



Learning of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) at a Public University in Central Mexico

Crespo JE¹, García-Lirios C^{2*} and Moreno G³

¹University of Los Lagos, Chile

²Autonomous Mexico State University, México

³University of the Americas, Chile

***Corresponding author:** Cruz García-Lirios, Autonomous Mexico State University, México, Tel: 525525347531; Email: cruzlirios@icloud.com

Research Article

Volume 8 Issue 1

Received Date: December 05, 2023

Published Date: April 02, 2024

DOI: 10.23880/phoa-16000282

Abstract

The emergency of the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus and the COVID-19 disease forced educational systems to move from face-to-face to virtual classrooms. In this scenario, the dissemination of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) on virtual platforms intensified immersive learning. The objective of this work was to establish the neural network of a sample of students exposed to the immersive dissemination of the SDGs during the pandemic. An exploratory, cross-sectional, and correlational study was conducted with a sample of 100 professional practitioners and social servants attached to a public university in central Mexico. The results show the prevalence of four nodes related to SDGs 9, 13, 14, and 15. The present work found an innovation in the order of SDGs most widespread and assimilated by the sample and about the state of the art and the limits of the sample size it is recommended to extend the study to the type of immersion: gamified, augmented, or virtualized reality to establish significant differences by type of SDG. In this sense, the gamification of quality of life was anticipated by innovative industrialization and climate action, although the other SDGs should be modeled as predictors of quality of life without gamification and rather in a risk scenario such as the effects of climate change.

Keywords: Agenda; Immersive Learning; Quality of Life; Intellectual Capital; Sustainable Development Goals

Abbreviations: ICT: Information and Communication Technologies; HEIs: Higher Education Institutes; SGD: Sustainable Development Goals.

Introduction

Human Development is structured at different levels [1]. At the individual or personal level theories that explain the impact of childhood on the other stages of life prevail [2]. Next, the interpersonal level where the influence of relationships between humans concerning third parties is analyzed [3]. Then, the group level is where differences are observed within the group or compared to other groups concerning their needs, expectations, or resources in the face

of conflicts and changes [4]. Finally, the collective, social, or ideological level where the discipline appreciates the logic of centrality as a guide for economic, political, and social decisions concerning the periphery as a provider of natural and human resources for the development of centrality [5].

From this level of explanation approach, Human and Sustainable Development are linked by the relationships between individuals, groups, and societies [6]. Indeed, the literature and curricular plans do not link and rather oppose the SDGs with Human Development by reducing it to an individual level. Still, recent studies suggest that both face the challenges of climate change [7]. Therefore, the Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management (GIRD) and the

Civil Protection Frameworks (MPC) warn that the threats, risks, and dangers of climate change make individuals, groups, and societies more vulnerable and resilient [8].

In this new paradigm, the quality of life shows competitive advantages that make it a central node of communication; prevention, and risk reduction [9]. In this way, Human Development is linked to Sustainable Development [10]. Such is the case of quality-of-life models which are the analysis of vulnerability, resilience, helplessness, and happiness or subjective well-being [11]. These are the variables that would allow a diagnosis of the impact of risks, dangers, and threats on individuals, groups, and societies [12]. Such variables can be observed indirectly in the classroom [13,14]. In this sense, immersive learning, defined as the communication of content through gamification, virtuality, or augmented reality, can serve to transfer communication, prevention, and risk reduction in the classroom [15].

Consequently, the inclusion of immersive learning about risks in the classroom will allow for updating the Human Development subject and specifying its relationship with the SDGs [16]. The objective of this work was to analyze the relationship between the SDGs and Human Development through immersive learning published in the literature from 2020 to 2023.

Are there significant differences between the SDGs disseminated in social digital networks to immersive learning of the SDGs in the classroom?

Hypothesis 1: Given that the SDGs and quality of life can be reduced to a minimum expression for teaching and learning in the classroom, significant differences are expected between the universal guidelines and their dissemination through gamification, augmented reality, or virtuality.

Hypothesis 2: If the SDGs and quality of life can be made affordable through immersive learning, then reduced dissemination of the SDGs in the classroom through Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management (IDRM) paradigms or International Protection Frameworks will be possible. Civilian (MIPC). In this way, the differences between the general and immersive contents suggest differences in terms of gamification, augmented reality, or virtuality in Higher Education Institutes (HEIs).

Hypothesis 3: Suppose there are differences between the SDGs concerning immersive broadcasting. In that case, impacts on quality of life and its dimensions of life satisfaction, opportunity expectations, and perceived resources will be anticipated.

Method

A cross-sectional, exploratory, and correlational study was carried out with a sample of 100 ($M = 21.23$ $DE = 4.3$

years and $M = 9'897.00$ $DE = 4'762.00$ monthly income) professional practitioners and social servants of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), Learning and Knowledge Technologies (TAC) and Empowerment and Participation Technologies (TEP) at a public university in central Mexico.

The Immersive Learning Inventory was used, which includes 17 items around three dimensions of analysis: 1) Gamification ("The first SDG related to poverty will be more important if it is disseminated as a game"), 2) Virtuality ("The fifth SDG alluding to gender equality will be more relevant if it is disseminated virtually"), 3) Augmentation ("The seventh SDG regarding affordable and non-polluting energy will be more credible if it is disseminated increased"). Each item includes five response options ranging from 0 = "not at all agree" to 5 = "quite agree". The reliability reached alpha and omega values of 0.753 and 0.748, as well as correlations between the respective factor and item that ranged between 0.435 and 0.567.

The Quality of Life Gamification Scale was used, which includes 9 items structured in three dimensions related to life satisfaction ("The fourth SDG regarding quality education will be more satisfactory if its gamification is systematic"), perceived resources ("The fifth SDG related to gender equality will be more useful if real cases are disseminated in socio-digital networks"), expectations of opportunity ("The eighth SDG associated with decent work and economic growth will be more convincing if it is exhibited in augmented reality"). Each item is answered with seven response options ranging from 0 = "It does not look like my situation at all" to 7 = "It looks a lot like my situation". The reliability of the general scale and the subscales reached alpha and omega values that ranged between 0.745 and 0.770, as well as item factor correlations between 0.324 and 0.567.

Respondents were contacted through institutional mail. Confidentiality letters were attached to guarantee anonymity and information about the objectives of the study and those responsible for the project. In a focus group session, the concepts were equated, in another Delphi, the items were evaluated and in a final session, the respondents answered the final instrument. All the sessions were carried out on the page: <https://meet.jit.si/FollowingPathsUndermineHappily> The data was processed in JASP version 16.

The coefficients of centrality, grouping, and structuring were estimated to contrast the study hypotheses. The values of the parameters that approached the unit were assumed as evidence of non-rejection of the hypotheses.

Results

The centrality, estimated by four indicators, suggests that the immersive learning of SDG 13 related to climate action is a regulator of the other nodes. In this sense, the immersive

learning of SDG 13 differs from the other nodes in that it filters its impact on the study sample. SDG 13 reduces the impact of the other SDGs established as learning information nodes (Table 1).

Networks				
Variable	Betweenness	Closeness	Strength	Influence
SDGs1	-0.581	0.684	0.573	-1,204
SDGs2	-0.215	0.822	-0.529	0.352
SDGs3	1,614	1,073	1,155	-1,254
SDGs4	0.333	-0.136	-0.766	-0.528
SDGs5	-0.581	-1,997	-1,823	-0.959
SDGs6	-0.764	-0.594	0.849	-0.72
SDGs7	-0.581	-0.948	-0.091	1,385
SDGs8	-0.947	-1,778	-1,830	0.711
SDGs9	-0.215	-0.529	-0.798	-0.484
SDGs10	-0.398	0.012	0.014	1,275
SDGs11	-0.947	-0.548	0.149	-0.78
SDGs12	-0.581	0.209	0.562	1,405
SDGs13	2,162	1,568	1,047	1,280
SDGs14	-0.032	0.525	0.683	0.735
SDGs15	1,065	1,349	1,099	0.385
SDGs16	-0.947	-0.039	-1,215	-0.222
SDGs17	1,614	0.328	0.922	-1,376

Table 1: Centrality measures per variable.

The grouping measured by four other coefficients suggests that SDG 14, alluding to underwater life, reconfigures the other SDGs established as information, dissemination, and learning nodes. Therefore, the regulation of the SDGs,

although it is established by node 13, which suggests direct action against climate change, is complemented by SDG 14, referring to the importance of reefs as CO₂ collectors and oxygen producers (Table 2).

Networks				
Variable	Barratt	Onnela	WS	Zhang
SDGs1	-0.38	0.353	-0.67	-0.05
SDGs10	2,081	0.77	2,128	0.431
SDGs11	-0.282	0.327	-0.67	0.945
SDGs12	-0.143	-0.209	-0.16	1,969
SDGs13	1,396	1,281	1,192	-1,644
SDGs14	1,410	0.677	2,128	1,542
SDGs15	-1,474	0.711	-0.67	-0.71
SDGs16	0.377	-0.593	-0.16	-0.62
SDGs17	-0.925	0.359	-0.67	0.641

SDGs2	-0.469	-0.609	-0.67	-0.45
SDGs3	1,201	2003	1,192	-1,012
SDGs4	-0.891	-0.733	-0.16	-0.96
SDGs5	-0.191	-1,775	-0.16	0.461
SDGs6	-0.946	0.569	-0.67	-0.17
SDGs7	-0.79	-0.703	-0.67	1,075
SDGs8	0.405	-1,535	-0.67	-0.54
SDGs9	-0.377	-0.894	-0.67	-0.91

Table 2: Clustering measures per variable.

Structuring anticipates the input and output of information. In the case of node 13, it was related to node 9 related to industry, innovation, and infrastructure (.534). It means, then, that climate action has its principle of a learning network in industrialization with social responsibility. In

the case of node 14, it was associated with node 15 alluding to the life of terrestrial ecosystems (.729). In other words, responsible production and consumption end with the balance of terrestrial ecosystems (Table 3).

Networks																	
	SDGs1	SDGs2	SDGs3	SDGs4	SDGs5	SDGs6	SDGs7	SDGs8	SDGs9	SDGs10	SDGs11	SDGs12	SDGs13	SDGs14	SDGs15	SDGs16	SDGs17
SDGs1	0,000	0.222	-0.24	0.017	0.017	0.257	-0.23	0.224	-0.1	-0.122	-0.452	0.602	0.365	0.51	-0.036	-0.347	-0.566
SDGs2	0.222	0,000	0.593	0.233	-0.11	-0.08	0.05	-0.08	0.293	0.09	0.194	0.015	-0.487	0.215	-0.52	0.366	0.018
SDGs3	-0.24	0.593	0,000	-0.14	-0.3	-0.48	0.54	0.091	-0.27	0.407	-0.232	0.246	0.365	0,000	0.156	-0.213	-0.431
SDGs4	0.017	0.233	-0.14	0,000	0.334	-0.16	0.014	0.294	-0.34	0.187	-0.035	-0.351	0.383	-0.401	0.491	0,000	-0.02
SDGs5	0.017	-0.11	-0.3	0.334	0,000	-0.4	0.539	0.115	-6,994	0.233	0.075	0,000	0.139	-0.062	0.015	-0.201	-0.139
SDGs6	0.257	-0.08	-0.48	-0.16	-0.4	0,000	0.857	0.097	-0.25	0.852	0.101	-0.068	-0.08	-0.125	-0.147	0.285	-0.265
SDGs7	-0.23	0.05	0.54	0.014	0.539	0.857	0,000	0.023	0.109	-0.664	-0.16	0.032	0.132	0.093	0.136	-0.06	0.212
SDGs8	0.224	-0.08	0.091	0.294	0.115	0.097	0.023	0,000	0.485	-0.054	0.169	0.066	-0.479	0.023	-0.106	0.193	0.168
SDGs9	-0.1	0.293	-0.27	-0.34	-6,994	-0.25	0.109	0.485	0,000	0.322	-0.212	0.066	0.534	-0.139	0.147	-0.101	-0.01
SDGs10	-0.12	0.09	0.407	0.187	0.233	0.852	-0.66	-0.05	0.322	0,000	0.083	-0.079	0,000	0,000	0.21	-0.267	0.357
SDGs11	-0.45	0.194	-0.23	-0.04	0.075	0.101	-0.16	0.169	-0.21	0.083	0,000	0.616	0.383	0.51	-0.212	0.06	-0.523
SDGs12	0.602	0.015	0.246	-0.35	0,000	-0.07	0.032	0.066	0.066	-0.079	0.616	0,000	-0.007	-0.831	0.606	0.064	0.653
SDGs13	0.365	-0.49	0.365	0.383	0.139	-0.08	0.132	-0.48	0.534	0,000	0.383	-0.007	0,000	0.119	-0.483	0.484	0.191
SDGs14	0.51	0.215	0,000	-0.4	-0.06	-0.13	0.093	0.023	-0.14	0,000	0.51	-0.831	0.119	0,000	0.729	-0.012	0.614
SDGs15	-0.04	-0.52	0.156	0.491	0.015	-0.15	0.136	-0.11	0.147	0.21	-0.212	0.606	-0.483	0.729	0,000	0.366	-0.309
SDGs16	-0.35	0.366	-0.21	0,000	-0.2	0.285	-0.06	0.193	-0.1	-0.267	0.06	0.064	0.484	-0.012	0.366	0,000	0.071
SDGs17	-0.57	0.018	-0.43	-0.02	-0.14	-0.27	0.212	0.168	-0.01	0.357	-0.523	0.653	0.191	0.614	-0.309	0.071	0,000

Table 3: Weight matrix.

The examined centrality, grouping and structuring values suggest non-rejection of the hypotheses. In other words, the dissemination and learning of the SDGs in the immersive classroom is centered at node 13, clustered at node 14, started at node 9, and finished at node 15. Therefore, the neural network of information and learning was established with the immersive learning of SDGs 9, 13, 14, and 15 related to industrialization and innovation, climate action, life below water, and terrestrial ecosystems. That is the SDGs

that were assimilated through gamification, augmented and virtual reality suggest that species and their environment are compromised by an innovative industrialization in the making.

To establish the determinants of the gamified quality of life, we proceeded to estimate the trajectory model in which SDGs 9 and 13 are included as exogenous factors, and nodes 14 and 15 as predictive endogenous factors. The results

show that SDG 9 predicts gamification of quality of life.

Fit and residual values [$x^2 = 13.24$ (13gl) $p = 0.61$; GFI = 0.990; IFC = 0.995; RMSEA = 0.087] indicate non-rejection of the hypotheses. In other words, SDGs 9 and 13 are predictors of gamification of quality of life, even when the other nodes do not predict it satisfactorily. The two determining factors suggest that climate change and industry coexist in a gamification of favorable scenarios. for the quality of life.

Discussion

The objective of this work was to establish the information and learning network related to the immersion of the SDGs in the classroom. The results highlight those nodes 9, 13, 14, and 15 are central axes of the revised research agenda from 2020 to 2023. About the state of the art, the findings of this work indicate that the SDGs are disseminated asymmetrically in their immersive modality. In addition, the extension of the study is suggested to correct the limits of the sample and its effects on the coefficients. Regarding the implications in the classroom, the study can advance toward the differentiation of the teaching and learning of the SDGs depending on the type of immersion: augmentation, virtuality, and gamification. Regarding the quality of life, at least it seems to coexist and anticipate action in favor of climate change through the social responsibility of industrialization.

Conclusion

The objective of this work was to establish the learning network around the SDGs in a public university. The results show that SDGs 9, 13, 14 and 15 are the central axes of the university agenda. In relation to the literature, the findings corroborate the assumption around which the SDGs are assumed as dichotomous learning. The sample surveyed assumes industrialization is important, but also action for the climate and the protection of ecosystems. It is recommended to extend the study to the locality in order to observe the dissemination of the SDGs in the local ecosystem.

References

- Lombard A (2015) Global agenda for social work and social development: A path towards sustainable social work. *Social Work* 51(4): 482-499.
- Jayasooria D (2016) Sustainable development goals and social work: Opportunities and challenges for social work practice in Malaysia. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work* 1(1): 19-29.
- Muleya E (2020) Developmental social work and the sustainable development goals in South Africa: opportunities and challenges. *The International Journal of Community and Social Development* 2(4): 470-486.
- Cordoba PS, Bando L (2022) Social work and the sustainable development goals: A student placement model. *Australian Social Work* 75(4): 519-526.
- Bromfield NF, Duarte F (2022) Centering public impact scholarship among social work scholars to promote and contribute to the United Nations sustainable development goals. *Social Work Education* 41(7): 1427-1440.
- Cox C (2020) The sustainable development goals and aging: Implications for social work. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work* 5(1): 39-47.
- Nhapi T, Pinto C (2023) Embedding SDGs in social work education: insights from Zimbabwe and Portugal BSW and MSW programs. *Social Work Education* pp: 1-18.
- Rice K, Fisher C, Moore S (2022) Social work and the Sustainable Development Goals: an introduction to the special issue. *Social Work Education* 41(7): 1409-1411.
- Healy LM (2016) Situating social work within the post-2015 Global Agenda. *European Journal of Social Work* 20(1): 5-16.
- Sanhueza G, Sepúlveda TM, Moreno J (2022) Innovating social work education in Chile: Addressing the UN sustainable development goals, enhancing our profession. *Social Work Education* 41(7): 1460-1477.
- Pandey UC, Kumar C (2018) A SDG compliant curriculum framework for social work education: Issues and challenges. *Implementing Sustainability in the Curriculum of Universities: Approaches, Methods and Projects* pp: 193-206.
- Whittaker A, Taylor B (2017) Understanding risk in social work. *Journal of Social Work Practice* 31(4): 375-378.
- Marti Haidar YM, Akilova M, Carlson C, Zantaria A, Luo Y (2023) Application of social work in meeting the Sustainable Development Goals for children: A case study from Abkhazia. *International Social Work* 66(4): 1240-1246.
- Mapp S, Gabel GS (2022) Moving social work from international social work to global social work through aligning SDG principles and social work education standards. *Social Work Education* 41(7): 1412-1426.
- Shatberashvili N, Sadzaglishvili S (2022) SDG-Focused social work education in Georgia. *Social Work Education*

41(7): 1507-1524.

a case study teaching method. Social Work Education
41(7): 1478-1488.

16. Addo R, Koers G, Timpson WM (2022) Teaching sustainable development goals and social development: