BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

HE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERACTIVE AND VISUAL TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING ANATOMY AND HISTOLOGY: THE ROLE OF 3D ANATOMICAL SOFTWARE AND VIRTUAL MICROSCOPY IN KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION AND RETENTION

Aliyeva Munisaxon Nabiyevna
Head of the Department of General Professional Subjects,
Turkistan International Technical College, Bukhara, Uzbekistan
ORCID iD: 0009-0003-1590-3595
E-mail: munisa2002alieva@gmail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23834612

Abstract. Anatomy and histology form the morphological foundation of medical education, yet both subjects face reduced contact hours, limited access to cadaveric and glass-slide resources, and rising student expectations for digital learning. This article reviews current evidence on interactive and visual technologies in these disciplines, focusing on three-dimensional (3D) anatomical software and virtual microscopy. Drawing on multimedia learning, cognitive load, and dual coding theories, it explains how manipulable models and navigable digital slides support the understanding of complex spatial and microstructural relationships. Published studies suggest that 3D visualization improves spatial knowledge and engagement, while virtual microscopy yields examination results comparable with conventional microscopy and adds flexibility and standardization. Evidence on long-term retention is encouraging but depends on integration with active retrieval, formative assessment, and instructor guidance. Practical recommendations and the limitations of current research are also discussed. The article concludes that these tools are most effective as complements to, not replacements for, traditional laboratory teaching.

Keywords: anatomy education; histology; 3D anatomical software; virtual microscopy; interactive learning; knowledge retention; medical education; visual technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Anatomy and histology constitute the morphological foundation of medical education. A secure command of gross structure, microscopic organization, and the relationships between them underpins later learning in physiology, pathology, radiology, and clinical practice. Over the past decades, however, the way these subjects are taught has changed considerably. Surveys of medical schools in the United States describe a steady reduction in the number of hours devoted to gross anatomy, histology, and related anatomical sciences, accompanied by a shift toward integrated, system-based curricula [1]. At the same time, traditional resources such as cadavers, prosected specimens, and glass microscope slides are costly to maintain, require dedicated space and staff, and can be difficult to provide in sufficient quantity for large student groups [2].

These pressures have encouraged educators to search for complementary approaches that make better use of limited contact time. Interactive and visual technologies are among the most

widely adopted solutions. Three-dimensional (3D) anatomical software allows students to rotate, section, layer, and label digital models of the human body, whereas virtual microscopy replaces the physical slide and microscope with high-resolution digital images that can be viewed on any computer or mobile device. Both approaches promise greater flexibility, standardization of learning materials, and opportunities for self-directed study. Whether they genuinely help students to understand a topic and to remember it over time, however, is a more demanding question that deserves careful examination.

The aim of this article is to review the published evidence on the use of interactive and visual technologies in teaching anatomy and histology, with particular emphasis on the contribution of 3D anatomical programs and virtual microscopy to students' comprehension and long-term retention of course content. The article first outlines the cognitive principles that explain why such tools may enhance learning, then examines the evidence for each technology, discusses mechanisms related to retention, and finally offers practical recommendations and a critical view of current limitations.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Several well-established theories of learning help to explain the potential value of visual and interactive resources. The cognitive theory of multimedia learning proposes that people learn more deeply from words and pictures presented together than from words alone, provided that the material is designed to avoid overloading the learner's working memory [3]. Anatomy and histology are inherently visual disciplines, so well-designed images, animations, and interactive models correspond closely to the nature of the content.

Cognitive load theory adds that working memory is limited and that complex material with many interacting elements is especially demanding [4]. Anatomical knowledge is of this type: a single region contains numerous structures whose positions, shapes, and relationships must be understood simultaneously. When a student is required to mentally reconstruct a three-dimensional arrangement from flat textbook illustrations, a large share of mental effort is spent on visualization rather than on understanding function or clinical relevance. A manipulable 3D model can reduce this unnecessary, or extraneous, load by externalizing the spatial information and freeing cognitive capacity for deeper processing.

Dual coding theory suggests that information stored in both verbal and visual form is more likely to be remembered, because two complementary memory traces are created [5]. A student who studies the name of a structure, sees it in several orientations, and then relates it to its microscopic appearance builds a richer network of associations than a student who simply memorizes a list. Finally, research on test-enhanced learning demonstrates that actively retrieving information from memory strengthens long-term retention more than repeated passive re-reading [6]. Interactive programs that incorporate self-testing, labelling exercises, and immediate feedback therefore have the potential to turn visual exploration into effective retrieval practice.

THREE-DIMENSIONAL ANATOMICAL SOFTWARE

Contemporary 3D anatomical programs typically provide a layered digital representation of the human body. Users can peel away skin, muscles, vessels, and organs in sequence, isolate individual structures, rotate models through 360 degrees, display labels on demand, and in many

cases view cross-sections that correspond to computed tomography or magnetic resonance images. More advanced systems extend these functions into virtual and augmented reality environments, in which learners can examine structures at life size and from any angle [7]. In contrast to a printed atlas, the student determines the viewpoint, the depth of dissection, and the pace of exploration. The accumulated evidence suggests that these features benefit learning, particularly with respect to spatial understanding. A literature review of three-dimensional display technologies for anatomical education concluded that such tools generally support learning and are positively received by students, although the strength of the evidence varied between studies [7]. A meta-analysis of the educational effectiveness of 3D visualization technologies reported an overall positive effect on knowledge outcomes, with the clearest advantage for spatial knowledge, that is, understanding how structures are positioned in relation to one another [8]. This finding is consistent with the theoretical expectation that externalizing spatial information reduces the burden of mental visualization.

The picture is nevertheless not uniformly favorable. A review of the quality of the literature on 3D anatomy models noted that many studies are small, use different outcome measures, and differ widely in methodological rigor, which limits firm conclusions [9]. Individual differences also matter: a randomized trial of stereoscopic augmented reality visualization examined how learners' visual-spatial abilities modify the benefit obtained from the technology, indicating that students do not all gain equally from the same tool [10]. In practical terms, 3D software is likely to be most helpful for topics with complex spatial architecture, such as the skull base, the heart, the brachial plexus, the pelvis, and the course of the cranial nerves, and for students who find mental rotation difficult.

A further advantage of 3D programs is their capacity to connect anatomy with clinical imaging. When a student scrolls from a 3D reconstruction to the corresponding axial section, the abstract notion of a "slice" becomes concrete, which prepares learners for the interpretation of radiological images later in training. Because the software is available at any time, students can also revisit difficult regions repeatedly, which creates the distributed practice that is known to improve long-term retention [6].

VIRTUAL MICROSCOPY

Virtual microscopy, also known as whole-slide imaging, relies on scanners that digitize an entire glass slide at high magnification. The resulting file can be opened in a web browser or specialized viewer, where the student can pan across the section, zoom from low to high power, and, in many systems, view teacher annotations, labels, and linked questions [11]. The method has been widely adopted in histology and pathology teaching and is now regarded as a mature educational technology [12, 13].

The practical advantages are considerable. Every student studies exactly the same high-quality slide, whereas with glass slides the quality and the specific section can vary from one set to the next, and slides may fade, break, or become scratched with use. Access is not limited to scheduled laboratory hours, so learners can review material before and after class and at their own pace. Teachers can mark key areas, build structured exercises, and, in some systems, monitor how

students navigate a slide. Because the images are shared electronically, the approach also supports collaborative learning, in which students discuss the same field of view without being physically in the same room [11, 13].

With regard to learning outcomes, the available evidence is encouraging. A naturalistic experiment with a control group compared traditional microscopy instruction with a process-oriented virtual microscopy course and supported the view that virtual instruction can be at least as effective as conventional teaching [14]. A study evaluating virtual microscopy in medical histology teaching reported generally favorable student attitudes toward the method [15]. Moreover, online game-based platforms built around histological content have been associated with improved student performance and engagement [16], which suggests that the combination of digital slides with gamified retrieval exercises is a promising direction.

Virtual microscopy also has recognized limitations. Students who study only digital images do not acquire the practical skills of handling a microscope, adjusting focus and illumination, and selecting fields, which some programs consider important for future clinical or laboratory work [11]. Scanners, servers, and licenses require initial investment, and image loading depends on reliable internet access. For these reasons, many institutions retain a limited amount of conventional microscopy alongside the virtual approach.

KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION AND RETENTION

The central question for teachers is how these technologies influence what students understand and what they remember weeks or months later. Several mechanisms are plausible. First, active manipulation requires students to make decisions, such as which structure to remove, which magnification to select, and which feature to identify, and active processing is generally associated with deeper encoding than passive reading. Second, the presentation of the same content in several forms, such as a 3D model, a labelled diagram, a cross-section, and a micrograph, produces multiple memory pathways, as predicted by dual coding theory [5]. Third, self-paced access makes repetition and spacing possible, both of which strengthen long-term memory [6].

A fourth and particularly important mechanism is the integration of macroscopic and microscopic knowledge. Students often learn gross anatomy and histology in separate courses and treat them as unrelated subjects. Digital platforms make it easy to link a 3D model of an organ with virtual slides of its tissues, so that the student sees how the shape of the organ, the arrangement of its layers, and the cell types within them explain its function. Such integration creates meaningful connections between facts, and meaningful knowledge is retained better than isolated facts.

Engagement is a further contributor. A study of medical student engagement with technology-enhanced learning resources found that patterns of engagement were related to assessment outcomes, which suggests that resources that students actually use and value can influence performance [17]. Interactive tools tend to be more motivating than static materials, and motivated students spend more time on task.

It is important, however, to distinguish immediate performance from long-term retention. Most published studies measure knowledge shortly after the learning activity, and relatively few include delayed tests after several weeks or months. Consequently, the claim that visual

technologies improve retention is supported mainly by theoretical reasoning and by indirect evidence rather than by a large body of long-term trials. The available findings suggest that benefits are most likely to persist when technology is combined with strategies that are known to promote memory, namely retrieval practice, spaced review, and feedback [6]. A visually attractive resource used only for passive viewing is unlikely to produce lasting gains.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the evidence and the cognitive principles discussed above, several recommendations can be made for teachers who wish to introduce these technologies. A blended model is the most defensible approach. Students may use 3D software and virtual slides for preparation before a practical session, work through guided tasks during the session with the teacher available for questions, and complete short self-test exercises afterwards. This sequence combines exploration, application, and retrieval in a single cycle.

Second, the use of the technology should be tied to specific learning outcomes. Instead of asking students to browse a model freely, teachers can set concrete tasks, such as tracing the course of a nerve, identifying the layers of the intestinal wall, or comparing two epithelia, and ask students to justify their answers. Third, the principles of multimedia design should be respected: labels should be placed close to the structures they describe, complex scenes should be divided into manageable steps, and unnecessary decorative elements should be avoided in order to limit extraneous cognitive load [3, 4]. Fourth, clinical cases and radiological images should be incorporated so that structural knowledge is linked to its application [2]. Finally, teachers require training and time to become competent users of these tools, and students benefit from a short orientation to the software at the start of the course.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite their promise, interactive and visual technologies present several challenges. The first is cost and infrastructure. Software licenses, slide scanners, computers, and reliable internet access are not equally available in all institutions, and in resource-limited settings open-access atlases and freely available slide collections may provide a more realistic starting point. The second is the risk of passive or superficial use, in which students scroll through images without thinking. The third is that digital models cannot fully reproduce certain benefits of cadaveric dissection, such as appreciation of anatomical variation, tactile experience, teamwork, and professional attitudes toward the human body. For this reason, a combination of methods is generally recommended rather than the complete replacement of one resource by another [2].

Weaknesses in the research base should also be acknowledged. Many studies involve small samples from a single institution, measure satisfaction rather than objective performance, rely on short-term outcomes, and may be influenced by the novelty of a new tool [9]. Future research should therefore include multi-center randomized designs, standardized outcome measures, delayed post-testing, and analysis of how learner characteristics such as spatial ability affect results [10]. Emerging developments, including augmented reality and adaptive learning systems, offer further opportunities but will require the same rigorous evaluation.

CONCLUSION

Interactive and visual technologies, and in particular 3D anatomical software and virtual microscopy, represent valuable additions to the teaching of anatomy and histology. Theoretical frameworks and the available empirical evidence indicate that 3D models help students to understand spatial relationships, that virtual microscopy provides flexible, standardized, and effective access to histological material, and that both approaches can increase engagement and support the integration of macroscopic and microscopic knowledge. Evidence for long-term retention is promising but still limited, and the benefits appear to depend on how the technologies are used rather than on the technologies alone.

The most effective strategy is therefore a thoughtfully designed blended approach in which digital tools are combined with traditional laboratory teaching, active retrieval, regular feedback, and instructor guidance. Under these conditions, 3D programs and virtual microscopy can help students not only to learn anatomy and histology more efficiently but also to retain and apply this knowledge in later clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Drake RL, McBride JM, Pawlina W. An update on the status of anatomical scienceseducation in United States medical schools. Anat Sci Educ. 2014;7(4):321–325.
2. Estai M, Bunt S. Best teaching practices in anatomy education: A critical review.
3. Ann Anat. 2016;208:151–157.
4. Mayer RE. Multimedia Learning. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;2009.
5. Sweller J. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cogn Sci.
6. 1988;12(2):257–285.
7. Paivio A. Mental Representations: A Dual Coding Approach. New York: Oxford
8. University Press; 1986.
9. Roediger HL, Karpicke JD. Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves
10. long-term retention. Psychol Sci. 2006;17(3):249–255.
11. Hackett M, Proctor M. Three-dimensional display technologies for anatomical
12. education: A literature review. J Sci Educ Technol. 2016;25(4):641–654.
13. Yammine K, Violato C. A meta-analysis of the educational effectiveness of three-
14. dimensional visualization technologies in teaching anatomy. Anat Sci Educ. 2015;8(6):525–538.
15. Azer SA, Azer S. 3D anatomy models and impact on learning: A review of the
16. quality of the literature. Health Prof Educ. 2016;2(2):80–98.
17. Bogomolova K, van der Ham IJM, Dankbaar MEW, et al. The effect of stereoscopic
18. augmented reality visualization on learning anatomy and the modifying effect of visual-spatial abilities: A double-center randomized controlled trial. Anat Sci Educ. 2020;13(5):558–567.
19. Coleman R. Can histology and pathology be taught without microscopes? The
20. advantages and disadvantages of virtual histology. Acta Histochem. 2009;111(1):1–4.

21. Dee FR. Virtual microscopy in pathology education. Hum Pathol. 2009;40(8):1112–1121.
22. Hamilton PW, Wang Y, McCullough SJ. Virtual microscopy and digital pathology
23. in training and education. APMIS. 2012;120(4):305–315.
24. Helle L, Nivala M, Kronqvist P, et al. Traditional microscopy instruction versus
25. process-oriented virtual microscopy instruction: A naturalistic experiment with control group. Diagn Pathol. 2011;6(Suppl 1):S8.
26. Mione S, Valcke M, Cornelissen M. Evaluation of virtual microscopy in medical
27. histology teaching. Anat Sci Educ. 2013;6(5):307–315.
28. Felszeghy S, Pasonen-Seppänen S, Koskela A, et al. Using online game-based
29. platforms to improve student performance and engagement in histology teaching. BMC Med Educ. 2019;19:273.
30. Pickering JD, Swinnerton BJ. Exploring the dimensions of medical student
31. engagement with technology-enhanced learning resources and assessing the impact on assessment outcomes. Anat Sci Educ. 2019;12(2):117–128.