'Field' Work

Andrew Johnson[1], Thomas Moher[1], Yong-Joo Cho[1], Danny Edelson[2], Eric Russell[2]
[1]University of Illinois at Chicago
[2]Northwestern University
aej@evl.uic.edu

Abstract

Sixth grade students at Abraham Lincoln Elementary School explore a virtual field via an ImmersaDesk and collect data there using hand-helds computers. Back in the classroom they integrate their data, visualize it to see the patterns that emerge, and then propose explanations for these patterns. The goal is to help the students learn science inquiry skills within an environment that encourages their formation.

1. Introduction

Kevin Harris' Sixth Grade class has a mission. They need to find out why there are more red flowers some areas of this large field than in others. Mr. Harris breaks up the class into groups to explore different sectors of the field. It takes each group anywhere from 30 minutes to an hour to search their sector and record the position and type all the plants they find. When the children come upon a flower, they place a flag in the ground to mark the spot and record the position of the flower using a Pocket PC that doubles as a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver. They make sure they cover their entire sector with the help of a laptop computer tied into the GPS showing the path they have walked. They do all of this on the stage of the school's auditorium, working at an ImmersaDesk.

Once all of the sectors have been explored and all of the data collected, the students meet as a group in their classroom to integrate their data. Patterns that are not visible while collecting the data on the ground suddenly appear when that data is visualized as a whole on a 50" plasma panel that has been wheeled into their classroom. Using a program called MyWorld, different filters are applied to the data to make the patterns more obvious. Why are there more red plants in this circular area? Why are there more plants in the south than in the north? The students hypothesize about the causes for those patterns and then go back into the Field on the plasma panel to check their hypothesis.

This collaboration links the Virtual Reality (VR) educational work at the Electronic Visualization Laboratory, University of Illinois at Chicago with the desktop educational work at the School of Education and Social Policy at Northwestern University. It is part of a larger NSF funded project including the University of Michigan and Georgia Tech seeking to develop explicit guidelines and an engineering process to support software developers in building effective computer-based learning environments.

We have been focusing our efforts on young learners and science inquiry skills. What should young learners know? The Illinois Learning Standards for Science state that students should "understand the process of scientific inquiry and technological design to investigate questions, conduct experiments and solve problems." As a result of their studies students in late elementary school should be able to do the following:

- Formulate questions on a specific science topic and choose the steps needed to answer the questions
- Collect data for investigations using scientific process skills e.g. observing, estimating, and measuring
- Construct charts and visualizations to display data
- Use data to produce reasonable explanations
- Report and display the results of individual and group investigations.

Combining the virtual environments work with MyWorld allows us to help the children learn these skills in a controlled environment. At the same time we learn about how to provide appropriate aide to the children while they are engaged in these activities.

Section 2 describes the VR equipment that we have installed in the school. Sections 3 and 4 go into detail about the learning activity. Section 5 talks about what we learned from this study and section 6 describes our plans for future work.

2. The VR Resource in the School

Abraham Lincoln Elementary School is a K-6 elementary school in Oak Park, Illinois, a racially and economically diverse inner-ring suburb bordering Chicago's West Side. It is a large school (620+ students), nearly always allocating four (20-30-student) classrooms at each of the K-6 grade levels. Besides a racially and economically diverse student body (64% white, 29% African American, 4% Hispanic, 3% Asian) and faculty, Lincoln offers diversity of subject mastery, as reflected by IGAP (Illinois Goal Assessment Program) and Stanford-9 achievement tests. The school is also roughly average with respect to technology infusion, with about one computer for every five children, distributed both in classrooms and in the school's Media Center, and an orientation more toward computer literacy and technology education than conceptual learning.

Figure 1: For the in-class discussions we displayed the Field on a PC-based hand-tracked monoscopic plasma display that we moved into the classroom.



Figure 2: Sixth grade teacher Kevin Harris watches as three of his students explore their sector of the field. One student drives the group through the space with the Wanda; another records the flowers they find using the Pocket PC; the third tracks their progress on a laptop.

We have been working with Abraham Lincoln Elementary School in Oak Park Illinois since December 1998 when we moved an ImmersaDesk there as part of our work using VR to teach young children about the shape of the Earth. Over 500 students have used the ImmersaDesk at Lincoln with a variety of educational environments [Johnson 2001].

This experience at Lincoln has taught us that just being in the school isn't enough – we need to be in the classroom. In the spring of 2001 we augmented the ImmersaDesk with a mobile cart consisting of a 50" plasma panel driven by a Linux PC, with an additional PC to handle tracking. We lose stereo visuals and typically do not do head-track with the plasma panel, but we retain hand tracking (allowing the students to point in three dimensions), audio, and the ability to support small group work. This technology also has the advantage of being an order-of-magnitude less expensive than an ImmersaDesk, and employs consumer-driven commodity technologies.

3. The Activity

Teachers rely on local environments to give students something to observe and measure - collecting leaves in a field, measuring the acidity of a stream, or surveying the height of a hill. Local environments have the advantage of being local, and being real. However they also have three important drawbacks: they may emphasize activity over learning [Dewey 1910], they may limit the domain of inquiry, and they may constrain teachers' ability to scaffold learning by reducing complexity.

We believe that learning how to conduct an investigation within a virtual world can be beneficial in preparing students to conduct these investigations in the real world. The students can explore environments that are not locally accessible and measure phenomena that they can't physically measure. More importantly, the teacher can simplify the complexity of the world to focus on particular features.

Whether the students collect data from the real world or a virtual world, they need to be able to effectively visualize and analyze the data that they have collected. Pencil and paper and the ever-present blackboard are the typical options available. They are valuable for small data-sets but quickly become cumbersome with large amounts of data. Scientists use computers for this job and we would like to expose the students to this. However tools that work well for scientists won't work well for schoolchildren. As with using VR for exploration, we need to simplify the tools just as we have simplified the problem.

In the larger context of the NSF funded project we want to be able to swap 'components' in and out so that data can be collected in the real world, or from a virtual environment or from a pre-existing datastore. Similarly the students may do the actual data collection with a computer, or pencil and paper. They may visualize their results with a computer or blackboard. Changing these components doesn't affect the structure of the overall activity, but it will affect the kind of work they can do and type of assistance that the students can receive at each stage.

3.1 Initial Whole-Class Discussion

In this activity the sixth graders play the role of a team of scientists in an ink company that gets their ink from fields of red plants. The company would like to increase the number of red plants growing in this field. The students are to find out why there seem to be more red plants in some areas than others, and give recommendations for increasing the number of red plants.

We introduce this scenario in the classroom and then show them the Field on the plasma panel. See Figure 1. The students see what the Field looks like and how to move around it. They notice that there are both red flowers and white flowers growing in the Field. They also get a feeling for the size of the space they need to explore. Based on this brief visit to the Field the students

Figure 3: Aside from the ImmersaDesk, the students view three different displays during their survey. The Pocket PC acts as a GPS system showing the students' location and orientation in the Field as well as giving them the ability to record the plants that they find. The laptop map interface allows them to see where they have been. The laptop MyWorld interface allows them to see what plants they have found, and lets them see the interface they will use later to analyze the data.



Figure 4: Using MyWorld the class can integrate the data they collected and apply transformations. For example, the students can view all the plants regardless of colour (top), or compare the plants to the salinity of the soil (bottom).

are asked how they would systematically survey this large space. Several different 'lawnmower' algorithms are proposed. The students are also introduced to the PocketPC based GPS receiver and data collection tool that they will use. Mr. Harris, their teacher, then breaks them into groups and over the next two days groups of two or three are pulled out of class to visit the Field.

The Field: The Field is a square patch of flat ground 3000 feet on a side. It is divided into regions in two ways: picket fences divide the space into a 3x3 grid, and different patches of terrain divide the ground into regions of grass, sand, and gravel. Within this field there are trees, rocks, and plants. The Field was designed to be big enough that you could not stand in the center and see all of the important details, but not so big that you couldn't survey the space within a reasonable time.

The Field has limited affordances. The students can move around on the surface and plant flags at points of interest. In some studies we allow the students to take 'snapshots' of the space. Classrooms are usually broken into groups of two to four students each to visit the Field. Usually we break up the field geographically for the various groups with each group taking one of the nine sectors, but we have also broken up the Field temporally with each group visiting the Field in a different virtual month to see the growth rate of the plants.

We have used variations of the Field on the ImmersaDesk at Lincoln since the spring of 2000 with 2nd, 4th, and 6th grade classrooms. Jarvia Thomas' 2nd graders investigated issues of similarity and difference; Victor Baez's 4th graders learned about interpolation and extrapolation; Marilyn Rothstein's 6th graders learned to develop co-occurrence rules, and Joanna Peterson's 6th graders learned to estimate population distributions.

The children have no direct control over what is happening in the Field. Nothing that they do in the Field will affect the underlying simulation. We imposed this constraint to reduce the cognitive burden of exploring the space and limiting the students to familiar activities [Friedler et al. 1990, Jackson et al. 1994, DeJong et al. 1998]. This still allows the students to articulate and investigate hypothesis, but like Astronomy, the students can't manipulate the variables of the study.

Displays: The students use several different displays while collecting their data. The main display is the ImmersaDesk showing the Field. One of the students holds a Pocket PC showing the GPS position and orientation of the group. The Pocket PC also acts as a data entry tool where the student can click on the icon of the plant they have found and automatically record its coordinates. The students also have two laptop computers. The first shows a top-down view of the Field where the students can see the path they have taken. The second is the interface they will eventually use to analyze the data, MyWorld, which shows the plants that they have found. See Figures 2, 3.

We could have placed any or all of the various displays we use in this study onto the ImmersaDesk screen. There are two reasons why we didn't do this. First, we wanted to strengthen the illusion of being in the Field by only showing the Field on the ImmersaDesk screen. Second, the multiple displays give the multiple students different things to interact with and 'possess' as part of their 'job' in the survey.

Another option was to place virtual measuring devices into the Field, much as the students plant flags in the space as markers, and then read off the resulting measurements. We decided instead to go with the 'tricorder' metaphor of reading the data off of the Pocket PC because we have previously found that students have a hard time making the sorts of precise movements in the virtual world that would be required to accurately position measurement devices.

Broadening Engagement: We designed the Field to be viewed by multiple students simultaneously. Based on our previous experiences with educational VR environments we knew that giving one child control meant that the child with control tended to be more engaged with the educational content and tended to learn more, while the children that were 'along for the ride' tended to learn less [Roussos 1999].

Some of the solutions to broadening engagement are technical such as splitting a single generic control into multiple controls with specific functions, but we believe that more of the solution lies in the way the learning experience is structured. For small groups there are several ways to broaden engagement: pass full



Figure 5: The image on the left shows the plants that were placed in the field. The image on the right shows the plants that were found by the students. Red plants are marked with boxes, white plants with crosses. The students found roughly 90% of the plants.

control regularly between the children, divide control between the children, giving each child a particular role, and divide control between the children rotating the roles at regular intervals

With the Field we have chosen the third option of having multiple roles that the children rotate through. The driver had the wand; the person collecting data had the Pocket PC; and the navigator had the display of where they had already been. All of the students could see all of the displays but each had to focus on one display to accomplish the common task.

4. Analyzing Data Back in the Classroom

Once all of the data was collected, we moved the plasma panel back into their classroom and used it to show both MyWorld, the tool to analyze the data, and the Field. MyWorld [Edelson 1998] is a Geographic Information System (GIS) written as part of a research program to adapt data visualization and analysis tools to support inquiry learning for students in middle-school through college. My World is designed to provide the essential features of a professional GIS environment through a supportive interface designed with the needs of students and teachers in mind. Using MyWorld we took the data from each sector that the students collected and put it together in a single display showing the positions of the red and white plants.

When we set up the positions of all of the flowers in the field there were two effects that we wanted the children to see. The first is that in the entire field the red and white plants are evenly dispersed except for an obviously circular cluster of red flowers in one area. This couldn't be seen while exploring the individual sectors but is very apparent in the combination. The children had several suggestions about what could cause this: chemicals, insects, fertilizer, etc. They decided that it would be a good idea to take a look at what was at the center of the circle. Switching over to the field on the plasma display we walked over to that area and found a beehive that some of the students had seen during their survey but hadn't remembered. The students came to the conclusion that the bees were pollinating the red flowers and helping them take over that area of the Field.

The second effect was that there are more flowers towards the southern end of the field. The children came up with several possible causes. We focused on two – moisture content of the soil, and salinity. Our initial plan was to have the students go back into the Field with another probe to take moisture and salinity readings at regular intervals and then visualize those readings along with the plant distributions. Unfortunately we ran out of time at the end of the school year so we showed them what the collected moisture and salinity data would look like. The soil moisture had a gradient that was orthogonal to the plant density, while the salinity matched. Figure 4 shows several screens from MyWorld used during this discussion.

The students' final recommendations were to buy more beehives to plant around the Field, and if possible trade the land in the north for more land in the south.

5. Reaction

We needed to place enough plants in the space to ensure that both patterns (the bees and the salinity) were noticeable. This meant placing almost 550 plants into the space – 30 plants in each of the northern sectors, 60 in each of the central sectors, and 90 in each of the southern sectors. The groups in the northern sectors spend roughly 20 minutes to collect their data, those in the central sectors 40 minutes, and those in the south 60 minutes. The children were allowed to stay until they felt that they had completed their survey. We did not set a time limit.

The children did not have any trouble using any of the technology. We had not seen the children having any trouble using the ImmersaDesk but we thought that they might have troubles using the Pocket PC. They didn't. We showed them how to read the display and how to record a flower position and they took it from there. They also had little trouble integrating the different views presented by the different devices.

The children were enthusiastic both during the in-class discussion and during their exploration of the field – even when it cut into their recess time. Previously we had found that while second graders found the field very interesting, sixth graders tired of it quickly. We believe the addition of the extra displays kept all the children busy and interested. The children were very good about switching roles on their own. Again, we believe that the additional technology made each of their roles interesting. After helping the students to get into their correct sector, we generally tried to stay away from the action at the ImmersaDesk.

In addition to recording the children's actions on videotape, the computers were also keeping track of their actions. This is an advantage over doing the same kind of survey in a real field. Figure 5 shows the actual positions of all of the red and white flowers as well as the positions that the students marked. Overall the students did quite well with the groups finding and marking roughly 90% of the plants in their sector.

Most of the students were careful in placing their flag and recording their data close to the plant. A few preferred to zoom through the environment at high speed, barely slowing down as they passed by a flower to drop a flag and have their friend note the plant on the Pocket PC. In the context of this experiment that imprecision didn't affect the results, but it would (and should) affect a more careful survey of the field. We tried to encourage good surveying techniques during this excursion, but at the same time we realized that this could be a good learning experience showing how sloppy data gathering leads to sloppy results. The quality of the results was important to the children, at least to the extent that they were very interested in knowing which group did the best job, so there was incentive to do the job well.

The most common reason that the students missed a flower was that they didn't do a thorough survey. Even though the students articulated several different lawnmower algorithms in the class, very few groups implemented such a strategy. Several



Figure 6: This image shows the paths that each of the groups took as they explored their sector. While the class thought a 'lawnmower' approach would be effective, none of them actually implemented this strategy. Most groups did find 90% of the plants in their sector.

groups used the laptop map to see what areas they had missed and then tried to 'fill in' the blank spaces. Figure 6 shows the paths that the various students took during their explorations.

One of the reasons that we implemented a computerized data collection system in this study was that we previously used pencil and paper with poor results. The children have had very little experience with collecting data and in previous studies they lost or altered a great deal of data while writing it down. Here it was very important for the students to see the appropriate effects in the visualization so we wanted to minimize these kinds of errors.

We believe that this study had several benefits for the children involved. It made the math concepts real and gave them a purpose in the real world. The children developed the confidence that they could actually perform a real science research project and gained an appreciation for the importance of careful observation. The study also engaged children who are ordinarily less reluctant to participate.

6. Current Directions

Since this study was performed we have switched over from the ImmersaDesk to a GeoWall ($10,000 Linux/Windows/OS-X based passive stereo display – www.geowall.org) as our display for the Field at Lincoln, and we are continuing to use the plasma panel in classrooms. The GeoWall was used in the second iteration of this study, and individual desktop computers will be used in the third iteration of this study to be done this spring.

In this first iteration the students analyzed the data using MyWorld as a class on the plasma display. In the second iteration the students analyzed their data using MyWorld in their own groups using desktop computers before coming together as a class to discuss the results. As the students were able to successfully use MyWorld on their own, the third iteration will continue to have the groups analyze the data themselves.

We also want to look at varying the experience for different groups – some using the Pocket PC to collect the data, some paper, and others collecting the data from a desktop database. We also want to investigate whether the skills learned here in the virtual world transfer to the real world by having the children conduct a similar study out in a real field.

7. Acknowledgements

This project involves the hard work of a large number of people including Greg Dawe, Janet Kim, Dave Haas, Yalu Lin, Alan Verlo, Josh Radinsky, Jason Leigh. We would especially like to thank Kevin Harris and his 6th grade class, principal Carol Dudzik and the teachers, staff, and students at Lincoln Elementary.

This research was made possible through major funding from the National Science Foundation, specifically EIA 9720351, DUE 9979537, BCS 9907839, and EIA 0085946.

The virtual reality and advanced networking research, collaborations, and outreach programs at EVL are made possible by major funding from NSF awards EIA-9802090, EIA-0115809, ANI-9980480, ANI-0229642, ANI-9730202, ANI-0123399, ANI-0129527 and EAR-0218918, as well as the NSF ITR cooperative agreement ANI-0225642 to the University of California San Diego and the NSF PACI cooperative agreement ACI-9619019 to the National Computational Science Alliance. EVL also receives funding from the DOE ASCI VIEWS program, the State of Illinois, Microsoft Research, General Motors Research, and Pacific Interface on behalf of NTT Optical Network Systems Laboratory in Japan.

References

DEWEY, J. 1910. Science as subject-matter and as method. Science 31, pp. 121-127.

EDELSON, D., AND GORDIN, D. 1998. Visualization for learners: A framework for adapting scientists' tools. Computers and Geosciences, 24 (7), pp. 607-616.

FRIEDLER, Y., NACHMIA, R., AND LINN, M. 1990. Learning scientific reasoning skills in microcomputer-based laboratories. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27, pp. 173-191.

JACKSON, S., ET AL. 1994, Making dynamic modeling accessible to precollege science students. Interactive Learning Environments 4 (3), pp. 233-257.

JOHNSON, A., MOHER, T., OHLSSON, S., LEIGH, J., 2001. Exploring Multiple Representations In Elementary School Science Education In the proceedings of IEEE VR 2001, Mar 13-17, 2001, Yokohama, Japan, pp. 201-208.

DE JONG, T., ET AL. 1998. Self-directed learning in simulation-based discovery environments. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning 14, pp. 235-246.

ROUSSOS, M., JOHNSON, A., MOHER, T., LEIGH, J., VASILAKIS, C., BARNES, C. 1999. Learning and Building Together in an Immersive Virtual World. In Presence 8 (3), pp. 247-263.