RCHUB: JOURNAL OF COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING (JCISE)
VOL: 2, ISSUE 4, OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2026
RCHUB PUBLISHER
ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

IMMERSIVEXR: AN AI-DRIVEN ADAPTIVE AR/VR FRAMEWORK FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE ENGINEERING LABORATORIES AND INDUSTRIAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Sriram S
Researcher Department of CSE,
NITTR Chennai

Abstract

Computer Science Engineering (CSE) laboratories and industry-facing technical training share a common constraint: hands-on practice is bounded by hardware availability, cost, safety, and instructor bandwidth. Extended Reality (XR) technologies have been associated with improved engagement and, in several domains, improved learning outcomes, yet existing AR/VR laboratory solutions remain largely static — they deliver the same content at the same pace to every learner and stop at procedural task completion rather than diagnostic reasoning. This paper presents ImmersiveXR, a proposed AI-driven adaptive AR/VR framework built around three functional layers: an XR Simulation Layer for immersive laboratory and industrial-scenario practice; an AI Adaptation Engine that models learner competency in real time to recalibrate task difficulty, hints, and sequencing; and an Analytics and Feedback Loop that logs mastery evidence for learners and instructors. The framework further introduces scenario-based industrial troubleshooting (symptom → hypothesis → test → resolve) to extend practice beyond procedural lab exercises toward authentic diagnostic and decision-making skill-building, and proposes a comparative, mixed-methods assessment design contrasting XR-based instruction against conventional laboratory teaching across cognitive, psychomotor, and affective outcome measures. The study follows a design-science research approach across five phases — requirements analysis, architectural design, prototype development, pilot deployment, and comparative evaluation — targeting core CSE domains including computer assembly, microprocessor architecture, computer networks, and embedded systems. This paper sets out the problem statement, research questions, objectives, literature gap, proposed methodology, and expected contributions of this doctoral research, positioning ImmersiveXR as a unified response to four presently unaddressed needs: adaptive personalization, shared-hardware feasibility, authentic industrial diagnostics, and validated comparative assessment.

Keywords

Extended Reality (XR); Adaptive Learning; Intelligent Tutoring Systems; Computer Science Engineering Laboratories; Virtual Reality (VR); Augmented Reality (AR); Industrial Skill Development; Instructional Design; Artificial Intelligence in Education; Comparative Assessment

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

Thesis Statement

Teacher-guided classroom VR demonstrates a simple, evidence-backed principle: experienced learning outperforms passive learning. This paper argues that an AI-driven adaptive XR framework can extend that same principle to a harder problem — CSE laboratories and industrial training — by personalizing laboratory pacing in real time while simulating industrial-scale environments (cloud infrastructure, cybersecurity, IoT, and robotics contexts) that conventional laboratories cannot safely, affordably, or logistically replicate at scale. Coupling adaptive intelligence with immersive practice is thus positioned to close the gap between what CSE laboratories can currently teach and what real-world industrial skill development demands.

1. Introduction

Core CSE laboratory courses — computer assembly, microprocessor programming, computer networks, and embedded systems — are inherently hands-on. Building competence in these areas depends on repeated practice with physical equipment, yet the number of workstations, the risk of damaging costly components, and limited instructor time all constrain how much practice a given cohort can actually receive. Extended Reality (XR) offers a way through this constraint: Virtual Reality (VR) provides fully simulated laboratory and industrial scenes for risk-free, repeatable practice on virtual hardware, while Augmented Reality (AR) overlays step-by-step guidance, annotations, and safety cues directly onto real equipment in the physical laboratory. Layered above both is an AI-driven adaptation component capable of personalizing the guidance, difficulty, and learning path a given learner receives inside the immersive environment.

The working title of the underlying doctoral research is ImmersiveXR — an AI-driven adaptive AR/VR framework spanning CSE laboratories and industrial skill development. This paper summarizes the rationale, literature gap, problem statement, research questions, objectives, proposed methodology, and expected contributions of that research.

2. Motivation

Four considerations motivate an AI-driven XR approach to CSE laboratory and industrial training at this time. First, XR enables safe practice for high-risk tasks: procedures such as power-supply replacement, live wiring, and BIOS-level fault diagnosis can be attempted freely in a simulated environment, since mistakes carry no real cost. Second, virtual hardware does not wear out, so assembly and troubleshooting tasks can be repeated to mastery rather than being limited to a single attempt on a shared physical kit. Third, an immersive environment gives every learner a full workstation at any time, removing the queuing and capacity limits of a physical laboratory. Fourth, an AI tutor layered inside that environment can personalize hints, task difficulty, and learning-path

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

recommendations to each learner — a form of individualization that is not practically achievable in a crowded conventional laboratory.

This motivation is supported by a growing evidence base. A meta-analysis of thirty-five comparative studies reports an overall positive effect of VR and AR on learning outcomes in higher engineering education [1]. VR has also been shown to produce measurable gains in practical skills among science and engineering students [2], and is reported to be especially effective for conceptually abstract computer-science topics such as algorithm behaviour and hardware architecture [3]. More recent work on large-language-model-based tutors embedded in immersive VR reports significant improvements in learner engagement [4], reinforcing the case for combining immersive practice with adaptive, AI-driven guidance.

3. Problem Statement

Existing AR/VR laboratory solutions for CSE and technical training lack mechanisms to adapt content and assess learner competency dynamically, which limits their effectiveness in both academic and industrial upskilling contexts. This general problem can be decomposed into three persistent, interlinked gaps in current CSE practical training.

3.1 Access and Capacity

- Limited laboratory slots and hardware kits per cohort constrain how much hands-on practice any individual student receives.
- Practice opportunities are inconsistent across students within the same cohort.
- Remote or distance learners lack authentic hands-on exposure altogether.

3.2 Cost, Risk, and Repetition

- Damaging physical components — CPU pins, power supplies, motherboards — during learning is costly, which in turn discourages novice exploration for fear of breakage.
- Physical laboratory exercises are frequently one-shot, offering little opportunity for learning through repetition.

3.3 Industry Alignment

- Laboratory exercises tend to remain procedural rather than diagnostic, leaving a skill gap between coursework and the troubleshooting workflows expected in industry.
- Assessment of hands-on competence in conventional laboratories is often weak and subjective, with no standardized, comparative basis for evaluating XR-based alternatives.

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

Taken together, these gaps indicate the need for a unified, AI-driven adaptive AR/VR framework that integrates immersive CSE laboratory training, authentic industrial skill development, and a validated, standardized assessment methodology — which is the gap this research addresses.

4. Literature Review

4.1 XR in Engineering and CSE Laboratories

A systematic meta-analysis of studies published between 2013 and 2023 reports an overall positive effect of VR and AR interventions on learning outcomes across thirty-five comparative studies in higher engineering education [1]. A separate scoping review of VR applications in computer-science education finds VR effective for building conceptual understanding of abstract topics such as algorithm behaviour and hardware architecture, while noting limited content coverage and comparatively weak theoretical grounding across the existing literature as open gaps [3]. A meta-analysis focused specifically on virtual laboratories similarly concludes that virtual-lab interventions improve engineering-student performance relative to conventional laboratories, while cautioning that virtual laboratories are best understood as a complement to, rather than a full replacement for, hands-on practice [5][6]. Complementary evidence from science and engineering education more broadly shows measurable gains in practical skills attributable to VR-based instruction [2], and earlier work on AR-based electronics laboratories demonstrates direct precedent for AR-guided hardware training, reporting improved laboratory skills among engineering students exposed to an AR learning environment [7]. A closer precedent for this proposal's PC-assembly focus is a consumer-VR training exercise built on the Rec Room platform for Computer System Servicing NC II students, which used a small-sample ISO/IEC 25010-based evaluation to report favourable learner ratings for performance efficiency, maintainability, suitability, and usability, though as a single-platform prototype without an adaptive or AI-driven tutoring layer [12].

4.2 AI Tutoring in Immersive Environments

A separate strand of literature addresses AI-driven tutoring inside immersive environments. Recent work proposes an architecture for large-language-model-driven tutors operating as virtual agents in VR, combining natural-language dialogue with hand tracking, gaze, and haptic feedback, and reports significant gains in learner engagement as a result [4]. A comprehensive review of AI-based Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) finds that such systems can improve student performance by roughly twenty percent and identifies AR/VR integration as an emerging frontier for tutoring-system design [8]. Work on pedagogical-knowledge-augmented prompting for large-language-model tutors describes methods for mapping individual learner profiles onto instructional strategies, moving beyond one-size-fits-all model responses [9]. Research on virtual worlds as

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

Intelligent Tutoring Systems within metaverse-style environments further explores the synergy between immersive worlds and AI-driven personalization, while flagging computational demand and pedagogical complexity as open challenges still to be resolved [10].

4.3 Research Gap

Reviewed individually, these two strands of literature — XR-based engineering education on one hand, and AI-driven tutoring in immersive environments on the other — are each reasonably well established. What is absent from the literature is a single framework that combines immersive CSE laboratory modules, an AI-adaptive tutoring layer, authentic industrial troubleshooting practice, and a validated comparative assessment methodology within one coherent system. ImmersiveXR is proposed to address this gap by integrating all four elements.

5. Research Questions and Objectives

5.1 Research Questions

- RQ1: What XR instructional design framework best supports immersive laboratory learning for core CSE practical courses?
- RQ2: How can an AI tutor deliver personalized guidance, adaptive difficulty, and learning-path recommendations inside immersive laboratories?
- RQ3: Can scenario-based industrial troubleshooting in AR/VR develop authentic diagnostic and decision-making skills beyond procedural laboratory exercises?
- RQ4: Does immersive XR learning significantly improve cognitive, psychomotor, and affective outcomes compared with conventional laboratory instruction?

5.2 Objectives and Expected Contributions

- O1: Design and develop immersive AR/VR learning modules for core CSE laboratory courses — yielding an XR instructional-design framework and interactive, gamified laboratory modules with natural interaction (hand tracking and controller input).
- O2: Build an AI-driven adaptive tutoring layer for personalized learning inside immersive laboratories — yielding an AI tutor combining hints, learner analytics, large-language-model assistance, and adaptive difficulty.
- O3: Create immersive industrial troubleshooting and skill-based training scenarios (PC Assembly Laboratory) — yielding a scenario-based industrial problem-solving framework built on fault injection and realistic operating constraints.

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

- O4: Develop and validate a comparative assessment framework contrasting XR-based and traditional laboratories on learner satisfaction — yielding a validated assessment framework, scoring rubrics, and curriculum-integration guidelines.

Collectively, these four objectives correspond to the four planned chapters of the doctoral thesis, and their combined societal value lies in enabling safer, more equitable access to hands-on computing and industrial-skills training.

6. Proposed Framework and Methodology

6.1 Framework Architecture

ImmersiveXR is designed as a continuous three-layer loop that replaces the narrate–pause–quiz role traditionally performed by a human instructor:

- XR Simulation Layer: AR overlays guide interaction with physical laboratory hardware, while VR environments simulate industrial-scale settings such as network topologies, robotic assembly lines, and server racks that would be impractical to replicate physically at scale.
- AI Adaptation Engine: a learner model tracks accuracy, error patterns, and time-on-task, and uses these signals to adjust task difficulty, hint tiering, and module sequencing in real time, functioning as an always-available instructional presence.
- Analytics and Feedback Loop: continuous in-session assessment logs mastery evidence and feeds it back to both the human instructor and the AI adaptation engine, closing the loop between performance and instructional response.

6.2 Research Design

The study adopts a design-science research approach, structured across five phases. Requirements analysis draws on surveys and interviews with CSE educators and industry trainers to establish pedagogical, technical, and operational requirements. Architectural design specifies the adaptive XR framework around three core components — a learner model, a content-adaptation engine, and an AI-based assessment module. Prototype development integrates Unity- or Unreal-based XR platforms with machine-learning models for learner-performance prediction and adaptive task sequencing. Pilot deployment conducts field trials in both a CSE laboratory setting and an industrial training setting, to test the framework under realistic shared-hardware conditions. Comparative evaluation applies pre/post assessments, engagement metrics, and skill-transfer measures, benchmarked against control groups taught through conventional laboratory instruction or non-adaptive XR tools.

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

6.3 Illustrative Instructional Design: PC Assembly Laboratory

As a worked example of the AI Adaptation Engine, the PC-assembly laboratory module organizes eight sequential competencies — from safety and electrostatic-discharge protocol through component identification, motherboard and CPU installation, memory and storage installation, power-supply and cabling, cooling-system installation, cable management, and finally POST/BIOS troubleshooting — each tied to a machine-checkable mastery indicator. Guidance escalates only in response to detected struggle signals rather than interrupting unprompted, preserving productive struggle, and resets to its first tier at the start of each new sub-task. Difficulty adjustment is driven by a composite performance signal — accuracy, hint usage, hesitation time, and error-recovery behaviour — rather than accuracy alone, to avoid over- or under-adjusting for learners who are slow-but-accurate or fast-but-careless. Novel error patterns outside the state model, and any safety-relevant step, are deliberately routed to human escalation rather than left to AI improvisation.

6.4 Industrial Troubleshooting Scenarios

Beyond procedural laboratory tasks, the framework introduces scenario-based industrial troubleshooting modules — covering situations such as a computer that fails to boot, RAM-failure diagnosis, power-supply replacement, motherboard diagnostics, BIOS configuration, network troubleshooting, and assembly-language debugging — structured around a symptom → hypothesis → test → resolve problem-solving cycle. Decision-making is analysed from learner action logs, and skill acquisition is tracked through repeated immersive practice with competency scoring across accuracy, sequence, and safety.

7. Comparative Assessment Design

The central evaluative question for the fourth research objective is whether immersive XR learning significantly improves practical-skill outcomes compared with conventional laboratory instruction. The proposed experimental design assigns learners to two parallel groups: Group A follows a traditional laboratory sequence of lecture, hands-on practice, and assessment; Group B follows an XR-based sequence of immersive learning, AI-tutor-guided practice, industrial scenario training, and assessment. Both groups complete identical pre-tests, post-tests, practical performance tasks, and a delayed retention test, allowing outcomes to be compared across four dimensions: cognitive learning (concept understanding, knowledge retention, problem-solving, and higher-order thinking); psychomotor skills (assembly accuracy, component identification, procedural correctness, task time, and error rate); affective outcomes (motivation, engagement, confidence, self-efficacy, and interest); and industrial readiness (troubleshooting ability, decision-making, safety awareness, and workplace confidence).

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

Planned instruments include pre- and post-tests of knowledge, a practical-performance rubric combined with an Objective Structured Practical Examination (OSPE), task-completion logs capturing time, errors, and sequence, the NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) for cognitive workload, the System Usability Scale (SUS), a Presence Questionnaire (PQ/IPQ), the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI), a student-perception survey paired with a faculty-evaluation rubric, and a delayed retention test. Planned statistical analyses include independent-samples and paired t-tests for between- and within-group comparisons, ANOVA and repeated-measures ANOVA across multiple groups and time points, Cohen's d for practical effect size, Cronbach's alpha for scale reliability, correlation analysis across outcome dimensions, and regression analysis to identify predictors of performance such as sense of presence, cognitive workload, and prior knowledge.

8. Scope and Delimitations

8.1 Population Scope

The primary participants are undergraduate and postgraduate CSE students engaged in laboratory coursework, with early-career industry trainees undergoing technical upskilling as secondary participants. Faculty and corporate trainers are involved as facilitators and evaluators of the framework rather than as primary subjects of the adaptive AI model.

8.2 Pedagogical Scope

The research is limited to outcome-based, laboratory and skill-development contexts — that is, practical and applied learning — rather than theory-heavy classroom instruction. Alignment with Outcome-Based Education structures (CO–PO mapping, Bloom's-taxonomy-based skill levels) is considered where relevant to laboratory outcome attainment, though a full institutional OBE audit falls outside the scope of the study. Assessment is limited to formative, in-simulation performance metrics rather than long-term longitudinal employability tracking.

8.3 Exclusions

- Non-CSE engineering disciplines (mechanical, civil, and others), except where used as comparative baseline references.
- Fully immersive, high-fidelity industrial simulators that require specialized capital equipment beyond shared-hub feasibility.
- Long-term career-outcome or employability studies beyond the research timeframe.
- AI systems used purely for content generation (for example, automated slide or document creation) without an adaptive learning function.

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

- Institutions lacking any feasible pathway to shared AR/VR hardware access.

8.4 Geographical and Temporal Scope

The study will be conducted within institutions accessible for pilot deployment and data collection during the research period. Findings are intended to generalize to institutions with comparable shared-hardware adoption patterns — particularly resource-constrained or infrastructure-scaling contexts typical of many engineering colleges — rather than to claim universal applicability across all possible device-access models.

9. Expected Outcomes and Significance

The research is expected to yield a validated XR assessment framework; empirical evidence comparing XR-based and traditional laboratory instruction; standardized rubrics for immersive-laboratory assessment; curriculum-integration guidelines for institutions adopting shared AR/VR hardware; and insights into the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective dimensions of immersive technical learning. Independent, large-scale survey evidence lends indirect support to the underlying premise: a nationwide survey of approximately one thousand K–12 educators in the United States found that although a substantial majority believed VR would positively affect student learning, actual classroom access remained limited — a gap attributed less to hardware cost than to a fragmented, standards-unaligned VR content ecosystem [11]. This finding underscores a structural risk that ImmersiveXR is designed to avoid: that CSE laboratories could see XR adoption stall on scattered, one-off content in the same way K–12 VR adoption did, unless adaptive intelligence is built into the XR layer itself from the outset.

Beyond the academic contribution, the framework carries a societal dimension: by lowering the cost and risk barriers to repeated, personalized, hands-on practice, ImmersiveXR aims to widen safer and more equitable access to computing and industrial-skills training for students and trainees who might otherwise be constrained by limited physical laboratory capacity.

10. Conclusion

Classroom VR demonstrates a simple, evidence-backed principle: experienced learning outperforms passive learning. This paper has argued that coupling that principle with adaptive, AI-driven personalization inside an XR environment engineered for technical and industrial complexity can close the gap between what CSE laboratories can safely teach today and what real-world industrial skill development demands. The proposed ImmersiveXR framework — comprising an XR Simulation Layer, an AI Adaptation Engine, and an Analytics and Feedback Loop — together with a design-science research methodology and a comparative, mixed-methods

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

assessment design, is intended to make this argument empirically testable across four interlinked doctoral objectives: immersive laboratory module design, AI-driven adaptive tutoring, industrial troubleshooting scenario design, and validated comparative assessment. Suggestions and guidance from the Research Advisory Panel, University of Madras, are gratefully invited on the framework and methodology proposed here.

References

[1.] Yuan, S., Huang, H., & Wu, L. (2025). Virtual reality and augmented reality in higher engineering education: A systematic literature review. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 33, e70022. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.70022

[2.] Yang, C., Zhang, J., Hu, Y., et al. (2024). The impact of virtual reality on practical skills for students in science and engineering education: A meta-analysis. International Journal of STEM Education, 11, 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00487-2

[3.] Virtual reality applications in computer science education: A scoping review. (2026). Computers & Education: X Reality. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2949678026000279

[4.] An architecture for intelligent tutoring in virtual reality: Integrating LLMs and multimodal interaction for immersive learning. (2025). Information, 16(7), 556. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16070556

[5.] Li, J., & Liang, W. (2024). Effectiveness of virtual laboratory in engineering education: A meta-analysis. PLOS ONE. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0316269

[6.] Integrating educational theories with virtual reality: Enhancing engineering education and VR laboratories. (2024). Social Sciences & Humanities Open. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12449610/

[7.] Singh, G., Mantri, A., Sharma, O., Dutta, R., & Kaur, R. (2019). Evaluating the impact of the augmented reality learning environment on electronics laboratory skills of engineering students. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 27, 1361–1375.

[8.] A comprehensive review of AI-based intelligent tutoring systems: Applications and challenges. (2025). arXiv:2507.18882.

[9.] Leveraging large language models for adaptive tutoring system via pedagogical knowledge-augmented prompting. (2026). Expert Systems with Applications.

[10.] Can 3D virtual worlds be used as intelligent tutoring systems? Metaverse and AI in education. (2025). Engineering Proceedings, 87(1), 110. https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2025087110

[11.] di Lanzo, J. A., Valentine, A., Sohel, F., Yapp, A. Y. T., Muparadzi, K. C., & Abdelmalek, M. (2020). A review of the uses of virtual reality in engineering education.

ISSN: 3107-8168
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65725/JCISE/2/4/010

Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 28(3), 748–763. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22243

[12.] Parungao, G., Ramos, J. M., Sebuc, A. A., & Valencia, E. J. (n.d.). METACREATION: A PC assembling and disassembling using VR for ICT Computer System Servicing NC II. In Information Technology Cross Platform Application & Development (pp. 351–380).