


Wearable Device-Based Real-Time Monitoring of Physiological Signals: Evaluating Cognitive Load Across Different Tasks

Ling He^{ab}, Yanxin Chen^{ac}, Wenqi Wang^{ab}, Shuting He^{ab}, Xiaoqiang Hu^{ab}

^aFaculty of Education, Jiangxi Science and Technology Normal University, Nanchang, China; ^bVR Perception and Interaction Key Laboratory, Nanchang, China; ^cDecheng Technical School, Zhongshan, China

Abstract

This study employs cutting-edge wearable monitoring technology to conduct high-precision, high-temporal-resolution (1-second interval) cognitive load assessment on electroencephalogram (EEG) data from the FP1 channel and heart rate variability (HRV) data of secondary vocational students. By jointly analyzing these two critical physiological indicators, the research delves into their application value in assessing cognitive load among secondary vocational students and their utility across various tasks. The study designed two experiments to validate the efficacy of the proposed approach: Initially, a random forest classification model, developed using the N-BACK task, enabled the precise decoding of physiological signal characteristics in secondary vocational students under different levels of cognitive load, achieving a classification accuracy of 97%. Subsequently, this classification model was applied in a cross-task experiment involving the National Computer Rank Examination (Level-1), demonstrating the method's significant applicability and cross-task transferability in diverse learning contexts. Conducted with high portability, this research holds substantial theoretical and practical significance for optimizing teaching resource allocation in secondary vocational education, as well as for cognitive load assessment methods and monitoring. Currently, the research findings are undergoing trial implementation in the school.

Keywords

Cognitive Load; EEG; HRV; Real Time; Cross-Task

1. Introduction

In the sphere of China's secondary vocational education, there is a pressing need for effective methods to assess students' learning outcomes and cognitive load. However, this assessment is challenged by the scarcity of teaching resources and the diverse cognitive abilities of students. To tackle this issue, this study explores the potential of physiological indicators, such as electroencephalogram (EEG) and heart rate variability (HRV), due to their non-invasive nature and ability to enable real-time monitoring. The research aims to utilize advanced wearable monitoring technology to collect high-resolution EEG data from the fp1 channel and HRV data from secondary vocational school students. This method allows for second-by-second evaluation, providing an unprecedented level of temporal precision in the assessment of cognitive load in this context. Moreover, it also aims to determine their cross-task applicability, offering a portable and time-efficient method for evaluating cognitive load in diverse learning scenarios. This innovative approach has the potential to revolutionize the assessment of cognitive load in secondary vocational education, ultimately enhancing the educational

experience for students across various tasks and learning environments.

1.1. Significance of cognitive load in secondary vocational education

In the domain of secondary vocational education, the role of cognitive load is crucial, particularly in practice-oriented courses. Cognitive load refers to the mental effort required by learners to process new information or perform complex tasks, which often varies dynamically during activities[2]. Additionally, students in secondary vocational schools frequently encounter new knowledge and skills, which impose varying degrees of cognitive load and its fluctuations. Therefore, the rapid, accurate, and real-time assessment of students' cognitive load is essential for enhancing teaching quality and learning efficiency. By scientifically quantifying cognitive load, educators can gain a better understanding of students' cognitive states during the learning process, thus facilitating personalized instruction. Personalized teaching methods can adjust instructional strategies and content based on students' cognitive load, ensuring effective learning under appropriate cognitive load conditions. Moreover, precise assessment of cognitive load aids in the optimal allocation of learning resources. Educators can use cognitive load data to optimize the distribution of teaching resources, such as adjusting instructional time, the difficulty and quantity of learning materials, and providing necessary support to ensure efficient resource utilization. In summary, accurate measurement and evaluation of cognitive load in secondary vocational education are not only beneficial for optimizing teaching strategies and improving student learning outcomes but also have a profound impact on the rational allocation of educational resources and overall enhancement of educational quality. Therefore, strengthening research on cognitive load and applying it to secondary vocational education practice is a key approach to improving educational effectiveness.

1.2. Meaning of EEG and HRV

EEG serves as a non-invasive neurophysiological metric, offering high-temporal-resolution recordings of brain activity. By focusing on signals from specific regions, such as the FP1 channel, we can gain a more direct understanding of neural activity changes associated with cognitive load. The following table summarizes the EEG signals across various frequency bands and their implications.

Table 1. EEG Frequency Bands and Significances

Band	Frequency Range (Hz)	Description
Delta	0.5 - 4	Deep sleep, slow-wave sleep, brain recovery, and repair processes[41]
Theta	4 - 8	Early stages of sleep, light sleep, meditation, relaxation[28]
Alpha	8 - 12	Relaxation, state with closed eyes, alert but relaxed state, meditation[3]
Beta	12 - 30	Alertness, concentration, activity, cognitive tasks, anxiety, excitement[8]
Gamma	> 30	Higher cognitive functions, information processing, integration of

Table 1. EEG Frequency Bands and Significances

Band	Frequency Range (Hz)	Description
		perception and consciousness[26]

HRV measures the fluctuation in the time between heartbeats, serving as a marker for the activity of the autonomic nervous system and the body's response to stress. During periods of high mental effort, like intense studying, HRV tends to drop, suggesting increased stress. HRV is calculated using the Root Mean Square of Successive Differences (RMSSD) of R-R interval values, which are the gaps between consecutive heartbeats recorded on an Electrocardiography (ECG)[7]. These variations indicate how the heart's rhythm is regulated by the autonomic nervous system. Essentially, RMSSD quantifies these changes, giving insight into the system's activity, particularly the influence of the vagus nerve, which is pivotal in maintaining heart rate regularity. Thus, HRV serves as a valuable tool for assessing stress coping mechanisms.

1.3. Potential advantages of EEG signals and HRV as indicators of cognitive load

The combined utilization of these two metrics offers potential advantages, providing a multifaceted assessment of cognitive load that more comprehensively reveals learners' cognitive load levels across various tasks and contexts. As physiological indicators, EEG and HRV each reflect cognitive load information from different perspectives; their integrated analysis can offer a more profound and comprehensive evaluation of cognitive load, providing valuable insights for educational research and practice. This method of combined usage is expected to facilitate more precise and comprehensive analysis and understanding in the field of cognitive load research.

1.4. Machine learning potential in this field

In the field of cognitive load assessment, Random Forest models possess formidable capabilities in parsing nonlinear relationships. Firstly, a notable feature of the Random Forest algorithm is its efficacy in deciphering nonlinear characteristics within data, which is particularly critical when dealing with physiological signals such as EEG and HRV. Secondly, given that the nervous system is a complex nonlinear system, participants undergoing cognitive tasks elicit a series of reactions through the nervous system. These reactions manifest as EEG and HRV signals, providing the Random Forest model with a wealth of nonlinear features. Consequently, the Random Forest model can accurately predict cognitive load states by precisely identifying and interpreting these nonlinear features in physiological signals (Figure 1), endowing it with significant advantages and potential applications in cognitive load assessment. This method notably surpasses traditional, subjective-based cognitive load assessment techniques. Through in-depth analysis of large datasets, these models can uncover subtle patterns indiscernible by traditional methods, making real-time or near-real-time cognitive load monitoring feasible. In practical application domains such as education and workplaces, the deployment of this technology suggests the potential for

dynamically adjusting teaching or working environments based on individuals' real-time cognitive states, thereby optimizing learning outcomes and enhancing work performance. With ongoing exploration into more physiological and psychological signal types and advancements in machine learning algorithms, the precision and applicability of cognitive load assessment are anticipated to further improve.




Figure 1. Cognitive Activity To Classification

1.5. Relation Work

The realm of cognitive load assessment comprises three pivotal elements: physiological signals, feature selection, and evaluation methodologies. In terms of physiological signals, researchers frequently utilize EEG, ECG, and EDA, among others, to reflect an individual's cognitive load level during task execution. For feature selection, various methods such as sequential backward selection and particle swarm optimization are employed to screen features related to cognitive load. In evaluation methods, classifiers like decision trees and support vector machines are widely used in assessment models. Regarding assessment accuracy, Ronglong Xiong et al. (2020) achieved an accuracy rate of 96.3% using a decision tree classifier for binary classification of cognitive load states versus baseline states[51]. Pieter Vanneste et al. (2021) also reported relatively high accuracy rates[46]. In terms of the number of physiological signal modalities, Pieter Vanneste et al. (2021) utilized three modalities: EEG, EDA, and EOG[46]. Regarding EEG channel count, Dai Buyun et al. (2019) employed two channels (Fp1, Fp2) for cognitive load assessment[6]. In terms of devices, YUEH-MIN HUANG et al. (2020) used a headband EEG device for cognitive load assessment[43]. In cross-task

assessments, Luis Cabañero Gómez et al. (2021) conducted cognitive load assessments under n-back and Stroop tasks[4]. For prediction time resolution, Shan Zhang et al. (2021) used an 800-ms time window to predict cognitive load[59]. However, cognitive load fluctuates during task execution, and current research still has limitations in addressing cross-task, real-time prediction, and wearables use simultaneously. Therefore, future studies can further explore how to optimize the application of multimodal physiological signals in cognitive load assessment, with a focus on improving the accuracy and real-time performance of portable device predictions in cross-task experiments.

1.6. Research in this article


This study aims to explore the application of EEG and HRV physiological indicators in the real-time (1-second interval) assessment of cognitive load using wearable devices, specifically applied to vocational education students across different tasks. Firstly, a random forest model is employed to reveal the potential relationship between EEG and HRV signals and cognitive load. Secondly, by establishing this model, we aim to provide a more accurate basis for assessing the cognitive load of secondary vocational students. Finally, we anticipate the practical application of this model in cross-task environments for accurate cognitive load assessment.

Research Hypothesis: A classification model constructed by integrating EEG and HRV signals can accurately perform classification tasks in the N-BACK task, and this model can effectively transfer and maintain classification accuracy in the practical learning environment.

Study Population: Secondary Vocational Students.

2. Methods and Procedures

This paper will conduct two experiments. Experiment 1 is to construct a random forest classification model with N-BACK task to decode the physiological signal characteristics of secondary vocational students under different cognitive load levels. Experiment 2 takes the National Computer Rank Examination (Level-1) as a cross-task experiment, uses the classification model to classify physiological signals, and compares the classification results with the difficulty coefficient. The experimental process is shown in Figure 2.



*Note: Cog.Load.Lv=Cognitive Load Level

Figure 2. Experimental Procedure

2.1. Experiment 1: N-BACK task

2.1.1. Experimental design

To elicit corresponding levels of cognitive load in participants, the N-Back task was selected. The N-Back task is a widely utilized tool in cognitive load research, which requires learners to determine if the current stimulus matches any of the previous n stimuli in a sequence. The uniqueness of this task design lies in its ability to precisely control task difficulty by altering the value of parameter N and setting different accuracy requirements for participants (Table 2). It is noteworthy that the choice of 1-back and 2-back tasks in our experimental design was based on feedback from preliminary trials. In the initial tests, we attempted the more complex 3-back task, but the accuracy rates were alarmingly low, falling below 10%. The students generally found the task excessively challenging, frequently considered giving up, and consequently lacked the motivation to engage the necessary cognitive resources to tackle the 3-back task. Under these circumstances, the data we collected might have been confounded with their performance in a resting state. Therefore, we decided to employ the Rest, 1-back tasks, and 2-back tasks

This design enables the observation and analysis of learners' cognitive responses

to varying levels of challenge. The choice of the N-Back task facilitates a deeper understanding of the changes in physiological indicators such as EEG signals and HRV in learners under different cognitive load conditions, providing a robust tool and data for the study. The experimental design of this study comprises three task modules: Resting State, 1-BACK, and 2-BACK, with each task being executed in two consecutive rounds. The experimental procedure within each task is divided into three stages: task instruction, practice phase, and formal experiment phase. During the practice phase, participants become familiar with the task requirements and operational procedures to ensure the validity and accuracy of the experimental data. In the formal experiment Phase, EEG and HRV data of the participants are recorded during task execution to analyze the neurophysiological responses of learners under different task loads (Figure 3).

Table 2. Task Descriptions

Task	Dur.(s)	Cognitive Load Level	Acc. Req.
Round 1			
Rest	90	Baseline	-
1-Back	75	Low	>60%
2-Back	95	High	>50%
Round 2			
Rest	90	Baseline	-
1-Back	75	Low	>60%
2-Back	95	High	>50%

*Note: Dur.(s) = Task Duration(s)
Acc. Req. = Accuracy Requirement




Figure 3. Subjects in the N-BACK Task

To ensure the reliability and validity of the study, a stringent participant recruitment process was conducted. Careful selection yielded a cohort of 30 participants, who were not only similar in age, educational level, and cognitive ability but also met specific criteria. This recruitment strategy was designed to mitigate the impact of individual differences, thereby enhancing the generalizability and comparability of the research findings. Purposive selection of vocational students as the research subjects was based on the rich variability they exhibit in cognitive tasks, coupled with a moderate level of learning experience. This choice is intended to render the study's results more instructive for practical applications (Table 3).

Table 3. Participant Profile

Population		30	
Gender	Male	13	43.3%
	Female	17	56.7%
Age	Avg	16.0	
	Std	0.6	
Edu. Background	Secondary vocational		
Conditions	1. Ensure ≥ 6 hours of sleep for two nights before testing.		
	2. Avoid stimulating foods 24 hours prior to testing.		
	3. Refrain from intense psychological stimuli within 24 hours of testing.		
	4. Avoid vigorous exercise 6 hours before testing.		

2.1.2. Data collection

We utilized the BrainLink Pro wearable EEG sensor developed by MacroTellec (Figure 4), which can connect to various terminal devices via Bluetooth technology. Leveraging the advanced brain-computer interface technology and the software development kit (SDK) provided by BrainLink Pro, we were able to capture the energy values (i.e., average power, Table 4) of each EEG band and the R-R interval of heartbeats within a last 1-second time window, ensuring data capture at a resolution of once per second, thereby enhancing data immediacy. Subsequently, the obtained R-R interval values were processed using the RMSSD method to calculate HRV, and the average power values were converted to average voltage amplitudes through a square root transformation (Formula 1). This transformation not only has statistical significance (Table 8) but also demonstrated excellent performance in classification models (Table 9).

On the server-side, data transmitted via Bluetooth protocol from the BrainLink Pro

sensor was received. The data collection program, developed using the C# WinForm framework (Figure 5), was responsible for recording the received data in csv file format, facilitating subsequent data processing and analysis.

Table 4. Data obtained (1-second interval) from the BrainLink Pro SDK

Name	Frequency Range (Hz)	Data Meaning
Delta	0-3	average power
Theta	4-7	average power
Low Alpha	7-9	average power
High Alpha	10-12	average power
Low Beta	13-17	average power
High Beta	18-30	average power
Low Gamma	31-39	average power
Middle Gamma	41-49	average power
R-R	-	R-R interval values[7]



Figure 4. BrainLink Pro

$$\begin{aligned}
Delta_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{Delta_Average_Power} \\
Theta_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{Theta_Average_Power} \\
LowAlpha_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{LowAlpha_Average_Power} \\
HighAlpha_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{HighAlpha_Average_Power} \\
LowBeta_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{LowBeta_Average_Power} \\
HighBeta_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{HighBeta_Average_Power} \\
LowGamma_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{LowGamma_Average_Power} \\
MiddleGamma_Average_Amplitude &= \sqrt{MiddleGamma_Average_Power} \\
HRV &= RMSSD(R - R_Interval_Values)
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}$$




Figure 5. EEG Collection Application

2.1.3. Data pre-processing

Considering the number of participants, the number of experimental rounds, and the duration of each round, a total of 15360 data samples were collected. Each data sample comprised nine feature values, which were utilized for subsequent data analysis and interpretation. In the data pre-processing stage, the initial 1-3 seconds of the experimental data were truncated, as participants were typically in a preparatory state during this period, potentially leading to less accurate physiological data collection.

2.1.4. Feature extraction method

To gain a deeper insight into the physiological state of learners, a feature extraction method was employed. The energy values of eight frequency bands (Delta, Theta, Low Alpha, High Alpha, Low Beta, High Beta, Low Gamma, Middle Gamma) were individually subjected to square root transformation. The resulting values, combined

with the HRV metrics, formed a 9*1 feature vector (feature). The corresponding cognitive load level was designated as the label (Formula 2 and Table 5). Subsequently, the K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) algorithm was employed to identify and eliminate potential dirty data, thereby retaining effective signals related to cognitive load (Formula 3).

$$feature = \begin{bmatrix} \textit{Delta_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{Theta_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{LowAlpha_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{HighAlpha_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{LowBeta_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{HighBeta_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{LowGamma_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{MiddleGamma_Average_Amplitude} \\ \textit{HRV} \end{bmatrix} \quad label = \textit{Level} \quad (2)$$

$$d_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n (x_{ik} - x_{jk})^2} \quad (3)$$

2.1.5. Classification model construction

The topology of the Random Forest model is depicted in Figure 6. The dataset was divided into training and testing sets, accounting for 80% and 20% of the total dataset, respectively. Subsequently, a Random Forest model was constructed based on the parameters determined in Table 5, and it was trained using the training set.

Table 5. Parameters of Random Forest model

Parameters	Value
bootstrap	True
max_features	sqrt
min_samples_leaf	1
min_samples_split	2
n_estimators	200
random_state	24




Figure 6. Random Forest Topological Structure

2.1.6. Cross-Validation

We utilized the Leave-One-Group-Out-Cross-Validation (LOGO-CV), treating each participant as a unique group, to evaluate our model's performance. Specifically, as shown in Table 2 and Table 3, our dataset includes 30 participants, with each providing data from two task rounds. Each round consists of physiological signals recorded under three cognitive load levels. The schematic diagram of LOGO-CV is shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7. LOGO-CV Diagram

Utilizing LOGO-CV allowed us to evaluate the model’s generalizability across different participants, mitigating the risk of overfitting to the task patterns specific to any single participant. This methodology is particularly advantageous for assessing model performance in the context of participant variability. The results of this cross-validation will be detailed in the Results section.

2.2. Experiment 2: National Computer Rank Examination(Level-1)

2.2.1. Experimental design

To elicit the physiological characteristics of low and high cognitive load in participants engaging in basic computer operations and spreadsheet skills, we meticulously selected relevant questions from the actual National Computer Rank Examination (Figure 8) for the experimental tasks. The questions, as presented in Table 7, were designed with a significant gradient of difficulty, aiming to stimulate low and high levels of cognitive load through task demands, and the participants' physiological signals were recorded for subsequent analysis.

Data collection, pre-processing, and feature extraction in this section are consistent with those of Experiment 1.




Figure 8. National Computer Rank Examination Simulator

Table 7. Exam question and difficulty

#	Operation-Questions	Time Limit	Exam Difficulty
1	<p>1. Copy the folder named YANG from the LIOIAN folder in the candidate's folder to the WANG folder under the candidate's folder.</p> <p>2. Set the file named ARI.EXP in the TIAN folder under the candidate's folder to read-only.</p> <p>3. Create a new folder named GIRL in the ZIIAO folder under the</p>	8 min	Low

Table 7. Exam question and difficulty

#	Operation-Questions	Time Limit	Exam Difficulty
	candidate's folder. 4. Delete the FANG folder under the candidate's folder.		
2	Select Sheet1, merge cells A1:F1 into one cell with centered text alignment. Use the VLOOKUP function to fill in the "Class" column of Sheet1 based on the information from the "Student Class Information" sheet within this workbook. Use a function to provide the content for the "Grade Level" column, referring to the information in the G4:H8 cell range for the grade level comparison. Use the COUNTIF function to calculate the number of students enrolled in each class (identified by course number) for classes 1, 2, and 3, and place the results in the H14:H17, I14:I17, and J14:J17 cell ranges, respectively. Use the AVERAGEIF function to calculate the average score for each course (identified by course number) and place the results in the K14:K17 cell range (number format, with one decimal place). Use conditional formatting to format the "Grade Level" column, setting cells with a grade level of "A" to have a color of "Cyan, Accent 5, Lighter 40%" and a pattern fill style of "25% Gray". Apply a table style to the G13:K17 cell range using "Table Style Light 2".	8 min	High

3. Results

In Experiment 1, firstly, the Kruskal-Wallis test was employed to assess the differences among groups in terms of EEG average amplitude and HRV (Table 8). The results indicate highly significant differences across all frequency bands and HRV measures ($p < .001$), with the exception of Low Beta and Middle Gamma, where the differences were significant but less pronounced ($p = 0.138$ and $p = 0.075$, respectively). Secondly, we divided the dataset into 30 groups based on participant data and employed LOGO-CV to assess the model's generalization across different participants. The mean accuracy of the test set was 96%, with a standard deviation of 0.84% (Figure 9). Finally, we trained the Random Forest model on the complete dataset, using 80% for training and 20% for testing. The model demonstrated robust performance across various metrics, achieving high precision, recall, and F1 scores for both baseline and differentiated categories, with an overall accuracy of 95%.

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results for EEG average amplitude and HRV in Experiment 1

	χ^2	fd	p
Delta	2273.30	2	<.001***
Theta	148.84	2	<.001***
Low Alpha	21.48	2	<.001***
High Alpha	1607.48	2	<.001***
Low Beta	3.96	2	0.138
High Beta	104.69	2	<.001***
Low Gamma	92.40	2	<.001***
Middle Gamma	5.18	2	0.075
HRV	608.47	2	<.001***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$




Figure 9. Accuracy Curves for LOGO-CV in Experiment 1

Table 9. Random Forest Performance Metrics in Experiment 1

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
Baseline	0.96	0.96	0.96	962
Low	0.95	0.95	0.95	799
High	0.95	0.95	0.95	1004
accuracy			0.95	2765
macro avg	0.95	0.95	0.95	2765
weighted avg	0.95	0.95	0.95	2765

In Experiment 2, the collected physiological signal dataset was input into the

Random Forest classification model trained in Experiment 1 to perform the classification task. Initially, the physiological signals, exam difficulty, and their corresponding classification outcomes were recorded. Subsequently, the Chi-Square test (Table 10) was conducted to assess the relationship between exam difficulty and cognitive load level in Experiment 2. The analysis yielded a chi-square statistic of 14,946.8 with 2 degrees of freedom, and a p-value less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant association between the variables. The sample size for this analysis was 28,800. Measures of association included Cramer's V, which was 0.720, and the Phi coefficient, which was 0.720, both suggesting a strong effect size. Moreover, percentage statistics were conducted on the cognitive load results at each difficulty level. The statistical results show (Figure 10) that at the low difficulty level, low (78.57%) was the predominant component in the Predicted outcomes, whereas at the high difficulty level, high (80.93%) was the predominant component. Furthermore, we conducted a quantification on exam difficulty and cognitive load (Table 11). To quantify cognitive load level, we calculated the average values at the same time points for all participants. Finally, we plotted the trends of cognitive load over time under different exam difficulty conditions (Figure 11). The average cognitive load was 1.07 under low difficulty conditions and 1.71 under high difficulty conditions, with the curves fluctuating around their respective mean values.

Additionally, participants in both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 completed the NASA-TLX questionnaire, and statistical analysis was performed using Tukey's Post-Hoc test. As shown in Table 12, there were no significant differences in scores for tasks of the same difficulty level (Exp_1_Low vs. Exp_2_Low, Exp_1_High vs. Exp_2_High) in either Experiment 1 or Experiment 2 ($p > 0.05$). However, significant differences were observed between tasks of different difficulty ($p < 0.001$).

Table 10. Chi-Square Test of Exam Difficulty and Cognitive Load Level in Experiment 2

Statistic	Value
Chi-square Statistic	14946.8
Degrees of Freedom	2
p-value	<0.001***
Sample Size	28800
Cramer's V	0.720372
Phi Coefficient	0.720408

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 11. Cognitive Load and Exam Difficulty quantification

Level	Value
Cognitive Load Level	

Table 11. Cognitive Load and Exam Difficulty quantification

Baseline	0
Low	1
High	2
Exam Difficulty	
Low	1
High	2




Figure 10. Cognitive Load Frequency Ratios by Exam Difficulty in Experiment 2




Figure 11. Average Cognitive Load (quantized) over time by Exam Difficulty in Experiment 2

Table 12. Tukey Post-Hoc Test Results for NASA-TLX in Experiments 1 and 2

		Exp_1_High	Exp_1_Low	Exp_1_Rest	Exp_2_High	Exp_2_Low
Exp_1_High	Mean difference	—	3.53	5.41	0.352	3.310
	p-value	—	<.001 ***	<.001 ***	0.095	<.001 ***
Exp_1_Low	Mean difference		—	1.87	-3.182	-0.224
	p-value		—	<.001 ***	<.001 ***	0.504
Exp_1_Rest	Mean difference			—	-5.055	-2.097
	p-value			—	<.001 ***	<.001 ***
Exp_2_High	Mean difference				—	2.958
	p-value				—	<.001 ***
Exp_2_Low	Mean difference					—
	p-value					—

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

4. Analysis

Experiment 1 was designed around the use of the 1-back and 2-back tasks, with a strategic approach to requiring participants to achieve specific levels of accuracy throughout the task. This approach allows for the control of participants' cognitive load levels through the manipulation of task difficulty. To accurately assess cognitive load and mitigate the potential impact of cognitive fatigue on the research outcomes, we implemented meticulous control measures to limit the duration of each task to 100 seconds. After performing LOGO-CV analysis on the data from 30 groups of participants using the random forest model, the average accuracy of the test set reached 96%, with a standard deviation of only 0.84%. This significant result strongly demonstrates the model's excellent generalization capability across different participants (Figure 9). Subsequently, we trained the model using the complete dataset, and the model's performance under different cognitive load levels (Baseline, Low, High) demonstrated high consistency and accuracy. Specifically, the model achieved high levels of precision, recall, and F1-score, each reaching 0.95, indicating excellent performance in the classification tasks. This result remained stable across all cognitive load levels, with an overall accuracy of 0.95, further confirming the robustness and reliability of the model. Overall, the Random Forest

model exhibited high accuracy and consistency under varying cognitive load conditions, providing strong support for subsequent research.

In Experiment 2, the initial step involved meticulously selecting stimuli from the highly esteemed and rigorously vetted National Computer Rank Examination (Level 1), ensuring the authority and reliability of the task. Subsequently, the experimental framework incorporated an extensive problem system, requiring participants to comprehensively understand and retain multiple key information nodes through visual media, followed by logical reasoning and operations based on this information, thereby enhancing the cognitive demands on the participants. The collected physiological dataset was input into the pre-trained Random Forest model. Given that the device provides data feedback once per second, we effectively classify the cognitive load generated by participants on a per-second basis. Based on the chi-square test of the categorized data (Table 10), it can be concluded that there is a correlation between cognitive load level and exam difficulty. Frequency distribution of cognitive load levels across all participants was analyzed by grouping based on exam difficulty (Figure 10). Based on the varying exam difficulty, we analyzed the frequency distribution of cognitive load levels for all participants. The results (Figure 10) indicate that, under conditions of lower exam difficulty, participants spent 78.57% of the time at low cognitive load level; whereas, under conditions of higher exam difficulty, participants spent 80.93% of the time at high cognitive load level. This finding suggests that, for the majority of the time, participants' cognitive load levels align with the changes in exam difficulty. After quantifying the difficulty of the exams and the levels of cognitive load, we grouped the data according to exam difficulty. Subsequently, for each time point, we calculated the average cognitive load levels for participants in each group and visualized the results using trend graphs (Figure 11). From the graph, it is evident that under low exam difficulty conditions, the average cognitive load levels for all participants consistently remained at a lower level. In contrast, under high exam difficulty conditions, the cognitive load levels showed a significantly higher trend compared to the low exam difficulty condition. Specifically, the average cognitive load level under low exam difficulty was 1.07, whereas it was 1.71 under high exam difficulty. This indicates a distinct difference in the trend of cognitive load levels across varying exam difficulty conditions.

In addition, participants in both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 completed the NASA-TLX questionnaire, and statistical analyses were conducted using Tukey's post hoc test. As shown in Table 12, there were no significant differences in scores for tasks of the same difficulty level (e.g., Exp_1_Low vs. Exp_2_Low and Exp_1_High vs. Exp_2_High) between Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 ($p > 0.05$). However, there were significant differences between tasks of different difficulty levels ($p < 0.001$). Specifically, there was no significant difference in cognitive load between the 1-Back task in Experiment 1 and the low difficulty exam task in Experiment 2, nor between the 2-Back task in Experiment 1 and the high difficulty exam task in Experiment 2. This indicates that both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 effectively controlled the cognitive load levels of the participants.

5. Conclusions

In this study, we successfully implemented a wearable-device-based cross-task cognitive load assessment by integrating EEG and HRV data with a Random Forest model in machine learning.

The results of Experiment 1 demonstrated that our model achieved an accuracy of up to 95% in the N-BACK task and exhibited good individual adaptability across different participants. Additionally, Kruskal-Wallis tests revealed significant differences in physiological indicators across different cognitive load levels, further confirming the physiological basis of cognitive load. These findings not only enhance the understanding of cognitive load assessment but also provide a solid foundation for future technological development and research.

In Experiment 2, we successfully applied this model to the National Computer Rank Examination (Level 1), demonstrating its generalizability across different tasks. This result not only validates the applicability of our model in diverse task evaluations but also underscores the potential of the Random Forest model in cognitive load assessment. Notably, the National Computer Rank Examination (Level 1), being a compulsory practical course for vocational school students, highlights the importance of this study in the field of vocational education.

Overall, this study validates the efficacy of using EEG and HRV data for cognitive load assessment and demonstrates that the Random Forest model serves as a robust machine learning tool, providing accurate and real-time (1-second interval) classification across tasks. This approach facilitates monitoring fluctuations in cognitive load and allows for timely adjustments to instructional strategies, which is of particular significance in practical vocational education settings.

Study shortcomings: While this study has made some strides, it still bears certain limitations. Firstly, the experimental design may not comprehensively cover all types of cognitive tasks, potentially constraining a thorough assessment of the model's accuracy and adaptability. Secondly, exploring the model's application across diverse cultural and educational contexts, and integrating it with real-world teaching strategies, stands as pivotal directions for future investigations. In summary, this study furnishes an effective method for cross-task assessment of cognitive load, yet opportunities for refinement persist. Our efforts are geared towards advancing educational technology, ensuring robust support and guidance for real-world teaching practices, especially in vocational education.

6. Disclosure statement

We declare that we have no conflict of interest.

7. ORCID

Yanxin Chen  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7084-1184>

8. References

- [1] Abuhamdeh, S. (2020). Investigating the “Flow” Experience: Key Conceptual and Operational Issues. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11.
- [2] Antonenko, P., Paas, F., Grabner, R., & Van Gog, T. (2010). Using Electroencephalography to Measure Cognitive Load. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(4), 425–438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9130-y>
- [3] Başar, E. (2012). A review of alpha activity in integrative brain function: Fundamental physiology, sensory coding, cognition and pathology. *International Journal of*

- Psychophysiology, 86(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.07.002>
- [4] Cabañero Gómez, L., Hervás, R., González, I., & Villarreal, V. (2021). Studying the generalisability of cognitive load measured with EEG. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, 70, 103032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bspc.2021.103032>
- [5] Cohen, M. R., & Maunsell, J. H. R. (2011). When Attention Wanders: How Uncontrolled Fluctuations in Attention Affect Performance. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(44), 15802 – 15806. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3063-11.2011>
- [6] Dai Buyun, Deng Lei, Jian Xiaozhu, Wang Dongdong, & Wang Yajie. (2019). The influence of information carriers on the cognitive load and attitude preferences of seventh-grade students. *Psychological Exploration*, 39(4), 363–367.
- [7] DeGiorgio, C. M., Miller, P., Meymandi, S., Chin, A., Epps, J., Gordon, S., Gornbein, J., & Harper, R. M. (2010). RMSSD, a measure of vagus-mediated heart rate variability, is associated with risk factors for SUDEP: The SUDEP-7 Inventory. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 19(1), 78–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2010.06.011>
- [8] Engel, A. K., & Fries, P. (2010). Beta-band oscillations—Signalling the status quo? *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 20(2), 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2010.02.015>
- [9] Fatemeh Fahimi, Zhuo Zhang, Wooi Boon Goh, Tih-Shi Lee, Kai Keng Ang, & Cuntai Guan. (2019). Inter-subject transfer learning with an end-to-end deep convolutional neural network for EEG-based BCI. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 16(2), 026007. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aaf3f6>
- [10] Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2020). *car: Companion to Applied Regression*. [R package]. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=car>.
- [11] Gao Zhenhai, Duan Lifei, Zhao Hui, & Yu Huili. (2015). Assessment of cognitive load of drivers under multitasking based on physiological signals. *Automotive Engineering*, 37(1), 33 – 37. <https://doi.org/10.19562/j.chinasae.qcgc.2015.01.006>
- [12] Gjoreski, M., Mahesh, B., Kolenik, T., Uwe-Garbas, J., Seuss, D., Gjoreski, H., Lustrek, M., Gams, M., & Pejovic, V. (2021). Cognitive Load Monitoring With Wearables – Lessons Learned From a Machine Learning Challenge. *IEEE Access*, 9, 103325 – 103336. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3093216>
- [13] Grzeszczyk, M. K., Adamczyk, P., Marek, S., Pręcikowski, R., Kuś, M., Lelujko, M. P., Trzcíński, T., Sitek, A., Malawski, M., & Lisowska, A. (n.d.). Can gamification reduce the burden of self-reporting in mHealth applications? A feasibility study using machine learning from smartwatch data to estimate cognitive load.
- [14] Guo Zizheng, Pan Yirun, Pan Yufan, Wu Zhimin, Xiao Qiong, Tan Yonggang, & Zhang Jun. (2015). Method for identifying the level of driver's mental workload based on EEG entropy. *Journal of Southeast University(Natural Science Edition)*, 45(5), 980 – 984.
- [15] Guo, J., Wan, B., Wu, H., Zhao, Z., & Huang, W. (2022). A Virtual Reality and Online Learning Immersion Experience Evaluation Model Based on SVM and Wearable Recordings.
- [16] Guohun Zhu, Fangrong Zong, Hua Zhang, Bizhong Wei, & Feng Liu. (2021). Cognitive Load During Multitasking Can Be Accurately Assessed Based on Single Channel Electroencephalography Using Graph Methods. *IEEE Access*, 9, 33102 – 33109. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3058271>

- [17] Gupta, K., Hajika, R., Pai, Y. S., Duenser, A., Lochner, M., & Billinghamurst, M. (2019). In AI We Trust: Investigating the Relationship between Biosignals, Trust and Cognitive Load in VR. 25th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology, 1 – 10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359996.3364276>
- [18] Hakim, N., deBettencourt, M. T., Awh, E., & Vogel, E. K. (2020). Attention fluctuations impact ongoing maintenance of information in working memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 27(6), 1269 – 1278. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-020-01790-z>
- [19] Hakim, N., deBettencourt, M. T., Awh, E., & Vogel, E. K. (2020). Attention fluctuations impact ongoing maintenance of information in working memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 27(6), 1269 – 1278. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-020-01790-z>
- [20] Han, Z., Chang, H., Zhou, X., Wang, J., Wang, L., & Shao, Y. (2022). E2ENNet: An end-to-end neural network for emotional brain-computer interface. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 16, 942979. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2022.942979>
- [21] Hart, S. G., & Staveland, L. E. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In P. A. Hancock & N. Meshkati (Eds.), *Advances in psychology* (Vol. 52, pp. 139-183). North-Holland. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62386-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9)
- [22] He, D., Donmez, B., Liu, C. C., & Plataniotis, K. N. (2019). High Cognitive Load Assessment in Drivers Through Wireless Electroencephalography and the Validation of a Modified N -Back Task. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 49(4), 362 – 371. <https://doi.org/10.1109/THMS.2019.2917194>
- [23] Head, J., & Helton, W. S. (2014). Sustained attention failures are primarily due to sustained cognitive load not task monotony. *Acta Psychologica*, 153, 87 – 94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.09.007>
- [24] Huang, Y.-M., Cheng, Y.-P., Cheng, S.-C., & Chen, Y.-Y. (2020). Exploring the Correlation Between Attention and Cognitive Load Through Association Rule Mining by Using a Brainwave Sensing Headband. *IEEE Access*, 8, 38880 – 38891. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2975054>
- [25] Igor Zyma, Sergii Tukaev, Ivan Seleznev, Ken Kiyono, Anton Popov, Mariia Chernykh, & Oleksii Shpenkov. (2019). Electroencephalograms during Mental Arithmetic Task Performance. *Data*, 4(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/data4010014>
- [26] Jensen, O., & Mazaheri, A. (2010). Shaping Functional Architecture by Oscillatory Alpha Activity: Gating by Inhibition. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2010.00186>
- [27] Joan Bruna & S. Mallat. (2013). Invariant Scattering Convolution Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 35(8), 1872 – 1886. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2012.230>
- [28] Klimesch, W. (1999). EEG alpha and theta oscillations reflect cognitive and memory performance: A review and analysis. *Brain Research Reviews*, 29(2–3), 169–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0173\(98\)00056-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0173(98)00056-3)
- [29] Kucyi, A., Hove, M. J., Esterman, M., Hutchison, R. M., & Valera, E. M. (2016). Dynamic Brain Network Correlates of Spontaneous Fluctuations in Attention. *Cerebral Cortex*, bhw029. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhw029>
- [30] Lawhern, V. J., Solon, A. J., Waytowich, N. R., Gordon, S. M., Hung, C. P., & Lance, B.

- J. (2018). EEGNet: A Compact Convolutional Network for EEG-based Brain-Computer Interfaces. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 15(5), 056013. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aace8c>
- [31] Li Jinyao, Du Xiaobing, Zhu Zhiliang, Deng Xiaoming, Ma Cuixia, & Wang Hong'an. (2023). A comprehensive review of deep learning research on EEG-based emotion recognition. *Journal of Software*, 34(1), 255 – 276. <https://doi.org/10.13328/j.cnki.jos.006420>
- [32] LI Xiao-jun, LING Jia-xin, & SHEN Yi. (2021). Visual fatigue relief zone in an extra-long tunnel using virtual reality with wearable EEG-based devices.
- [33] Ludi Bai, Zehui Yu, Shifeng Zhang, Kangying Hu, Zhan Chen, & Junqi Guo. (2020). An In-class Teaching Comprehensive Evaluation Model Based on Statistical Modelling and Ensemble Learning. *2020 IEEE International Conference on Smart Internet of Things (SmartIoT)*, 256 – 260. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SmartIoT49966.2020.00045>
- [34] Nilkamal More, Varun Parmar, Ameya Tathavadkar, Tanish Shah, & Meet Shah. (n.d.). Classification of Emotions From EEG Signals using Machine Learning Algorithms. *International Journal of Engineering Research*, 10(05).
- [35] Nilkamal More, Varun Parmar, Ameya Tathavadkar, Tanish Shah, & Meet Shah. (n.d.). Classification of Emotions From EEG Signals using Machine Learning Algorithms. *International Journal of Engineering Research*, 10(05).
- [36] Pan Pingping. (2014). Research on methods for detecting mental fatigue based on EEG signals [Master, Guangxi University]. <https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CMFD&dbname=CMFD201501&filename=1014379467.nh&v=>
- [37] Prathaban, S., Sisodia, V., & Puthusserypady, S. (2019). Consequence of Stress on Cognitive Performance: An EEG and HRV Study. *TENCON 2019 - 2019 IEEE Region 10 Conference (TENCON)*, 1969 – 1974. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TENCON.2019.8929634>
- [38] R Core Team (2021). R: A Language and environment for statistical computing. (Version 4.1) [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org>. (R packages retrieved from MRAN snapshot 2022-01-01).
- [39] Shan Meixian & Dong Yan. (2022). Research on the influencing factors of cognitive load in project-based collaborative learning. *Modern Distance Education Research*, 3, 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.13927/j.cnki.yuan.20220422.001>
- [40] Shou, K., Yuan, Q., Chen, K., Yao, Z., & Pan, Z. (2023). A Perspective Taking Supported AR Learning Platform with a User Study on Learning Three-View Drawing. *International Journal of Human – Computer Interaction*, 1 – 26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2276521>
- [41] Steriade, M. (2006). Grouping of brain rhythms in corticothalamic systems. *Neuroscience*, 137(4), 1087–1106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2005.10.029>
- [42] Su Qing. (2017). Study on the impact of music genres on learning and memory based on EEG analysis. [Master, Hebei University Of Technology]. <https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CMFD&dbname=CMFD202001&filename=1019924901.nh&v=>
- [43] Sun Han. (2019). Research on human-computer interaction technology based on multimodal bioelectric signals. [Doctor, Southeast University].

<https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CDFD&dbname=CDFDLAST2021&filename=1020310800.nh&v=>

- [44] Tarrant, J., Jackson, R., & Viczko, J. (2022). A Feasibility Test of a Brief Mobile Virtual Reality Meditation for Frontline Healthcare Workers in a Hospital Setting. 3.
- [45] The jamovi project (2022). jamovi. (Version 2.3) [Computer Software]. Retrieved from <https://www.jamovi.org>.
- [46] Vanneste, P., Raes, A., Morton, J., Bombeke, K., Van Acker, B. B., Larmuseau, C., Depaepe, F., & Van Den Noortgate, W. (2021). Towards measuring cognitive load through multimodal physiological data. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 23(3), 567 – 585. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-020-00641-0>
- [47] West, R., & Alain, C. (2000). Effects of task context and fluctuations of attention on neural activity supporting performance of the Stroop task. *Brain Research*, 873(1), 102 – 111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-8993\(00\)02530-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-8993(00)02530-0)
- [48] Wu Wei, Sun Youzhao, & Zhang Xia. (2022). Research on the design of cockpit warning information based on EEG. *Avionics Technology*, 53(4), 17 – 23.
- [49] Wu Yuanpei, & Huang Chen. (2017). Design and application of mobile augmented reality systems based on cognitive load theory. *Computer Applications and Software*, 34(11), 184 – 187.
- [50] Xiashuang Wang, Yinglei Wang, Dunwei Liu, Ying Wang, & Zhengjun Wang. (2023). Automated recognition of epilepsy from EEG signals using a combining space – time algorithm of CNN-LSTM. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 14876. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-41537-z>
- [51] Xiong, R., Kong, F., Yang, X., Liu, G., & Wen, W. (2020). Pattern Recognition of Cognitive Load Using EEG and ECG Signals. *Sensors*, 20(18), 5122. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20185122>
- [52] Xu Xiaoping, Lv Jian, Jin Yutong, & Ji Wenyuan. (2020). Research on cognitive load of user-driven natural interaction in VR. *Application Research of Computers*, 37(7), 1958 – 1963. <https://doi.org/10.19734/j.issn.1001-3695.2018.12.0936>
- [53] Xu Ziming, Niu Yifan, Wen Xuyun, Zhou Yueying, Wang Pengpai, Wu Xia, & Zhang Daoqiang. (2021). A review of cognitive load assessment based on EEG signals. *Space Medicine & Medical Engineering*, 34(4), 339 – 348.
- [54] Yi Ding, Neethu Robinson, Su Zhang, Qiu hao Zeng, & Cuntai Guan. (2022). TSception: Capturing Temporal Dynamics and Spatial Asymmetry from EEG for Emotion Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 1 – 1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAFFC.2022.3169001>
- [55] Yuan, Q., Chen, K., Yang, Q., Pan, Z., Xu, J., & Yao, Z. (2023). Exploring Intuitive Visuo-Tactile Interaction Design for Culture Education: A Chinese-Chess-Based Case Study. *International Journal of Human – Computer Interaction*, 1 – 21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2223863>
- [56] Yuan, Q., Wang, R., Pan, Z., Meng, Q., Xu, S., Wang, Z., & Liu, J. (2022). TIPTAB: A tangible interactive projection tabletop for virtual experiments. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 30(5), 1350 – 1369. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22524>
- [57] Zha Xianjin, Huang Chengsong, Yan Yalan, & Guo Jia. (2020). Advances in the Application Research of Foreign Cognitive Load Theory. *Journal of the China Society for*

Scientific and Technical Information, 39(5), 547–556.

- [58] Zhang Pengcheng, Leng Ying, & Lu Jiamei. (2017). An empirical study on the impact of emotional experience and cognitive load on working memory. *Psychological Exploration*, 37(1), 17 – 22.
- [59] Zhang, S., Yan, Z., Sapkota, S., Zhao, S., & Ooi, W. T. (2021). Moment-to-Moment Continuous Attention Fluctuation Monitoring through Consumer-Grade EEG Device. *Sensors*, 21(10), 3419. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s21103419>
- [60] Zheng Ruiling, & Zhang Junsong. (2020). Cognitive load evaluation method of digital graphic interface based on spatio-temporal multi-feature fusion of EEG. *Journal of Computer-Aided Design & Computer Graphics*, 32(7), 1062 – 1069.

9. About the authors

Ling He an Associate Professor holding a Master's degree. She serves as the Chairperson of the Labor Union in the School of Education and has been awarded multiple teaching excellence awards. From 2015 to 2016, she was a National Young Backbone Visiting Scholar at the School of Education, Peking University.

Yanxin Chen received the Bachelor of Communication Engineering degree from Dongguan University of Technology in 2016. Professionally, he is currently employed as a senior computer engineer and teacher. Also he is now a postgraduate majoring in modern Educational technology at Jiangxi Science and Technology Normal University. His research is predominantly focused on the domains of brain-computer interfaces and the integration of artificial intelligence within educational frameworks.

Wenqi Wang received the bachelor degree in Educational Technology from Yuzhang Normal University in 2022, is now a postgraduate majoring in modern Educational technology at Jiangxi Science and Technology Normal University. Her main research direction is the application of virtual reality technology in education.

Shuting He graduated from Nanchang Institute of Technology with a bachelor's degree in Human Resource Management in 2021, and is now a graduate student of Modern Educational Technology in Jiangxi University of Science and Technology. Her main research interest is the application of virtual reality technology in education.

Xiaoqiang Hu a professor and master's supervisor. He holds a Master's degree in Computer Applications from Wuhan University. He is recognized as a leading academic figure among young and middle-aged faculty members in provincial universities. He serves as a member and deputy secretary-general of the VR Special Committee of the China Graphics Society.