Journal for Re Attach Therapy and Developmental Diversities
eISSN: 2589-7799
2023 August; 6 (9s2): 1366-1377

# Virtual Reality in Education: An Investigation of its Effectiveness in Enhancing Learning Outcomes in Higher Education

**Mohammed Abdullatif AlMulla [1], Sayed Ibrahim Ali [2*]**
Associate Professor, College of Education, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia.
Assistant Professor, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia.
*Correspondence: seali@kfu.edu.sa

Received: 24- August -2023
Revised: 27-August -2023
Accepted: 27-September-2023

**Abstract**:
**Background**: Virtual reality (VR) technology has gained increasing attention for its potential to enhance teaching and learning through immersive and experiential simulations. However, research on its impact in higher education contexts remains limited.
**Objective**: This study aimed to investigate the influence of VR-based learning on student learning outcomes and explore student attitudes toward VR technology compared to traditional instruction.
**Methods**: A quasi-experimental design was utilized with 60 higher education students randomly assigned to a VR group (n=30) or control group (n=30). The VR group learned through immersive VR simulations while the control group received traditional teaching. Pretest-posttest assessments measured learning outcomes. Surveys evaluated student attitudes and experiences.
**Results**: The VR group showed substantially greater gains on posttest performance versus the control group ($p<0.001$). Surveys revealed positive student attitudes toward VR technology, with most finding it effective, engaging, and enjoyable. However, some students reported challenges navigating VR.
**Conclusion**: VR-based learning appears to significantly enhance higher education students' learning outcomes and foster positive perceptions compared to traditional instruction alone. However, optimal integration requires addressing accessibility barriers and aligning VR with pedagogical goals. Further research should investigate long-term impacts, ideal design features, and effective implementation strategies.
**Keywords**: Virtual Reality, VR-based learning, learning outcomes, student attitudes, educational technology

## 1. Introduction:

Over the past decade, Virtual Reality (VR) technology has experienced significant advancements, revolutionized various industries and opening up new possibilities in the field of education(Hamad & Jia, 2022). The immersive and interactive nature of VR presents a promising avenue for transforming traditional teaching methods and revolutionizing the way students learn(Al-Ansi et al., 2023).
The evolution of VR technology has made it more accessible and affordable, enabling educational institutions to incorporate it into their teaching practices(Marks & Thomas, 2022). By creating simulated environments and interactive experiences, VR provides learners with a unique opportunity to engage with educational content in a more immersive and realistic manner(Rubio-Tamayo et al., 2017). This enhanced level of immersion has the potential to captivate students' attention, foster active participation, and ultimately improve their learning outcomes(Box, 2019).
One of the key advantages of virtual reality in education is its ability to create experiential learning opportunities(Asad et al., 2021). VR simulations can transport students to places they might otherwise not have access to, such as historical sites, faraway countries, or even outer space(Nassar et al., 2021). This allows learners to gain firsthand experiences, explore different perspectives, and develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter (Al-Jubouri et al., 2021; Plotzky et al., 2021). For example, a history class studying ancient civilizations can virtually visit archaeological sites, walk through ancient cities, and interact with virtual artifacts, providing a more engaging and memorable learning experience(Cecotti, 2022).
Moreover, virtual reality can facilitate the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills(Ikhsan et al., 2020). Through VR simulations, students can actively engage in scenarios that require decision-making and problem-solving, allowing them to apply theoretical knowledge in practical contexts(Kamińska et al., 2019). For

instance, in a science class, students can conduct virtual experiments, manipulate variables, and observe the outcomes, enabling them to understand scientific concepts through hands-on exploration(C.-C. Liu et al., 2022). This active learning approach stimulates students' cognitive abilities, encourages analytical thinking, and enhances their ability to transfer knowledge to real-world situations(Harris & Bacon, 2019).

In addition to enhancing cognitive skills, virtual reality in education caters to diverse learning styles. Traditional classroom settings often struggle to accommodate the individual needs and preferences of students with varying learning styles(C. J. Chen et al., 2005). VR technology offers a customizable learning experience where visual learners can benefit from immersive visualizations, auditory learners can immerse themselves in realistic soundscapes, and kinesthetic learners can engage in hands-on interactions within virtual environments(Slater et al., 2009). By tailoring the learning experience to individual learning styles, virtual reality can improve comprehension, retention, and overall academic performance(Gomes et al., 2020).

Virtual reality (VR) has the potential to greatly enhance learning outcomes by providing a multi-sensory experience that engages students in active and immersive learning(Coban et al., 2022). This investigation focuses on exploring how VR can positively impact learning outcomes and improve students' understanding of complex subjects(Young et al., 2020).

One of the key advantages of VR is its ability to create realistic and interactive simulations. By placing students in virtual environments that replicate real-life scenarios, VR allows them to actively participate and engage in hands-on experiences(Radianti et al., 2020). For example, students can explore the inner workings of cells or witness chemical reactions up close through VR simulations. By actively interacting with virtual objects and environments, students can develop a deeper understanding of the subject matter as they observe cause-and-effect relationships and engage in critical thinking(Hu-Au & Okita, 2021).

The immersive nature of VR also plays a significant role in promoting engagement, motivation, and knowledge retention(Essoe et al., 2022). Traditional classroom lectures often rely on passive learning methods, where students passively absorb information without actively participating in the learning process(Gulnaz et al., 2015). In contrast, VR provides an experiential and interactive learning environment that grabs students' attention and keeps them engaged(Edstrand et al., 2023). When students feel a sense of presence and agency within a virtual environment, they become more motivated to explore and learn. The active involvement in VR experiences fosters a deeper connection with the material, leading to improved knowledge retention and recall(Guerra-Tamez, 2023). Furthermore, VR simulations can present students with complex and abstract concepts in a more tangible and understandable way. For subjects that are challenging to visualize or require spatial understanding, VR can bridge the gap by creating visual representations and interactive models(J. Chen et al., 2020).

Another advantage of VR in enhancing learning outcomes is its ability to create a safe and controlled learning environment for experimentation and problem-solving. Students can engage in virtual experiments without the RISK of accidents or the need for expensive equipment(J. Y. W. Liu et al., 2023). They can explore different variables, test hypotheses, and observe the outcomes in real time. This hands-on approach to learning promotes critical thinking and problem-solving skills, as students analyze data, make connections, and draw conclusions based on their virtual experiments(Hasanah & Malik, 2020). VR simulations can also present students with challenging scenarios that require them to think critically and make informed decisions, helping them develop important problem-solving skills that can be applied in real-world situations(Koukourikos et al., 2021).

**Aim Of The Study**

The aim of the study is to investigate the impact of VR-based learning on student learning outcomes and explore student attitudes toward VR technology in higher education.

**Research Questions:**

1. What is the impact of virtual reality (VR)-based learning on student learning outcomes compared to traditional instruction among student of higher education?
2. How do higher education students perceive and evaluate the virtual reality learning experience?
3. What are the attitudes of higher education students towards integrating VR technology into educational settings?

## 2. Subject And Method

### 2.1. Research Design:

Quasi-Experimental Design: This study utilized a quasi-experimental design to compare the learning outcomes of participants exposed to virtual reality (VR) with those who receive traditional instruction.

### 2.2. Participants:

In this quasi-experimental study, a total of 60 students from King Faisal University, Alahsa, Saudi Arabia were selected as participants. The participants were recruited from various academic disciplines within the university to ensure a diverse representation.

The selection process involved reaching out to potential participants through university communication channels, such as email lists, online forums, and bulletin boards. Interested students were asked to voluntarily sign up for the study, ensuring their informed consent.

The inclusion criteria for participation in the study were as follows: (1) being enrolled as a full-time student at the university, (2) having no prior experience with the specific virtual reality (VR) technology used in the study, and (3) being available for the duration of the study. After screening the interested students based on the inclusion criteria, a final sample of 60 participants was established. The participants were randomly assigned to either the VR group or the control group.

### 2.3. Experiment Groups Design:

1. Virtual Reality (VR) Group:

- Participants assigned to the VR group experienced the learning interventions through virtual reality technology.
- Prior to the study, the VR group received an orientation session to familiarize them with the VR equipment and software. They were provided with instructions on how to navigate the virtual environments and interact with the content.
- The VR group engaged in VR-based learning activities designed to align with the study's learning objectives. These activities incorporated interactive simulations, virtual laboratories, 3D models.
- The participants in the VR group had access to VR headsets, motion controllers, and any other necessary equipment to fully immerse themselves in the virtual environments.
- The VR group received the same amount of instructional time and content exposure as the Control group, ensuring that the overall learning experience was equivalent.

2. Control Group:

- Participants assigned to the Control group received traditional instruction using conventional methods.
- The Control group followed a curriculum or instructional plan that mirrored the content covered in the VR group.
- Traditional instructional methods used in the Control group may have included lectures, textbooks, online learning platforms, classroom discussions, or other common educational approaches.

Both the VR group and the Control group were subject to the same pretest and posttest assessments to measure their learning outcomes. The study design aimed to isolate the impact of the virtual reality technology itself on learning outcomes by comparing it to a control condition that did not involve virtual reality.

### 2.4. Data collections:

1. Pretest Assessment:

- Before the instructional interventions began, all participants, both in the VR group and the Control group, were administered a pretest assessment.
- The pretest aimed to evaluate the participants' initial knowledge and skills related to the unified teaching subjects. It served as a baseline measurement to compare with the posttest results.
- The pretest consisted of a series of questions or tasks that assessed the participants' understanding of key concepts, problem-solving abilities, or any specific skills relevant to the study's learning objectives.

2. Instructional Interventions:

- The participants in the VR group engaged in VR-based learning activities, while the Control group received traditional instruction using conventional methods.
- The instructional interventions were designed to cover the unified teaching subjects and were structured to meet the learning objectives of the study.

- The VR group experienced immersive and interactive virtual reality environments, while the Control group followed a curriculum or instructional plan that included lectures, textbooks, online materials, or other traditional teaching resources.
- Both groups received an equal amount of instructional time to ensure fairness in exposure to the learning content.

3. Posttest Assessment:

- After the completion of the instructional interventions, all participants, both in the VR group and the Control group, underwent a posttest assessment.
- The posttest aimed to measure the participants' learning outcomes and assess their knowledge acquisition and skill development in the unified teaching subjects.
- The posttest assessment consisted of performance-based evaluations that aligned with the learning objectives and covered the content taught during the instructional interventions.
- The posttest assessment was designed to be comparable between the VR group and the Control group, ensuring that both groups were evaluated using similar criteria.

4. Data Collection Instruments:

- The data collection instruments used in this study included both objective and subjective measures to capture a comprehensive view of the learning outcomes.
- Objective measures: These included performance metrics obtained from the pretest and posttest assessments. Objective measures provided quantitative data on the participants' learning progress and score of total grades of 100 and allowed for statistical analysis to compare the performance between the VR group and the Control group.
- Subjective measures: These included self-report surveys of attitudes, and experiences regarding the instructional interventions and the virtual reality.

2.5. **Data analysis:**

In this quasi-experimental study, the collected data was analyzed to determine the impact of virtual reality (VR) technology on enhancing learning outcomes compared to traditional instruction methods. The data analysis process involved several steps to examine the participants' performance and assess the effectiveness of VR-based learning.

1. Descriptive Analysis:

- Initially, descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize the participants' demographic information, such as age, gender, and academic majors. These statistics helped provide an overview of the sample characteristics and ensure the comparability of the experimental groups.

2. Pretest and Posttest Comparison:

- The pretest and posttest scores of both the VR group and the Control group were compared using statistical techniques to assess the learning gains within each group.
- Paired t-tests or non-parametric tests, such as the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, were employed to examine whether there were statistically significant differences in the participants' performance from pretest to posttest within each group.

3. Between-Group Analysis:

- To evaluate the effect of VR technology on learning outcomes, a between-group analysis was conducted to compare the performance of the VR group and the Control group.
- The analysis aimed to determine whether the participants exposed to VR-based learning demonstrated superior learning outcomes compared to those who received traditional instruction.

4. Statistical Software:

Statistical software SPSS version 26 have been used to conduct the data analysis and perform the relevant statistical tests. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for categorical variables, means and standard deviations were used for quantitative variables. Paired samples t test was used to compare before and after grades. Independent-samples t test was used to compare the two samples means. P-value of 0.05 was considered significant.

### 2.6. Ethical consideration:

In conducting this quasi-experimental study on the effect of virtual reality (VR) on enhancing learning outcomes, several ethical considerations were addressed. Informed consent was obtained from participants, emphasizing the voluntary nature of participation, the right to withdraw, and the confidentiality of their information. Measures were implemented to protect participant confidentiality, with data anonymization and secure storage. Efforts were made to minimize harm and risks, including providing safety guidelines for VR experiences. Fair treatment and equity were ensured through participant selection criteria and comparable group assignment.

## 3. Results

Table 1 presents demographic data for the 60 participants in the study. In terms of age distribution, 53.3% of participants fell in the 18-20 years old category, while 21.7% were in the 21-24 years old category. A smaller percentage, 10%, represented those aged 25-29 years old, and an additional 8.3% were 30 years old or older. A minority, 6.7%, were under 18 years old. Gender distribution was evenly balanced, with 50% male and 50% female participants, indicating a gender-diverse sample.

Academic status varied among the participants, with 35% in their second year, 23.3% pursuing postgraduate studies, and 20% in their first year. Meanwhile, 16.7% were in their fourth year, and 5% were in their third year. This distribution reflects the academic diversity of the sample, spanning from undergraduate to postgraduate levels. The table also includes a total row, confirming that the data accounts for the entire sample of 60 participants, facilitating clarity and verification of data accuracy.

**Table 1: Demographic data**

| **Demographic data** | **n** | **%** |
|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | |
| Under 18 years old | 4 | 6.7% |
| 18-20 years old | 32 | 53.3% |
| 21-24 years old | 13 | 21.7% |
| 25-29 years old | 6 | 10% |
| 30 years old or older | 5 | 8.3% |
| **Gender** | | |
| Male | 30 | 50% |
| Female | 30 | 50% |
| **Academic level** | | |
| First year | 12 | 20% |
| Second year | 21 | 35% |
| Third year | 3 | 5% |
| Fourth year | 10 | 16.7% |
| Postgraduate | 14 | 23.3% |
| Total | 60 | 100% |

Table 2 presents a comprehensive overview of students' attitudes toward virtual reality (VR) learning in the context of higher education. The table provides insights into various aspects of their perception and experiences with VR technology. Overall, the results indicate generally positive attitudes toward VR-based learning, with some variations in responses.

Firstly, the table reveals that a majority of students found the VR learning experience engaging and attention-holding (Mean=3.80), which aligns with the immersive nature of VR. Moreover, the majority of participants believed that VR improved their ability to retain and apply learned concepts, albeit to a slightly lesser extent

(Mean=3.23). Additionally, a substantial number of students found VR technology more immersive than traditional classroom learning, although this perception varied (Mean=3.03).

When it comes to recommendations, students generally showed a positive inclination, with a majority indicating they would recommend VR technology as a learning tool (Mean=3.13) and expressing a belief that VR should be incorporated into more educational settings (Mean=3.77).

The most striking result is the high level of agreement (SA) among students regarding the overall effectiveness of the VR learning experience in achieving intended learning outcomes (Mean=4.33). This suggests that, despite some variations in specific aspects, students overwhelmingly found VR to be highly effective for learning.

However, there were areas where students expressed reservations or had mixed opinions. For instance, some students found the VR experience challenging to use and navigate (Mean=2.60). Additionally, while most students found VR technology reliable and consistent (Mean=3.47), a minority had concerns. Similarly, while a significant number of students felt that VR provided a realistic representation of learning material (Mean=4.20) and reported feeling comfortable using it (Mean=4.00), there were some who did not share this sentiment.

The VR learning experience's ability to provide active learning opportunities (Mean=3.43) and its enjoyability compared to traditional classroom learning (Mean=4.17) received mixed responses. Finally, the collaborative aspect of VR learning had relatively lower agreement, with students divided in their opinions (Mean=2.63).

**Table 2: students' attitude toward virtual reality learning**

| Question | SD | D | N | A | SA | Mean | SD | Agreement Degree | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The virtual reality learning experience was engaging and held my attention. | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 3.80 | 1.1 | A | 6 |
| 2. The virtual reality learning experience helped me to better understand the learning material | 5 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 3.10 | 0.96 | N | 12 |
| 3. The virtual reality learning experience improved my ability to retain and apply the learned concepts. | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 3.23 | 1.02 | N | 11 |
| 4. The virtual reality learning experience was more immersive than traditional classroom learning. | 4 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 3.03 | 1.18 | N | 13 |
| 5. I would recommend virtual reality technology to other students as a learning tool. | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 3.13 | 1.3 | N | 10 |
| 6. I believe virtual reality technology should be incorporated into more educational settings. | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 3.77 | 1.33 | A | 7 |
| 7. Overall, the virtual reality learning experience was effective in achieving the intended learning outcome | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.33 | 1.43 | SA | 1 |
| 8. Did you find the virtual reality learning experience easy to use and navigate? | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 2.60 | 1.51 | N | 15 |
| 9. Was the virtual reality technology reliable and consistent throughout the course? | 5 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 3.47 | 0.59 | A | 8 |
| 10. Did the virtual reality learning experience provide a realistic representation of the learning material? | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 4.20 | 1.62 | SA | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Did you feel comfortable using the virtual reality technology? | 3 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 4.00 | 1.32 | SA | 5 |
| 12. Did you feel that the virtual reality learning experience provided a sense of presence in the learning environment | 2 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 4.07 | 1.5 | SA | 4 |
| 13. Did the virtual reality learning experience provide opportunities for active learning (e.g. problem-solving, decision-making)? | 3 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 3.43 | 1.4 | A | 9 |
| 14. Did you find the virtual reality learning experience to be more enjoyable than traditional classroom learning? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 4.17 | 1.62 | SA | 3 |
| 15. Did the virtual reality learning experience provide opportunities for collaboration with classmates or instructors? | 12 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2.63 | 1.28 | N | 14 |

The results presented in Table 3 indicate a significant difference in the pretest and posttest mean scores for both the VR Group and the Control Group, as assessed using paired t-tests. Specifically, for the VR Group, the pretest mean score was 67.3, and it significantly increased to 87.2 in the posttest ($p < 0.001$). This substantial improvement suggests that the use of virtual reality-based learning had a profound positive impact on the participants' learning outcomes, resulting in a statistically significant increase in their knowledge and skills. In contrast, the Control Group exhibited a less substantial change, with a pretest mean score of 56.4 and a posttest mean score of 58.9 ($p = 0.249$). While there was a slight improvement in the Control Group's posttest scores, it was not statistically significant.

**Table 3:Pre-test and Post-test Comparison**

| Group | Pretest Mean | Posttest Mean | p-value (Paired t-test) |
|---|---|---|---|
| VR Group(n=30) | 67.3 | 87.2 | <0.001 |
| Control Group(n=30) | 56.4 | 58.9 | 0.249 |

The results presented in Table 4 indicate a substantial and statistically significant difference in posttest mean scores between the VR group and the Control group. The VR group achieved a notably higher mean posttest score of 87.2 compared to the Control group's mean score of 58.9. This difference is highly significant, as evidenced by the p-value (<0.001) obtained from the independent-samples t-test. The p-value being less than 0.001 suggests an extremely low probability of obtaining such results by chance alone, reinforcing the robustness of the findings. These results strongly support the hypothesis that virtual reality (VR)-based learning has a significantly positive impact on student learning outcomes compared to traditional instruction. The substantial difference in mean scores underscores the potential of VR technology to enhance educational experiences and improve academic performance among higher education students, highlighting the promising role of immersive technologies in the future of education.

**Table 4: Post-test Comparison**

| Group | **Posttest mean** | p-value (Independent-samples t-test) |
|---|---|---|
| VR Group(n=30) | 87.2 | <0.001 |
| Control Group(n=30) | 58.9 | |

## 4. Discussion:

The present study offers compelling empirical evidence that virtual reality (VR) technology can substantially enhance learning processes and outcomes in higher education settings compared to traditional teaching methods alone. The VR group demonstrated significantly higher gains in posttest scores, indicating improved acquisition and application of knowledge. Moreover, students reported overwhelmingly positive perceptions of the VR learning experience, underscoring its ability to captivate attention, promote active involvement, and increase enjoyment.

These results align with and build upon previous research documenting VR's instructional benefits, including more impactful experiential learning, increased motivation and engagement, improved spatial understanding and visualization of abstract concepts, and active construction of knowledge through immersive simulations (Al-Ansi et al., 2023; Marougkas et al., 2023; Young et al., 2020). This study reinforces VR's capacity to facilitate deeper learning, higher-order thinking, and long-term retention through dynamic first-person explorations impossible to replicate using conventional media.

Several interrelated factors may explain VR's advantages. Firstly, active learning pedagogies are enhanced through realistic VR simulations that promote learner agency, prompt critical thinking, and provide immediate feedback(Lanzieri et al., 2021). Students can manipulate variables, test hypotheses, problem-solve, assess consequences, and construct causal models based on experiential discoveries made possible by interactive virtual environments(Merchant et al., 2014). This transformation from passive to active learners fosters meaningful knowledge construction.

Additionally, the immersive quality of VR capitalizes on multisensory processing and cognitive involvement, increasing motivation and engagement intrinsic to the compelling experience itself(Tao et al., 2021). Novelty and realism may also initially pique curiosity. This captures attention, heightening focus on learning tasks. The sense of presence and autonomy further allows students to take an active role in discoveries, potentially enhancing ownership over the learning process itself (D. Wang et al., 2021).

Furthermore, VR can reduce cognitive load by presenting complex conceptual information across visual and spatial modalities, facilitating comprehension through 3D models, dynamic visualizations, and manipulations(Albus et al., 2021) . For abstract subject matter requiring spatial ability and visualization, VR representations help concretize understanding. This dual coding across verbal and imagistic mental models strengthens encoding and retrieval.(Gómez-Tone et al., 2021)

However, certain challenges and limitations should be acknowledged. Despite orientation sessions, some students still reported difficulties navigating the VR technology, indicating issues with usability. Technical problems or poorly optimized VR environments can impose extraneous cognitive load unrelated to learning goals, overtaxing working memory resources(Frederiksen et al., 2020). This may frustrate or distract students. Carefully designed VR experiences that minimize needless interactions and clearly communicate objectives are critical.

Additionally, VR integration may introduce accessibility barriers or equity issues regarding cost, prior exposure, and tech-literacy. Some students may experience discomfort or cybersickness from prolonged VR use as well. Educators will need to provide adequate support, alternative options, and manage time in VR judiciously. Individual differences in spatial abilities, learning styles, and preferences should also be considered when determining appropriateness of VR (Weech et al., 2019). Students may benefit most from selective and periodic VR sessions, avoiding complete substitution of other proven modalities.

Furthermore, collaboration and student discourse may be impeded by isolated VR experiences. Debriefing discussions afterwards or occasional cooperative VR tasks could foster peer interactions and social construction of knowledge (Hodges, 2018). Implementing VR experiences sequentially across lessons with integration of complementary technologies may prove most effective, leveraging respective affordances while mitigating limitations. This blended learning model warrants additional research(Cowan & Farrell, 2023).

Longitudinal studies tracking VR's lasting impacts will provide greater insight into retention and transfer effects. Larger samples with varied populations and learning domains are needed to generalize conclusions. Future work should also explore optimal VR simulation design features, pedagogical implementation strategies, complementary technologies, and circumstances most conducive to immersive VR effectiveness. Developing best practices and guidelines for VR integration informed by learning sciences and instructional design principles will maximize its considerable potential(Hassan et al., 2023; A. Wang et al., 2021)

Finally, active involvement of educators in co-designing VR experiences that align with curricular goals and support teachable moments will be essential for successful adoption. Innovative VR tools hold immense promise for redefining learning experiences. But purposeful integration respecting established wisdom and avoiding techno chauvinism will be critical. Further research on implementation models involving VR and teacher training programs can uncover pathways for widespread enhancement of educational practices through emerging technologies.

## 5. Conclusion:

Immersive VR technology is a promising instructional aid that can enhance higher education teaching and learning when implemented judiciously. Its experiential and interactive nature appears to improve knowledge acquisition, comprehension, and student engagement. However, successful integration of VR depends on careful content development, alignment with pedagogical objectives, and consideration of individual differences. Further research into VR's long-term impacts, ideal design approaches, and effective implementation strategies across diverse educational contexts will be valuable. Overall, VR provides an exciting new arrow in the quiver of student-centered teaching that can dynamically complement traditional methods when used purposefully.

## 6. Recommendations:

Based on the findings and discussion of the current study, several recommendations can be made to inform future research and guide educational practices involving virtual reality (VR) technology:

1. Further explore the impact of VR technology in different educational domains: While the current study focused on a specific subject or learning area, future research should investigate the effectiveness of VR technology across various disciplines. This will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the potential benefits and limitations of VR-based learning in different educational contexts.
2. Conduct longitudinal studies to assess long-term effects: The current study measured the immediate impact of VR technology on learning outcomes. However, it is crucial to examine the long-term effects and sustainability of the observed improvements. Longitudinal studies can provide insights into the durability of learning gains and whether VR-based instruction leads to continued positive outcomes over time.
3. Investigate the optimal integration of VR technology with other instructional methods: While VR technology can be an effective learning tool, it should not replace other instructional methods entirely. Future research should explore how VR can be integrated with traditional classroom instruction, online learning platforms, or other emerging technologies to create blended learning environments that leverage the strengths of each approach.
4. Address accessibility and equity concerns: VR technology can introduce barriers related to cost, access, and technical requirements. It is crucial to address these concerns to ensure equitable access to VR-based learning experiences. Future studies should explore strategies to make VR technology more affordable, accessible, and inclusive for diverse student populations.
5. Focus on instructional design and pedagogical approaches: Effective instructional design is crucial for optimizing the learning outcomes of VR-based experiences. Future research should investigate the best practices for designing VR learning environments, including task design, feedback mechanisms, and scaffolding strategies. Additionally, exploring different pedagogical approaches, such as problem-based learning or collaborative learning, within VR environments can further enhance engagement and learning outcomes.
6. Involve educators in the design and implementation of VR experiences: Collaboration between researchers, developers, and educators is essential to ensure that VR-based learning experiences align with educational objectives and instructional strategies. Involving educators in the design and implementation process can provide valuable insights into the practical considerations and challenges of integrating VR technology into existing curricula.

**Funding:** This research was funded by Deanship of Scientific Research at King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, (GRANT 3532).

**Acknowledgments:** The authors acknowledge the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Faisal University for obtaining financial support for research, authorship, and the publication of research (GRANT 3532).

**Conflicts Of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data available upon request

**References:**

[1] Al-Ansi, A. M., Jaboob, M., Garad, A., & Al-Ansi, A. (2023). Analyzing augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) recent development in education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *8*(1), 100532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100532

[2] Al-Jubouri, M. B., AL-Fayyadh, S., Jaafar, S. A., Alabdulaziz, H., Nashwan, A. J., Jahlan, I. O., & Shaban, M. (2021). Incivility among Arabic-speaking nursing faculty: testing the psychometric properties of the Arabic version of incivility in nursing education-revised. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1515/ijnes-2021-0020

[3] Albus, P., Vogt, A., & Seufert, T. (2021). Signaling in virtual reality influences learning outcome and cognitive load. *Computers & Education*, *166*, 104154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104154

[4] Asad, M. M., Naz, A., Churi, P., & Tahanzadeh, M. M. (2021). Virtual Reality as Pedagogical Tool to Enhance Experiential Learning: A Systematic Literature Review. *Education Research International*, *2021*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/7061623

[5] Box, C. (2019). Formative Assessment in United States Classrooms. In *Formative Assessment in United States Classrooms: Changing the Landscape of Teaching and Learning*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03092-6

[6] Cecotti, H. (2022). Cultural Heritage in Fully Immersive Virtual Reality. *Virtual Worlds*, *1*(1), 82–102. https://doi.org/10.3390/virtualworlds1010006

[7] Chen, C. J., Toh, S. C., & Ismail, W. M. F. W. (2005). Are Learning Styles Relevant To Virtual Reality? *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *38*(2), 123–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2005.10782453

[8] Chen, J., Huang, Y., Lin, K., Chang, Y., Lin, H., Lin, C., & Hsiao, H. (2020). Developing a hands-on activity using virtual reality to help students learn by doing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *36*(1), 46–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12389

[9] Coban, M., Bolat, Y. I., & Goksu, I. (2022). The potential of immersive virtual reality to enhance learning: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, *36*, 100452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100452

[10] Cowan, P., & Farrell, R. (2023). Using Virtual Reality to Support Retrieval Practice in Blended Learning: An Interdisciplinary Professional Development Collaboration between Novice and Expert Teachers. *Digital*, *3*(3), 251–272. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital3030016

[11] Edstrand, E., Sjöberg, J., & Sofkova Hashem, S. (2023). *Teachers' Educational Design Using Adaptive VR-Environments in Multilingual Study Guidance to Promote Students' Conceptual Knowledge* (pp. 79–94). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34550-0_6

[12] Essoe, J. K.-Y., Reggente, N., Ohno, A. A., Baek, Y. H., Dell'Italia, J., & Rissman, J. (2022). Enhancing learning and retention with distinctive virtual reality environments and mental context reinstatement. *Npj Science of Learning*, *7*(1), 31. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-022-00147-6

[13] Frederiksen, J. G., Sørensen, S. M. D., Konge, L., Svendsen, M. B. S., Nobel-Jørgensen, M., Bjerrum, F., & Andersen, S. A. W. (2020). Cognitive load and performance in immersive virtual reality versus conventional virtual reality simulation training of laparoscopic surgery: a randomized trial. *Surgical Endoscopy*, *34*(3), 1244–1252. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-019-06887-8

[14] Gomes, N., Lou, Y., Patwardhan, V., Moyer, T., Vavala, V., & Barros, C. (2020). *The Effects of Virtual Reality Learning Environments on Improving the Retention, Comprehension, and Motivation of Medical School Students* (pp. 289–296). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25629-6_45

[15] Gómez-Tone, H. C., Martin-Gutierrez, J., Bustamante-Escapa, J., & Bustamante-Escapa, P. (2021). Spatial Skills and Perceptions of Space: Representing 2D Drawings as 3D Drawings inside Immersive Virtual Reality. *Applied Sciences*, *11*(4), 1475. https://doi.org/10.3390/app11041475

[16] Guerra-Tamez, C. R. (2023). The Impact of Immersion through Virtual Reality in the Learning Experiences of Art and Design Students: The Mediating Effect of the Flow Experience. *Education Sciences*, *13*(2), 185. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13020185

[17] Gulnaz, F., Alfaqih, A. M., & Mashhour, N. A. (2015). Paradigm Shift: A Critical Appraisal of Traditional and Innovative Roles of an English Teacher in Saudi ELT Classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(5), 934. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0505.07

[18] Hamad, A., & Jia, B. (2022). How Virtual Reality Technology Has Changed Our Lives: An Overview of the Current and Potential Applications and Limitations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(18), 11278. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811278

[19] Harris, N., & Bacon, C. E. W. (2019). Developing Cognitive Skills Through Active Learning: A Systematic Review of Health Care Professions. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, *14*(2), 135–148. https://doi.org/10.4085/1402135

[20] Hasanah, H., & Malik, M. N. (2020). Blended learning in improving students' critical thinking and communication skills at University. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *15*(5), 1295–1306. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i5.5168

[21] Hassan, S., Baiee, H. A., Shaban, M., El, M., Zaky, S., & Mahdi, M. T. (2023). Healthcare Providers ' Knowledge and Challenges They Face Regarding Growth Charts ' Utilization in Primary Healthcare Practice. *Medical Journal of Babylon*, *20*(3), 574–579. https://doi.org/10.4103/MJBL.MJBL

[22] Hodges, L. C. (2018). Contemporary Issues in Group Learning in Undergraduate Science Classrooms: A Perspective from Student Engagement. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *17*(2), es3. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-11-0239

[23] Hu-Au, E., & Okita, S. (2021). Exploring Differences in Student Learning and Behavior Between Real-life and Virtual Reality Chemistry Laboratories. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *30*(6), 862–876. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-021-09925-0

[24] Ikhsan, J., Sugiyarto, K. H., & Astuti, T. N. (2020). Fostering Student's Critical Thinking through a Virtual Reality Laboratory. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, *14*(08), 183. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i08.13069

[25] Kamińska, D., Sapiński, T., Wiak, S., Tikk, T., Haamer, R., Avots, E., Helmi, A., Ozcinar, C., & Anbarjafari, G. (2019). Virtual Reality and Its Applications in Education: Survey. *Information*, *10*(10), 318. https://doi.org/10.3390/info10100318

[26] Koukourikos, K., Tsaloglidou, A., Kourkouta, L., Papathanasiou, I., Iliadis, C., Fratzana, A., & Panagiotou, A. (2021). Simulation in Clinical Nursing Education. *Acta Informatica Medica*, *29*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.5455/aim.2021.29.15-20

[27] Lanzieri, N., McAlpin, E., Shilane, D., & Samelson, H. (2021). Virtual Reality: An Immersive Tool for Social Work Students to Interact with Community Environments. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *49*(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-021-00803-1

[28] Liu, C.-C., Wen, C.-T., Chang, H.-Y., Chang, M.-H., Lai, P.-H., Fan Chiang, S.-H., Yang, C.-W., & Hwang, F.-K. (2022). Augmenting the effect of virtual labs with "teacher demonstration" and "student critique" instructional designs to scaffold the development of scientific literacy. *Instructional Science*, *50*(2), 303–333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-021-09571-4

[29] Liu, J. Y. W., Yin, Y.-H., Kor, P. P. K., Cheung, D. S. K., Zhao, I. Y., Wang, S., Su, J. J., Christensen, M., Tyrovolas, S., & Leung, A. Y. M. (2023). The Effects of Immersive Virtual Reality Applications on Enhancing the Learning Outcomes of Undergraduate Health Care Students: Systematic Review With Meta-synthesis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *25*, e39989. https://doi.org/10.2196/39989

[30] Marks, B., & Thomas, J. (2022). Adoption of virtual reality technology in higher education: An evaluation of five teaching semesters in a purpose-designed laboratory. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(1), 1287–1305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10653-6

[31] Marougkas, A., Troussas, C., Krouska, A., & Sgouropoulou, C. (2023). Virtual Reality in Education: A Review of Learning Theories, Approaches and Methodologies for the Last Decade. *Electronics*, *12*(13), 2832. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12132832

[32] 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

[33] Nassar, A. K., Al-Manaseer, F., Knowlton, L. M., & Tuma, F. (2021). Virtual reality (VR) as a simulation

modality for technical skills acquisition. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, *71*, 102945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2021.102945

[34] Plotzky, C., Lindwedel, U., Sorber, M., Loessl, B., König, P., Kunze, C., Kugler, C., & Meng, M. (2021). Virtual reality simulations in nurse education: A systematic mapping review. *Nurse Education Today*, *101*, 104868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.104868

[35] 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103778

[36] Rubio-Tamayo, J., Gertrudix Barrio, M., & García García, F. (2017). Immersive Environments and Virtual Reality: Systematic Review and Advances in Communication, Interaction and Simulation. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, *1*(4), 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/mti1040021

[37] Slater, M., Lotto, B., Arnold, M. M., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2009). How we experience immersive virtual environments: The concept of presence and its measurement. *Anuario de Psicologia*, *40*(2), 193–210.

[38] Tao, G., Garrett, B., Taverner, T., Cordingley, E., & Sun, C. (2021). Immersive virtual reality health games: a narrative review of game design. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, *18*(1), 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-020-00801-3

[39] Wang, A., Thompson, M., Uz-Bilgin, C., & Klopfer, E. (2021). Authenticity, Interactivity, and Collaboration in Virtual Reality Games: Best Practices and Lessons Learned. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frvir.2021.734083

[40] Wang, D., Md Khambari, M. N., Wong, S. L., & Razali, A. B. (2021). Exploring Interest Formation in English Learning through XploreRAFE+: A Gamified AR Mobile App. *Sustainability*, *13*(22), 12792. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212792

[41] Weech, S., Kenny, S., & Barnett-Cowan, M. (2019). Presence and Cybersickness in Virtual Reality Are Negatively Related: A Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00158

[42] Young, G., Stehle, S., Walsh, B., & Tiri, E. (2020). Exploring Virtual Reality in the Higher Education Classroom: Using VR to Build Knowledge and Understanding. *JUCS - Journal of Universal Computer Science*, *26*(8), 904–928. https://doi.org/10.3897/jucs.2020.049