

Συνέδρια της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Ένωσης Τεχνολογιών Πληροφορίας & Επικοινωνιών στην Εκπαίδευση

Τόμ. 1 (2010)

7ο Πανελλήνιο Συνέδριο ΕΤΠΕ «Οι ΤΠΕ στην Εκπαίδευση»



Measuring presence in a collaborative physics learning activity in Second Life

Ioannis Vrellis, Nikiforos M. Papachristos, Antonis Natsis, Tassos A. Mikropoulos

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Vrellis, I., Papachristos, N. M., Natsis, A., & Mikropoulos, T. A. (2023). Measuring presence in a collaborative physics learning activity in Second Life. *Συνέδρια της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Ένωσης Τεχνολογιών Πληροφορίας & Επικοινωνιών στην Εκπαίδευση*, 1, 095–102. ανακτήθηκε από <https://eproceedings.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/cetpe/article/view/4930>

Measuring presence in a collaborative physics learning activity in Second Life

Ioannis Vrellis, Nikiforos M. Papachristos, Antonis Natsis, Tassos A. Mikropoulos

ivrellis@uoi.gr, npapachr@grads.uoi.gr, anatsis@cc.uoi.gr, amikrop@uoi.gr

Department of Primary Education, University of Ioannina, Greece

Abstract

Multi-user virtual environments (MUVES) are surrounded by hype regarding their impact on and potential in education. Many issues regarding the educational affordances of MUVES and the learning experience of users are still under research. Presence is an important phenomenon users experience when interacting with and via virtual environments and seems to play an important role in learning. This paper presents empirical data gathered from an exploratory study regarding a problem-based physics learning activity in Second Life (SL). Our aim is to gain knowledge and experience about the sense of presence (spatial and social) that emerges while students collaborate in MUVES. Students (n=30) collaborated “in-world” in order to solve a problem. Data were gathered using the Temple Presence Inventory (TPI) questionnaire. Results indicate higher scores of social presence than spatial presence. Correlations were found between dimensions of presence, subjective computer expertise and tendency to become involved in activities.

Keywords: multi-user virtual environments, Second Life, spatial presence, social presence, physics

Introduction

Following Dede’s description of “‘Alice-in-Wonderland’ multi-user virtual environments interfaces” that would “shape how people learn” (2002), nowadays, *Multi-user virtual environments* (MUVES) are being surrounded by hype regarding their impact on and potential in education. Their support to constructivist approaches to teaching and learning seems to be of major importance for educators and researchers. MUVES can provide rich learning experiences, enhance the sense of (social) presence of learners, and allow multifaceted interaction.

Some MUVES have been designed specifically for educational use, like *River City*, a MUVES fostering inquiry-based learning (Ketelhut et al., 2006), *AquaMoose3D*, a graphical MUVES for mathematics learning (Edwards, Elliott, & Bruckman, 2001), and *Quest Atlantis*, a 3D multi-user environment which engages children in educational tasks (Barab et al., 2005). On the other hand, general-purpose MUVES are more widely utilized in many educational settings and domains of subject matter. *Second Life*® (SL) seems to be the most popular MUVES among educators. In higher education, SL has attracted a great deal of attention, with over 400 academic institutions holding a virtual presence in it (Campusin3D.com, n.d.), more and more official courses are being offered “in-world” and classes are taught in architecture, English as a second language, science, engineering, law, computer science, history, arts, etc (Calgone & Hiles, 2008). SL is a persistent (24/7) computer-generated virtual world with no pre made content. Rather, its residents are creating the content. It is a

platform with open-ended possibilities which can be utilized to develop educational virtual environments and to design learning activities.

As often happens when hype prevails, there are many issues regarding the educational affordances of MUVES that are still under-reported such as how educators design learning activities, with specific learning goals to be conducted in MUVES and even less data comes from empirical studies related to instructional design and pedagogy in MUVES. A very important and unique characteristic of educational virtual environments (Mikropoulos, 2006) that seems to play an important role in learning (Winn & Windschitl, 2000; Selverian & Lombard, in press) and is also not well reported, is the sense of spatial and social presence that emerges when humans interact with and via a virtual environment.

Presence is a central conceptual phenomenon related to virtual environments, which Lombard & Ditton (1997) excellently described as “the perceptual illusion of non-mediation”, the phenomenon where a person fails to perceive or acknowledge that a mediated experience is mediated. A major branch of presence conceptualization defines presence as consisting of two interrelated phenomena: spatial presence (also known as physical presence or telepresence) and social presence (Heeter, 1992; Biocca, 1997; Ijsselstein et al., 2000; Biocca & Harms, 2002; Biocca, Harms & Burgoon, 2003). Spatial presence refers to “the sense of being physically located somewhere” (Ijsselstein et al., 2000) while social presence refers to “being with others” in a mediated environment (Heeter, 1992). Many factors have been suggested as possibly affecting the sense of presence, including media form factors, content factors and user characteristics (Ijsselstein et al., 2000). Presence measuring is following two major methodological strands, subjective measuring and objective-physiological measuring, but it seems that subjective post-test ratings are the most widely used methods to approach presence measuring. Among others, the following questionnaires have been developed to access presence: the Slater-Usoh-Steed (SUS) Questionnaire (Slater, Usoh & Steed, 1994), the Presence Questionnaire (PQ) (Witmer & Singer, 1998), the Igroup Presence Questionnaire (Schubert, Friedmann & Regenbrecht, 2001) and the Temple Presence Inventory (Lombard, Ditton & Weinstein, 2009).

This work is part of a research project that aims at designing learning activities in order to study learning in MUVES in terms of learning outcomes, collaboration and presence.

In the first study of this project (Vrellis et al., 2010) an authentic, collaborative learning activity concerning light reflection was designed and developed in Second Life. First results concern educational environment design issues, collaboration and instructional issues.

Regarding design issues, students prefer to perform the whole learning activity in the educational virtual environment. That is, they want “in-world” intuitive object manipulation, educational material and tools that work in the environment, instead of “out of world” dialogue menus, browsers and tools that could distract their attention from the environment and learning activity. Even though virtual environments allow object manipulation at user’s will (all degrees of freedom), restricting degrees of freedom to the necessary ones, depending on the specific instructional design and educational scenario, has no negative effect on creating an engaging authentic learning task. Moreover, students prefer to perform activities in settings relevant to the specific educational scenario, even out of the conventional ‘classroom representation’ setting.

As far as collaboration is concerned, results show that participating in collaborative learning activities conducted in MUVES is very important for their education and they evaluated positively the presence of a tutor in the activity. They felt that they could interact with the other participants and evaluated their experience as interactive and sociable.

Students prefer to collaborate through rich communication channels that do not filter out important non verbal communication signals.

Finally, concerning instructional issues the study reveals that pedagogical methods of constructivist approach, like scaffolding, can be implemented in SL through properly designed problem-based learning activities

This paper presents empirical data gathered from a study regarding a problem-based physics learning activity in SL. Our aim is to gain knowledge and experience about the sense of presence (spatial and social) that emerges while students collaborate in MUVES. This study is a step towards the investigation of the relationship between learning outcomes and presence.

Method

Virtual Environment and Learning Activity

The virtual environment was designed and developed in SL. It refers to physics learning and specifically to the reflection of light. The design of the learning activity followed a constructivist approach (Vrellis et al., 2010). The problem posed to the students presents an authentic task in a “real” world environment. Students had to collaborate in order to shoot an apple down from a tree using a laser beam and a plane mirror. They had to calculate the correct angle of the mirror in order to reflect the laser beam to the apple. Students were not allowed to use a trial and error approach. Instead, they had to use trigonometry for the calculation of the correct angle before shooting. Several virtual tools, such as rulers, a calculator, a whiteboard and posters presenting relevant mathematics content were available to the students (Fig. 1).




Figure 1. The activity setting

Subjects

Thirty (30) second-year, future teacher students (22 women, 8 men) of the University of Ioannina, participated in the study. They all were experienced users of SL, since they had

attended a class on potential educational uses of SL. Their participation was voluntary. The students registered in pairs for the collaborative activity.

Procedure

The empirical data was gathered from 15 sessions where a pair of students and the tutor participated. They were physically located in three different rooms and collaborated exclusively through SL. Each session lasted about 40 minutes. Before the experiment, the students answered a personal questionnaire on demographics, computer and 3D-VR games experience, tendency to become involved in activities and previous knowledge related to light reflection and trigonometry.

Participants used their personal SL accounts and avatars to log in and were teleported to the Educational Approaches to Virtual Reality Technologies Lab's island in SL (Earthlab Education Island). There, they met the tutor who guided them to the activity's setting. The students and tutor communicated via the SL voice and text chat and their screens, microphones and webcams data was recorded.

The tutor made a brief introduction to the topic under study in a virtual classroom. There, the students familiarized with the use of the available educational material and virtual objects and tools. After that, the participants walked outside the classroom, where the activity setting was located. The tutor posed the problem the students had to solve collaboratively and let them work, remaining nearby available to provide assistance.

After finishing the activity, the students answered a questionnaire measuring presence and took part in a debriefing interview with the tutor.

The presence questionnaire used was the Temple Presence Inventory (TPI) that measures multiple dimensions of presence (Lombard et al, 2009).

Results

Table 1 shows the results from the spatial presence part of the TPI questionnaire.

Table 1. Spatial presence

| Question | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|--|------------|------------|-------------|------------------|
| How much did it seem as if the objects and people you saw/heard had come to the place you were? | 1 | 7 | 4.37 | 1.771 |
| How much did it seem as if you could reach out and touch the objects or people you saw/heard? | 1 | 7 | 4.40 | 1.734 |
| How often when an object seemed to be headed toward you did you want to move to get out of its way? | 1 | 7 | 3.50 | 1.815 |
| To what extent did you experience a sense of being there inside the environment you saw/heard? | 2 | 7 | 4.77 | 1.591 |
| To what extent did it seem that sounds came from specific different locations? | 1 | 7 | 3.93 | 1.791 |
| How often did you want to or try to touch something you saw/heard? | 1 | 7 | 4.13 | 1.795 |
| Did the experience seem more like looking at the events/people on a movie screen or more like looking at the events/people through a window? | 1 | 7 | 4.60 | 1.958 |

The overall score for spatial presence is 4.25 (SD 1.258). This value is little above the average indicating a moderate sense of spatial presence in the MUVE. This result is rather expected. SL is a desktop virtual environment that does not exploit all the available VR technologies. High scores of spatial presence are usually associated with highly immersive virtual environments.

Table 2 presents the results from the social presence – actor within medium (parasocial interaction) part of the TPI questionnaire. “In a parasocial interaction media users respond to social cues presented by persons they encounter within a medium even though it is illogical to do so” (Lombard et al., 2000). The overall score for social presence is 5.29 (SD 0.837). The score is higher than that for spatial presence. This can be attributed to the nature of SL as a multiuser virtual environment that enables social interaction and collaboration, as well as to the nature of our learning activity.

Table 2. Social presence

| Question | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|--|-----|-----|------|-----------|
| How often did you have the sensation that people you saw/heard could also see/hear you? | 1 | 7 | 5.50 | 1.480 |
| To what extent did you feel you could interact with the person or people you saw/heard? | 4 | 7 | 5.63 | 0.928 |
| How much did it seem as if you and the people you saw/heard both left the places where you were and went to a new place? | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 1.561 |
| How much did it seem as if you and the people you saw/heard were together in the same place? | 2 | 7 | 5.50 | 1.383 |
| How often did it feel as if someone you saw/heard in the environment was talking directly to you? | 3 | 7 | 5.70 | 1.291 |
| How often did you want to or did you make eye-contact with someone you saw/heard? | 1 | 7 | 4.57 | 1.455 |
| Seeing and hearing a person through a medium constitutes an interaction with him or her. How much control over the interaction with the person or people you saw/heard did you feel you had? | 3 | 7 | 5.47 | 1.279 |

Table 3 shows the results from the questions concerning social richness. Social richness as a dimension of presence is the extent to which users perceive the virtual environment, when it is used to interact with others, as sociable, warm, sensitive, personal or intimate (Lombard et al., 2000). The overall score for social richness is 5.63 (SD 0.990). The score is well above the average. Specifically, the students found their experience as highly responsive (6.20, SD 0.925) and lively (6.00, SD 1.259).

Table 4 presents the mean values for social realism. The social realism questions evaluate whether the portrayed events would or could occur in the real world. The overall score for social richness is 5.48 (SD 1.225). This score is also high and in accordance with the previous two social dimensions of presence (social presence and social richness). Engagement with the learning activity is an important parameter that contributes to learning outcomes regardless of whether the learning environment is mediated or not.

Table 5 shows the results concerning the engagement of students in the experience. The overall score for engagement is 5.42 (SD 1.049). It is remarkable that students found the story (activity) very engaging (6.37, SD 0.928). This result indicates that the instruction design based on constructivist approaches incorporating authentic tasks engage students in the learning activity.

Table 3. Social richness

| Question | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|-----|-----|------|-----------|
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Remote - Immediate | 3 | 7 | 5.83 | 1.147 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Unemotional- Emotional | 1 | 7 | 4.87 | 1.548 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Unresponsive - Responsive | 4 | 7 | 6.20 | 0.925 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Dead - Lively | 3 | 7 | 6.00 | 1.259 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Impersonal - Personal | 1 | 7 | 5.60 | 1.404 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Insensitive - Sensitive | 1 | 7 | 5.07 | 1.438 |
| Please circle the number that best describes your evaluation of the media experience: Unsociable - Sociable | 3 | 7 | 5.83 | 0.986 |

Table 4. Social realism

| Question | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|-----|-----|------|-----------|
| The events I saw/heard would occur in the real world | 3 | 7 | 5.53 | 1.383 |
| The events I saw/heard could occur in the real world | 1 | 7 | 5.72 | 1.412 |
| The way in which the events I saw/heard occurred is a lot like the way they occur in the real world | 2 | 7 | 5.20 | 1.400 |

Table 5. Engagement (mental immersion)

| Question | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|--|-----|-----|------|-----------|
| To what extent did you feel mentally immersed in the experience? | 2 | 7 | 5.13 | 1.456 |
| How involving was the experience? | 3 | 7 | 5.80 | 1.157 |
| How completely were your senses engaged? | 2 | 7 | 5.00 | 1.390 |
| To what extent did you experience a sensation of reality? | 1 | 7 | 4.93 | 1.507 |
| How relaxing or exciting was the experience? | 1 | 7 | 5.27 | 1.639 |
| How engaging was the story? | 3 | 7 | 6.37 | 0.928 |

Below some of the statistically significant correlations found between the variables are presented.

Table 6 shows the correlations between engagement and various components of presence. It is clear that engagement and other dimensions of presence are strongly correlated. This implies that an engaging constructivist learning activity can increase the sense of presence of the learner. Other interesting findings were the negative correlations between (subjective) computer expertise and the sense of spatial presence ($r=-0.384$, $p<.05$) and engagement ($r=-0.437$, $p<.05$). This would imply that the more experienced a user considers herself in computer usage, the more difficult it is for her to feel present in the MUVE. Nevertheless this finding should be regarded cautiously since no significant correlations between other subtypes of computer expertise (internet, video-games, virtual environments, SL) and presence or engagement were found.

Table 6. Engagement and presence correlations

| Engagement (mental immersion) | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Spatial_Presence | Pearson Correlation | 0.587 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.01 |
| Social_Presence | Pearson Correlation | 0.643 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.01 |
| Social_Richness | Pearson Correlation | 0.739 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.01 |
| Social Realism | Pearson Correlation | 0.487 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.01 |

Table 7 shows that some variables indicating the user's tendency to become involved in activities are correlated with her sense of spatial presence.

Table 7. Tendency to become involved in activities and spatial presence

| Spatial Presence | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------|
| I concentrate well also on disagreeable tasks | Pearson Correlation | 0.407 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.05 |
| Sometimes I am so involved in a game that having the impression of being part of the game rather than moving a joystick or watching the screen | Pearson Correlation | 0.440 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.05 |
| I have been scared by something happening on a TV show or in a Movie | Pearson Correlation | 0.522 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | < 0.01 |

Conclusions

This paper presents empirical data about the sense of presence (spatial and social) gathered from a study regarding a collaborative problem-based physics learning activity in SL. Even though exploratory studies like this tend to generate more questions than they answer, first results suggest that constructivist collaborative learning activities in a multiuser virtual environment like SL have the potential to engage students. Furthermore, the social dimensions of presence scored well above average while spatial presence remained average, which is rather expected because SL is a socially oriented multiuser virtual environment based on non-immersive desktop technology. Moreover, strong positive correlations between engagement and other dimensions of presence were observed, while subjective computer expertise seemed to be negatively correlated to spatial presence and engagement, although these findings should be regarded with caution. Finally, the users' tendency to become involved in activities seems to be related to the sense of spatial presence she experiences in MUVE-like environments.

The above results constitute a basis and also a motivation towards the investigation of the relationship between presence and learning outcomes from learning activities in SL.

Our next step towards this investigation includes the analysis of screen, webcam and voice recordings in order to assess qualitative aspects of presence and collaboration.

References

- Barab, S., Thomas, M., Dodge, T., Carteaux, R., & Tuzun, H. (2005). Making learning fun: Quest Atlantis, a game without guns, *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(1), 86-108.

- Biocca, F. (1997). The Cyborg's dilemma: progressive embodiment in virtual environments. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(2).
- Biocca, F., & Harms, C. (2002). Defining and measuring social presence: Contribution to the Networked Minds Theory and Measure. *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual International Workshop PRESENCE 2002* (pp. 7-36).
- Biocca, F., Harms, C., & Burgoon, J. K. (2003). Toward a more robust theory and measure of social presence: Review and suggested criteria. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 12(5), 456-480.
- Calgone, C., & Hiles, J. (2008). *Blended Realities: A virtual tour of education in Second Life*. Retrieved Jan 3, 2010 from <http://edumuve.com/blended/BlendedRealitiesCalongneHiles.pdf>.
- Campusin3D.com. (n.d.). *Second Life*. Retrieved Jan 3, 2010 from <http://www.campusin3d.com/en/second-life>
- Dede, C. (2002). Vignettes about the future of learning technologies. In *2020 visions: Transforming education and training through advanced technologies* (pp. 18-25), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Edwards, E., Elliott, J., & Bruckman, A. (2001). AquaMoose 3D: math learning in a 3D multi-user virtual world. *ACM CHI 2001 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Seattle, Washington, USA.
- Heeter, C. (1992). Being there: the subjective experience of presence. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 1(2), 262-271.
- Ijsselstein, W. A., Ridder, H. d., Freeman, J., & Avons, S. E. (2000). Presence: concept, determinants, and measurement. *Proceedings of the SPIE, Human Vision and Electronic Imaging* (pp. 520-529). San Jose.
- Ketelhut, D. J., Dede, C., Clarke, J., & Nelson, B. (2006). A multi-user virtual environment for building higher order inquiry skills in science. *Proceedings of the American Educational Research Association Conference*. San Francisco: CA, USA.
- Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the Heart of It All: The Concept of Presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(2).
- Lombard, M., Ditton, T. B., Crane, D., Davis, B., Gil-Egui, G., Horvath, K., Rossman, J., & Park, S. (2000). Measuring presence: A literature-based approach to the development of a standardized paper-and-pencil instrument. *Third International Workshop on Presence*, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Lombard, M., Ditton, T. B., & Weinstein, L. (2009). *Measuring presence: The Temple Presence Inventory (TPI)*. Retrieved on November 20, 2009 from http://astro.temple.edu/~tuc16417/papers/Lombard_et_al.pdf
- Mikropoulos, T. A. (2006). Presence: A unique characteristic in educational virtual environments. *Virtual Reality, special issue 'Using Virtual Reality in Education'*, 10(3-4), 197-206
- Schubert, T., Friedmann, F., & Regenbrecht, H. (2001). The experience of presence: Factor analytic insights. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 10, 266-281.
- Selverian, M. E., & Lombard, M. (in press). A 'real' component in a model to make human-computer interface factors meaningful in the virtual learning environment. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*.
- Slater, M., Usoh, M., & Steed, A. (1994). Depth of presence in virtual environments. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 3, 130-144.
- Vrellis, I., Papachristos, N. M., Bellou, J., Avouris, N., & Mikropoulos, T. A. (2010). Designing a collaborative learning activity in Second Life: An exploratory study in physics. *Proceedings of the 10th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*, Sousse, Tunisia.
- Winn, W. D., & Windschitl, M. (2000). Learning science in virtual environments: the interplay of theory and experience. *Themes in Education*, 1(4), 373-389.
- Witmer, B., & Singer, M. (1998). Measuring presence in virtual environments: A presence questionnaire. *Presence*, 7(3), 225-240.