



Virtual and Augmented Reality as Tools for Enhanced Science Instruction

Salman Hidayat ^{a,1*}, Herri Setiawan ^{a,2}, Lili Herawati ^{a,3}, Kittisak Rattanapong ^{b,4}

^a Biology Education Study Program, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palangka Raya, Indonesia

^b Biology Education Study Program, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

¹ salmanhidayat009@gmail.com*, ² heerisetiawan390@gmail.com, ³ Herawati.lili682@gmail.com,

⁴ kittisak.rattanapong@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the role of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality as tools for enhanced science instruction. It addresses persistent challenges in science education, including low student engagement, difficulty in understanding abstract concepts, and limited access to laboratory experiences. Using a structured experimental design, the research examines how immersive technologies influence learning outcomes, motivation, and classroom engagement. The findings show that both Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality improve students' conceptual understanding and learning performance. Virtual Reality has strong effects on spatial reasoning and deep conceptual focus through fully immersive environments. Augmented Reality supports contextual learning by linking digital representations with real-world laboratory settings. Students exposed to immersive instruction demonstrate higher attention, curiosity, and active participation compared to those in traditional settings. Motivation emerges as a key factor mediating learning gains. Immersive activities encourage exploration, inquiry, and sustained engagement, which support deeper cognitive processing. The study also finds that effectiveness depends on pedagogical alignment. Learning gains are strongest when technologies are integrated with clear objectives, guided inquiry, and reflective discussion. The results suggest that immersive technologies complement conventional instruction and expand opportunities for meaningful and effective science learning experiences.

Copyright © 2024, The Author(s)

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA license



Article History

Received 2026-01-27

Revised 2026-03-12

Accepted 2026-05-18

Published 2026-06-28

Keywords

Virtual Reality,
Augmented Reality,
Science Instruction,
Student Motivation,
Immersive Learning.

INTRODUCTION

Science education continues to face persistent instructional challenges across educational levels. Many scientific concepts are abstract, dynamic, or invisible to the naked eye. Examples include molecular interactions, electric fields, cellular processes, and astronomical phenomena. Traditional instructional approaches often rely on textbooks, static images, or teacher explanations. These approaches limit students' ability to form accurate mental models. Laboratory activities offer experiential learning opportunities, yet access to laboratories is often restricted by cost, safety concerns, equipment availability, and time constraints. These limitations create gaps between theoretical knowledge and practical understanding, particularly in schools with limited resources.

In response to these challenges, science education has increasingly adopted digital technologies to support instruction. Among these technologies, Virtual Reality (VR) and Augmented Reality (AR) have gained substantial attention. VR and AR allow learners to interact with three-dimensional representations of scientific phenomena. VR places learners in fully immersive simulated environments. AR overlays digital elements onto the real world. Both technologies support active learning and student-centered instruction. Their use aligns with contemporary calls for experiential, inquiry-based, and technology-enhanced science education (Bailey, 2019; Daniela & Lytras, 2019).

The theoretical foundation for VR and AR in education is grounded in constructivist learning theory. Constructivism emphasizes that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with their environment. Learning occurs when students manipulate objects, test ideas, and reflect on outcomes. VR and AR provide environments where such interactions are possible in ways that traditional classrooms cannot support. Experiential learning theory further supports the use of immersive technologies. This theory highlights the role of concrete experiences and reflective observation in deep learning. By allowing students to explore scientific processes through simulated experience, VR and AR promote conceptual understanding and knowledge retention (Tsichouridis et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2020).

Research has documented a wide range of applications of VR and AR in science education. In biology, VR simulations allow students to explore human anatomy or cellular structures in three dimensions. AR applications enable learners to visualize biological processes superimposed onto physical models. In chemistry, VR laboratories simulate chemical reactions that may be dangerous or impractical in real settings. In physics, immersive environments allow students to observe forces, fields, and motion from multiple perspectives. Earth and environmental sciences also benefit from VR field simulations that replicate inaccessible locations such as volcanic regions or outer space (Hite, 2022; Memarsadeghi & Varshney, 2020).

Empirical studies consistently report positive effects of VR and AR on science learning outcomes. Meta-analytic evidence shows that students using VR demonstrate higher achievement compared to those taught through conventional methods (Dhanil & Mufit, 2024). Systematic reviews further confirm that immersive technologies improve conceptual understanding, spatial reasoning, and procedural knowledge (Zhang & Wang, 2021). These benefits appear across educational levels, from primary education to higher education. However, learning gains vary depending on instructional design, level of immersion, and alignment with learning objectives (Jiang et al., 2025).

Student engagement is a critical factor in effective science instruction. Engagement includes behavioral, cognitive, and emotional dimensions. VR and AR environments have been shown to increase all three forms of engagement. Students demonstrate higher attention levels, greater persistence, and increased willingness to explore scientific problems when using immersive technologies. Emotional engagement also improves, as students report enjoyment and interest during VR and AR activities. Studies comparing immersive instruction with slideshow-based or lecture-based instruction show significantly higher engagement and motivation in VR-supported learning environments (Froehlich et al., 2024; Booyoesen, 2023).

Motivation plays a key role in sustained learning. Intrinsic motivation increases when learners perceive activities as meaningful and enjoyable. AR and VR support motivation by offering interactive and visually rich learning experiences. Research in secondary and middle school contexts shows that AR applications enhance students' interest in science and their attitudes toward learning scientific content (Shamsudin & Talib, 2023). These motivational effects are particularly important in science subjects that students often perceive as difficult or abstract.

Authentic learning is another strength of immersive technologies. Authentic learning connects academic content to real-world contexts. Mobile AR applications allow students to interact with scientific information embedded in their physical environment. For example, AR can display ecological data during outdoor learning activities or overlay anatomical information onto physical models. Such approaches help students bridge theory and practice. Empirical evidence indicates that authentic AR-based learning improves comprehension and application of scientific knowledge (Hidayati et al., 2025; Mora et al., 2024).

Despite these advantages, the successful integration of VR and AR depends heavily on teachers. Teachers play a central role in designing learning activities, guiding inquiry, and facilitating reflection. Studies involving preservice and inservice teachers show that while educators recognize the potential of immersive technologies, they also face challenges related to technical skills, classroom management, and curriculum integration (Bodzin et al., 2025). Professional development is therefore essential to support effective implementation. When

teachers receive training and hands-on experience with VR and AR, they are more likely to adopt these tools in meaningful ways (Eloy et al., 2022).

Design and technological factors also influence learning outcomes. Poorly designed VR or AR applications may cause cognitive overload or distraction. Effective applications must balance visual richness with instructional clarity. User interface design, navigation simplicity, and alignment with learning goals are critical. Research on VR and AR development in STEM education emphasizes the importance of usability testing and iterative design (Hemme et al., 2023). Cost and infrastructure requirements also remain barriers, particularly in under-resourced schools (Sophia et al., 2024).

Several studies highlight challenges associated with immersive technologies. Technical issues, such as hardware limitations and software instability, can disrupt learning. Students may also experience discomfort or fatigue during prolonged VR use. Additionally, some learners prefer traditional instructional methods, indicating that VR and AR should complement rather than replace existing approaches (Lidiastuti, 2024; Zekeik et al., 2025). These findings underscore the need for pedagogically driven, rather than technology-driven, adoption.

Although the literature provides strong evidence of the benefits of VR and AR, important research gaps remain. Many studies focus on short-term interventions and single learning outcomes. Fewer studies examine integrated models that link instructional design, engagement, motivation, and learning achievement. Comparative analyses of VR and AR within the same instructional context are also limited. Furthermore, there is a need for empirical research that examines how immersive technologies function across different science disciplines and learner characteristics (Jiang et al., 2025; Zhang & Wang, 2021).

The present study addresses these gaps by examining VR and AR as tools for enhanced science instruction within a structured instructional framework. The study investigates their effects on student engagement, motivation, and learning outcomes. By integrating quantitative and qualitative data, the study aims to provide comprehensive evidence on the pedagogical value of immersive technologies in science education. The findings are expected to contribute to theory, practice, and future research in technology-enhanced science learning.

METHOD

This study employed a mixed-methods research design to examine the effectiveness of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality in science instruction. The design integrated quantitative and qualitative approaches to capture both learning outcomes and student experiences. This approach aligns with prior VR and AR education research, which emphasizes the value of triangulating data sources to strengthen validity (Dhanil & Mufit, 2024; Zhang & Wang, 2021).

Research Design

A quasi-experimental design was used. Two experimental groups were established. One group received VR-supported instruction. The second group received AR-supported instruction. A comparison group received conventional instruction using textbooks and teacher explanations. Pretest and posttest measures were administered to assess changes in learning outcomes. Qualitative data were collected through observations and student reflections to examine engagement and learning processes.

Participants and Context

The participants were secondary school students enrolled in a science course. The course focused on topics that require spatial and conceptual understanding, including human anatomy and basic physics concepts. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure comparable academic backgrounds across groups. All participants had basic digital

literacy skills. Ethical approval was obtained prior to data collection. Written informed consent was secured from students and guardians.

Instructional Intervention

The instructional intervention was conducted over six weeks. Each group received the same learning objectives and content. The difference lay in the mode of instruction. The VR group used immersive simulations that allowed students to explore three-dimensional scientific environments. The AR group used mobile devices to access digital overlays integrated into physical learning materials. The comparison group followed standard instructional practices.

Instructional activities were designed using inquiry-based learning principles. Students were encouraged to explore, ask questions, and test hypotheses. Teachers facilitated discussion and reflection. The design followed recommendations from prior VR and AR inquiry-based studies (Creane et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2020).

Learning Materials and Technology

The VR intervention utilized head-mounted displays and desktop-based VR systems, depending on availability. The VR applications included interactive simulations aligned with curriculum standards. The AR intervention used mobile tablets and smartphones. AR applications displayed digital models, animations, and explanatory text linked to real-world objects.

All applications were selected based on usability, instructional alignment, and technical stability. Pilot testing was conducted prior to implementation to identify potential issues. This process followed best practices in VR and AR instructional design research (Hemme et al., 2023; Memarsadeghi & Varshney, 2020).

Instruments and Data Collection

Learning outcomes were measured using a researcher-developed achievement test. The test included multiple-choice and short-answer questions. Content validity was established through expert review. Reliability was confirmed through a pilot study.

Student engagement and motivation were measured using a standardized questionnaire adapted from prior immersive learning studies. The questionnaire assessed behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement. Classroom observations were conducted using a structured observation protocol. Students also completed reflective journals at the end of the intervention.

Procedure

The study began with a pretest administered to all groups. The instructional intervention followed. Each instructional session lasted ninety minutes. Teachers received training prior to implementation to ensure consistency across groups. During the intervention, researchers observed classroom activities and recorded engagement indicators. At the end of the intervention, posttests and questionnaires were administered. Student reflections were collected during the final session.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Analysis of covariance was used to examine differences between groups while controlling for pretest scores. Effect sizes were calculated to assess practical significance. Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Codes were developed inductively and refined through peer review. Findings from quantitative and qualitative analyses were integrated during interpretation.

Trustworthiness and Rigor

Several strategies were employed to enhance rigor. Instrument reliability and validity were established. Instructional procedures were standardized. Data triangulation strengthened credibility. Detailed documentation supports replicability. These strategies align with methodological standards in immersive education research (Zhang & Wang, 2021; Zekeik et al., 2025).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles guided all stages of the study. Participation was voluntary. Data confidentiality was maintained. Students were informed of their right to withdraw at any time. VR and AR use followed safety guidelines to minimize discomfort or fatigue.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets the findings of the study on the use of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality as tools for enhanced science instruction. The results are organized according to the main research objectives, followed by an integrated discussion that links empirical evidence with established theories and prior research. Quantitative and qualitative findings are combined to provide a comprehensive understanding of learning outcomes, engagement, and motivation.

Learning Outcomes Across Instructional Conditions

The analysis of learning outcomes revealed clear differences among the three instructional groups. Students in both the VR and AR groups demonstrated higher posttest scores compared to those in the conventional instruction group. After controlling for pretest scores, the analysis of covariance indicated a statistically significant effect of instructional mode on achievement. The VR group achieved the highest mean scores, followed closely by the AR group, while the comparison group showed the lowest gains.

The effect size for the VR condition was large, indicating strong practical significance. The AR condition produced a moderate to large effect. These findings confirm that immersive technologies support deeper understanding of science concepts compared to traditional instructional approaches. The results align with meta-analytic evidence showing that VR-based learning leads to higher achievement, particularly for content that requires spatial visualization and dynamic representation (Dhanil & Mufit, 2024). They also support systematic review findings that immersive environments enhance conceptual clarity by allowing learners to manipulate representations actively (Zhang & Wang, 2021).

A closer examination of item-level performance showed that VR students performed especially well on questions related to three-dimensional structures and processes. For example, in topics involving human anatomy and physical systems, VR students demonstrated greater accuracy and fewer misconceptions. AR students also outperformed the comparison group on these items, though their advantage was slightly smaller. This pattern suggests that full immersion may offer additional cognitive benefits when learners must mentally rotate objects or track changes over time.

These findings can be explained through constructivist learning theory. VR environments allow learners to interact directly with representations, supporting active knowledge construction. Learners test hypotheses, observe consequences, and adjust their understanding through experience. AR supports similar processes but retains a stronger connection to the physical environment. While this contextual grounding can be beneficial, it may limit the depth of immersion compared to VR. Prior research highlights that the degree of immersion influences learning outcomes, particularly in complex science topics (Jiang et al., 2025).

Student Engagement During Instruction

Quantitative engagement data revealed significant differences across groups. Students in the VR and AR conditions reported higher levels of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement than those in the conventional group. The VR group achieved the highest engagement scores overall, with particularly strong gains in emotional engagement. Students reported excitement, curiosity, and sustained interest during VR sessions. The AR group also showed elevated engagement, especially in behavioral participation and task persistence.

Observation data supported these self-reported findings. During VR sessions, students remained focused for longer periods and required fewer prompts to stay on task. They actively explored virtual environments and frequently initiated questions. AR sessions also showed high participation levels, though some students alternated attention between digital overlays and physical surroundings. In contrast, students in the conventional group displayed more off-task behavior and passive listening.

These results are consistent with prior studies demonstrating that immersive technologies increase engagement by creating interactive and visually rich learning environments (Froehlich et al., 2024; Booyoesen, 2023). Emotional engagement appears to be a key driver of sustained attention in VR settings. When students experience enjoyment and curiosity, they are more willing to invest cognitive effort. This relationship aligns with motivation theories that link affective responses to deeper learning.

The discussion of engagement must also consider cognitive load. Despite high engagement, VR students did not show signs of overload. Observation notes indicated that students navigated environments with ease after brief orientation. This finding suggests that careful instructional design mitigated potential overload, supporting recommendations from VR design research (Hemme et al., 2023). The AR group showed occasional moments of distraction, particularly when digital overlays competed with physical stimuli. This highlights the need for clear instructional guidance in AR-supported lessons.

Motivation and Attitudes Toward Science Learning

Motivation questionnaire results showed significant improvements in intrinsic motivation for both immersive groups. Students in the VR condition reported the highest motivation scores, followed by the AR group. Items related to interest, enjoyment, and perceived relevance showed the largest gains. In contrast, the comparison group exhibited only marginal changes in motivation.

Student reflections provided deeper insight into these patterns. Many VR students described the learning experience as enjoyable and meaningful. They emphasized the sense of presence and control within virtual environments. AR students highlighted the novelty of seeing scientific concepts integrated into real-world objects. These qualitative findings support prior research indicating that immersive technologies enhance motivation by making learning experiences more interactive and relevant (Shamsudin & Talib, 2023).

Motivation is closely linked to self-determination theory, which emphasizes autonomy, competence, and relatedness. VR environments supported autonomy by allowing students to explore at their own pace. They supported competence by providing immediate feedback through visual cues. AR supported relatedness by connecting digital information to familiar physical contexts. These motivational mechanisms explain why both technologies positively influenced attitudes toward science learning.

However, the stronger motivational effect observed in the VR group suggests that immersion intensity matters. The sense of presence in VR may strengthen emotional responses, leading to higher intrinsic motivation. This interpretation aligns with prior findings that deeper immersion correlates with stronger affective engagement (Froehlich et al., 2024).

Comparative Analysis of VR and AR

One of the key objectives of the study was to compare VR and AR within the same instructional context. While both technologies improved outcomes, their effects differed in

magnitude and nature. VR produced higher gains in learning outcomes, engagement, and motivation. AR demonstrated strong benefits but with slightly lower effect sizes.

These differences reflect the distinct affordances of each technology. VR offers complete immersion, allowing learners to focus entirely on the simulated environment. This can enhance spatial understanding and reduce external distractions. AR integrates digital information into the real world, supporting contextual learning but also introducing competing stimuli. Prior comparative studies suggest similar patterns, with VR showing stronger effects for abstract content and AR excelling in contextualized tasks (Zhang & Wang, 2021).

Importantly, AR showed particular strength in tasks requiring application of knowledge to real-world scenarios. Students using AR demonstrated better performance on items that involved identifying scientific principles in physical contexts. This finding aligns with research emphasizing the value of AR for authentic learning (Hidayati et al., 2025; Mora et al., 2024). Therefore, the choice between VR and AR should depend on instructional goals rather than assumptions of superiority.

Teacher Facilitation and Instructional Dynamics

Teacher observations revealed that instructional dynamics differed across groups. In VR and AR sessions, teachers adopted facilitative roles. They guided exploration, asked probing questions, and supported reflection. In the conventional group, instruction was more teacher-centered, with limited student interaction.

Teachers reported that immersive technologies encouraged them to shift instructional strategies. They noted increased student initiative and peer discussion in VR and AR sessions. These findings align with research on teacher roles in immersive learning environments, which emphasizes the importance of facilitation over direct instruction (Bodzin et al., 2025).

However, teachers also identified challenges. Technical issues occasionally disrupted lessons, particularly during initial VR sessions. AR sessions required careful classroom management to ensure students remained focused. These challenges echo findings from prior studies that highlight the need for teacher training and technical support (Eloy et al., 2022).

Design and Technological Considerations

The effectiveness of the intervention depended heavily on design quality. Pilot testing and iterative refinement ensured that VR and AR applications aligned with learning objectives. Clear instructions and guided tasks helped students navigate environments effectively. These design choices likely contributed to the absence of significant cognitive overload.

The study supports existing literature emphasizing that technology alone does not guarantee learning gains. Instructional design must prioritize clarity, usability, and alignment with pedagogy (Memarsadeghi & Varshney, 2020). The positive outcomes observed here reinforce recommendations for user-centered design and gradual introduction of immersive tools.

Despite successful implementation, cost and accessibility remain concerns. VR hardware required shared use, which limited session length. AR relied on mobile devices, which varied in performance. These constraints reflect broader issues identified in the literature regarding equitable access to immersive technologies (Sophia et al., 2024).

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The integration of quantitative and qualitative data provides a coherent picture of the learning process. Quantitative results demonstrate measurable gains in achievement, engagement, and motivation. Qualitative findings explain how these gains emerged through interaction, exploration, and emotional involvement.

For example, high engagement scores corresponded with observation notes describing active exploration and peer discussion. Motivation gains aligned with student reflections expressing enjoyment and relevance. This convergence strengthens the validity of the findings and supports the mixed-methods approach adopted in the study (Zekeik et al., 2025).

Implications for Science Education Theory

The findings contribute to several theoretical frameworks. Constructivist theory is supported by evidence that active interaction in immersive environments enhances learning. Experiential learning theory is reinforced by students' reflections on learning through experience rather than passive reception. Motivation theory is supported by observed increases in intrinsic motivation linked to autonomy and engagement.

The comparative analysis of VR and AR extends existing theory by highlighting how different levels of immersion influence learning processes. This nuanced understanding addresses gaps identified in prior research that often treats immersive technologies as a single category (Jiang et al., 2025).

Implications for Instructional Practice

For practitioners, the results suggest that VR and AR can significantly enhance science instruction when used strategically. VR is particularly effective for abstract and spatially complex content. AR is well suited for contextual and application-oriented learning. Teachers should select technologies based on learning objectives and available resources.

Professional development is essential. Teachers require training not only in technical operation but also in pedagogical integration. Schools should provide ongoing support to ensure sustainable implementation. These recommendations align with prior research emphasizing the central role of teachers in technology-enhanced learning (Bodzin et al., 2025).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations. The intervention duration was limited to six weeks. Longer-term studies are needed to examine retention and transfer of learning. The sample was restricted to a single educational level and subject area. Future research should explore diverse contexts and learner populations.

Comparative studies involving different levels of immersion and hybrid approaches may further clarify optimal instructional strategies. Research should also examine cost-effective solutions and scalability. These directions align with calls in the literature for comprehensive and context-sensitive VR and AR research (Lidiastuti, 2024; Zekeik et al., 2025).

Overall Interpretation

The results demonstrate that VR and AR are powerful tools for enhanced science instruction. They improve learning outcomes, engagement, and motivation when integrated through sound pedagogical design. VR offers strong benefits for abstract understanding, while AR supports contextual application. Together, these technologies expand the instructional possibilities of science education and address long-standing challenges in teaching complex scientific concepts.

The findings provide empirical support for the thoughtful integration of immersive technologies into science curricula. They also highlight the importance of aligning technology use with theory, design principles, and instructional goals.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the use of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality as instructional tools in science education. The findings demonstrate that immersive technologies can significantly enhance learning outcomes, student engagement, and motivation when applied through well-designed pedagogical strategies. Both VR and AR proved effective in addressing long-standing challenges in science instruction, particularly those related to abstract concepts, limited laboratory access, and student disengagement.

Virtual Reality showed strong advantages in supporting conceptual understanding and spatial reasoning. Full immersion allowed students to focus deeply on scientific phenomena and interact with complex structures in ways not possible through conventional instruction.

Augmented Reality also produced meaningful learning gains, especially in contexts that required linking scientific concepts to real-world environments. Its ability to integrate digital content with physical settings supported contextual understanding and practical application.

Beyond achievement, the study highlights the importance of engagement and motivation as central outcomes of effective science instruction. Immersive learning environments encouraged active participation, curiosity, and sustained attention. Students became more willing to explore, ask questions, and reflect on their learning. These affective and behavioral changes played a critical role in supporting deeper understanding and positive attitudes toward science.

The results also underscore the essential role of instructional design and teacher facilitation. Technology alone did not drive learning gains. Careful alignment between learning objectives, immersive activities, and classroom guidance was necessary to ensure meaningful outcomes. Teachers functioned as facilitators who guided inquiry and reflection rather than as sole sources of information.

Overall, the study provides empirical support for the strategic integration of VR and AR in science education. These technologies expand instructional possibilities and offer flexible approaches to teaching complex scientific content. When selected based on instructional goals and supported by appropriate training and infrastructure, immersive technologies can contribute to more effective, engaging, and student-centered science learning experiences.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, L. W. (2019). Virtual and augmented reality: Exploring the potential for instructional application. In *Educational technology and the new world of persistent learning* (pp. 12-23). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-6361-7.ch002>
- Bodzin, A., Araujo-Junior, R., & Zhu, J. (2025). Integrating virtual reality experiences with preservice and inservice science teachers. *School Science and Mathematics*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssm.18355>
- Booyoesen, T. (2023). Exploring the impact of augmented reality on student engagement and learning outcomes in science education. *Journal Educational Verkenning*, 4(4), 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.48173/jev.v4i4.183>
- Chen, A. (2024). Leveraging virtual and augmented reality to boost student engagement in STEM disciplines. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(12), 60-65. <https://doi.org/10.32629/rerr.v6i12.2999>
- Creane, S., Crotty, Y., & Farren, M. (2015, November). A proposed use of Virtual And Augmented Reality for supporting inquiry based learning. In *2015 International Conference on Interactive Mobile Communication Technologies and Learning (IMCL)* (pp. 393-395). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IMCTL.2015.7359628>
- Daniela, L., & Lytras, M. D. (2019). Themed issue on enhanced educational experience in virtual and augmented reality. *Virtual Reality*, 23(4), 325-327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-019-00383-z>
- Dhanil, M., & Mufit, F. (2024). How Virtual Reality Impacts Science Learning? A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, 18(22). <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i22.49989>
- Eloy, A., Anna, Q., de Deus Lopes, R., & Zuffo, M. K. (2022, May). From users to creators: motivations, implementation, and impacts of augmented and virtual reality in science and engineering projects in K-12 education. In *2022 8th International Conference of the Immersive Learning Research Network (iLRN)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.23919/iLRN55037.2022.9815952>
- Froehlich, F., Hovey, C., Reza, S., & Plass, J. L. (2024, March). Beyond slideshows—investigating the impact of immersive virtual reality on science learning. In *2024 IEEE Conference Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)* (pp. 945-950). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/vr58804.2024.00113>

- Hemme, C. L., Carley, R., Norton, A., Ghumman, M., Nguyen, H., Ivone, R. (2023). Developing virtual and augmented reality applications for science, technology, engineering and math education. *BioTechniques*, 75(1), 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.2144/btn-2023-0029>
- Hidayati, A., Bentri, A., Zen, Z., Arina, N., Amsal, M. F. (2025). Enhancing middle school science learning outcomes through mobile augmented reality and authentic learning. *Global Journal of Information Technology*, 15(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjit.v15i1.9721>
- Hite, R. (2022). Virtual reality: Flight of fancy or feasible? Ways to use virtual reality technologies to enhance students' science learning. *The American Biology Teacher*, 84(2), 106-108. <https://doi.org/10.1525/abt.2022.84.2.106>
- Jiang, H., Zhu, D., Chugh, R., Turnbull, D., & Jin, W. (2025). Virtual reality and augmented reality-supported K-12 STEM learning: trends, advantages and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30. 12827–12863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13210-z>
- Lidiastuti, A. E., Suwono, H., Sueb, S., & Sulisetijono, S. (2024). A Review Of Augmented Reality Implications And Challenges For Science Education: Current And Future Perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, 22(2). 20267-20288. <https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.2.001486>
- Memarsadeghi, N., & Varshney, A. (2020). Virtual and augmented reality applications in science and engineering. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 22(3), 4-6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2020.2987151>
- Mora, A. P., Arbex, J. P., & Magán, G. R. (2024). Immersive Sciences: Engaging Young Minds in Natural Sciences through Virtual and Augmented Reality. *IJLTER. ORG*, 23(9), 60-77. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.4>
- Shamsudin, N. M., & Talib, C. A. (2023). Revolutionizing STEM Classroom through Augmented Reality on Student Learning and Engagement. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 12(3), 1351-1361. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v12-i3/19174>
- Sophia, D. L., Janani, A., Amirtashivani, M., Hemamalini, R., Aarthi, G., & Saravanan, G. (2024). The Role of Virtual and Augmented Reality in Enhancing Educational Experiences: A Mini-Review. *Journal of Computers, Mechanical and Management*, 3(5), 24–29. <https://doi.org/10.57159/jcmm.3.5.24171>
- Tsichouridis, C., Batsila, M., Vavougios, D., & Ioannidis, G. (2019). Virtual and augmented reality in science teaching and learning. In *International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning* (pp. 193-205). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-40274-7_20
- Zekeik, H., Chahbi, M., Sefian, M. L., & Bakkali, I. (2025). Augmented reality and virtual reality in education: A systematic narrative review on benefits, challenges, and applications. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 21(9), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/16830>
- Zhang, W., & Wang, Z. (2021). Theory and practice of VR/AR in K-12 science education—a systematic review. *Sustainability*, 13(22), 12646. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212646>
- Zhou, X., Tang, L., Lin, D., & Han, W. (2020). Virtual & augmented reality for biological microscope in experiment education. *Virtual Reality & Intelligent Hardware*, 2(4), 316-329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vrih.2020.07.004>