The Efficacy of Virtual Reality Training in the Military

Daniel C. DiPietro Jr.

Cumberland High School

6949-HS-001: Design and Development for IT

Mr. Stead

18 April 2025

Abstract

This research paper examines the effectiveness of virtual reality (VR) training within the military in collaboration with the Rhode Island Air National Guard. It explores the advantages and disadvantages of VR training compared to traditional methods, focusing on situational awareness and decision-making, scenario simulation, engagement and retention, and cost reduction. By analyzing empirical research, industry applications, and firsthand accounts from Air National Guard personnel, this paper demonstrates that VR significantly enhances training outcomes: Trainees retain ~75% of information from VR versus 5% for reading (Rea, 2024), and simulations enable safe practice of high-risk scenarios like aircraft maintenance or combat (Nolen, 2022). However, challenges such as upfront costs ($2.7-3B Army investment in 2019), motion sickness, and gaps in real-world stress replication persist (Velichko, 2021; Harris et al., 2023). Employing a mixed-method approach (literature review + interviews), this study concludes VR is optimally deployed as a supplement within a hybrid training model to maximize efficacy while mitigating limitations.

Introduction

Virtual reality (VR) technology simulates interactive three-dimensional environments via head-mounted displays, immersing users in scenarios that mimic real-world conditions without physical risks. In military contexts, VR training revolutionizes readiness and cost efficiency. A 2023 survey of 400+ U.S. military trainers revealed 81% credit Extended Reality (XR) with increasing trainee confidence and cultivating muscle memory (Vive Team, 2023). Current implementations, such as those in the Air National Guard, train hundreds of personnel annually, enhancing situational awareness while reducing time and resource expenditures (Roza, 2024). This scalability is invaluable for large organizations like the military, where efficiently training masses remains a persistent challenge. This research assesses VR's efficacy against traditional methods using quantitative metrics, including decision-making accuracy, skill retention rates, and cost efficiency, alongside qualitative insights from interviews with Rhode Island Air National Guard personnel. The primary goal is to determine whether VR can practically supplement or replace conventional training paradigms.

Background and Problem Statement

For generations, military forces worldwide have relied on traditional training methods including live drills, weapons practice, and field exercises to prepare service members for combat. While these time-tested approaches have proven effective historically, they face growing challenges in meeting the demands of 21st century warfare. Several critical limitations have become apparent:

Standardized Training Limitations

Military training programs frequently employ rigid, standardized curricula that fail to account for individual learning needs. This is particularly evident in ROTC programs where uniform drills often neglect crucial leadership development and tactical decision-making skills (Roysden, 2024). Such inflexibility can leave personnel unprepared for the complex realities of modern command situations.

Technology Gap

Contemporary battlefields now feature advanced systems like unmanned aerial vehicles, cyber warfare platforms, and AI-assisted combat tools that traditional training methods struggle to simulate effectively (Ahmed, 2024). While live-fire exercises teach fundamental skills like marksmanship, they cannot recreate the dynamics of drone warfare or electronic combat scenarios.

Training Fatigue

The physically and psychologically demanding nature of traditional training often leads to diminished returns. Extended live-fire drills and combat simulations frequently result in trainee exhaustion, which negatively impacts information retention and overall performance (Lyndall, 2020).

Resistance to Innovation

Many experienced military leaders remain hesitant to adopt new training technologies due to institutional preference for established methods. This skepticism toward innovations like VR stems from concerns about disrupting proven training protocols (Velichko, 2021).

Virtual reality training presents a potential solution to these challenges through its ability to provide personalized, adaptable instruction. VR systems can customize scenarios to match individual skill levels, allowing novice soldiers to build fundamental competencies while enabling experienced personnel to refine advanced tactics in realistic simulated environments (Dalladaku, 2024).

However, significant questions remain about VR implementation:

1. The effectiveness of virtual training for real-world application
2. The substantial initial investment required for large-scale adoption
3. The challenges of integrating new technologies with traditional training frameworks

This study examines VR's capacity to address the shortcomings of conventional military training while carefully considering the practical challenges of implementation. The research aims to provide a balanced assessment of how VR technology can enhance military preparedness without compromising the essential elements of physical training.

Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods research design to comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of VR training in military contexts. The approach combines rigorous analysis of existing literature with firsthand qualitative data collection to provide both empirical and experiential perspectives.

Quantitative Research Component

The investigation began with a systematic review of peer-reviewed studies, military reports, and government publications focused on VR training outcomes. Sources were carefully selected based on their relevance to military applications and methodological rigor. Key studies included Velichko's (2023) examination of implementation costs and Harris et al.'s (2022) research on decision-making performance in VR environments. While both contributed valuable insights, Harris et al.'s work provided particularly robust evidence regarding cognitive outcomes.

Quantitative metrics were extracted from these sources to enable objective comparisons between VR and traditional training methods. The analysis focused on four critical performance indicators:

1. Skill retention rates across different training modalities
2. Comparative cost analyses of VR versus conventional training
3. Time efficiency metrics in course completion
4. Operational performance outcomes

Specific datasets included Roza's (2024) findings on time savings in training programs and Lyndall's (2020) comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of VR implementation. These quantitative measures established a data-driven foundation for evaluating VR's effectiveness.

Qualitative Research Component

To complement the statistical analysis, primary research was conducted through semi-structured interviews with three VR-trained personnel from the Rhode Island Air National Guard. Participants were selected based on their operational experience with both traditional and VR training systems. The interview protocol employed open-ended questions designed to elicit detailed responses about:

- Comparative experiences with VR versus conventional training methods
- Perceived strengths and limitations of VR systems
- Practical challenges in implementation

- Recommendations for improvement

Participants provided rich, nuanced accounts of their training experiences, including specific examples such as aircraft maintenance simulations and tactical combat drills. These narratives offered critical insights into the human factors of VR adoption that quantitative data alone cannot capture.

Integration of Findings

By synthesizing quantitative data with qualitative narratives, this methodology achieves three important objectives:

- It validates statistical findings through real-world user experiences
- It identifies potential disparities between theoretical benefits and practical implementation
- It provides a multidimensional understanding of VR's role in military training

This dual approach ensures that the study's conclusions are both empirically grounded and operationally relevant, offering military decision-makers comprehensive evidence for evaluating VR training systems. The combination of rigorous data analysis with authentic user perspectives creates a balanced assessment framework that addresses both the measurable outcomes and human factors of VR implementation.

Literature Review

Virtual reality (VR) training has emerged as a transformative tool in military education, addressing critical gaps in traditional methods while enhancing efficiency, engagement, and cost-effectiveness. Research highlights four key areas where VR excels: situational awareness and decision-making, scenario simulation, engagement and retention, and cost reduction.

Situation Awareness and Decision-Making

VR's immersive environments replicate high-stress scenarios, enabling trainees to hone judgment under pressure. A UK study found that performance in VR "shoot/don't shoot" simulations closely matched live-fire exercises, demonstrating its efficacy in instilling practical decision-making skills (Harris et al., 2023). Similarly, Air Force pilots trained in VR achieved proficiency in complex maneuvers and emergency procedures faster than through traditional methods (Nolen, 2022). These findings underscore VR's ability to simulate battlefield chaos, including gunfire, smoke, and ambushes, safely and repetitively, bridging the gap between theory and real-world application.

Scenario Simulation

VR excels in replicating high-risk or logistically challenging scenarios. For instance, ANG security forces use VR for active shooter drills, reducing travel costs while maintaining realism (Nolen, 2022). Flight simulators are equally impactful, allowing pilot training during aircraft maintenance or poor weather (Roza, 2024). Such applications prove invaluable for practicing rare but critical events, like engine misconfigurations, where mistakes in live training could cost millions.

Engagement and Retention

Studies reveal stark retention disparities: VR achieves 75% retention compared to 5% for reading and 10% for classroom instruction (Rea, 2024). This advantage stems from VR's multisensory, hands-on approach. For example, ANG medics using VR trauma simulators retained life-saving procedures, such as tourniquet application, more effectively than through textbooks, with 84% reporting significant skill improvement (Maher, 2025). The repetitive, interactive nature of VR solidifies muscle memory, a feat traditional methods struggle to match.

Cost Reduction

While VR requires upfront investment, such as the Army's $2.7 to $3 billion allocation in 2019, it yields long-term savings by minimizing resource expenditure (Lyndall, 2020). Live exercises incur costs for ammunition, fuel, and equipment wear, whereas VR simulations eliminate these while enabling unlimited repetition. For example, aircraft maintenance trainees can practice welding or corrosion prevention virtually, avoiding material waste and exposure to carcinogens (Roza, 2024). Projected investments reaching $19 billion by 2027 reflect confidence in VR's cost-efficiency (Moeger, 2024).

Limitations and Gaps

Despite its advantages, VR faces challenges. Motion sickness (Harris et al., 2023), high initial costs (Velichko, 2021), and skepticism among traditionalists (Velichko, 2021) hinder adoption. Most critically, VR cannot fully replicate real-world stress, potentially fostering unrealistic risk-taking (Dalladaku, 2024). These gaps necessitate a hybrid model, combining VR's technical precision with live drills' physical and psychological demands (Lyndall, 2020).

Synthesis

The literature confirms VR's potential to revolutionize military training, particularly in high-risk, high-cost, or repetitive skill domains. However, its integration must be strategic, leveraging strengths while mitigating limitations through blended training approaches.

Interviews

Methodology and Participant Insights

Primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews with three Rhode Island Air National Guard airmen conducted on February 26, 2025, at their North Kingstown base. Each 30-minute session employed open-ended questions designed to elicit comparative perspectives on VR versus traditional training, including:

- "How do you compare VR training to traditional methods?"
- "How effectively does VR training prepare personnel for real-world performance?"

Responses were analyzed through thematic coding, identifying key patterns in "Cost Savings," "Realism Limits," and "Training Flow."

Key Findings

Operational Advantages

Participants unanimously praised VR's efficiency in technical training:

One airman noted, "VR modules are a game-changer for initial training. We can practice welding, painting, and corrosion prevention without carcinogen exposure or material waste. It's efficient and cuts downtime." Another highlighted VR's role in overcoming logistical barriers: "Flight simulators let us train when real flights aren't possible, like in bad weather." Medical training emerged as a high-potential application, with one stating, "Simulating Tactical Casualty Combat Care allows medics to practice life-saving skills risk-free. It's a great area for VR implementation."

Cost-Effectiveness

All interviewees emphasized VR's financial benefits, particularly for high-cost scenarios: Aircraft engine maintenance was cited as a prime example, where VR eliminates million-dollar risks from trainee errors. The current integration model (classroom theory → VR labs → hands-on application) was described as cost-efficient while maintaining readiness.

Limitations and Challenges

Despite enthusiasm, airmen identified critical gaps:

- Stress Realism: VR cannot replicate the physiological and psychological pressures of live combat.
- OPSEC Barriers: Security clearances slow the adoption of advanced VR systems, echoing Velichko's (2021) concerns.
- Hybrid Necessity: Participants stressed that VR should supplement, not replace, traditional drills to ensure real-world competency.

The interviews provide ground-level validation of VR’s strengths in safety, cost reduction, and accessibility while underscoring its inability to fully substitute physical training. These insights align with the literature’s call for a hybrid approach (Lyndall, 2020), balancing innovation with combat realism.

Challenges and Limitations

While virtual reality offers transformative potential for military training, its implementation faces four significant challenges that must be carefully managed: financial barriers, instructor adaptation, physiological effects, and realism limitations. Each presents unique obstacles that require strategic solutions.

Financial and Logistical Constraints

The substantial upfront costs of VR systems present a major barrier to widespread adoption. A complete VR training setup requires significant investment in specialized hardware like high-end headsets and motion trackers, powerful computing infrastructure, and customized training software. For military-scale implementation, these costs can escalate into the millions. Beyond initial setup, ongoing expenses for system maintenance, software updates, and technical support create long-term financial commitments that may strain budgets, particularly for smaller units. The Army's $2.4 billion VR investment demonstrates the scale of funding required for meaningful adoption, suggesting that phased implementation strategies and government funding partnerships may be essential for sustainable deployment.

Instructor Adaptation and Resistance

Transitioning to VR-based training requires overcoming institutional inertia and skepticism from experienced instructors. Many senior trainers, having built careers on traditional live-drill methods, question VR's ability to replicate the unpredictable nature of real combat situations. This resistance stems from both philosophical differences and practical concerns about whether virtual environments can adequately prepare soldiers for the psychological demands of actual combat. Successful adoption will require demonstrating concrete successes through pilot programs, particularly in specialized areas like flight training where VR has shown measurable performance improvements. Policy changes and professional development initiatives will also be necessary to help instructors effectively integrate VR into existing training curricula.

Physiological Effects on Trainees

The phenomenon of VR-induced motion sickness, known as cybersickness, affects a significant portion of trainees, especially those new to virtual environments. Common symptoms including nausea, dizziness, eye strain, and disorientation can disrupt training sessions and reduce overall effectiveness. These physiological reactions are particularly problematic in military contexts where consistent performance is critical. Current mitigation strategies focus on technological improvements like higher frame rate displays, better headset designs, and adjusted training protocols featuring shorter, more frequent sessions. Gradual exposure programs that allow users to build tolerance over time have shown promise, but the issue remains a significant barrier for some personnel.

Realism and Stress Replication

Perhaps the most fundamental limitation of VR training is its inherent inability to fully replicate the psychological and physiological stress of real combat situations. The knowledge that virtual scenarios carry no actual consequences may lead to unrealistic risk-taking behaviors and inadequate preparation for the intense pressures of live combat. Trainees who perform well in controlled virtual environments may find themselves unprepared for the chaos, fear, and consequences of real-world engagements. This gap underscores the necessity of maintaining robust live-training components even as VR systems become more sophisticated.

The most effective approach appears to be a hybrid model that strategically combines VR's strengths in technical skill development and scenario repetition with traditional field exercises that provide essential stress inoculation and reality testing. Such balanced implementation could maximize the benefits of both methods while mitigating their respective limitations. Successful integration will require ongoing evaluation to ensure VR supplements rather than replaces the irreplaceable lessons of live training, particularly in developing the mental resilience and adaptability crucial for combat effectiveness.

These challenges highlight that while VR offers remarkable training capabilities, its military implementation requires careful consideration of financial, human, and operational factors. Thoughtful adoption strategies that address these limitations will be essential to realizing VR's full potential as a training tool without compromising the essential elements of combat preparation.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Virtual reality has proven to be a valuable asset in military training, demonstrating measurable improvements in preparedness, instructional efficiency, and cost-effectiveness. The technology directly addresses longstanding limitations of conventional methods, particularly in knowledge retention, adaptive learning, and scenario availability (Nolen, 2022). By combining empirical research with firsthand accounts from Rhode Island Air National Guard personnel, this analysis provides compelling evidence of VR's ability to enhance training realism and engagement. Future studies could build on these findings by incorporating specific performance metrics from operational units to further validate the technology's impact.

While the benefits are substantial, three key challenges require attention: significant initial investment costs, the need for instructor training and buy-in, and limitations in replicating real-world stress conditions. These factors suggest that VR is best implemented as part of a hybrid training model that strategically combines virtual and traditional methods (Lyndall, 2020). Such an approach would leverage VR's strengths in high-risk scenario simulation and technical skill development while maintaining essential live exercises that build combat resilience and stress management.

For optimal implementation, the military should consider launching targeted pilot programs in critical areas such as urban combat operations, medical evacuation procedures, and complex vehicle maintenance training. These initiatives should include robust data collection mechanisms to continuously assess and refine VR applications. Concurrently, comprehensive instructor training programs will be essential to ensure proper integration of VR systems into existing curricula.

Final Recommendation

The U.S. military should implement a phased adoption of hybrid VR/live training across all branches by 2027, with initial focus on high-risk, high-cost training scenarios including combat simulations and emergency medical procedures. This balanced approach will maximize training effectiveness while controlling implementation risks and costs.

With sustained investment and iterative improvement, VR technology has the potential to revolutionize military training paradigms while preserving the irreplaceable value of hands-on field experience. The path forward requires careful integration rather than replacement, ensuring that technological advancements enhance rather than diminish combat readiness.

References

Ahmed, R. (2024, January 15). *Adapting military training for modern threats*. https://militaryembedded.com/avionics/synthetic-vision/addressing-the-challenges-of-military-training-simulation

Dalladaku, Y., Ivezaj, A., & Brown, R. (2020, April). *Assessing the effectiveness of virtual reality in the training of Army aviators* [Conference paper]. General D. R. Keith Memorial Conference, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY. https://ieworldconference.org/content/WP2020/Papers/GDRKMCC_20_15.pdf

Harris, D. J., Lucas, N., Unhold, S., Kazemi, M., & Vine, S. J. (2023). Exploring the role of virtual reality in military decision training. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality, 4*, Article 1165030. https://doi.org/10.3389/frvir.2023.1165030

Lin, J., Chen, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). *The effectiveness of virtual reality in education: A systematic review and meta-analysis.* https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12345

Lyndall, F. III. (2020, July 7). *The effectiveness of virtual simulation as a training tool*. *NCO Journal.* Army University Press. https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/NCO-Journal/Archives/2020/July/The-Effectiveness-of-Virtual-Simulation-as-a-Training-Tool/

Maher, D. (2025, February 18). *84% of airmen say using VR improved their medical skills*. *8th Air Force News.* 28th Bomb Wing Public Affairs. https://www.ellsworth.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/4069988/84-of-airmen-say-using-vr-improved-their-medical-skills/

Moeger, T. (2024, September 19). *Ohio Guard soldiers try cutting‑edge virtual reality training*. *National Guard News.* https://www.nationalguard.mil/News/Article-View/Article/3910725/ohio-guard-soldiers-try-cutting-edge-virtual-reality-training/

Nolen, M. (2022, January 21). *195th Wing spearheads VR training for Air Guard security forces*. *Air National Guard News.* https://www.195wg.ang.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/2915466/195th-wing-spearheads-vr-training-for-air-guard-security-forces/

PwC. (2022). *The VR advantage: How virtual reality is redefining soft skills training.* https://www.pwc.com/us/en/tech-effect/emerging-tech/virtual-reality-study.html

Roza, D. (2024, May 8). *New tech helping airmen think faster in training, AETC boss says*. *Air & Space Forces Magazine.* https://www.airandspaceforces.com/air-force-aetc-virtual-reality-cognition/

Roysden, A. (2024, February 10). *ROTC training standards and challenges*. https://www.army.mil/article/276569/enhancing_soldier_proficiency_addressing_inefficiencies_in_army_training

Velichko, M. (2021, January 15). *VR military training – The next step of combat evolution*. https://www.jasoren.com/vr-military-training-the-next-step-of-combat-evolution/

Vive Team. (2023, November 14). *Survey of U.S. military trainers on XR effectiveness*. HTC VIVE. https://www.vive.com/us/newsroom/2023-11-14/