento de operacionalização 47

Inteligencia Artificial 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150

Intersocial competences 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177

L

Learning 38, 47, 48, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 70, 72, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 93, 95, 104, 159,

160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 171, 174, 176, 177, 179, 184, 190, 193, 207, 219, 220, 230
Learning platform 59
Lectura 89, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158
Liderazgo 14, 128, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217,
218, 219, 220, 221

M

Maltrato a los niños 232
Modelo educativo 37, 192, 193, 197, 198, 200, 201, 219, 222, 229

N

Neuroeducación 93, 95, 100, 107, 110, 114, 116, 117, 126, 129, 138, 140, 143, 145, 147
Nociones 179, 180, 187, 188, 189
Non-native speakers of English 59

P

Percepciones 110, 112, 118, 119, 120, 124, 125, 150, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 201
Planejamento de ensino 47, 50
Plataforma 43, 59, 60, 84, 85, 88, 115, 118, 151, 153, 154, 156, 182, 230
Posgrado 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 179, 240
Práctica curricular 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 56, 57
Psicología 1, 5, 81, 87, 90, 107, 147, 151, 152, 153, 156, 158, 203, 241

R

Realidad virtual y aumentada 93
Redes sociales 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91
Revitalisation 17
Ruta de la calidad 37, 40, 45

S

Slovenia 59, 60
Social justice 159, 160, 162, 163, 165, 169, 171, 174, 177, 178
Subempleo 6, 7, 9, 13
Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 159

T

Tecnología educativa 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 110, 114, 116, 123, 150

U

Universitarios 1, 5, 80, 83, 85, 90, 91, 149, 151, 152, 157, 158, 194, 203, 204, 205, 206, 216, 218, 221, 222

V

Virtual collaboration 159, 177

Virtudes 186, 203, 209, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219

Y

YouTube 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84