IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

VIRTUAL REALITY INTEGRATION IN STEAM INSTRUCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: ADVANCING VIRTUAL LABORATORY LEARNING IN M.SC. PHYSICS

[1]Prerana Prada Padhan, [2]Chandan Kumar Satpathy

[1, 2] Research Scholar

[1, 2] Department of Education,

[1, 2] Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, India

ORCiD: 0009-0003-9219-6492 (Corresponding Author), ORCiD: 0009-0009-1774-2055

Abstract

Virtual reality (VR) is increasingly positioned as a transformative educational technology for Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instruction in higher education. Its immersive, interactive and spatially oriented environments can support the visualisation of abstract phenomena, experimental rehearsal, collaborative inquiry and interdisciplinary problem-solving. This paper critically examines the integration of VR in higher education STEAM instruction, with particular emphasis on virtual laboratory learning in Master of Science (M.Sc.) Physics programmes. Drawing upon constructivism, experiential learning, embodied cognition and the Technology, Pedagogy and Content Knowledge framework, the paper argues that VR laboratories can enrich physics learning by enabling students to explore microscopic, computational and experimentally hazardous phenomena that are difficult to access through conventional laboratories alone. The paper discusses pedagogical affordances, instructional design principles, applications in advanced physics practicals, assessment strategies, equity concerns and implementation challenges. It proposes a blended techno-laboratory model in which VR serves as a preparatory, complementary and reflective environment before and after actual laboratory experimentation. The paper concludes that VR should not be treated as a replacement for physical laboratories; rather, it should be integrated as a pedagogically designed bridge between theoretical visualisation, procedural understanding and experimental authenticity.

Keywords: Virtual Reality, STEAM Education, Higher Education, Virtual Laboratory, M.Sc. Physics, Immersive Learning, Techno-Laboratory

1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education is undergoing a significant transformation as digital technologies reshape the ways in which knowledge is accessed, represented and constructed. Within this transformation, virtual reality has emerged as an important medium for immersive learning. VR refers to computer-generated, interactive three-dimensional environments in which users experience a sense of presence and can manipulate virtual objects through head-mounted displays, desktop interfaces, controllers, sensors or haptic devices. Unlike conventional multimedia instruction, VR can position learners within a simulated environment and enable them to interact with phenomena through movement, observation, experimentation and decision-making.

The relevance of VR is particularly strong in Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics instruction. STEAM education seeks to connect scientific inquiry, technological competence, engineering design, artistic creativity and mathematical reasoning through interdisciplinary learning experiences. However, conventional higher education teaching often continues to separate these domains into disciplinary compartments. Physics students may learn mathematical derivations in classrooms, computational modelling in computer laboratories and experimental procedures in physical laboratories, but may not always experience meaningful integration among these modes of learning. VR can contribute to this integration by creating immersive environments in which theoretical concepts, simulations, instruments, data and visual representations are brought together.

The potential of VR is especially significant for M.Sc. Physics education. At the postgraduate level, students encounter advanced and highly abstract content such as quantum mechanics, condensed matter physics, spectroscopy, crystallography, semiconductor physics, electromagnetism, nuclear physics, computational physics and materials science. Many of these domains involve phenomena that cannot be directly observed through the human senses. Students may calculate lattice parameters, interpret diffraction patterns, model electron density distributions or analyse band structures, yet struggle to connect mathematical representations with experimental processes. VR-based laboratories can help address this challenge by enabling students to enter simulated experimental spaces, visualise invisible physical processes and rehearse complex procedures before handling expensive instruments.

Virtual laboratories have become increasingly common in higher education STEM contexts. A scoping review by Sellberg et al. (2024) observed that virtual laboratories are used across professional and disciplinary settings to provide flexible opportunities for scientific exploration and laboratory-oriented learning. Similarly, Luo et al. (2021) found that VR can support learning through immersion, interaction and visualisation, although instructional design remains more important than technological novelty. In physics education, virtual experiments have been used extensively in mechanics and electricity, while optics, acoustics, thermodynamics and advanced postgraduate physics remain comparatively underexplored (Zhang et al., 2025).

This paper examines how VR may be integrated into higher education STEAM instruction, with special attention to virtual laboratory learning in M.Sc. Physics. It argues that VR is most educationally meaningful when used within a blended techno-laboratory model that combines virtual exploration, computational modelling, physical experimentation, collaborative interpretation and reflective assessment.

2. CONCEPTUALISING VIRTUAL REALITY IN STEAM INSTRUCTION

VR should not be understood merely as a sophisticated visual technology. Its educational value depends on the relationship between immersion, interaction, instructional guidance and disciplinary learning outcomes. In higher education, VR can range from non-immersive desktop simulations to semi-immersive projection environments and fully immersive head-mounted display systems. Each form offers different pedagogical possibilities.

In STEAM instruction, VR can support three interconnected purposes. First, it can provide conceptual visualisation. Learners can observe phenomena that are too small, too large, too dangerous, too expensive or too abstract to be directly experienced. Second, it can enable procedural rehearsal. Students can practise laboratory sequences, safety protocols, instrument operation and data collection without the risks associated with physical experimentation. Third, it can support creative and interdisciplinary design. Learners can construct models, test prototypes, explore aesthetic representations of scientific ideas and collaborate across disciplinary boundaries.

The integration of the arts within STEM is important because scientific understanding is not only analytical; it is also representational, imaginative and communicative. Physics students need to interpret graphs, construct models, communicate findings and visualise multidimensional relationships. VR environments can support these capacities by allowing learners to engage with scientific representations spatially and creatively. For example, a student may explore a crystal lattice in three dimensions, manipulate unit cells, observe symmetry operations and connect structural patterns with diffraction data. Such an activity brings together physics, mathematical reasoning, digital technology and visual design.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The educational use of VR in M.Sc. Physics can be interpreted through several complementary theoretical perspectives.

Constructivism suggests that learners actively construct knowledge through engagement with experiences, prior understanding and social interaction. VR environments can support constructivist learning when students are encouraged to investigate, manipulate variables, test hypotheses and discuss outcomes rather than merely observe pre-programmed demonstrations. A virtual diffraction experiment, for example, becomes constructivist when students alter wavelength, crystal spacing and detector angle, observe changes in diffraction patterns and interpret the results using Bragg's law.

Experiential learning theory emphasises the cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation (Kolb, 1984). VR can provide a form of concrete experiential engagement, especially where actual physical access is limited. However, VR experience must be followed by reflection, conceptual interpretation and further experimentation. A student who performs a virtual X-ray diffraction experiment should subsequently analyse data, compare simulated and empirical results and reflect on possible sources of error.

Embodied cognition is also relevant. It proposes that learning is shaped by bodily action, perception and interaction with the environment. In immersive VR, students may use gestures, movement and spatial orientation to explore scientific objects. Research suggests that immersive environments can support spatial understanding when the design reduces unnecessary cognitive demands and aligns bodily interaction with conceptual goals (Makransky & Petersen, 2021).

The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge framework is useful for understanding the teacher's role. Effective VR integration requires more than technological competence. Teachers need to understand the physics content, the pedagogical sequence, the affordances and limitations of VR tools and the ways in which students may interpret simulations. VR should therefore be designed through the integration of technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and disciplinary content knowledge (Mishra & Koehler, 2006).

4. VIRTUAL REALITY AND THE M.SC. PHYSICS LABORATORY

The M.Sc. Physics laboratory is not simply a location for verifying textbook concepts. It is a space in which students learn measurement, calibration, uncertainty, data interpretation, scientific reasoning, safety, instrument handling and research ethics. Physical laboratories remain essential because they provide tactile, sensory and procedural experiences that simulations cannot fully reproduce. Students must learn to align optical components, handle samples, troubleshoot apparatus, manage noise, record observations and respond to unexpected experimental outcomes.

Nevertheless, many postgraduate physics experiments involve instruments that are expensive, technically demanding or inaccessible to all learners. X-ray diffractometers, scanning electron microscopes, spectrometers, cryogenic systems, vacuum chambers and semiconductor characterisation equipment may have limited availability. Students may receive only brief exposure to such instruments because of time constraints, safety requirements and institutional resource limitations. VR laboratories can provide repeated opportunities to explore equipment, understand experimental architecture and rehearse procedures.

For example, in a virtual X-ray diffraction laboratory, students can inspect the X-ray source, sample holder, goniometer, detector and control interface. They can rotate a crystal structure, examine lattice planes, vary incident angles and observe the emergence of diffraction peaks. They can then connect these observations with Bragg's law.

Such visual and procedural rehearsal may make the subsequent physical laboratory experience more meaningful. Instead of encountering unfamiliar equipment for the first time, students can focus on calibration, alignment, sample preparation, data quality and error analysis.

Table 1

Potential VR Applications in M.Sc. Physics Laboratory Learning

Physics area	Virtual laboratory activity	Key learning outcome	Connection with STEAM
X-ray diffraction	Manipulation of crystal lattices, diffraction geometry and peak generation	Understanding lattice spacing, Bragg diffraction and crystal structure	Science, mathematics, digital modelling
Semiconductor physics	Exploration of band structure, carrier movement and p–n junction behaviour	Understanding band gap, conductivity and device behaviour	Science, engineering, technology
Optics and photonics	Virtual alignment of lenses, lasers, interferometers and spectrometers	Understanding optical paths, interference and measurement precision	Science, engineering, visual design
Nuclear physics	Simulation of radiation detection, decay processes and shielding	Understanding safety, stochastic processes and detector response	Science, technology, ethics
Computational physics	Interactive visualisation of simulations and parameter changes	Linking equations, algorithms and physical interpretation	Mathematics, computing, visualisation
Materials science	Exploration of microstructure, defects and phase transformations	Understanding structure–property relationships	Physics, engineering, design
Electromagnetism	Manipulation of electric and magnetic fields in three dimensions	Understanding field lines, force and induction	Science, mathematics, spatial design

5. PEDAGOGICAL AFFORDANCES OF VR LABORATORIES

VR laboratories offer several important pedagogical affordances. The first is visualisation. Physics often involves entities and processes that are not directly visible, including electric fields, wave functions, atomic structures, energy bands and radiation interactions. VR can transform symbolic and graphical representations into interactive three-dimensional experiences. This may support students who struggle to translate between equations, diagrams and physical meaning.

The second affordance is repetition. In a physical laboratory, students may have limited time to conduct an experiment. Equipment may be shared among groups, and mistakes may consume valuable laboratory hours. In a VR environment, students can repeat procedures, restart experiments and compare outcomes under different conditions. Repetition is particularly valuable for learning procedural sequences and developing confidence.

The third affordance is safety. Some experiments involve high voltage, radiation, vacuum systems, cryogenic materials, lasers or hazardous chemicals. VR allows students to learn safety protocols and observe the consequences of unsafe actions without physical danger. This does not eliminate the need for actual safety training; rather, it provides a preparatory space in which students can understand why safety procedures matter.

The fourth affordance is accessibility. Students in institutions with limited laboratory infrastructure may not have regular access to advanced instruments. Virtual laboratories can reduce some inequalities by enabling exposure to scientific equipment and experiments that may otherwise remain unavailable. In India, this potential is especially relevant for universities and colleges where access to advanced research laboratories is uneven. National initiatives such as Virtual Labs have demonstrated the value of digital laboratory resources for widening access to scientific experimentation (Government of India, 2024).

The fifth affordance is data-rich inquiry. Well-designed VR laboratories can generate datasets that students must interpret rather than simply observe. Students can collect virtual measurements, construct graphs, calculate uncertainty, compare theoretical and simulated values and prepare laboratory reports. The learning value of VR increases when it requires students to engage in scientific reasoning rather than passive exploration.

6. A BLENDED TECHNO-LABORATORY MODEL FOR M.SC. PHYSICS

VR should not be positioned as a substitute for actual laboratory work. Research across science education indicates that virtual laboratories can support conceptual learning, but evidence regarding technical skills, motivation and transfer to physical practice remains mixed (Choate et al., 2021). Therefore, a blended approach is more educationally defensible.

The proposed techno-laboratory model consists of four phases: virtual orientation, guided simulation, actual experimentation and reflective integration. In the first phase, students enter a VR environment to explore the apparatus, laboratory layout, safety rules and theoretical principles. In the second phase, they conduct guided virtual experiments, manipulate variables and predict outcomes. In the third phase, they perform the corresponding physical experiment in the actual laboratory. In the final phase, they compare virtual and empirical results, identify differences and reflect on the role of error, material conditions and instrument limitations.

Figure 1

Blended Techno-Laboratory Model for M.Sc. Physics

PHASE 1: VIRTUAL ORIENTATION
Equipment familiarisation • Safety • Concept visualisation

↓

PHASE 2: GUIDED VR EXPERIMENTATION
Variable manipulation • Prediction • Simulation-based data

↓

PHASE 3: ACTUAL LABORATORY PRACTICE
Instrument handling • Calibration • Measurement • Error analysis

↓

PHASE 4: REFLECTIVE INTEGRATION
Comparison of virtual and actual data • Report writing • Discussion

↓

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC CONCEPTUALISATION

This model is particularly appropriate for M.Sc. Physics because postgraduate students are expected to develop both conceptual depth and research-oriented competence. VR can prepare students for actual laboratory work, while physical experimentation provides the authenticity, uncertainty and material engagement necessary for scientific training.

7. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES

The effectiveness of VR depends heavily on instructional design. A visually impressive environment may fail educationally if learners are overwhelmed by irrelevant details or unclear tasks. Makransky and Petersen (2021) proposed that immersive VR can influence learning through presence and agency, but may also create cognitive load. Therefore, VR laboratory design should follow several principles.

First, learning objectives must be explicit. Each VR activity should identify whether the intended outcome is conceptual understanding, procedural rehearsal, safety training, data analysis, spatial reasoning or collaborative inquiry. Second, the simulation should include meaningful interaction. Students should make decisions, manipulate variables and observe consequences. Third, guidance should be gradually reduced. Beginners may require prompts, demonstrations and feedback, while advanced students may undertake open inquiry tasks.

Fourth, virtual tasks should be aligned with actual laboratory activities. If students will later conduct an XRD experiment, the VR environment should represent relevant equipment, terminology, procedural steps and data forms. Fifth, reflection must be incorporated. Students should be asked to explain observations, predict results and compare virtual outcomes with theoretical models. Sixth, accessibility should be considered. VR content should include desktop alternatives, captions, adjustable interfaces and low-bandwidth options for students who cannot use head-mounted displays.

Table 2

Instructional Design Guidelines for VR-Based Physics Laboratories

Design principle	Application in VR laboratory	Expected educational value
Alignment with outcomes	Match VR task with specific laboratory competency	Focused learning and valid assessment
Guided inquiry	Use prompts, hypotheses and feedback	Development of scientific reasoning
Authentic representation	Model relevant instruments, procedures and data	Better transfer to actual laboratory work
Variable manipulation	Allow changes in experimental conditions	Understanding cause-and-effect relationships
Reflection	Include post-simulation questions and discussion	Deeper conceptualisation
Collaboration	Enable group roles and shared problem-solving	Communication and teamwork
Accessibility	Provide non-immersive alternatives and inclusive controls	Equitable participation
Assessment integration	Use observation, reports and concept tests	Evidence-based evaluation

8. ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING IN VR LABORATORIES

Assessment should examine more than students' satisfaction with VR. Positive attitudes do not necessarily indicate conceptual learning or procedural competence. A comprehensive assessment framework for M.Sc. Physics should include conceptual, procedural, analytical and reflective dimensions.

Conceptual learning may be assessed through pre-tests and post-tests, concept inventories, oral explanations and problem-solving tasks. Procedural understanding may be assessed through checklists that examine whether students can sequence experimental steps, identify apparatus components, follow safety protocols and respond to simulated errors. Analytical competence may be assessed through data interpretation, graph construction, uncertainty calculation and comparison between theoretical and observed values. Reflective competence may be assessed through laboratory journals, reflective notes and group discussions.

Table 3

Assessment Framework for VR-Integrated M.Sc. Physics Laboratories

Dimension	Sample indicator	Possible assessment method
Conceptual understanding	Explains diffraction, band gap or interference accurately	Concept test, viva voce, written explanation
Procedural familiarity	Identifies correct sequence of experimental operations	Observation checklist, simulation log
Data interpretation	Analyses graphs, peaks and experimental trends	Laboratory report, data-analysis task
Scientific reasoning	Predicts outcomes and justifies variable changes	Inquiry worksheet, oral presentation
Safety awareness	Recognises hazards and appropriate precautions	Scenario-based assessment
Reflective learning	Compares virtual and actual outcomes critically	Reflective journal, group discussion
Collaborative competence	Participates in shared inquiry and role allocation	Peer assessment, teacher observation

9. CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Despite its potential, VR integration presents several challenges. Cost remains a major issue. Head-mounted displays, high-performance computers, software licences, maintenance and technical support may be difficult for many institutions to sustain. Institutions must also consider whether the investment improves learning sufficiently to justify expenditure.

A second challenge is the digital divide. Students may have unequal access to devices, internet connectivity and quiet learning spaces. VR integration should therefore not create a new form of exclusion. Desktop-based simulations, mobile-compatible alternatives and shared laboratory facilities may be necessary in resource-constrained contexts.

A third challenge is cognitive overload. Highly immersive environments may distract learners if visual effects, navigation demands or game-like features are not related to learning objectives. Teachers must ensure that VR supports scientific inquiry rather than entertainment alone.

A fourth challenge concerns physical discomfort. Some users experience motion sickness, eye strain, fatigue or disorientation in immersive environments. Sessions should be appropriately timed, and alternative learning modes should be available. Privacy is another important concern, as VR systems may collect behavioural, movement and interaction data. Institutions should establish clear policies regarding data protection, consent and responsible use.

Finally, there is a pedagogical risk of treating simulation as equivalent to reality. Virtual environments may present idealised conditions, while actual laboratories involve noise, equipment limitations, material imperfections and human judgement. Students must be taught to recognise this distinction. The purpose of VR is not to erase the complexity of experimentation but to prepare learners to engage with it more intelligently.

10. IMPLICATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE

Higher education institutions should integrate VR through curriculum planning rather than isolated technological projects. Departments of physics, education, computer science, engineering and design can collaborate to develop locally relevant VR laboratory modules. Such collaboration reflects the interdisciplinary spirit of STEAM education.

Teacher preparation is equally important. Faculty members need opportunities to learn how to select VR resources, design inquiry tasks, facilitate discussion and assess learning outcomes. Without pedagogical preparation, VR may remain underused or reduced to a demonstration tool.

For Indian higher education, VR laboratories may contribute to wider access to advanced scientific learning. However, implementation should be sensitive to institutional diversity. Universities with strong research infrastructure may use VR to supplement sophisticated physical laboratories, whereas resource-constrained colleges may use VR to introduce students to instruments and procedures that are otherwise inaccessible. National digital education initiatives can support shared repositories, multilingual interfaces, open educational resources and collaborative development of virtual experiments.

11. CONCLUSION

Virtual reality has substantial potential to enrich STEAM instruction in higher education, particularly in advanced physics learning. Its major contribution lies in its ability to make abstract phenomena visible, enable safe and repeatable procedural rehearsal, support data-rich inquiry and connect theoretical learning with experimental practice. For M.Sc. Physics students, VR laboratories can provide meaningful preparation for complex experiments involving crystallography, semiconductor physics, optics, electromagnetism, materials science and computational modelling.

However, VR should not be regarded as a replacement for actual laboratory work. Physical laboratories remain indispensable for developing instrument handling, tactile competence, calibration skills, error awareness and scientific judgement. The most promising approach is a blended techno-laboratory model in which VR functions as a preparatory, complementary and reflective learning environment. When aligned with clear outcomes, guided inquiry, authentic assessment and inclusive access, VR can strengthen the relationship between conceptual visualisation and experimental authenticity. Future research should examine the long-term transfer of VR-based procedural learning to actual laboratory performance, especially in postgraduate physics education in diverse institutional contexts.

REFERENCES

[1] Akçayır, M., & Akçayır, G. (2017). Advantages and challenges associated with augmented reality for education: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Research Review, 20*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.11.002

[2] Allcoat, D., & von Mühlenen, A. (2018). Learning in virtual reality: Effects on performance, emotion and engagement. *Research in Learning Technology, 26*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v26.2140

[3] Bailenson, J. N. (2018). *Experience on demand: What virtual reality is, how it works, and what it can do*. W. W. Norton.

[4] Birt, J., & Moore, E. (2019). A mixed methods evaluation of the use of smartphone immersive virtual reality in undergraduate anatomy education. *Anatomical Sciences Education, 12*(6), 631–642. https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1836

[5] Bricken, M., & Byrne, C. M. (1993). Summer students in virtual reality: A pilot study on educational applications of virtual reality technology. In A. Wexelblat (Ed.), *Virtual reality: Applications and explorations* (pp. 199–217). Academic Press.

[6] Choate, J., Groenewald, B., & Klingenberg, G. (2021). Are virtual physiology laboratories effective for student learning? A systematic review. *Advances in Physiology Education*, *45*(4), 774–785. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00016.2021

[7] Dalgarno, B., & Lee, M. J. W. (2010). What are the learning affordances of 3-D virtual environments? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *41*(1), 10–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.01038.x

[8] de Freitas, S., Rebolledo-Mendez, G., Liarokapis, F., Magoulas, G., & Poulovassilis, A. (2010). Learning as immersive experiences: Using the four-dimensional framework for designing and evaluating immersive learning experiences in a virtual world. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *41*(1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.01024.x

[9] Finkelstein, N. D., Adams, W. K., Keller, C. J., Kohl, P. B., Perkins, K. K., Podolefsky, N. S., Reid, S., & LeMaster, R. (2005). When learning about the real world is better done virtually: A study of substituting computer simulations for laboratory equipment. *Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research*, *1*(1), Article 010103. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.1.010103

[10] Government of India. (2024). *Virtual Labs: An initiative of the Ministry of Education*. https://www.vlab.co.in

[11] Hodges, L. F., Anderson, P., Burdea, G. C., Hoffman, H. G., & Rothbaum, B. O. (2001). Treating psychological and physical disorders with VR. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, *21*(6), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1109/38.963459

[12] Huang, H. M., Rauch, U., & Liaw, S. S. (2010). Investigating learners' attitudes toward virtual reality learning environments: Based on a constructivist approach. *Computers & Education*, *55*(3), 1171–1182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.014

[13] Jensen, L., & Konradsen, F. (2018). A review of the use of virtual reality head-mounted displays in education and training. *Education and Information Technologies*, *23*, 1515–1529. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-017-9676-0

[14] Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

[15] Makransky, G., & Lilleholt, L. (2018). A structural equation modeling investigation of the emotional value of immersive virtual reality in education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *66*, 1141–1164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9581-2

[16] Makransky, G., & Petersen, G. B. (2021). The cognitive affective model of immersive learning (CAMIL): A theoretical research-based model of learning in immersive virtual reality. *Educational Psychology Review*, *33*, 937–958. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09586-2

[17] Merchant, Z., Goetz, E. T., Cifuentes, L., Keeney-Kennicutt, W., & Davis, T. J. (2014). Effectiveness of virtual reality-based instruction on students' learning outcomes in K–12 and higher education: A meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, *70*, 29–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.07.033

[18] Mikropoulos, T. A., & Natsis, A. (2011). Educational virtual environments: A ten-year review of empirical research. *Computers & Education*, *56*(3), 769–780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.020

[19] Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

[20] Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2002). Verbal redundancy in multimedia learning: When reading helps listening. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(1), 156–163. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.156

[21] National Education Policy. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Ministry of Education, Government of India.

[22] National Research Council. (2012). *A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas*. National Academies Press.

[23] Parong, J., & Mayer, R. E. (2018). Learning science in immersive virtual reality. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *110*(6), 785–797. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000241

[24] Radianti, J., Majchrzak, T. A., Fromm, J., & Wohlgenannt, I. (2020). A systematic review of immersive virtual reality applications for higher education: Design elements, lessons learned and research agenda. *Computers & Education*, *147*, Article 103778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103778

[25] Reeves, T. C., Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2002). Authentic activities and online learning. In A. Goody, J. Herrington, & M. Northcote (Eds.), *Quality conversations* (pp. 562–567). HERDSA.

[26] Sellberg, C., Nazari, Z., & Solberg, M. (2024). Virtual laboratories in STEM higher education: A scoping review. *Nordic Journal of Systematic Reviews in Education, 2*(1), 58–75. https://doi.org/10.23865/njsre.v2.5766

[27] Slater, M., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2016). Enhancing our lives with immersive virtual reality. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 3*, Article 74. https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2016.00074

[28] Smetana, L. K., & Bell, R. L. (2012). Computer simulations to support inquiry-based science instruction. *International Journal of Science Education, 34*(9), 1337–1370. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2011.605182

[29] Southgate, E., Smith, S. P., Cividino, C., Saxby, S., Kilham, J., Eather, G., & Sceats, G. (2019). Embedding immersive virtual reality in classrooms: Ethical, organisational and educational lessons in bridging research and practice. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction, 19*, 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2018.10.002

[30] Vidak, A., Movre Šapić, I., Gomzi, V., & Mešić, V. (2026). Immersive virtual reality in learning physics: A systematic review of opportunities and challenges. *European Journal of Physics, 47*(3). https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6404/ae72d3

[31] Wang, P., Wu, P., Wang, J., Chi, H. L., & Wang, X. (2018). A critical review of the use of virtual reality in construction engineering education and training. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *15*(6), Article 1204. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15061204

[32] Zacharia, Z. C., & Olympiou, G. (2011). Physical versus virtual manipulative experimentation in physics learning. *Learning and Instruction, 21*(3), 317–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2010.03.001

[33] Zhang, Y., Li, X., & Chen, H. (2025). Virtual experiments in physics education: A systematic literature review. *Research in Science & Technological Education, 43*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2024.2327995