

This is a preprint of the paper to be published in International Journal of Interactive Learning Research (IJILR). The final version is available in AACE Digital Library.

Virtual Campus in the Context of an Educational Virtual City

Mikhail Fominykh¹, Ekaterina Prasolova-Førland², Mikhail Morozov³ and Alexey Gerasimov⁴

^{1, 2} Program for learning with ICT, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway

^{3, 4} Multimedia Systems Laboratory, Mari State Technical University, Russia

mikhail.fominykh@svt.ntnu.no, ekaterip@idi.ntnu.no, morozov@marstu.mari.ru,

gerasimov.marstu@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is focused on virtual campuses, i.e. virtual worlds representing real educational institutions that are based on the metaphor of a university and provide users with different learning tools. More specifically, the idea of integrating a virtual campus into the context of a virtual city is suggested. Such a virtual city, where students live and work, can extend the possibilities of a virtual campus in supporting learning and socializing. This paper provides a description and analysis of an empirical case study that was performed to test and develop these ideas. Based on the results of the study, a set of guidelines for designing a virtual campus in a city context is presented.

Introduction

In recent years, the use of 3D virtual worlds has been continuously increased, and adopting virtual worlds for educational settings is becoming more and more widespread. As it is stressed in (de Freitas, 2008), in the future all kinds of virtual worlds will offer different opportunities for learning. In (Prasolova-Førland & Divitini, 2003) we have argued that virtual worlds have promising potential for supporting learning communities, providing students and teachers with a place where they can perform overcoming the barriers of the physical world. According to (Kelton, 2007), virtual worlds allow people to interact in a way that conveys a sense of presence lacking in other media.

3D virtual worlds can be defined as “networked desktop virtual reality in which users move and interact in simulated 3D spaces” (Dickey, 2005). Within such environments, users are represented by avatars – 3D animated characters that allow users to convey their identity, presence, location and activities and interact with other users, agents or virtual objects. Communication possibilities are usually presented in the form of a limited choice of gestures and text-based chat tools, in some cases also a voice chat. Examples of successful 3D virtual world applications include Second Life (www.secondlife.com), Active Worlds (www.activeworlds.com), Wonderland (<https://lg3d-wonderland.dev.java.net>) and others.

The design of educational virtual worlds is often based on the social constructivist approach (Vygotsky, 1978), allowing learners to co-construct their environment and understanding together with their peers (Bryceson, 2007). In this way, the virtual space provides a dynamic and flexible environment where distributed learners can share information and form the environment according to their needs. Virtual worlds provide possibilities for serendipity that is usually defined as a fluke, but in fact an environment should be created to support it. As it is stressed in (Waters, 2009), a special value of virtual worlds for education is that they have more opportunities for accidental interactions than any other media.

This paper is concentrated upon one type of educational virtual worlds, *virtual campuses*. More specifically we suggest an idea of placing a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city. A virtual campus can be defined as an environment that uses the metaphor of a university and provides users with a range of different tools for learning. A growing number of universities have introduced virtual representations of themselves in the form of virtual campuses for supporting a wide range of educational activities. But we argue, referring to (Vygotsky, 1978),

that socializing is of essential importance for learning and needs to be maintained. Using a city context can extend a campus not only spatially, but also add more possibilities for learning, gaming and socializing. While virtual campuses often focus on collaboration among people that are geographically distributed, the metaphor of “virtual city” brings local issues back into the distributed virtual environment, recognizing the critical role of place and local communities in learning. This not only supports interactions with “others around the world, but also – and, perhaps more importantly, with people nearby” (Rheingold, 2003).

Previously we argued that a virtual campus can benefit the learning process in many ways. In (Fominykh, Prasolova-Førland, Morozov, & Gerasimov, 2008), based on the survey and case studies made, we derived an initial set of requirements for a 3D virtual campus and presented the start-up of NTNU’s campus design. We consider a virtual campus as a special *place* to perform learning activities and with a *set of tools* to benefit educational process (Clark & Maher, 2001).

A virtual city can supplement a virtual campus by providing additional arenas for their social activities, such as places for clubs, concerts, parties and so on. Moreover, a virtual city around the campus can be an additional place for dissemination and sharing of educational content, educational simulations and demonstrations, as well as a place where students, using special tools, can collaboratively create and share their own content, including 3D constructions. While virtual campuses have substantial potential in terms of attracting new students (Fominykh, et al., 2008), a virtual city is probably best suited for these purposes. It can provide an atmosphere of a real city and information in the form of different media, allowing prospective foreign students and any other users to learn about the local culture, architecture, history, etc.

In the next section an overview of existing virtual campuses and cities discussing their features and current weaknesses is presented and the concept of a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city is suggested. The third section an empirical case study that was performed to test and develop our initial ideas. Further the case study results are presented and discussed in the fourth section. As an outcome of the discussion, we propose a set of guidelines for designing a virtual campus in the city context. Finally, the fifth section concludes the paper, outlining directions for future work.

Related work

Many different educational projects that define themselves as ‘Virtual Universities’ or ‘Virtual Campuses’ have been developed. Such projects started as online multimedia services for distance learning in the early 90s. Today providing online educational services for time and space separated users is one of the most important roles of virtual campuses. Generally, virtual campuses provide users with different sets of possibilities, ranging from web-based systems (e.g. <http://vu.org/>) to immersive 3D worlds. This paper primarily focuses on the latter category as well as considering ‘Virtual Cities’ as another type of 3D virtual worlds.

3D virtual campuses are created based on different types of platforms and technological solutions. For example, Virtual Campus of Nanyang Technological University in Singapore (Prasolova-Førland, Sourin, & Sourina, 2006) is based on blaxxun technology (www.blaxxun.com). This virtual campus provides a very realistic, ‘photographic’ resemblance of the corresponding physical campus, with offices and students’ rooms. There are also different tools available there for students for getting consultations, following lectures and doing practical

exercises, especially in computer graphics. There are also numerous examples of virtual representations of real educational institutions in Active Worlds, such as iUni (<http://iuni.slis.indiana.edu>). However, the most widely used platform at the moment is Second Life, although it has certain disadvantages as a learning environment (Helmer, 2007). Over 500 universities and colleges have a presence in Second Life, a 3D virtual world opened to the public in 2003, which today is inhabited by millions of ‘residents’ from around the globe. Major universities already using SL include California State University, Harvard University, Ohio State University, University of Hertfordshire and University of Sussex, just to mention a few. The presence of institutions working in Second Life varies broadly, from full-scale, highly realistic campuses, less realistic ‘digital interpretations’ to individual classes taught in common areas. For example, Northern Illinois University is supplementing both credit and non-credit courses with Second Life classes in art, computer science, education, and communication (Kelton, 2007). In Ohio State University’s virtual campus visitors can take several courses, get access to learning materials, visit art installation, music center and other places. Harvard Law School offered a course in Second Life called “CyberOne: Law in the Court of Public Opinion” (Jennings & Collins, 2008). It is common for many of virtual campuses that they attempt to create a ‘familiar’ atmosphere for the students. Virtual campuses often provide a clear association with the real educational institutions they represent, conveying their ‘spirit’ and atmosphere by different means. These means may include a realistic outlook, informational resources, possibilities to contact the representatives of the educational institutions, etc.

Virtual campuses and cities are often created within bigger virtual worlds, using their advantages, but also being restricted by their limitations. ‘Social virtual worlds’, such as Second Life, that are often used for virtual campuses resemble only little parts of real world or sometimes do not even have anything in common with the reality. Whereas virtual worlds that represent the physical world in a very direct and realistic way, known as ‘mirror worlds’, do not have satisfactory support of learning and socializing (de Freitas, 2008). Examples of mirror worlds include *virtual cities* that nowadays often have detailed and attractive models and advanced functionality. The most known virtual cities are made for Geo-navigation, such as in Google Earth (<http://earth.google.com>), heritage preservation, such as Rome Reborn (<http://www.romereborn.virginia.edu>) and Forbidden City (<http://www.beyondspaceandtime.org>). There also exist virtual cities that are made for gaming and socializing, for example Cybertown (<http://www.cybertown.com>) and Citypixel (<http://www.citypixel.com>). However, virtual city designers focus even less on education and training (de Freitas, 2008), (Dickey, 2005) and (Prasolova-Førland, 2005).

It is supported in (Dokonal, Martens, & Plösch, 2004), emphasizing that in the virtual city design the most important questions are probably for what purposes and how virtual cities can be used. Although the level of detail is often of high importance, it is not only an issue of creating a realistic 3D model of the city. A virtual city can not only be a space, but a place which is invested with social meaning (Harrison & Dourish, 1996). In such a way, provided functionality of a virtual campus as well as a virtual city acquire significant importance, because the system should allow users to *do* something in the environment. These may include facilities for communicating and exploring the environment, collaborative work, learning and socializing, tools for creating and sharing the content and other resources.

Based on the discussion in the Introduction and the presented literature overview, we suggest the concept of a virtual campus integrated into a virtual city. The city context can extend the possibilities of a virtual campus to support learning and socializing. At the same time, a

campus can enrich a virtual city with social meaning and educational content. Together, the integration of a virtual city and a campus may connect local and distributed communities of learners. We have performed an explorative case study to identify to what extent a virtual world of a city and a campus can enhance educational process and what functionality is required. In our work we develop further a systematic approach to virtual campus design (Fominykh, et al., 2008) and consider this empirical study as a view in a broader perspective and a source of up-to-date feedback.

Case Study

The case study presented in the paper had several goals, including providing the target group of students with an experience in collaboration and improving the developed concept of a virtual campus. The main research objectives of the case study were:

- Identifying the requirements (in terms of appearance, functionality, content and so on) for an educational virtual city as well as for a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city;
- Evaluating an original 3D virtual environment, where the case study took place;
- Identifying expectations that present-day Norwegian students have of a virtual campus of their university and of a virtual city representing their home city;

The case study was conducted mostly among the students at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). The students performed a number of educational activities in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola (VCYO).

System Description

This section presents a short description of the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola (VCYO) system. In reality Yoshkar-Ola is a city in the Volga region in Russia, where Multimedia Systems Laboratory (VCYO developer) is located. VCYO is a multiuser virtual environment representing the central part of the real city in exact manner with buildings (with examples of interiors), streets, yards, trees and other elements (Fig. 1 and 2).



Figure 1. The main square in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola

The model of the city contains also the main building of NTNU as a symbol of collaboration between universities and as a fun element (Fig. 2). The system is a Research and Development project, which is freeware and available on the web (<http://virtyola.ru/index.php?lang=english>).

The system's functionality includes representing users by realistic customizable avatars. A user can explore the world, moving his/her avatar by using simple interface. A big and a mini-map as well as teleportation are available to facilitate navigation in the virtual city. Users can communicate to each other by text chatting (private, local-group and global chats); voice chatting is being tested. The system also supports social software (Owen, Grant, Sayers, & Facer, 2006) functionality. It is possible to examine descriptions of places and buildings in the city, users' notes and photos in the virtual world (Fig. 2). A user can also add their own comments to existing notes or photos, to leave their own notes and put their own pictures around the world. Such user-generated content often shows users' opinions of the virtual and the corresponding real places that can be useful and interesting for other users.




Figure 2. Photo-sharing in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola

A citizen of the virtual city can also create a social network with other users, filling a profile, adding friends to a friend list, keeping a blog and commenting others' blogs. VCYO also contains some educational tools to enable live virtual lectures such as facilities for slide show, video and web.

Case study settings

The research goal of the case study was investigating how a 3D virtual city can better support collaborative learning and socializing among students as well as identifying users' expectations of a virtual campus and its integration into the virtual city context. As the system used in the case study was still in a "beta" version, the feedbacks from the students were useful for identifying existing problems and suggesting improvements and new features.

34 students divided into 8 groups participated in the case study, most of them in their 4th year of study. The students included both ethnical Norwegian and exchange students from other cultural backgrounds as well as a small group of Russian students. The students were given an exercise where during the preparatory phase they were supposed to explore a virtual world VCYO, aiming to analyze the different design features used and to discuss the usage of virtual worlds for learning and socializing. The students were also asked to make suggestions how they would have designed a virtual campus representing NTNU and a virtual city of Trondheim (the city where NTNU is situated) in the most appropriate way.

As a practical part of the exercise students first had to customize their avatars and explore the world, different places and objects in it. Next, they had to try different communication functionalities and contact other on-line users. Furthermore, students were supposed to explore

the social network of the virtual city's community and use social software functionality to build their own social network. A central task was participation in a virtual lecture. The lecture took place in the open-air auditorium (Fig. 3) in VCYO, where several tools for learning are situated. Lecture theatre with slide show, web browser and video screens with a pointer, as well as chat were used during the lecture. The event lasted about 2 hours that included the lecture itself and the associated discussion. Due to technical problems and server overload, the originally planned lecture had to be interrupted and finished 9 days later. After the lecture, the students had a discussion on virtual worlds and virtual cities in educational settings.



Figure 3. Virtual lecture in the open-air auditorium in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola

The students also delivered essays answering a number of questions regarding their experience in the virtual city and their opinions about the future design of NTNU's virtual campus and the virtual city of Trondheim.

All the data in this explorative case study was gathered from the following sources of evidence:

- direct observation of students' activities online
- archival records (visiting statistics, chat log as well as notes, pictures and comments recording)
- users' feedback (essays and questionnaires)

Respecting the main objectives of the case study, the data have been analyzed to define the following:

- The overall impression from VCYO, how to improve it and what functionality is missing
- How navigation tools were used in the system, how to improve them and what other tools are needed

- How social software and communication tools were used in the system and how helpful these tools were for social navigation and for building a social network
- What places in VCYO were the most sought-for, what roles they played and what other places are needed in a virtual campus/city
- What educational experience the students got and how it can be improved in any virtual campus
- How Norwegian students would design a virtual campus of NTNU and a virtual representation of their home city

Two questionnaires were conducted during the case study: one at the planning phase and another after the case study. The first questionnaire was performed before the case study among students taking a different course. Questionnaires were distributed with short descriptions of a virtual city and a virtual campus, since these students were not necessarily familiar with virtual worlds and virtual cities.

The approach has a number of limitations. First, the degree of participation of the participants varied to a certain extent, from logging on regularly, exploring almost all the environment and trying to use all the available tools to participating only in the virtual lecture. Also there have been variations in previous experience in virtual worlds the students had before they started to use VCYO. Student experience in the system was on some occasions limited by technical problems. All this might have influenced the quality and accuracy of the feedback provided in the essays.

When conducting questionnaires we were mostly interested in the overall trends. We are also aware that with the given data foundation and response rate makes it rather complicated to arrive at statistically significant results. For example, for different reasons (e.g. obtaining response from a wider student population) it was not feasible to distribute the 1st and the 2nd questionnaire to the same student group. Therefore in our analysis we generally focus on identifying the major tendencies rather than arriving at concrete conclusions.

Results and discussion

In this section the results from the case study are summarized and discussed. Afterwards a set of guidelines for designing a virtual campus in the context of an educational virtual city is outlined.

Results from in-world observations

This sub-section presents the empirical data that were gathered during the case study that is mostly how the students used communication and social software tools, path recording data, the results of two questionnaires as well as some examples. From the 34 students participating in the study, 27 communicated by chat and posted text-notes and pictures. 28 discussions, in which students took part, were selected in the chat-log (excluding the lecture). Most commonly during these discussions the students helped each other to understand the system's functionality details and navigate in the virtual city, shared their impressions generally about the VCYO, as well as about particular places and objects, etc. Some of the observed students also met other visitors of VCYO and had some informal conversations. In general, we observed a number of examples of 'social navigation', where the students were guided by peers (for example, how to enter

buildings or to get to the lecture place) or invited friends to see some places (for example, to take a walk on the city's roofs).

Students posted 135 notes in the virtual city; some of them were commented by their peers or other virtual citizens. Notes were tagged to particular places so that students from the observed group used them mostly to ask about interesting places, buildings and objects, while local virtual citizens often answered by commenting on those notes. For example, there were discussions around the virtual gallery in VCYO replicating the one available in reality in the city of Yoshkar-Ola (Fig. 4). Some of the Norwegian students expressed their interest in the exposition, wishing to learn more about Russian art.



Figure 4. Example of note with comments in a gallery in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola

The students from the observed group were interested in the photos of the real city posted in appropriate places in the virtual one; however, they uploaded relatively few pictures of their own. But there was one exception – the main building of NTNU that was created and placed in the outskirts of the VCYO. All of Norwegian students could easily recognize this building and some of them posted photos of it, also leaving a lot of notes discussing the building, the university and other issues (Fig. 2).

Concerning profiles, friend lists and personal blogs functionality, it should be said that it was used to a smaller degree, due to technical problems and the relatively small size of the community and a short trial period.

Path recording was performed during the whole case study time (Fig. 5) and during the lecture event alone (Fig. 6). These data were also used to analyze how much time students spent in the virtual city and what places they visited. Students used different 'movement patterns', but




Figure 6. Visiting statistics in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola during the virtual lecture

Results from questionnaires

Two questionnaires were conducted during the case study: one at the planning phase and another after the case study. The first pre-questionnaire was performed before the case study among students taking a different course. Questionnaires were distributed with short descriptions of a virtual city and a virtual campus, since these students were not necessarily familiar with virtual worlds and virtual cities.

Both questionnaires had the same set of questions:

- Q1. What virtual city would you like to visit/participate in its life?
- Q2. What tools and facilities would you need in a virtual city?
- Q3. If a virtual city of Trondheim (where NTNU is situated) will be created, would you visit it/participate in its life?
- Q4. To what extent would you engage in the following activities at the Virtual Campus of NTNU?
- Q5. What tools and facilities would you need at the Virtual Campus of NTNU?
- Q6. What experience do you have with 3D virtual worlds?

Questions Q1, Q2, Q4 and Q5 had sub-questions stressing specific issues such as different activities and facilities/tools are suitable or not for a virtual campus and a virtual city. The students were asked to position their answer on a Likert scale.

The first questionnaire was performed among a group of students taking a different course (not working with the system). The goal of this questionnaire was obtaining feedbacks from a broader student audience. The results from the first questionnaire were analysed and

major implications are discussed below. Generally the respond was positive: from totally 24 sub-questions and 26 responses for each, 60 most negative (9,6%), 88 negative (14,1%), 166 neutral (26,6%), 189 positive (30,3%) and 121 most positive answers (19,4%) were received. However several issues were prioritized. The students generally expressed interest in visiting a virtual city: a city where they live, where they are going to live and going to visit for tourism (Fig. 7). In such a city they mostly expect to see high quality models of buildings, often with media content, showing city's culture and history. Additionally the students showed interest in the “interactive quizzes and games” possibility. Tools for social and educational activities were considered less important. Generally, all mentioned means that a virtual city is seen as a game and/or educational environment with advanced graphics and possibilities for learning from realistic 3D buildings as well as from other media (Fig. 8).




Figure 7. First questionnaire results: Virtual city, question 1




Figure 8. First questionnaire results: Virtual city, question 2

According to the results of the same questionnaire, in a virtual campus the students would engage in many activities such as virtual lectures, practical exercises, accessing and sharing resources and group work. However the respondents considered educational games, community building and socializing less suitable for a virtual campus (Fig. 9). For mediating their activities in a virtual campus the students would mostly prefer “traditional” tools, such as slide sharing, text, images and video presentation. As for a virtual city the students consider a high quality of 3D models important. Interactive facilities such as lab simulations and experiments were found potentially useful. Tools for socializing and community building were again recognized as less necessary as well as tools for 3D constructing and presenting 3D content (Fig. 10).




Figure 9. First questionnaire results: Virtual campus, question 4




Figure 10. First questionnaire results: Virtual campus, question 5

The second questionnaire was performed among the students that participated in the case study. The respond was also rather positive: from totally 24 sub-questions and 12 responses for each, 33 most negative (11,5%), 55 negative (19,1%), 89 neutral (30,9%), 69 positive (20,4%) and 42 most positive answers (14,6%) were received. However, the results show a difference in the priorities compared to the first questionnaire. In addition, two groups of students: one from Norway and one from Russia had different opinions on several issues. The results for these two groups were compared, with major implications are outlined below.

In a virtual city the students mostly prioritized interactive facilities (quizzes and games), media content, showing city's culture and history, socializing tools and tools for community building, while high quality of building paled into insignificance. This resonated with the ideas students expressed during the discussions in the virtual city and in their essays: virtual city contained only models of building, even very accurate ones, has a very limited value (Fig. 12). Answering what virtual city they would like to visit, Norwegian students prioritized the option "A city that I would like to visit for tourism", while Russian students supported the option "A city where I live now". This means that user preferences to a significant degree depend on their existing experience, since VCYO represents the home city of Russian students, while for Norwegians the case study was similar to a virtual tourist trip (Fig. 11).




Figure 11. Second questionnaire results: Virtual city, question 1




Figure 12. Second questionnaire results: Virtual city, question 2

During the case study the students have got an educational experience in a 3D virtual world that, though containing a number of educational tools, could not be called a virtual campus. It appears that the difference in the results of the two questionnaires could be attributed to this experience. Participating in virtual lectures and accessing resources were less attractive for these students in comparison with those answering the first questionnaire, while practical exercises in virtual laboratories, group work and educational games were more attractive (Fig. 13). Realistic models of building in the campus receded into the background, while tools for presenting 3D content got more support than tools for presenting text, graphics and video in the 2nd questionnaire. Tools for socializing and community building tools were slightly more supported than in the 1st questionnaire (Fig. 14).




Figure 13. Second questionnaire results: Virtual campus, question 4




Figure 14. Second questionnaire results: Virtual campus, question 5

Discussion

In this section the case study results are analysed in terms of navigation, community network, educational experience and virtual places, noting how the system's existing functionalities support or limit users' experience in the VCYO. We also discuss the results of two questionnaires that were performed during the case study, investigating what activities, facilities and tools are suitable for a virtual campus and a virtual city.

The *navigation* and exploration of the city was mostly concentrated around the entry and a few other areas of interest such as the main square, the main building of NTNU and the lecture place as the navigation patterns in Figs. 5, 6 and direct students' feedbacks showed. One of the reasons for that was that the students did not get sufficient information upon log-in about the different places in the city that might be interesting to visit, plus at this stage of development not all constructions had enough informational content to motivate in-depth exploration. However, students noted that they had some accidental interactions with local virtual citizens. Despite of the locals did not speak English well enough, they encouraged Norwegians to explore the environment, guiding them and showing different places. The environment therefore supports random serendipity meetings that are useful in a virtual city context, as students' feedback shows. Still, the navigation patterns showed that the existing support for social navigation (by chat and posting notes) was not fully efficient and that additional facilities are needed.

The *community network* development allowed us to analyze the efficiency and limitations of the different tools in the virtual city context. Considering the small quantity of virtual citizens in this case study, the limited time-span and some technical problems, the resulting community network (in terms of blogs and friend-lists) was moderate but satisfactory.

One of the most useful tools was the one allowing to see 'who is on-line' and teleporting to any user from the list. User notes were used quite a lot, allowing students to discuss asynchronously particular places or objects and enriching the environment with user-generated content. Notes with comments often contained quite meaningful discussions and were usually attached to the places related to the discussion topic. For example, there were a lot of notes with questions about buildings and places, highlighting the need for 'marking the buildings', explaining their purpose. The functionality allowing posting photos was mostly useful in relation to places familiar from reality, showing the importance of the connection between the real and the virtual.

The total amount of notes was less, but comparable to the amount of chat messages – the main communication tool. The findings above suggest that the notes functionality was easy to use and helpful, but most importantly, they highlight the importance of 'situatedness' and context for community development in the virtual city. The students used the virtual city as a discussion board, connecting together the content and virtual places. Moreover, posting notes and photos the students together with local citizens enriched the environment with new user-generated content.

The *educational experience* included taking part in the virtual lecture. Tools for live lecturing available in the open air auditorium (shared displays for slide show, video and co-browsing) proved to be useful for the lecture joining 2 cities, Trondheim and Yoshkar-Ola. Still, there were some problems. For example, visibility problems: it was difficult to see all 3 displays simultaneously, because of the narrow view angle and other avatars, blocking parts of screens. This highlighted the necessity to work further on the organizational settings for virtual lectures. In addition, there were some technical problems due to the server overload. Web and video

displays played some movie clips with sounds during the lecture, making it more alive and interesting, though it was inaudible for students using public computers in the lab. The students strongly recommended using voice chat in the future since text chat appeared to be useful, but not sufficient.

Virtual places within virtual environments can play a number of different roles in an educational context, such as information spaces, meeting and work places, virtual stages, demonstration and exhibitions (Prasolova-Førland, 2005). Our experience and direct students' feedbacks showed that a virtual city itself can provide a number of such places as well as supplement a virtual campus. For example, the streets and squares could serve as natural meeting places, with prominent landmarks such as 'street corners', famous buildings and so on serving as navigation aids. The same landmarks (such as the main building of NTNU in our example) as well as designated places (libraries, campus, boards at teleportation hubs) where community members can store resources and leave their notes, announcements and comments, function as an information place set in a rich context. In our case, it allowed Norwegian students to learn about a foreign city by posting their questions on the buildings of interest and receiving answers from the locals.

A virtual city can also function as an exhibition, attracting public interest to the corresponding exhibition in reality and allowing the community members to post comments and questions, as shown in the gallery example (Fig. 4). The city itself could be seen as a gallery with buildings and virtual citizens acting as exhibits. Navigating through high quality 3D models and communicating with virtual citizens provide an impression of being in the city, of course, not as bright as in real life, but much closer to reality than with other media. As our experience with the virtual lecture shows, a virtual city can function as a workplace. Still this requires that corresponding facilities are in place as discussed earlier. An important aspect here, as noted in almost all students' essays, is the 'disturbance' factor while having a lecture in an open space (a square) with other users wondering around and other visual impressions diverting attention from the lecture itself. It was suggested to keep such 'serious' educational events 'indoors' in settings close to real-life auditoriums, to create a better focus on the educational content. Such open places in the city are better suited to serve as 'virtual stages' for concerts, city events and gatherings, promoting a feeling of 'togetherness' and presence among distributed users.

Conducting *questionnaires* during the case study we were interested mostly in what activities the students would be engaged and what tools and features they would need. In addition comparing first and second questionnaire allowed investigating how getting experience changes students' preferences.

The results of the first-questionnaire shows that students without much experience in virtual cities and virtual campuses support more traditional and conservative approaches. They support advanced graphics – a well known advantage of virtual worlds, but almost reject social activities. They support an idea of integrating traditional educational activities, such as virtual lectures, and traditional tools, such as shared whiteboards, in a virtual campus, but doubt of more advanced tools. This trend was supported especially by the students, who answered that they have experience in 3D virtual worlds (including games, social virtual worlds and other virtual reality applications). This could be explained that experienced users are influenced by current technical limitations of virtual reality applications. At the same time another part of the target group – non-experienced users – was more positive and more open: they prioritized also entertainment facilities and information about community life in a virtual city, as well as supported community building tools and tools for presenting 3D content in a virtual campus. The

results of the first questionnaire show that 3D virtual environments should be further studied, since even users who consider themselves as experienced are not fully able to see the range of possibilities and implications offered by this technology.

Moreover, the results of the questionnaires indicate that even a brief experience is important for forming an opinion about a virtual city and a virtual campus. Using advanced graphics and adopting traditional learning methods (such slide show and so on) at first sight seems to be most suitable strategy in virtual campuses and cities. The practice shows that these features are rather necessary, but not as a central part of virtual city and campus. Other specific tools that use unique advantages of 3D collaborative environment would most probably play the most important role.

To conclude, our case study in VCYO educed some limitations of the system, but at the same time it showed that a virtual city can successfully be used in a wide range of educational activities and in particular as a context for a virtual campus.

Guidelines for designing a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city

Based on the case study results and the discussion in the previous sub-section, we propose a set of guidelines for designing a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city. Since in (Fominykh, et al., 2008) we have already presented an initial set of requirements for a virtual campus, in the following guidelines we will focus more on the aspects of a virtual campus as an integral part of a virtual city, creating together an arena where students can learn and socialize (Fig. 15).




Figure 15. Learning “L” and Socializing “S” in a virtual campus are extended by city context

We can think of a scenario where the city’s cafes, clubs, squares, museums and libraries constitute a network connected to the infrastructure of the campus. We made these guidelines focusing primarily on the city of Trondheim (that is often called a “nr. 1 student city in Norway”) and on the Virtual Campus of NTNU. Trondheim is actively used by the students for festivals,

parties and educational activities, containing a number of dedicated buildings and businesses offering student-targeted services. Still we believe that these findings and guidelines can also be applicable in other similar contexts:

The *appearance* of a virtual campus as well as a virtual city should be as authentic as possible to create a familiar atmosphere and aid navigation. The overall structure of a campus and a city should be presented in a maximally realistic way, while special attention should be paid to the major and most significant buildings, such as main campus buildings and city's points of interest. Both the campus and the city should contain places for students' socializing such as cafes, coffee bars, squares and other open places for gatherings, student clubs, places for sports activities (such as tennis and football) and stores selling commodities that students might need. The design of certain places for various educational, social, fun or other activities could have a limited reality resemblance to serve the specific goals in a best possible way, such as auditoriums, buildings representing courses and faculties, but also private houses and educational spaces that can be built by the students and teachers within the major structure of the campus/city. Also, the outside of certain buildings might be scaled down to make it easier for users to move around while the inside could be scaled up to give more space for activities.

Informational resources should be an essential part of a virtual campus and a virtual city. It was generally agreed that only models of buildings without corresponding information have a very limited value and meaning, especially for the users not familiar with the city and the campus. Therefore, there should be a strong correspondence between the constructions in the virtual city/campus and the associated informational resources and facilities. For example, the city hall should contain information about local government; the doctors' offices should contain information about the medical services. The faculty buildings should contain information about the corresponding study programs and research projects, the different auditoriums and course rooms in the campus should display information on lecture schedules and contain resources such as video recordings of the lectures. Informational resources should also be contained in the offices of university teachers and city officials. In some cases, these could be represented by virtual humans, being able to answer a certain set of 'frequently asked questions'. According to the students, this approach would lead to a lower threshold for asking for help. Such informational resources are especially relevant for foreign students who need to get acquainted with the city and local customs as quickly as possible. The students also emphasized the need for library resources with appropriate search facilities. For better efficiency and availability, such resources in the campus and the city should be interconnected, giving the students access to contextualized information, such as what political events took place in the city during a certain historical period studied in a history class.

The city should in general contain multimedia resources such as sound, pictures, video, 3D resources and 'enactments' with virtual agents associated with relevant important buildings and landmarks, allowing the users to learn about the city, its history and culture. The same applies to campus as on several occasions the students expressed the need for animations to be used as a learning aid in different courses. The possibility to work with 3D content is one of the main advantages of many environments that can benefit learning. Therefore a virtual campus should provide support for presenting, storing, reusing and especially – creating new 3D content. Referring to the feedback from students, we can conclude that the system should provide a special toolkit for working on the media content in order not to overload the system's interface. This toolkit should include easy to use instruments to create and modify any content, including 3D objects, and should be available for all users.

A wide array of *community resources and tools* reflecting and supporting the life of the student community should be integrated in a virtual world of a campus and a city, in a situated and contextualized manner. For example, there should be established some virtual places for social activities (imaginary ones or representations of real places) such as squares, parks, art galleries, museums, student clubs, open-air auditoriums. Other examples include bulletin boards with announcements, blogs and virtual houses for community members, discussion forums and tools for supporting social networks with extensive possibilities for the users to share, annotate and modify the content. There should be clear connections between the community resources and the related virtual places. Moreover, there should be possibilities for automatic recording of the events happening in certain places such as lectures in the lecture halls. A basic support for commercial activities targeting students' needs should be provided to ensure better integration of local businesses into the student community. The students specifically emphasized the importance of 'friends' networks, maintaining the awareness of the activities and whereabouts of ones' friends, as well as their social and educational calendars. In this way a student will have the possibility to teleport to a place in the city or on the campus where his/her friends have a party or a working meeting. There should be search possibilities for locating community members with the needed characteristics (e.g. potential collaboration partners).

Various *navigation facilities* should be available for users to access the content in a virtual campus and a city in the most efficient way. For the campus it could be, for example, teleportation links between buildings and faculties, including different geographically distributed sub-campuses, areas for meetings and research environments. The system should allow advanced searches to get an overview of both social structures (such as the positions of friends and their virtual 'offices') and course and research-related structures. The city environment should provide for example 'city tours' led by agents, 'tourist offices' with information and links to the major points of interest plus searchable maps with filters where one can look for shops, local businesses, historical places and so on. There should be bookmarks and 'transportation routes' marked clearly between different places. In order to support social navigation, there should be possibilities for sharing information on paths taken and places visited by other users. The navigation systems for the campus and the city should be integrated to allow free movement within the overall social and educational space. Such integrated system would be especially useful for new students, serving as a virtual 'helpmate' and supplementing the physical helpmates who according to tradition are assigned at the beginning of the academic year to all newcomers to show them around the area.

Atmosphere plays an important role, according to students' feedbacks. Appropriate music and sounds, moving objects, mystery elements such as "hidden doors and secret passages," presence of other users, real or artificial, will contribute to make the virtual world more 'alive' and appealing. The students repeatedly suggested adding gaming elements to the virtual campus and the city. This includes both games as a part of different courses, different types of quests and social games similar to those available on MSN Messenger. Another unexpected elements suggested by the students are places for sports that are not always straightforward to practice in a virtual environment, suggesting that the atmosphere created by such places is more important than the actual functionality.

Conclusions and future work

This paper proposes and discusses the concept of a virtual campus integrated into a virtual city. The settings and the results of the case study that took place in the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola are also presented. Gathered empirical data and the students' direct feedbacks allowed analysing and discussing the effectiveness of different tools supporting educational and social activities and make suggestions for their development and improvement. As a result of this discussion, the paper presents a set of the major guidelines for designing a virtual campus in the context of a virtual city. These guidelines will be used for designing a virtual city representing Trondheim, where a virtual campus of NTNU is supposed to be the main feature.

Future work will include the development of the theoretical framework for designing 3D immersive virtual worlds for learning, focusing on the integration of the virtual campus and virtual city concepts. As a result, the authors plan further development of the Virtual City of Yoshkar-Ola as well as the design of the NTNU's Virtual Campus integrated in the city of Trondheim context.

References

- Bryceson, K. (2007). The online learning environment - A new model using social constructivism and the concept of 'Ba' as a theoretical framework. *Learning Environments Research*, 10(3), 189-206.
- Clark, S., & Maher, M. L. (2001). *The Role of Place in Designing a Learner Centered Virtual Learning Environment*. Paper presented at the CAAD Futures Conference.
- de Freitas, S. (2008). *Serious Virtual Worlds report*: Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC).
- Dickey, M. D. (2005). Three-dimensional virtual worlds and distance learning: two case studies of Active Worlds as a medium for distance education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(3), 439-451.
- Dokonal, W., Martens, B., & Plösch, R. (2004). *Creating and Using Virtual Cities*. Paper presented at the eCAADe Conference (Education in CAAD in Europe)
- Fominykh, M., Prasolova-Førland, E., Morozov, M., & Gerasimov, A. (2008). *Virtual Campus as a Framework for Educational and Social Activities*. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Computers and Advanced Technology in Education (CATE).
- Harrison, S., & Dourish, P. (1996). *Re-place-ing space: the roles of place and space in collaborative systems*. Paper presented at the ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work.
- Helmer, J. (2007). Second Life and Virtual Worlds. *Learning Light Limited*.
- Jennings, N., & Collins, C. (2008). Virtual or Virtually U: Educational Institutions in Second Life. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3).
- Kelton, A. J. (2007). Second Life: Reaching into the Virtual World for Real-World Learning. *ECAR Research Bulletin*, 2007(17).
- Owen, M. L., Grant, L., Sayers, S., & Facer, K. (2006). *Social software and learning*. London: Futurelab.
- Prasolova-Førland, E. (2005). *Place Metaphors in Educational CVEs: An Extended Characterization*. Paper presented at the 4th Conference on Web-based Education (WBE).
- Prasolova-Førland, E., & Divitini, M. (2003). *Collaborative virtual environments for supporting learning communities: an experience of use*. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Supporting Group Work.
- Prasolova-Førland, E., Sourin, A., & Sourina, O. (2006). Cybercampuses: design issues and future directions. *Visual Computer*, 22(12), 1015-1028.
- Rheingold, H. (2003). *Smart Mobs - The Next Social Revolution*: Cambridge, MA, Perseus Publishing.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Waters, J. K. (2009). A 'second life' for educators. *Technological Horizons In Education*, 36(1), 29-34.