CONVERGENCE: JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Vol. 1, No. 1, April 2026, pp. 31-37
ISSN 3165-1909, DOI: 10.68831/cjiis.v1i1.2026.10

Integrating Digital Technology into STEM Learning: Pedagogical Roles, Platform Selection, and Implementation Challenges

Marlina [1]
[1] Department of Islamic Education Management, Faculty of Tarbiyah, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Takengon, Aceh, Indonesia

Article Info

Keywords:

STEM education,
Technology integration
Digital learning,
Virtual laboratories,
Teacher digital competence,
Equitable access

ABSTRACT

Digital technology integration in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education requires decisions about instructional purpose, platform suitability, and implementation conditions. This conceptual article develops a previously published book chapter, "Integrasi Teknologi dalam Pembelajaran STEM," within its three themes: the pedagogical roles of technology, digital platforms and tools, and implementation challenges. A chapter-based conceptual analysis is supplemented by a targeted narrative examination of relevant literature. The discussion distinguishes potential technological affordances from measured learning outcomes and separates evidence from different educational contexts. Simulations and virtual laboratories are related to inquiry and conceptual understanding, immersive environments to visualization and instructional support, and online platforms to collaboration, feedback, and access. Implementation is examined through infrastructure, teacher digital competence, organizational support, and equitable participation. A proposed planning sequence connects learning needs, technological functions, contextual feasibility, and evidence of learning. No new field data, pooled effect estimates, or validation of the sequence is reported. Technology integration is presented as a conditional pedagogical decision, not as evidence of instructional quality in itself.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA 4.0 License

Corresponding Author:

Marlina
Department of Islamic Education Management, Faculty of Tarbiyah, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Takengon, Aceh, Indonesia
Email: marlinasabil@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital technology can enter STEM learning through simulations, virtual laboratories, immersive environments, collaborative platforms, and tools for creating or analyzing representations. Chapter IV of *Pendidikan STEM di Era Digital: Menyiapkan Generasi Masa Depan* organizes this topic around the roles of technology, platforms and tools, and the challenges of integration. It discusses conceptual understanding, collaboration, and the conditions required for implementation [1]. These themes constitute the primary source and boundaries of the present article.

The central issue is not whether a device is available but what it enables learners to do with disciplinary knowledge. Roehrig et al. [2] distinguish technology as a tool of STEM practice from more general uses of educational technology. Kelley and Knowles [3] similarly emphasize explicit connections among disciplinary content and authentic practices. Together, these perspectives support examining technology through its instructional function rather than treating digital delivery as sufficient evidence of STEM integration.

The chapter's broad discussion also requires careful qualification when converted into a journal article. A tool's capacity to visualize a process is different from evidence that students understand it better; reported engagement differs from achievement; and findings from higher education cannot automatically be applied to school classrooms. For example, Sandrone et al. [4] distinguish students' reported engagement from observed learning outcomes in the college context they discuss.

This article therefore asks: what pedagogical roles justify technology integration in STEM; how should digital tools be selected for those roles; and what implementation conditions constrain their use? It remains within Chapter IV's subject matter. It does not attempt to reconstruct the book's discussions of the history of STEM, comprehensive curriculum design, or all aspects of twenty-first-century education. The contribution is a focused conceptual reorganization of technology integration, supported by a critical reading of relevant literature.

2. SOURCE AND ANALYTICAL APPROACH

2.1. Primary Source and Scope

The primary source is Marlina's chapter, "Integrasi Teknologi dalam Pembelajaran STEM," in the collectively authored book *Pendidikan STEM di Era Digital: Menyiapkan Generasi Masa Depan*. The chapter addresses technology's instructional roles, examples of digital environments, and barriers involving resources, competence, access, and institutional conditions. Only this chapter supplies the book-based content for the present article; other chapters are not treated as primary evidence [1].

The analysis follows those themes rather than imposing a broader framework drawn from the entire book. Statements about benefits are recast as potential functions or context-bounded findings where appropriate. The article does not adopt the chapter's general positive language as proof that every technology improves learning. Its author's relationship to the source chapter is disclosed in the declarations.

2.2. Supporting Literature and Interpretation

A targeted narrative search was used to examine literature on technology-supported STEM learning, simulations and immersive environments, online instruction, teacher competence, and implementation barriers. Sources were selected purposively for their relevance to the chapter's themes and the substantive information available. Previously examined literature was reused when directly relevant. This process was not a systematic review and does not establish comprehensive coverage of the field.

Supporting literature is used to clarify or qualify the chapter, not to imply that every reference cited within the book has been independently verified. Sources available only as abstracts or summaries are used for explicitly reported statements, without reconstructing missing methods. Review findings, empirical observations, and conceptual recommendations are distinguished. Findings from primary education, secondary education, and higher education are identified where relevant rather than treated as interchangeable.

No new participants were recruited, and no field observations, interviews, experiments, meta-analysis, or formal risk-of-bias assessment was conducted. The planning sequence developed below is a conceptual proposal. Neither its validity nor its effect on student learning has been tested in this article.

3. PEDAGOGICAL ROLES OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY

3.1. Supporting Conceptual Exploration and Inquiry

The source chapter describes simulations and virtual experimentation as ways for students to examine variables and revisit alternative solutions [1]. For this article, the relevant instructional question is which relationship or process a digital environment makes available for investigation, and what explanation students are expected to produce afterward. The existence of a simulation is not itself evidence that inquiry has occurred.

D'Angelo et al. [5] report an overall positive pattern for simulation use and science achievement in the studies they reviewed. Santos and Prudente [6] likewise report benefits of virtual laboratories for achievement, including within secondary education. The available summary of Zaturrahmi et al. [7] identifies conceptual understanding and student achievement as central concerns in virtual-laboratory research. These sources support considering simulations for learning purposes, but they do not demonstrate that any particular application will benefit every STEM domain.

Kefalis et al. [8] identify inquiry-based learning as a prominent strategy in the simulation studies they reviewed. An implication proposed here is to pair digital exploration with explicit prompts: identify a variable, predict a relationship, examine a pattern, and justify an interpretation. These prompts constitute a planning recommendation, not a procedure whose effectiveness has been established by the present article.

3.2. Supporting Visualization without Equating Immersion with Understanding

Chapter IV discusses virtual and augmented reality as environments for visualizing abstract concepts and interacting with representations [1]. A critical distinction is needed between access to a representation and the instructional support required to interpret it. The chapter establishes the relevance of these technologies to the discussion, not a universal learning effect.

The review by Ibáñez-Espiga and Kloos [9] identifies exploration and simulation as common activities in augmented-reality STEM applications, while noting that few studies provided assistance during learning. Its recommendation for metacognitive scaffolding and experimental support is particularly relevant: interactive features need to be connected to questions, explanations, and reflection.

Tene et al. [10] report favorable learning experiences across many of the immersive-technology studies they reviewed, while calling for a more coherent implementation framework. Tene et al. [11] distinguish reports of direct performance improvement from broader improvements in learning experience within higher education. These categories should not be collapsed into a single claim that immersive technology raises achievement.

Guerra et al. [12] discuss new learning possibilities through immersive environments in distance higher education. That review offers a supplementary perspective on linking theory and practice, not direct evidence of effectiveness in secondary schools. The decision to use immersion should therefore remain conditional on the concept being taught, the support available, and the learning evidence required.

3.3. Supporting Collaboration, Creation, and Feedback

The chapter considers collaborative platforms, design software, programming, and multimedia as possible supports for shared problem solving and the creation of digital products. It also discusses automated feedback. These functions are retained as topics within the chapter's scope, but their presence is not treated as proof that collaboration, creativity, or conceptual understanding has improved [1].

Sandrone et al. [4] describe asynchronous lectures combined with online case-based group work and virtual breakout rooms in college STEM education. Their proposed instructional model illustrates how platform functions can be organized around activity, while the discussion of learning outcomes and engagement demonstrates why these outcomes should remain distinct. Riabov [13], available through its summary, likewise discusses electronic resources alongside tutoring, self-study, faculty training, and partnerships rather than treating a platform as a complete instructional solution.

An implication proposed here is to require a visible collaborative process: students record contributions, explain design choices, and respond to peers' evidence. Automated feedback, including AI-supported feedback, should be framed as a possible source of guidance rather than an established replacement for teacher judgment. This article does not independently evaluate an AI system or claim that AI-generated comments improve learning.

4. SELECTING PLATFORMS AND DIGITAL TOOLS

4.1. Selection Should Follow the Learning Need

Roehrig et al. [2] emphasize alignment between a design challenge and content objectives. Walker et al. [14] identify digital and nondigital tools within STEM curriculum planning. Applied to technology selection, these perspectives suggest beginning with the intended disciplinary task and then selecting a tool, rather than beginning with an application and inventing a task to justify it.

The proposed selection questions are practical rather than evaluative findings. Does the tool enable observation, measurement, modeling, explanation, or revision that serves the objective? What will students produce that demonstrates the intended understanding? Can the same function be provided more accessibly through a simpler tool? These questions make a digital option accountable to pedagogy without assuming that either digital or nondigital instruction is always preferable.

The framework and rubric discussed by Walker et al. [14] illustrate the value of planning and reflection when institutions begin integrated STEM work. McLure et al. [15] identify limited reporting of how integration is actually enacted. Consequently, documentation should describe what learners do with a tool and which disciplinary connections they make, rather than merely listing software names.

4.2. Online Delivery Is Not Automatically Superior Instruction

The source chapter associates online and blended learning with wider access and potential efficiency [1]. The journal article qualifies that discussion through Chirikov et al. [16], who randomly assigned college students to in-person, blended, or online instruction. They found little evidence of differences in final examination scores and estimated lower instructor compensation costs for the digital delivery conditions studied. These findings are specific to the courses and institutions examined, not a universal guarantee of higher quality or lower total implementation cost.

The same study permitted more attempts on weekly assessments in the online condition and did not test novel interactive platform activities. It therefore should not be used to claim that automated feedback or immersive features caused superior learning. Tene et al. [11] separately emphasize aligning technological interventions with pedagogical objectives in higher education. Together, these sources support disciplined selection rather than technological enthusiasm alone [16].

4.3. Platforms Need to Produce Interpretable Learning Evidence

Butler et al. [17] connect STEM learning design, formative assessment tasks, and digital assessment tools within a conceptual framework that they explicitly describe as provisional. Their work supports considering assessment when selecting a platform, while preserving the distinction between a design resource and a validated instrument.

In the present proposal, evidence may include predictions, explanations of graphs, revisions to a model, or responses to peer critique. Login counts, completed clicks, and attractive products are not selected as sufficient evidence of conceptual understanding. The proposed indicators require contextual refinement and have not been validated in this article. Clear outcomes remain necessary before claims about learning can be tested, as emphasized by Kelley and Knowles [3].

5. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES

5.1. Infrastructure, Compatibility, and Equitable Access

The chapter identifies infrastructure, device compatibility, and unequal access as major concerns. It also connects these concerns with the feasibility of instructional design [1]. A critical implication is that implementation cannot be assessed solely by counting available devices; access needs to be considered in relation to what students must do during an activity.

Akram et al. [18], in a review of teachers' perceptions of ICT integration, identify inadequate infrastructure and limited resources among the major reported barriers. Their review concerns ICT integration more broadly and should not be treated as a direct experiment on STEM achievement. Its relevance here lies in explaining why a technically appealing platform may remain difficult to use in practice.

Kahn et al. [19], available through its abstract, report unequal difficulties involving study spaces, internet access, and peer connections during emergency online college STEM learning. Their outcomes concern self-assessments of motivation and self-efficacy rather than objective achievement. Jackson et al. [20] provide a complementary conceptual perspective by positioning equity within every component of STEM literacy. Together, these sources support treating participation conditions as part of design, not as an afterthought.

Possible responses proposed here include shared-device arrangements, low-bandwidth materials, downloadable resources, and alternative ways to demonstrate the same learning objective. These options should be evaluated locally; this article does not claim that they have already eliminated access inequities. The appropriate alternative depends on the task and the resources available.

5.2. Teacher Digital Competence and Professional Learning

Chapter IV links implementation difficulties with limited digital skills, uneven training, and the need for continuing support [1]. Akram et al. [18] likewise identify teachers' technological competence as a prominent reported challenge. This supports attention to professional learning, while not establishing the effectiveness of any particular training package.

Ramli and Arsad [21] report a relationship between digital literacy knowledge and technology integration in a survey of secondary-school STEM teachers in Malaysia. The study provides context-specific evidence of association, not proof that raising a questionnaire score causes better student learning. Training recommendations should therefore address both tool use and its pedagogical application, with separate evaluation of classroom outcomes.

Boz [22], reviewing primary-school integrated STEM professional development, found that the reviewed studies did not collect student data to assess changes in knowledge, skills, or attitudes. This finding is used here as a methodological warning from a different educational level: participation in professional development and improved student learning are separate claims requiring different evidence.

5.3. Organizational Support, Workload, and Responsible Use

The source chapter identifies resistance to change, limited teacher collaboration, workload, and insufficient time as organizational obstacles. Stohlmann et al. [23] emphasize support and materials alongside teaching and recommend time for collaboration and partnerships. These perspectives place technology integration within institutional practice rather than treating it as an individual teacher's technical responsibility alone [1].

Sukarman and Retnawati [24] distinguish intrinsic barriers involving teachers' knowledge and practice from extrinsic constraints. Margot and Kettler [25] note that secondary teachers may perceive interdisciplinary initiatives as challenging their expectations of instructional quality. These sources support discussing implementation choices with teachers and allowing time to examine their curricular consequences. They do not establish that resistance is always irrational or that adopting more technology necessarily improves teaching.

Responsible use also requires attention to data and platform practices. Riabov [13] identifies privacy concerns in cloud and social-media communication among the unresolved issues of online STEM provision. In the present proposal, schools should specify what data are collected, who can access them, and whether an activity can be completed without unnecessary personal disclosure. These are recommendations for local governance, not findings from a privacy audit.

6. A PROPOSED PLANNING SEQUENCE

The following sequence is an analytical extension of Chapter IV's themes, not a framework tested in the source chapter or in the present article. It makes the chapter's discussion usable as a set of planning decisions while maintaining the distinction between technological potential and evidence of learning.

First, specify the disciplinary learning need. State what learners should be able to explain, investigate, or design, and identify an obstacle that technology could help address. Second, select a technological function, such as varying model parameters, collecting measurements, visualizing relationships, or sharing evidence. Select the platform only after identifying that function.

Third, examine contextual feasibility. Consider connectivity, available devices, compatibility, teacher support, time, and an accessible alternative. Fourth, define evidence of learning before implementation: for example, a prediction followed by an explanation, a graph interpreted in relation to a scientific concept, or a revised design

justified with data. Fifth, review implementation and outcomes separately. Record what was delivered and what students demonstrated without assuming that completion establishes causation.

As a hypothetical illustration, a teacher could select a simulation to investigate the relationship between two physical variables. Students would state a prediction, vary one parameter while recording the conditions, compare the pattern with their prediction, and explain a discrepancy. A shared display or prepared sequence of outputs could provide an alternative when individual devices are unavailable. This is a proposed activity, not a report of classroom implementation or an assertion that simulation and alternative formats produce equivalent outcomes.

The sequence's value is conceptual: it links instructional purpose, tool choice, feasibility, and evidence. The need for explicit disciplinary connections is supported by Kelley and Knowles [3], while McLure et al. [15] underscore the importance of documenting enactment. These sources motivate the planning questions; they do not validate this particular sequence.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER EVALUATION

The article is intentionally restricted to Chapter IV as its book-based source. Supporting literature does not turn the discussion into a systematic review, and the search does not guarantee that all relevant or contradictory studies have been retrieved. Some supporting publications were available only through abstracts or partial text. References cited in the original chapter are not automatically treated as studies independently examined for this article.

The evidence includes different educational stages, instructional settings, and outcome types. Planned online instruction differs from emergency pandemic delivery; perceptions of engagement differ from achievement; and review findings do not test the planning sequence proposed here. No new quantitative synthesis, causal evaluation, or comparison of platform effectiveness has been conducted.

The article is an acknowledged adaptation and critical extension of a published chapter. It does not establish that the proposed organization is unprecedented or that every passage has been assessed for textual overlap. Editorial assessment of overlap and any permissions needed for protected material remain distinct from bibliographic acknowledgment. No source figure or table is reproduced in this manuscript.

Further work could examine the clarity and feasibility of the planning questions, document teacher decisions, and test whether the proposed evidence captures the intended learning. A later outcome evaluation would require a design appropriate to the question and context. These are proposed next steps, not research procedures already completed.

8. CONCLUSION

This article reorganizes Chapter IV's discussion of technology integration into three connected concerns: pedagogical roles, platform selection, and implementation conditions. Simulations, immersive environments, and online collaboration are considered in terms of the activities and explanations they support rather than their novelty. Teacher competence, infrastructure, equitable participation, and organizational support are treated as design considerations.

The proposed planning sequence connects a disciplinary need with a technological function, feasible conditions, and interpretable evidence. It offers a guide for planning and critical reflection, not a validated model or proof of improved achievement. The main implication is to make technology choices accountable to learning objectives and local conditions while maintaining clear boundaries between potential benefits, observed findings, and untested recommendations.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Source Adaptation and Prior Publication

This article is adapted from and critically extends the author's chapter, "Integrasi Teknologi dalam Pembelajaran STEM," in *Pendidikan STEM di Era Digital: Menyiapkan Generasi Masa Depan* [1]. The chapter is acknowledged as previously published source material. The article is not presented as wholly unpublished intellectual content, a translation of the full book, or an empirical study. It introduces a more focused argument, supporting literature, and explicit qualifications of claims.

Author Contributions

Marlina is the sole author and is responsible for conceptualization, source interpretation, writing, revision, and approval of the final manuscript. Verification of the revised content, additional sources, and submission declarations remains the author's responsibility before submission.

Funding and Competing Interests

No specific funding was received from public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies for preparing this article. The author declares no competing interests.

Data Availability and Research Ethics

No new empirical data were collected or analyzed. Sources supporting the discussion are identified in the references. The article does not involve participant recruitment, personal data collection, or experiments involving humans or animals; no research ethics approval number is reported.

Use of Artificial Intelligence Assistance

Artificial intelligence assistance was used for supporting literature searches, structural organization, drafting, language editing, and translation. The author remains responsible for source verification, academic integrity, and approval of the final version before submission.

REFERENCES

[1] Marlina, "Integrasi teknologi dalam pembelajaran STEM," in *Pendidikan STEM di Era Digital: Menyiapkan Generasi Masa Depan*, D. M. Rosyidah, Ed. PT Nawala Gama Education, 2025, pp. 44–53.

[2] G. Roehrig, E. A. Dare, J. A. Ellis, and E. A. Ring-Whalen, "Beyond the basics: A detailed conceptual framework of integrated STEM," *Discip. Interdiscip. Sci. Educ. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s43031-021-00041-y.

[3] T. R. Kelley and J. Knowles, "A conceptual framework for integrated STEM education," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s40594-016-0046-z.

[4] S. Sandrone, G. Scott, W. J. Anderson, and K. Musunuru, "Active learning-based STEM education for in-person and online learning," *Cell*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.045.

[5] C. D'Angelo, C. J. Harris, and D. Rutstein, "Systematic review and meta-analysis of STEM simulations," in *Int. Conf. Comput. Support. Collab. Learn.*, 2013. [Online]. Available: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/fc63b1eda4eea2ece51130412a88f1165ae0aa43

[6] M. L. Santos and M. Prudente, "Effectiveness of virtual laboratories in science education: A meta-analysis," *Int. J. Inf. Educ. Technol.*, 2022, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.2.1598.

[7] Z. Zaturrahmi, F. Festiyed, and E. Ellizar, "The utilization of virtual laboratory in learning: A meta-analysis," 2020, doi: 10.24042/ijsme.v3i2.6474.

[8] C. Kefalis, C. Skordoulis, and A. Drigas, "Digital simulations in STEM education: Insights from recent empirical studies, a systematic review," *Encyclopedia*, 2025, doi: 10.3390/encyclopedia5010010.

[9] M. Ibáñez-Espiga and C. D. Kloos, "Augmented reality for STEM learning: A systematic review," *Comput. Educ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.002.

[10] T. Tene, J. A. Marcatoma Tixi, M. de L. Palacios Robalino, M. J. Mendoza Salazar, C. Vacacela Gomez, and S. Bellucci, "Integrating immersive technologies with STEM education: A systematic review," *Front. Educ.*, 2024, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2024.1410163.

[11] T. Tene, M. Guevara, G. Moreano, J. Vera, and C. Vacacela Gomez, "The role of immersive virtual realities: Enhancing science learning in higher education," *Emerg. Sci. J.*, 2024, doi: 10.28991/esj-2024-sied1-06.

[12] A. Guerra, L. F. de Medeiros, and M. Gericota, "A review of immersivity in distance higher education STEM subjects," in *Int. Conf. Immersive Learn. Res. Netw.*, 2023, doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-47328-9_39.

[13] V. Riabov, "Enriching STEM curricula with electronic resources for teaching online," *Ubiquitous Learn. Int. J.*, 2022, doi: 10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v15i02/37-53.

[14] W. S. Walker, T. Moore, S. Guzey, and B. Sorge, "Frameworks to develop integrated STEM curricula," *K-12 STEM Educ.*, 2018, doi: 10.14456/k12stemed.2018.14.

[15] F. I. McLure, K.-S. Tang, and P. Williams, "What do integrated STEM projects look like in middle school and high school classrooms? A systematic literature review of empirical studies of iSTEM projects," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, 2022, doi: 10.1186/s40594-022-00390-8.

[16] I. Chirikov, T. Semenova, N. Maloshonok, E. Bettinger, and R. F. Kizilcec, "Online education platforms scale college STEM instruction with equivalent learning outcomes at lower cost," *Sci. Adv.*, 2020, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aay5324.

[17] D. Butler, E. McLoughlin, M. O'Leary, S. Kaya, E. Costello, and M. Brown, "Towards the ATS STEM conceptual framework," Rep. 5, 2020, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3673559.

[18] H. Akram, A. H. Abdelrady, A. S. Al-Adwan, and M. Ramzan, "Teachers' perceptions of technology integration in teaching-learning practices: A systematic review," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 13, Art. no. 920317, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920317.

[19] S. Kahn, J. Vertesi, S. Adriaenssens, J. Byeon, M. Fixdal, K. Godfrey, J. Lumbroso, and K. Wagoner, "The impact of online STEM teaching and learning during COVID-19 on underrepresented students' self-efficacy and motivation," *J. Coll. Sci. Teach.*, 2022, doi: 10.1080/0047231X.2022.12315644.

[20] C. Jackson, M. J. Mohr-Schroeder, S. B. Bush, C. Maiorca, T. Roberts, C. Yost, and A. Fowler, "Equity-oriented conceptual framework for K-12 STEM literacy," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40594-021-00294-z.

[21] F. N. A. Ramli and N. M. Arsad, "STEM teacher digital literacy: Relationship between digital literacy and

technology integration in teaching and learning post Covid-19," *J. Nusant. Stud.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 314–331, 2023, doi: 10.24200/jonus.vol8iss2pp314-331.

[22] T. Boz, "Teacher professional development for STEM integration in elementary/primary schools: A systematic review," *Int. Electron. J. Elem. Educ.*, 2023, doi: 10.26822/iejee.2023.306.

[23] M. Stohlmann, T. Moore, and G. Roehrig, "Considerations for teaching integrated STEM education," *J. Pre-Coll. Eng. Educ. Res.*, 2012, doi: 10.5703/1288284314653.

[24] S. S. Sukarman and H. Retnawati, "Teachers' barriers in implementing integrated STEM education: A literature review," in *Proc. 4th Int. Semin. Innov. Math. Math. Educ. (ISIMMED) 2020*, 2022, doi: 10.1063/5.0108059.

[25] K. C. Margot and T. Kettler, "Teachers' perception of STEM integration and education: A systematic literature review," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s40594-018-0151-2.