

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Integrative Model Of Physics Education In The Digital Environment

 **Khalikov Kurbanbay Tuychievich**

Associate Professor of the Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue02 2026

PAGE: 50-52

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Pedagogics, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

The analysis shows that the proposed model can serve as a methodologically grounded and systematic conceptual solution for visualizing abstract physical processes, improving the effectiveness of teaching in resource-limited laboratory conditions, and ensuring competency-based learning outcomes. The model interprets digital tools not as isolated add-ons, but as an integrated instructional management system combining didactic mechanisms with assessment and learning analytics.

KEY WORDS

Virtual laboratory, learning management system (LMS), augmented and virtual reality, adaptive learning, inquiry-based learning.

INTRODUCTION

Physics education in the system of natural sciences is distinguished by its theoretical complexity, reliance on mathematical modeling, and experimental nature. Topics such as fields, electromagnetic induction, wave and optical processes, and quantum phenomena require abstract imagination, spatial thinking, and argumentation. However, since the content of physics is not a collection of formulas, but a scientific system verified by experience, based on measurement results, and explained by cause-and-effect relationships, laboratory classes are an integral component that forms the skills of connecting theory with a real phenomenon, analyzing accuracy and error, and drawing scientific conclusions [1]. In practice, however, in many educational institutions, laboratory work is not fully organized due to insufficient or outdated equipment, safety restrictions, time constraints, and uneven infrastructure; as a result, the student, instead of performing the experiment independently, is often limited to observing the finished result, becoming a passive observer rather than an active participant in the scientific process, and conceptual assimilation and research

skills are not sufficiently formed.

In solving these problems, digital technologies create important pedagogical opportunities. While virtual laboratories allow for conducting experiments in a secure, repetitive, and controlled environment, independently modifying parameters, instantly seeing the result, and working on errors,[2] interactive simulations enhance the understanding of their internal logic by visualizing invisible or complex processes[3]. AR/VR creates conditions for immersive perception of spatial and invisible phenomena, contributing to a deeper understanding of field, wave, and micro-world processes [4], while LMS provides continuous pedagogical communication by providing prompt feedback based on planning and managing the educational process, monitoring, and analytics [5]. However, the problem lies not in the existence of the technology, but in its pedagogically appropriate integration: a virtual laboratory or simulation becomes a result only when it is combined with didactic mechanisms, assessment criteria, and educational activity. Therefore, in conditions of limited resources, the adaptation of digital tools to teaching practice,

the development of methodological recommendations, and the integration of digital content with research-based and problem-based teaching approaches remain relevant scientific tasks. Although the ideas of modernization and step-by-step integration are highlighted in domestic research [6], the need remains for a unified system model that combines the process from input conditions to results as a controlled cycle.

This conceptual direction is based on the integration of several fundamental theories:

- based on the active formation of knowledge through the experimental learning cycle "experiment-reflection-conceptualization-application," virtual laboratories allow this cycle to be implemented in an operational, repetitive, and controlled manner [7];

- cognitive multimedia learning theory emphasizes that the harmony of visual and verbal information enhances understanding, and simulations balance cognitive load by simultaneously demonstrating the dynamics of formulas, graphs, and processes [8].

These foundations, combined with the active learning approach, transform the student not into a passive recipient of knowledge, but into a hypothesizing, testing, and analyzing subject [6]; problem-based learning forms knowledge through the solution of real situations, connecting physical content with practical context [9]. The STEAM approach enriches this process through interdisciplinary integration and project activities [3], enhances spatial perception of AR/VR, and educational analytics allows managing an individual approach and continuous improvement based on data by analyzing the "digital footprint" of educational activities [7]. The resultant direction is determined by a competency-based approach, which requires evaluating education not only with knowledge, but also with multidimensional results, such as scientific thinking, critical analysis, digital literacy, and independent learning.

METHODS

Research project: conceptual modeling and system analysis. The methodological approach of this study was aimed at developing a conceptual model for organizing physics education in the digital environment and its scientific and methodological justification. At the center of the research was not the question "which technology is effective?," but "how is the technology transformed into a result through a didactic mechanism?." Therefore, technology was interpreted not as

an independent tool, but as a goal-oriented mechanism within the pedagogical system.

The "input-process-output" logic was adopted as the methodological basis. At the introductory stage, the student's level of knowledge, motivation and digital literacy, features of the content of physics, educational standards, and the stability of the technical infrastructure were analyzed. At the stage of the process, virtual laboratories, interactive simulations, LMS, artificial intelligence, and AR/VR technologies were considered in integration with didactic approaches. At the exit stage, conceptual knowledge, practical research skills, scientific thinking, digital competence, and the ability for independent learning were interpreted as measurable results. Thus, the model presents education not as a collection of individual lessons, but as a managed and improved system.

For practical modeling, the cycle "planning→performance→analysis→feedback→improvement" was chosen as a methodological basis. Digital platforms allow for consistent recording of student activity: such indicators as task completion time, repeat attempts, and error dynamics are analyzed. This allows the teacher to make pedagogical corrections during the process, and the effectiveness of feedback is confirmed by meta-analysis.

The methodological approach was based on three directions. Firstly, the conditions of access and their interaction were clarified through system analysis; for example, if digital literacy is low, the cognitive load may increase and the conceptual result may decrease. Secondly, based on conceptual modeling, the functions of each technology were clearly defined: virtual laboratory - a tool for experimental learning, a simulation-visualization mechanism, LMS - a control and monitoring platform, artificial intelligence - a tool for adaptive adaptation, AR/VR - interpreted as a component that enhances spatial perception. Thirdly, the internal consistency of the model was substantiated as a dynamic system through the "planning-implementation-analysis-improvement" cycle.

Also, in the model, information, activity, and evaluation flows were considered as an interconnected system. The results of the activity are transferred to the analytical block, where they are analyzed and the scenario is reconfigured through feedback. Based on the principle of "educational activity - assessment - correspondence of results," indicators and assessment tools corresponding to each type of activity were determined, which transforms the digital environment into a

measurable ecosystem.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Entrance conditions: factors determining the quality of education. The "entry conditions" block of the conceptual model combines determinants that determine the effectiveness of digital and virtual learning in a single system. The main idea is that the result of education depends not on the technology itself, but on the pedagogical and ecological environment in which it operates. A virtual laboratory or simulation becomes a real pedagogical result only when combined with the student, content, standard, and infrastructure.

The first factor is the characteristics of the student. The level of knowledge, internal motivation, and digital literacy are the central factors in the effectiveness of learning in the digital environment. In virtual learning, the student is not a passive listener, but an active participant, managing parameters, repeating the experiment, and analyzing the result. Studies have shown that the level of engagement directly affects the quality of assimilation. If simulation is perceived not as a scientific research tool, but simply as an interactive tool, a conceptual result will not emerge. Therefore, diagnostic evaluation at the introductory stage identifies conceptual errors, the level of understanding of the experimental algorithm, and digital skills, and adapts the process.

The second factor is the content of physics. The model rejects the "the same technology for each topic" approach and promotes the principle of a "topic-appropriate digital mechanism." In sections with multi-parameter and complex cause-and-effect relationships, visualization and modeling enhance conceptual understanding. Simulations are selected based on a scenario aimed at minimizing typical conceptual errors. As a result, the digital tool becomes a didactic tool that deepens the content.

The third factor is educational standards and competencies. In the modern approach, the result is measured not only by factual knowledge, but also by practical research skills, scientific thinking, and digital competence. Therefore, at the introductory stage, it is clarified which competence is formed through which activity and by what indicators it is assessed. This approach transforms the virtual environment from a visual tool into a competency-building system.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulwahed, M., & Nagy, Z. K. (2009). Applying Kolb's experiential learning cycle for laboratory education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 98 (3), 283-294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2009.tb01025.x>
2. Brinson, J. R. (2015). Learning outcome achievement in non-traditional (virtual and remote) versus traditional laboratories: A review of the empirical research. *Computers & Education*, 87, 218-237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.07.003>
3. Bybee, R. W. (2013). *The case for STEM education: Challenges and opportunities*. NSTA Press.
4. Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction* (4th ed.). Wiley.
5. De Jong, T., Linn, M. C., & Zacharia, Z. C. (2013). Physical and virtual laboratories in science education. *Science*, 340 (6130), 305-308. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230579>
6. Freeman, S., et al. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111 (23), 8410-8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
7. Gameage, D., Perera, I., & Fernando, S. (2020). Moodle and LMS-based learning analytics: A systematic review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 141568-141592. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3012012>
8. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning*. Routledge.
9. Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16 (3), 235-266. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3>
10. Ibanez, M. B., & Delgado-Kloos, C. (2018). Augmented reality for STEM learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 123, 109-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.002>