WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

WHAT'S IN A NAME? BRINGING ORDER TO THE TERMINOLOGY OF VIRTUAL FIELD EXPERIENCES Foley, Kristen¹, Tinigin, Laura¹, Petcovic, Heather¹, and Semken, Steven² ¹Western Michigan University, ²Arizona State University

Project Purpose

With improved technology, educators and learners are using more electronic f experiences throughout K-16 education. However, the propagation of availabl electronic geologic field learning experiences is limited due to inconsistent terminology. By identifying the varied terminology associated with learning and teaching through electronic geoscience field experiences as reported in publisl literature, our goal is to create a working taxonomy that characterizes experier as defined by common immersive and interactive components. Our question

How do users of electronic geoscience field experiences perceive the deg interaction and immersive qualities associated with specific terminology described in recent literature?

escribe are worth noting Methods in the findings of the literature review. First, a single term such as "virtual field trip" has been used to describe a wide range of student learning experiences across a wide range Many terms associated with digital learning and electronic field experiences have of technology and platforms (e.g., websites, virtual immersion systems, etc.). Not all appeared in the published literature, but concise and uniform definitions are often terms accurately describe the technology or platform they represent. Future work is lacking for each term. We performed a search of published papers using a wide needed to classify the different digital learning systems used in the geosciences, and to range of terms, including "virtual field trip," "geology virtual field trip," and "virtual compile complete and concise definitions for each. Different types of virtual and digital geology." Additionally, article references were searched for additional sources that learning systems and platforms have varying amounts of user presence and immersion, fit the criteria. We then created a table that showcases the variable definitions and adding to the confusion of what name to give it. To help determine how users interact descriptions for the term "virtual field trip" (Table 1). Table 2 shows the range of with the terms currently in use, you are invited to show us where you think different terms used to describe electronic geoscience field learning experiences that we terms belong on the interaction-immersion graph (Figure 1). found in the literature.

Table 1. Definitions and Descript	tic
Author Definition of "Virtual Field Trip"	A
Activities available on computers used for teaching ¹	St
"A digital representation of, or remote access to a field site, real or fictional, through which students engage in learning activities" ² p. 536	A
"a journey taken without actually making a trip to the field site ³ " p. 323	Α
Used to provide partial amounts of information and interaction that typically occur on real field trips. ⁴	In ai
None Given ^{5,6,7}	In In
A capture of the "real world environment of a specific location or region through a collection of data, photographs, cartography and other technologies such as GIS, without the cost of physically being there" ⁸ (p.3)	In

n the geology classroom. Journal of Geoscience Education, 45(3), 246-251. 8 Cliffe, A. (2017). A review of the benefits and drawbacks to virtual field guides in today's Geoscience higher education environment. International Journal Of Educational Technology In Higher Education, 14(1), 1-14.

a stand	A State of the sta	A State of the Sta	the set	
	Table 2. Range of Terminology Associated with Virtual Field Le			
field	Virtual Field Trip (8) ^a	Virtual Field Guides (2) ^b	Virtual Field Env	
le	Virtual Environments (1) ^d	Virtual Visit (1) ^e	Virtual Learning E	
	Virtual Fieldwork (1) ^g	Virtual Internet Trips (1) ^h	Virtual Field Ex	
nd	Information Technology (1) ^j	Virtual Outcrops (1) ^k	Virtual Learnir	
shed e <u>nces</u> , is:	a Norris, E., Shelton, N., Dunsmuir, S., Duke-Williams, O., & Stamatakis, E. (2015). Teacher and pupil perspectives on the use of Vi Geoscience Education, 65, 531-541; Lei, S. A. (2015). Revisiting virtual field trips: Perspectives of college science instructors. Educ field trips for mobile and smart devices. Geosphere, 13(2), 260-268.; Stumpf, R., Douglass, J., & Dorn, R. (2008). Learning desert ge to virtual field guides in today's Geoscience higher education environment. International Journal Of Educational Technology in Hi today's Geoscience higher education environment. International Journal Of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 14(1), 1 geoscience teacher education; issues, techniques, and models. Special Paper - Geological Society of America, 492, 285-303. d Mo Geological Society of America. e Hurst, S. (1998). Use of "virtual" field trips in teaching introductory geology. Computers and Geo (2017). A review of the benefits and drawbacks to virtual field guides in today's Geoscience higher education environment. Internet B., & Cooper, J. (2019). Virtual field experiences in introductory geology: Addressing a capacity problem, but finding a pedagogic learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of America. k Cawood, A. J., & Bond, C. E. (2018) Mind II: A synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of America. Core Geological Society of Mind II: A synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of Mind II: A synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of Mind II: A synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of Mind II: A synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences (Vol.2, pp. 131-164). Denver, CO: Geological Society of Mind II: A synthesis of researc	cation, 135(3), 323-327.; Hurst, S. (1998). Use of "virtual" field trips in teaching introductory geology. Computers and Geosci geomorphology virtually versus in the field. Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 32(3), 387-399.; Gore, P. (1997). Usin gher Education, 14(1), 1-14. b Litherland, K., & Stott, T. (2012). Virtual Field Sites: Losses and gains in authenticity with sem: -14. c Granshaw, F. D. (2019). Tablets in the field 2019: New tools and techniques for student-created virtual field environm gk, D. W., & Goodwin, C. (2012). Learning in the field: Synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences. In I sciences, 24(7), 653-658. f Carabajal, I. G., Marshall, A. M., & Atchison, C. L. (2017). A synthesis of instructional strategies in national Journal Of Educational Technology In Higher Education, 14(1), 1-14. h Stumpf, R., Douglass, J., & Dorn, R. (2008). Le el one. Journal of Geoscience Education, 67, 1-17. jMogk, D. W., & Goodwin, C. (2012). Learning in the field: Synthesis of research on the Stumpf, R., Douglass, J., & Dorn, R. (2008). Le	ences, 24(7), 653-658.; Bursztyn, N., Walker, A., Shelton, B., & Pederson, J. (2017). A g the world-wide web in the geology classroom. <i>Journal of Geoscience Education</i> , 4 antic technologies. <i>Technology, Pedagogy and Education</i> , 21(2), 213-230.; Cliffe, A. (ents. <i>In the Trenches</i> , 9(1), 5-7.; Granshaw, F., Duggan-Haas, D., Whitmeyer, S. J., Bë K. A. Kastens & C. A. Manduca (Eds.), Earth and Mind II: A synthesis of research on th geoscience education literature that address barriers to inclusion for students with arning desert geomorphology virtually versus in the field. <i>Journal of Geography in F</i> . search on thinking and learning in the geosciences. In K. A. Kastens & C. A. Manduca	
gree of	f Discussion			
	This review of the literature demonstrates the range of terms used to de electronic field learning experiences in the geosciences. Several issues an			

ons Associated with the Term "Virtual Field Trip"

uthor Description of "Virtual Field Trip"

tudents use digital maps to explore and learn about geologic content

subsection of VLE used to reinforce content before or after a physical field trip

- In alternative trip through the internet, CDs, movies, videos, or slides
- nterchangable with virtual visits, a valuable classroom aid that gives more control of data nalysis to the student
- nteractive systems increase student interest in the subject matter, and can increase motivation⁵; nterchangable with virtual internet trips⁶; A website⁷
- nterchangable with virtual field guide and virtual fieldwork; an alternative to fieldwork

earning

nvironment (2)^c Environment (1)

xperiences (1)ⁱ ing Spaces (1)^I

What Do You Think? Please use the provided stickers to indicate where the different terminology should be located on the diagram. By participating, you

are indicating that you agree to supply anonymous data that will be

used in this study.



INCREASING IMMERSIVE CHARACTERISTICS

Immersion is "the feeling that users are experiencing the environment" p. 536

Carabajal, I. G., Marshall, A. M., & Atchison, C. L. (2017). A synthesis of instructional strategies in geoscience education literature that address barriers to inclusion for students with disabilities. Journal of Geoscience Education, 65, 531-541.

Based on your perception of these virtual field experiences, please place the corresponding sticker on the diagram based on your perceived range of immersive and interactive characteristics.

= VIRTUAL FIELD TRIP

= VIRTUAL FIELD GUIDES

= VIRTUAL FIELD ENVIRONMENT

Arizona State

University