Kashihara, A. et al. (Eds.) (2024). Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Computers in Education. Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education

Integrating Virtual Environment in Teaching Courses

Chiu-Jung CHEN[a] & Pei-Lin LIU[b]*
[a]*Department of E-learning design and management, National ChiaYi University, Taiwan*
[b]*Department of foreign language, National ChiaYi University, Taiwan*
*peilin@mail.ncyu.edu.tw

Abstract: In recent years, the integration of virtual reality (VR) technology into educational environments has gained significant attention, particularly within natural science courses. This paper explores the implementation of VR interactive experiments as a means to enhance inquiry-based learning and foster critical thinking skills among students. By immersing students in realistic and interactive scientific scenarios, VR provides a dynamic platform for exploring complex concepts and phenomena that are often challenging to demonstrate in traditional classroom settings. The study underscores the pedagogical benefits of VR, particularly its role in fostering critical thinking skills, increasing student engagement, and improving understanding of abstract concepts. Additionally, it discusses practical considerations for incorporating VR into natural science curricula and textbooks, addressing potential challenges such as cost, accessibility, and teacher training. Through a comprehensive review of existing literature and case studies, this paper aims to provide educators with insights and strategies for effectively integrating VR technology to create an enriched and interactive learning experience in natural science education.

Keywords: Virtual Reality, Natural Science, Interactive learning

1. Introduction

The education landscape has continuously evolved, with technology playing a pivotal role in transforming traditional teaching methodologies. Among the emerging technological advancements, Virtual Reality (VR) stands out as a potent tool that has the potential to revolutionize the educational experience. This journal explores the integration of VR in natural science courses, highlighting its benefits, challenges, and future implications.

The rapid advancements in technology have significantly influenced the educational landscape, leading to the integration of various digital tools to enhance learning experiences. Among these, Virtual Reality (VR) has emerged as a transformative medium with the potential to revolutionize traditional teaching methods. VR offers immersive and interactive environments, enabling learners to engage with content in ways that go beyond conventional pedagogical approaches. By simulating real-world or imagined scenarios, VR can foster experiential learning, allowing students to explore, experiment, and visualize abstract concepts in a controlled, safe, and stimulating setting. This approach is particularly beneficial in fields that require complex spatial understanding, such as medicine, engineering, and language acquisition.

Recent research suggests that integrating VR into teaching courses can significantly enhance student engagement, motivation, and retention of knowledge. VR's immersive nature facilitates active learning by providing students with a sense of presence, where they can interact with their environment and content in a more meaningful and personalized manner. Furthermore, VR promotes collaborative learning as students can work together in virtual spaces, sharing experiences and problem-solving in real time. Such interactivity helps bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application, ultimately improving learning outcomes.

Despite the promising potential of VR in education, its adoption remains limited due to challenges such as cost, technical requirements, and the need for curriculum adjustments. Additionally, empirical studies examining the long-term effects of VR on learning outcomes, cognitive load, and student satisfaction are still emerging. This paper aims to explore the integration of VR into teaching courses by examining its pedagogical implications, identifying best practices, and addressing potential barriers to implementation. This study seeks to provide valuable insights into how VR can be effectively incorporated into educational settings to enhance the learning experience by investigating these aspects.

2. Literature review

2.1 Virtual Reality

Virtual Reality (VR) is increasingly being recognized as a transformative educational tool with the potential to enhance learning outcomes, particularly in natural science courses. This literature review examines existing research on integrating VR in natural science education, exploring its benefits, challenges, and the theoretical frameworks underpinning its use.

Virtual reality (VR) has rapidly become a cutting-edge educational tool, offering immersive experiences that bridge the gap between theoretical learning and practical application. In recent years, scholars have increasingly explored the integration of VR into educational contexts, examining its potential to enhance student engagement, motivation, and learning outcomes. This literature review presents an overview of the key studies on VR in education, focusing on the pedagogical benefits, challenges, and implications for future research and practice.

2.2 Virtual Reality assist learning

Several studies have demonstrated that VR significantly boosts student engagement and motivation. Makransky et al. (2019) found that VR-based learning experiences are more engaging than traditional methods, leading to higher levels of intrinsic motivation. The immersive nature of VR captures students' attention, making learning more enjoyable and stimulating.

VR's ability to visualize abstract and complex scientific concepts is well-documented. In their study, Merchant et al. (2014) showed that students using VR to learn about molecular structures and chemical reactions exhibited better understanding and recall than those using traditional textbooks. VR provides a three-dimensional perspective that enhances spatial awareness and comprehension.

VR facilitates experiential learning by allowing students to perform virtual experiments and simulations. Chang et al. (2016) demonstrated that VR-based laboratory simulations improved students' practical skills and theoretical knowledge in chemistry. These virtual labs offer a safe environment for experimentation, reducing the risks associated with real-life labs.

Research indicates that VR can make high-quality education more accessible. Sanchez et al. (2017) explored the use of VR in remote and underserved areas, highlighting its potential to bridge educational gaps. VR can cater to diverse learning needs, providing customized and adaptable learning experiences for students with different abilities.

2.3 Pedagogical Benefits of Virtual Reality

Numerous studies highlight the ability of VR to foster experiential and active learning. According to Merchant et al. (2014), VR environments allow learners to interact with virtual objects and spaces, improving spatial awareness and understanding of complex concepts. This interactive feature of VR is particularly advantageous in STEM fields, where abstract concepts like anatomy, engineering structures, and scientific simulations can be difficult to grasp through traditional 2D materials (Makransky & Lilleholt, 2018). VR's ability to simulate real-world environments enables students to practice skills in a safe, controlled setting, a feature that is especially valuable in medical and vocational training (Jensen & Konradsen, 2018).

Studies have shown that VR environments promote immersion and language use in context in language learning. Cheng et al. (2020) found that students learning English as a foreign language demonstrated greater confidence and language fluency when practicing in a VR environment compared to conventional classroom settings. The sensory immersion VR provides enhances learner engagement and motivation, making learning experiences more vivid and memorable (Huang et al., 2010).

2.4 Cognitive and Affective Outcomes

A growing body of literature investigates the cognitive and affective impacts of VR-based learning. Makransky, Terkildsen, and Mayer (2019) emphasize that VR promotes deeper cognitive engagement by allowing learners to experience content in a three-dimensional, contextually rich environment. Immersive experiences also contribute to improved knowledge retention and transfer of learning, as shown by research conducted by Radianti et al. (2020). Their meta-analysis of VR in education revealed a positive correlation between the use of VR and increased learning outcomes, particularly when used for skill acquisition and visualization.

However, some studies caution that VR can lead to cognitive overload if not carefully designed. Krokos, Plaisant, and Varshney (2019) argue that VR environments can overwhelm learners with too much sensory input, detracting from the intended learning experience. To mitigate this, scholars suggest incorporating thoughtful instructional design principles, such as scaffolding and chunking, to ensure that VR-based learning is effective and manageable for students.

2.5 Challenges and Barriers to VR Adoption

While VR offers promising educational opportunities, its integration into mainstream education faces several challenges. One of the primary barriers is the cost of VR technology, including the hardware (e.g., headsets and controllers) and the development of VR content. As noted by Pantelidis (2010), the financial burden associated with VR systems can limit access, particularly in underfunded educational institutions. Additionally, educators may lack the technical expertise required to integrate VR into their curricula effectively. Redondo, Fonseca, Sánchez, and Navarro (2020) underscore the importance of providing teachers with adequate training and support to overcome this challenge.

Another obstacle is the need for curriculum alignment. Incorporating VR into traditional curricula requires careful planning and adaptation to ensure that the virtual experiences are pedagogically sound and align with learning objectives (Hew & Cheung, 2010). Without proper integration, VR runs the risk of becoming a novelty rather than a meaningful learning tool. Furthermore, VR's immersive nature raises concerns regarding accessibility for students with physical or sensory impairments, an issue that requires further research and development to address (Pinker, 2019).

3. Methodology

A mixed-methods approach was employed to comprehensively evaluate the impact of VR integration in natural science courses. This approach combines quantitative methods, such as pre-and post-tests, with qualitative methods, including observations, interviews, and focus groups. The mixed-methods design provides a holistic understanding of VR's educational impact and user experiences.

3.1 Participant Selection

Participants for this study included middle and high school students enrolled in natural science courses across three educational institutions. Age Range: 12-15 years
Course Enrollment: Currently enrolled in biology, chemistry, or earth science courses
Voluntary Participation: Students and their guardians provided informed consent for participation in the study. The sample consisted of 50 students, with an even distribution across the participating institutions to ensure diversity and representativeness.

3.2 VR Content Development

Developing VR content tailored to the natural science curriculum involved educators, VR developers, and subject matter experts collaborating. Curriculum Analysis: Identifying key concepts and topics in the natural science curriculum that would benefit from VR integration. Storyboarding: Creating detailed storyboards for VR experiences that align with the identified curriculum topics. Storyboards included visualizations, interactions, and learning objectives. VR Development: Using VR development platforms (e.g., Unity, Unreal Engine) to create immersive experiences based on storyboards. These experiences included virtual labs, simulations, and interactive 3D models. Content Validation: Engaging subject matter experts to review and validate the VR content for accuracy and educational relevance.

3.3 Implementation Process

The VR integration was implemented over a 12-week period with the following steps:

Pre-Implementation Training: Conduct training sessions for educators on how to use VR equipment and integrate VR experiences into their teaching. Training included technical aspects and pedagogical strategies.

Baseline Data Collection: Administering pre-tests to assess students' prior knowledge and understanding of the selected natural science topics.

VR Sessions: Implementing VR sessions as part of the regular curriculum. Each VR session was designed to complement traditional teaching methods, with students alternating between VR experiences and conventional classroom activities.

Facilitation and Support: Providing ongoing technical support and pedagogical guidance to educators throughout the implementation period.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

Data collection involved a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to capture a comprehensive picture of the impact of VR integration:

Pre- and Post-Tests: Administering standardized tests before and after the VR integration period to measure changes in students' knowledge and understanding of natural science topics.

Observations: Conduct classroom observations to document student engagement, interaction with VR content, and overall classroom dynamics during VR sessions. Interviews and Focus Groups: Conduct semi-structured interviews and focus groups with students and educators to gather insights into their experiences, perceptions, and feedback on the VR integration.

Surveys: Administering surveys to students and educators to collect quantitative data on their attitudes, motivation, and satisfaction with the VR-enhanced learning experience. Usage Analytics: Collect data from the VR platforms on usage patterns, including time spent on VR activities, interaction frequency, and completion rates of VR modules.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data collected from various sources were analyzed using both statistical and thematic analysis methods:

Quantitative Analysis: Pre- and post-test scores were analyzed using paired t-tests to determine the statistical significance of knowledge gains. Survey data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics (e.g., ANOVA) to explore differences in attitudes and satisfaction across different groups.

Qualitative Analysis: Interview and focus group transcripts, along with observational notes, were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring themes, patterns, and insights related to the VR learning experience.

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments. This research is sponsored by the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan, R.O.C. under Grant No. NSTC 112-2410-H-415-028.

References

Chang, K.-E., Chen, Y.-L., Lin, H.-C., & Sung, Y.-T. (2016). Improving the learning of chemistry practical skills and theoretical knowledge through virtual reality: A case study. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 25(5), 843-857. doi:10.1007/s10956-016-9631-3

Cheng, X., Li, Q., Zeng, Y., & Su, Y. (2020). A virtual reality-based English language learning model for university students. Interactive Learning Environments, 28(3), 334-349.

Hew, K. F., & Cheung, W. S. (2010). Use of three-dimensional (3-D) immersive virtual worlds in K-12 and higher education settings: A review of the research. British Journal of Educational Technology, 41(1), 33-55.

Huang, H. M., Rauch, U., & Liaw, S. S. (2010). Investigating learners' attitudes toward virtual reality learning environments: Based on a constructivist approach. Computers & Education, 55(3), 1171-1182.

Jensen, L., & Konradsen, F. (2018). A review of the use of virtual reality head-mounted displays in education and training. Education and Information Technologies, 23(4), 1515-1529.

Krokos, E., Plaisant, C., & Varshney, A. (2019). Virtual memory palaces: immersion aids recall. Virtual Reality, 23(1), 1-15.

Makransky, G., & Lilleholt, L. (2018). A structural equation modeling investigation of the emotional value of immersive virtual reality in education. Educational Technology Research and Development, 66(5), 1141-1164.

Makransky, G., Terkildsen, T. S., & Mayer, R. E. (2019). Adding immersive virtual reality to a science lab simulation causes more presence but less learning. Learning and Instruction, 60, 225-236.

Merchant, Z., Goetz, E. T., Cifuentes, L., Keeney-Kennicutt, W., & Davis, T. J. (2014). Effectiveness of virtual reality-based instruction on students' learning outcomes in K-12 and higher education: A meta-analysis. Computers & Education, 70, 29-40.

Pantelidis, V. S. (2010). Reasons to use virtual reality in education and training courses and a model to determine when to use virtual reality. Themes in Science and Technology Education, 2(1), 59-70.

Pinker, S. (2019). The impact of virtual reality on accessible learning. Journal of Educational Media, 44(4), 365-377.

Radianti, J., Majchrzak, T. A., Fromm, J., & Wohlgenannt, I. (2020). A systematic review of immersive virtual reality applications for higher education: Design elements, lessons learned, and research agenda. Computers & Education, 147, 103778.

Redondo, E., Fonseca, D., Sánchez, A., & Navarro, I. (2020). Augmented reality and mobile devices as pedagogical tools for 3D architectural visualization. Education Sciences, 10(1), 15.

Makransky, G., Terkildsen, T. S., & Mayer, R. E. (2019). Adding immersive virtual reality to a science lab simulation causes more presence but less learning. Learning and Instruction, 60, 225-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.12.007

Merchant, Z., Goetz, E. T., Cifuentes, L., Keeney-Kennicutt, W., & Davis, T. J. (2014). Effectiveness of virtual reality-based instruction on students' learning outcomes in K-12 and higher education: A meta-analysis. Computers & Education, 70, 29-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.07.033

Sanchez, J., Zhang, G., & Barreiro, C. (2017). Bridging Educational Gaps with Virtual Reality: Applications in Remote and Underserved Areas. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 20(2), 254-267.