Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(2):489-496

Received: 26-01-2026
Accepted: 06-03-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Designing Hybrid Intelligent Ecosystems: A Conceptual Framework for AI-Enhanced Science Education

Konstantinos T Kotsis
Lab of Physics Education and Teaching, Department of Primary Education, University of Ioannina, Greece

Corresponding Author: **Konstantinos T Kotsis**

Abstract
The swift incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) into educational technologies is transforming science education, not via standalone tools but through the development of hybrid intelligent ecosystems that integrate digital experimentation with adaptive, data-driven intelligence. This integrative review consolidates research from 2019 to 2024 to propose a conceptual framework for the design of AI-enhanced science education environments, systematically incorporating interactive simulations, virtual laboratories, and immersive platforms alongside AI-driven analytics, adaptive feedback, and intelligent tutoring systems. The essay analyzes empirical studies and policy evaluations to explore how hybrid ecosystems can facilitate inquiry-based learning, enhance conceptual understanding, enable individualized instruction, and foster collaborative scientific practices. Simultaneously, it recognizes significant problems pertaining to teacher professional development, algorithmic transparency, data privacy, equity, and environmental sustainability. The proposed paradigm envisions hybrid intelligent ecosystems as multi-tiered structures that designate teachers as primary pedagogical agents responsible for interpreting AI-generated insights, coordinating digital learning experiences, and exercising professional judgment about automated recommendations. The paper advocates for a design-oriented approach to AI, positioning it as an adaptive layer that enhances digital experimentation while maintaining human agency and ethical oversight, rather than viewing it as a substitute for current digital tools or human expertise. This framework delineates essential design principles and governance factors, providing researchers, educators, and policymakers with a guide for creating science education systems that ethically incorporate AI and digital technologies to enhance learning and promote equitable educational outcomes.

Keywords: Hybrid Intelligent Ecosystems, AI in Education, Digital Technologies, Science Education, Professional Development

Introduction

In the last twenty years, science education has undergone two interconnected waves of technical advancement. The initial wave, propelled by digital technologies like interactive simulations, virtual laboratories, and immersive environments, broadened the opportunities for visualization, experimentation, and inquiry in both classroom and distant contexts. These instruments enabled students to change variables, gather data, and investigate phenomena that were previously unattainable owing to safety, cost, or temporal limitations. A recent second wave has arisen with the advent of artificial intelligence (AI), including adaptive learning systems, intelligent tutoring platforms, and generative analytics that may personalize education and automate assessment [1, 2]. Recent exploratory research has begun to examine the role of generative AI systems, such as ChatGPT, in science education, highlighting both their potential for supporting explanation, inquiry, and feedback and the pedagogical challenges they introduce [3]. Collectively, these two technical domains are transforming the construction, communication, and evaluation of scientific knowledge.

The combination of digital tools and AI technologies, formerly examined in isolation, is now shaping a new era of intelligent educational ecosystems. For instance, virtual laboratories can now include AI-powered analytics to monitor student progress in real time. Simultaneously, interactive simulations may utilize machine learning techniques to modify complexity according on user behavior [4]. Likewise, AI-driven natural language processing may evaluate student explanations produced during digital inquiry assignments, providing prompt feedback that enhances the exploratory capabilities of simulations and virtual reality. These hybrid environments obscure the boundary between "digital" and "AI," fostering opportunities for science education that are increasingly adaptive, data-intensive, and responsive.

The amalgamation of these technologies, however, offers both synergistic opportunities and systemic obstacles. Integrating AI with existing digital platforms is expected to improve inquiry-based learning, promote personalized routes, and facilitate more comprehensive evaluation methods [5]. In physics education specifically, machine learning models have demonstrated strong potential for predicting course outcomes based on students' learning behaviors and performance data, enabling earlier instructional interventions [6]. It also prompts fresh inquiries on teaching responsibilities, professional advancement, and ethical administration. Educators must traverse more intricate technological environments, knowing both the functionalities of digital tools and the analytical abilities necessary to interact with algorithmic suggestions and learning analytics [7]. Policymakers encounter simultaneous obstacles in developing legislative frameworks that guarantee equity, privacy, and environmental sustainability within integrated digital–AI infrastructures [8, 9].

This article presents a cohesive conceptual framework for comprehending the convergence of digital and AI technologies in science education. While recent systematic reviews have documented the expanding range of artificial intelligence applications in science education, along with their reported impacts and persistent challenges, they often examine AI tools in isolation from the digital experimentation environments in which they are embedded [10]. Building on this body of work, the present study focuses explicitly on the design of hybrid intelligent ecosystems that integrate AI with simulations, virtual laboratories, and immersive platforms. This text posits that the future of technology-enhanced science education depends on the intentional creation of hybrid ecosystems in which simulations, virtual laboratories, and adaptive AI systems function together, based on recent evaluations of non-AI digital tools and AI-driven advancements. The essay examines the integration of empirical studies and policy assessments from 2019 to 2024, focusing on how these technologies might enhance scientific inquiry, promote fair access to educational opportunities, and foster sustainable educational practices. This study seeks to elucidate the synergies and tensions inherent in this convergence, offering educators, researchers, and policymakers a framework for creating science education systems that are both technologically advanced and pedagogically sound.

Conceptual Framework: Toward a Blended Intelligent Ecosystem

The integration of digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI) in science education need a conceptual framework that encapsulates their synergistic roles and the educational opportunities they collectively generate. This section introduces the concept of a blended intelligent ecosystem, a dynamic learning environment where interactive simulations, virtual laboratories, and immersive platforms are cohesively interwoven with AI-driven analytics, adaptive feedback, and generative tools. This concept perceives digital and AI technologies not as sequential innovations, but as interdependent elements of a cohesive, developing system.

The ecosystem consists of three interconnected layers that interact continuously. The foundation consists of the digital experimentation layer, which includes existing technologies like interactive simulations, augmented reality, virtual reality applications, and online laboratory environments. These tools offer detailed, adjustable representations of scientific phenomena and facilitate opportunities for inquiry-based experimentation. In addition, emerging fabrication technologies such as educational 3D printing can function as powerful mediating tools, enabling learners to externalize abstract scientific ideas into tangible artifacts while simultaneously enhancing conceptual understanding, interest, and affective engagement with science [11]. Importantly, this layer does not replace hands-on experimentation, but complements established low-cost, classroom-based experimental practices, which remain powerful for fostering qualitative understanding and conceptual reasoning in physics education [12]. They represent the initial phase of digital transformation by allowing students to perceive imperceptible processes and do experiments that would otherwise be unfeasible or hazardous [4]. The AI-driven adaptive layer overlays this infrastructure, gathering real-time interaction data from digital environments and employing intelligent tutoring systems, predictive analytics, and natural language processing to modify content, deliver automated feedback, or suggest subsequent steps in the learning process [5]. In science education, and particularly in physics, such adaptive mechanisms can be informed by well-validated diagnostic instruments that systematically capture students' misconceptions, enabling more targeted and conceptually grounded instructional interventions [13]. From a broader epistemological perspective, students' alternative ideas should not be treated merely as errors to be corrected but as enduring and pedagogically valuable resources that can guide instructional design, formative assessment, and adaptive feedback within both digital and AI-enhanced learning environments [14]. This layer converts static digital activities into adaptive learning experiences tailored to the specific needs of individual pupils. The core of the ecosystem consists of the human pedagogical layer, wherein educators analyze AI-generated insights, coordinate digital activities, and ensure that technological interventions are consistent with curricular objectives. Educators act as intermediaries who preserve the human aspect of science education, incorporating ethical considerations and promoting critical thinking that artificial intelligence systems cannot emulate [1]. Their function is not lessened but transformed, transitioning from direct material delivery to the facilitation of inquiry and the management of data-driven decision-making.

The strength of the blended intelligent ecosystem derives from the synergy between these layers. An interactive simulation of planetary motion can be augmented with AI algorithms that identify misconceptions in students' manipulation of orbital parameters and produce targeted suggestions or scaffolded inquiries. A virtual chemistry laboratory can employ predictive analytics to suggest experimental pathways based on previous student success, while educators utilize this data to formulate subsequent investigations. These interactions demonstrate how AI converts digital tools from static resources into dynamic, interactive environments that react to student activities instantaneously.

For this ecosystem to operate efficiently, several foundational principles must guide its design and execution. AI algorithms must deliver interpretable feedback to enable teachers and students to comprehend the reasoning behind adaptive decisions, thus fostering transparency and confidence [8]. Infrastructure and policies must guarantee fair access to digital and AI resources, irrespective of socioeconomic status, to prevent exacerbating current educational disparities [9]. Educators must keep authority over instructional choices and possess the autonomy to supersede algorithmic suggestions when their professional judgment necessitates, so preserving a balance between machine-generated insights and human expertise [7]. Moreover, the ecological and economic implications of sustaining these integrated systems, such as energy usage and hardware longevity, necessitate meticulous evaluation to guarantee enduring sustainability.

This framework regards the mixed intelligent ecosystem as a research initiative and a design model. It encourages interdisciplinary research that investigates the interaction of digital and AI components in facilitating learning across several scientific fields. It provides a framework for practitioners to progressively integrate technology: educational institutions can enhance digital experimentation settings and subsequently incorporate AI-driven analytics and adaptive tools as infrastructure and educator proficiency develop. By seeing digital and AI technologies as interrelated rather than linear advances, the blended intelligent ecosystem establishes a basis for creating science education environments that are adaptive, inquiry-based, and ethically principled.

Pedagogical Synergies and Hybrid Learning Designs

The integration of artificial intelligence with existing digital technologies generates novel prospects for hybrid learning frameworks that combine the advantages of both technological advancements. Beyond analytics and adaptation, generative AI can also support narrative-based and imaginative learning designs, such as the creation of age-appropriate scientific stories, which have been shown to enhance conceptual engagement and meaning-making in primary physics education when aligned with curricular goals and teacher guidance [15]. Rather than viewing AI and digital platforms as separate entities, scientific instructors can create experiences where simulations, virtual laboratories, and immersive settings are actively augmented by AI-generated feedback and adaptive paths. These synergies transcend mere technological integration; they foster innovative learning modalities that are interactive, data-intensive, and attuned to both individual and collective requirements.

An illustration of this synergy is evident in AI-augmented simulation environments. Conventional simulations, exemplified by platforms like PhET, enable students to adjust physical parameters and witness results, so enhancing conceptual comprehension through investigation. However, research in physics education indicates that learning activities requiring learners to actively perform and manipulate actions, rather than merely observe representations, can lead to deeper conceptual understanding of dynamic phenomena such as circular motion, underscoring the pedagogical value of action-oriented and embodied learning designs [16]. When integrated with machine learning algorithms that identify error patterns or conceptual misconceptions, these simulations can transform into intelligent learning environments that offer tailored hints, scaffolded inquiries, or immediate prompts to facilitate exploration [4, 17]. In inquiry-based primary science education, generative AI tools such as ChatGPT can further function as dialogic scaffolds---supporting question generation, hypothesis refinement, and reflective discussion---when their use is intentionally structured and pedagogically guided by the teacher [18]. In this design, AI functions as a diagnostic and instructional framework, converting static digital representations into adaptive learning experiences that emulate the responsiveness of expert teaching.

Virtual laboratories offer an additional conducive environment for hybridization. In a fully online chemistry or physics laboratory, AI-driven analytics may track students' experimental decisions and results, forecasting when learners are prone to facing conceptual impasses or safety-related mistakes. Empirical evidence from higher education contexts further indicates that well-designed online physics laboratories can enhance students' conceptual understanding while simultaneously strengthening self-efficacy, even under constrained conditions such as emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic [19]. The algorithm can thereafter propose alternate approaches, promote follow-up studies, or identify aberrant data for additional examination. Educators can utilize these analytics to create customized enhancements to the laboratory experience, including interactive discussions about unforeseen outcomes or focused mini-lectures on fundamental principles [20]. The integration of computerized assistance and human facilitation establishes a feedback loop that enhances student engagement with the scientific process while preserving the interpretive advantages of instructor experience.

Hybrid designs facilitate more inclusive and differentiated instruction. AI-driven adaptive exams integrated into digital activities can identify pupils needing extra assistance, while simulations offer the adaptable surroundings necessary to provide that support effectively. Empirical evidence from one-to-one digital learning contexts further suggests that personal devices, such as tablets, can support conceptual understanding of core physics concepts---such as energy---by enabling sustained interaction, visualization, and individualized exploration within classroom settings [21]. Research in physics education further demonstrates that students' misconceptions about fundamental mechanics concepts are systematically related to developmental factors, such as mental age, highlighting the need for adaptive learning environments that are sensitive to cognitive variability rather than relying solely on chronological age or grade level [22]. A physics student encountering difficulties with vector addition can obtain AI-generated projects that progressively escalate in difficulty, while remaining within the same simulation environment as peers prepared for more advanced challenges. These designs adhere to the concepts of Universal Design for Learning by guaranteeing that all students can engage with content at a suitable level of complexity without being divided into several instructional pathways [1].

Furthermore, hybrid learning environments promote novel modalities of collaborative inquiry. AI systems may assess group interactions on digital platforms, identifying when teams encounter impasses and proposing cues to foster constructive discourse. Educators can utilize these insights to promote class-wide discussions that link individual inquiries to common scientific themes. Thus, AI not only customizes learning but also enriches the social aspects of science education, prompting students to negotiate meaning and cultivate collective understanding.

The educational consequences of these interactions are extensive. Integrating AI into digital infrastructures enables educators to establish learning environments that are flexible, collaborative, and inquiry-based. Such designs encourage students to transition seamlessly between experimentation, reflection, and discussion, so emulating the genuine methods of scientific research. Simultaneously, they necessitate that educators adopt new responsibilities as architects of hybrid experiences, analysts of real-time data, and moderators of ethical discussions around the utilization of intelligent technologies. When executed with care, hybrid learning models can revolutionize scientific education into a framework where human creativity and machine intelligence collaborate effectively.

Teacher Roles and Professional Development in a Hybrid Era

The advent of mixed intelligent ecosystems in science education necessitates that educators adopt enhanced professional roles that surpass conventional content delivery. With the integration of interactive simulations, virtual laboratories, and AI-driven analytics into hybrid learning environments, educators assume the roles of designers, interpreters, and ethical guardians of intricate technical systems. Their ability to manage these intersecting demands will ultimately ascertain whether hybrid science classrooms realize their educational potential.

In such situations, educators operate concurrently as instructional designers and data analysts. Recent research in primary science education illustrates how artificial intelligence can be integrated as a practical pedagogical resource for teachers, supporting lesson planning, instructional adaptation, and classroom decision-making when embedded within teacher-led instructional frameworks rather than used as autonomous systems [23]. Complementary work in physics education further demonstrates how concrete AI-supported tools and structured lesson plans can assist teachers in orchestrating inquiry-based activities, diagnosing student difficulties, and aligning AI use with curricular goals, thereby translating hybrid ecosystem principles into actionable classroom practice [24]. They must design learning activities that include digital simulations and AI analytics into cohesive sequences, ensuring that automated feedback enhances rather than supplants human instruction. This design duty requires an understanding of the capabilities and constraints of both technology layers, along with the capacity to predict student interactions with adaptive systems [1]. In addition to design, educators must analytically assess the real-time data produced by AI tools, such as predictive performance metrics or algorithmically detected misconceptions, and choose the appropriate timing and method for intervention. Research in physics education shows that students' alternative ideas can be systematically leveraged to trace learning curves and conceptual progression, particularly for foundational concepts such as force, highlighting the importance of teacher-led interpretation when translating diagnostic data into meaningful instructional decisions [25]. These interpretive skills are based on the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework proposed by Mishra and Koehler [26], but they also encompass the ability for algorithmic reasoning and an awareness of potential biases in AI outputs [7].

Consequently, professional development customized for this hybrid environment is imperative. Conventional workshops that concentrate exclusively on digital tool training are inadequate, as educators must also cultivate AI literacy, which includes comprehending machine learning principles, acknowledging the limitations of predictive analytics, and sustaining critical awareness of data privacy and ethical issues [27]. Recent systematic evidence from K–12 contexts further indicates that insufficient teacher preparation remains a major barrier to the effective and ethical integration of artificial intelligence in science education, underscoring the need for sustained, practice-oriented professional development models [28]. Effective professional development programs integrate technical instruction with pedagogical design and ethical contemplation. A year-long professional learning community in Singapore illustrated that ongoing collaboration focused on AI-assisted physics experiments resulted in a more profound integration of hybrid practices and enhanced utilization of adaptive analytics, in contrast to brief, isolated training sessions [29]. Participants in the program not only acquired technical proficiency but also engaged in meaningful discussions regarding the pedagogical and ethical ramifications of algorithmic decision-making.

A vital aspect of teacher training is the development of professional agencies. Educators must retain the authority to supersede algorithmic recommendations when their professional judgment indicates alternate learning approaches. In the absence of this agency, there exists a risk that AI systems may unintentionally govern classroom practices, thereby constricting avenues for creativity and human connection [30]. Effective professional development emphasizes not only the utilization of AI but also the critical examination of it, enabling educators to perceive algorithms as collaborative collaborators rather than infallible authorities.

Hybrid ecosystems necessitate novel forms of interdisciplinary collaboration. Science educators are progressively collaborating with computer scientists, data analysts, and instructional designers to create and sustain AI-enhanced educational settings. Professional development that promotes interdisciplinary collaborations enables educators to exchange knowledge and collaboratively address the technological and ethical dilemmas of hybrid learning [7]. These collaborations are particularly beneficial in tackling equity issues, since educators may provide nuanced perspectives on students' varied backgrounds and learning requirements that may be neglected by solely technical teams.

The professional identity of educators in a hybrid environment evolves from content specialist to technological facilitator and ethical steward. Empirical evidence from science education indicates that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs---particularly in physics teaching---play a critical role in shaping instructional choices, openness to innovation, and confidence in adopting new pedagogical approaches, underscoring the importance of addressing efficacy alongside technical competence in hybrid professional development models [31]. Continuous, cooperative professional development, institutional backing for innovation, and explicit policy frameworks are essential to equip educators for these complex responsibilities. In the absence of such support, even the most advanced hybrid systems may become underutilized or misapplied, so constricting their potential to revolutionize science education.

Ethical and Policy Integration in Hybrid Ecosystems

The creation of hybrid science education environments that integrate digital tools with artificial intelligence presents a set of ethical and policy concerns that are both more intricate and more pressing than those linked to each technology independently. While previous digital advances mainly prompted concerns regarding access and equity, the introduction of AI intensifies issues related to data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and the possible diminishment of teacher autonomy. It is imperative to address these challenges for mixed intelligent ecosystems to improve learning while maintaining the democratic and humanistic principles of education.

A critical issue pertains to data privacy and security. AI-augmented digital platforms rely on the ongoing acquisition of detailed data, encompassing clickstream logs, textual answers, biometric metrics, and interaction records. From a critical perspective, such processes of educational datafication are not neutral but embed particular assumptions about learning, measurement, and control, raising questions about power, surveillance, and governance in digitally mediated education [32]. Such fine-grained interaction data have been shown to support predictive models capable of identifying students at risk of academic underperformance in online learning environments [33]. This data facilitates adaptive feedback and predictive analytics, yet poses substantial risks if inadequately stored, shared, or monetized. Global assessments indicate inconsistent adherence to privacy regulations like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), particularly when educational institutions utilize commercial AI technologies created beyond their jurisdiction [8]. In hybrid ecosystems, where several digital and AI layers interact, data are frequently transmitted across diverse platforms, complicating the acquisition of consent and the assurance of responsible usage. In the absence of stringent security, students' personal information may be vulnerable to breaches or exploited for commercial purposes. More broadly, the increasing dependence on commercial digital platforms raises concerns about the extraction of economic value from educational data, as platform providers may accumulate long-term informational rents through the ownership and monetization of data generated within educational systems [34].

The issue of algorithmic bias and fairness is intricately linked to privacy concerns. AI models developed with historical or imbalanced datasets might replicate and exacerbate current societal inequalities. In science education, biases may arise when natural language processing technologies misinterpret student explanations that diverge from conventional linguistic standards, or when predictive models undervalue the talents of students from marginalized groups [30]. Hybrid ecosystems integrate AI analytics with digital simulations and virtual laboratories, potentially allowing biased predictions to affect both automated feedback and the adaptive sequencing of digital activities. Bias in a single layer might propagate across the system, influencing the learning trajectory in manners that disadvantage specific pupils.

Transparency and elucidation are essential for sustaining trust in hybrid systems. Educators and learners must comprehend the mechanisms underlying algorithmic decisions, such as the endorsement of a certain simulation or the identification of a conceptual error. Numerous AI models function as "black boxes," providing less transparency on their internal mechanisms [1]. When opaque algorithms are integrated into digital platforms, educators may find it difficult to assess the reliability of system-generated feedback or to contest erroneous predictions. The absence of interpretability diminishes teacher autonomy and hinders compliance with legal requirements for informed consent.

The amalgamation of AI with digital tools exacerbates issues about teacher autonomy and professional responsibilities. Automated grading, adaptive sequencing, and algorithmic recommendations can provide significant assistance; nevertheless, they may also limit professional judgment if educators feel compelled to accept machine-generated results without scrutiny. Protecting teacher autonomy necessitates clear policies that recognize the teacher as the ultimate decision-maker in instructional matters and establish procedures for superseding algorithmic suggestions when professional judgment warrants different actions [7].

International organizations have been formulating policy responses to these concerns. UNESCO [9] advocates for robust legal frameworks that provide privacy, transparency, and human oversight in AI-driven education, but the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) [35] suggests independent audits of AI systems to identify bias and assess impact. These worldwide principles establish a framework; however, effective governance necessitates local adaptation to consider cultural settings, national curricula, and existing digital infrastructures. Policies must be adequately adaptable to various educational systems yet sufficiently stringent to uphold universal ethical standards.

The sustainability of hybrid ecosystems necessitates a focus on environmental and economic factors. AI-driven platforms necessitate substantial processing resources, resulting in heightened energy usage and device turnover. Policymakers and educational leaders must evaluate these costs in relation to pedagogical advantages, advocating for solutions that are both educationally beneficial and environmentally sustainable.

The ethical and policy framework of hybrid science education necessitates multi-tiered governance encompassing technological standards, institutional practices, and legislative measures. Privacy safeguards, bias identification systems, transparent algorithmic frameworks, and educator empowerment must be integrated from the inception of system development rather than considered as subsequent additions. Only via integrated safeguards can hybrid intelligent ecosystems fulfill their potential in promoting equitable, inquiry-driven science education while preserving fundamental rights and professional integrity.

Future Directions for Research and Practice

The development of hybrid intelligent ecosystems offers a promising framework for future research and practical advancements in science education. Current research underscores the promise of integrating digital simulations, virtual laboratories, and AI-driven analytics; nevertheless, the swift advancement of technology leaves numerous pedagogical and policy issues unaddressed. Rectifying these deficiencies will necessitate synchronized endeavors across research, practice, and governance.

A primary focus entails longitudinal research investigating the impact of hybrid ecosystems on learning outcomes over prolonged durations. Most current research indicates temporary improvements in conceptual comprehension or engagement; however, there is limited knowledge regarding the long-term effects of AI-enhanced digital environments on students' scientific thinking, problem-solving abilities, or attitudes toward science. Longitudinal studies tracking cohorts of students through various grade levels may reveal if early engagement with hybrid learning fosters sustained retention, knowledge transfer, and the cultivation of scientific thinking [1]. Such studies would enable researchers to investigate the evolution of teachers' roles as they acquire experience in navigating complicated, data-intensive contexts.

Subsequent research should investigate disciplinary differences in the efficacy of hybrid technologies. Physics education has primarily concentrated on interactive simulations and AI-driven analytics [4, 17], although other scientific disciplines pose unique problems and opportunities. Chemistry, focusing on molecular interactions, could gain from AI-enhanced visualization tools, whereas biology may utilize AI to tailor investigations in genetics or ecology. Comparative research across disciplines helps elucidate the most successful combinations of digital and AI tools for certain scientific fields and learner demographics.

An further significant topic for examination is the socio-cultural aspects of equity and inclusion. While AI offers tailored learning experiences, disparities in infrastructure access and the potential for algorithmic bias may exacerbate current educational inequalities [8, 30]. Researchers ought to investigate the performance of hybrid ecosystems across varied cultural and economic contexts, particularly in low-resource environments, and establish design principles that promote fair participation. Mixed-methods research integrating learning analytics with ethnographic observations helps elucidate how students from many backgrounds engage with AI-driven personalization and assess whether these systems authentically accommodate diverse epistemologies.

The ecological sustainability of hybrid ecosystems requires careful consideration. AI algorithms necessitate substantial computational resources, resulting in increased energy use and electronic waste. Future research must evaluate the ecological impact of extensive hybrid implementations and investigate methods for minimizing energy consumption via efficient coding, cloud optimization, and hardware recycling [35]. Confronting sustainability is not solely a technical issue but an ethical obligation, considering the increasing focus on science education as a foundation for environmental care.

There is an urgent necessity for design-based research that connects laboratory findings with classroom practice. Collaborative initiatives among educators, computer scientists, and policymakers can provide iterative design cycles wherein hybrid technologies are co-created, evaluated, and enhanced in genuine learning contexts. Such collaborations can produce practical insights into the orchestration of hybrid activities by educators, the interaction of students with adaptive feedback, and the ways in which governmental frameworks might facilitate responsible innovation. These design experiments must prioritize teacher agency and student voice, ensuring that technological advancement is rooted in the actual experiences of classrooms.

These research directions collectively indicate a future where hybrid intelligent ecosystems are not only assemblages of digital and AI technologies, but meticulously crafted settings that enhance scientific comprehension, foster equity, and function sustainably. Aligning empirical research with ethical and policy frameworks will facilitate the next phase of inquiry, ensuring that the incorporation of digital and AI technologies reinforces the fundamental principles of science education while equipping students for engagement in a progressively data-centric society.

Conclusion

The integration of advanced digital technologies and artificial intelligence is initiating a new era of hybrid intelligent ecosystems in science education. These ecosystems combine the exploratory potential of interactive simulations and virtual laboratories with the adaptive features of AI-driven analytics, resulting in learning environments that are data-rich, responsive, and inquiry-oriented. This synthesis provides significant opportunities to improve conceptual comprehension, facilitate differentiated education, and encourage collaborative problem-solving in physics and related sciences [17, 4].

However, the revolutionary potential of these ecosystems is accompanied by equally substantial limitations. The educational potential of adaptive learning relies on educators' ability to analyze algorithmic results, create significant digital-AI interactions, and uphold ethical standards of privacy, transparency, and fairness [1, 7]. In the absence of continuous professional development and institutional backing, even the most advanced technologies may devolve into mere automated grading systems or data dashboards that contribute minimally to student learning. Policy issues regarding algorithmic unfairness, unequal access to infrastructure, and the environmental consequences of computationally intensive AI systems are as urgent [8, 35]. Resolving these difficulties necessitates collaborative efforts among researchers, educators, policymakers, and technology developers.

The evidence examined indicates that the future of science education resides not in selecting between digital or AI advancements, but in creating deliberate hybrids that utilize the distinct advantages of both. Such systems must establish teachers as pivotal agents who facilitate inquiry, analyze real-time data, and promote ethical thinking. They must also integrate strong governance frameworks to guarantee that technological advancement does not undermine equity or sustainability. The blended intelligent ecosystem signifies not merely a technical integration but also a pedagogical and ethical commitment to employing evolving technologies to enhance scientific comprehension while preserving the principles of human agency, inclusion, and environmental stewardship.

Future success in implementation will rely on longitudinal research, interdisciplinary collaboration, and policies that harmonize innovation with regulation. By enhancing teacher proficiency, guaranteeing fair access, and incorporating transparency into AI systems, stakeholders may establish science education environments that equip students to not only comprehend scientific concepts but also to critically engage with the technologies influencing their reality. The hybrid future of science education, if directed by these principles, promises to integrate human creativity with machine intelligence to foster deeper learning and promote a more equitable and sustainable society.

References

1. Holmes W, Bialik M, Fadel C. Artificial intelligence in education. In: Data Ethics: Building Trust: How Digital Technologies Can Serve Humanity. Globethics Publications, 2023, 621-653. Doi: 10.58863/20.500.12424/4276068
2. Zawacki-Richter O, Marín VI, Bond M, Gouverneur F. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2019; 16(1):39. Doi: 10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0
3. Cooper G. Examining science education in ChatGPT: An exploratory study of generative artificial intelligence. J Sci Educ Technol. 2023; 32(3):444-452. Doi: 10.1007/s10956-023-10039-y
4. Banda HJ, Nzabahimana J. Effect of integrating physics education technology simulations on students' conceptual understanding in physics: A review of literature. Phys Rev Phys Educ Res. 2021; 17:023108. Doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.17.023108
5. Liu Q, Ouyang Y, Lu X. Intelligent tutoring systems for physics education: A systematic review. Educ Inf Technol. 2020; 25(3):1679-1705. Doi: 10.1007/s10639-019-10037-7
6. Zabriskie C, Yang J, DeVore S, Stewart J. Using machine learning to predict physics course outcomes. Phys Rev Phys Educ Res. 2019; 15:020120. Doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.15.020120
7. Miao F, Holmes W, Huang R, Zhang H. AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO Publishing, 2021. (UNESCO Working Paper Series on AI and Education). Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000376709
8. Kerssens N, Van Dijck J. The platformization of primary education in the Netherlands. Learn Media Technol. 2021; 46(3):250-263. Doi: 10.1080/17439884.2021.1876725
9. UNESCO. Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO Publishing, 2023. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455
10. Fayzullina AR, *et al*. Artificial intelligence in science education: A systematic review of applications, impacts, and challenges. Contemp Educ Technol. 2025; 17(4):ep613. Doi: 10.30935/cedtech/17519
11. Pantazis S, Stylos G, Kotsis KT, Georgopoulos K. The effect of 3D printing technology on primary school students' content knowledge, anxiety and interest toward science. Int J Educ Innov. 2021; 3(1):38-50. Doi: 10.69685/YTQA3097
12. Stylos G, Kotsis KT. Use of a simple homemade apparatus to teach basic thermal concepts, six qualitative demonstrations/experiments. Phys Teach. 2021; 59:477-479. Doi: 10.1119/10.0006134
13. Stylos G, Sargioti A, Mavridis D, Kotsis KT. Validation of the thermal concept evaluation test for Greek university students' misconceptions of thermal concepts. Int J Sci Educ. 2021; 43(2):247-273. Doi: 10.1080/09500693.2020.1865587
14. Kotsis KT. Alternative ideas about concepts of physics are a timelessly valuable tool for physics education. Eurasian J Sci Environ Educ. 2023; 3(2):83-97. Doi: 10.30935/ejsee/13776
15. Kotsis KT. Artificial intelligence creates fairy tales for physics teaching in primary education. Eur J Open Educ E-learning Stud. 2024; 9(1):1-16. Doi: 10.46827/ejoe.v9i1.5250
16. Christonasis A, Kotsis KT. Observing or performing actions? Understanding circular motion via two types of learning activities. Eur J Educ Stud. 2022; 9(10). Doi: 10.46827/ejes.v9i10.4493
17. Graesser AC, Chipman P, King B. AutoTutor and its evolution: Interactive dialogue systems for learning. Int J Artif Intell Educ. 2016; 26(2):225-246. Doi: 10.1007/s40593-015-0079-y
18. Kotsis KT. Integrating ChatGPT into the inquiry-based science curriculum for primary education. Eur J Educ Pedagogy. 2024; 5(6):28-34. Doi: 10.24018/ejedu.2024.5.6.891
19. Stylos G, Christonasis A, Georgopoulos K, Kotsis KT. The impact of an online physics lab on university students' self-efficacy and understanding of thermal concepts during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Math Sci Teach. 2023; 3(2):em049. Doi: 10.29333/mathsciteacher/13701
20. Liu Y, Fan S, Xu S, Sajjanhar A, Yeom S, Wei Y. Predicting student performance using clickstream data and machine learning. Educ Sci. 2023; 13(1):17. Doi: 10.3390/educsci13010017
21. Kotsis KT, Tsiouri E. Use of one-to-one iPad in primary school to teach the concept of energy in physics: A case study. Eur J Educ Stud. 2023; 10(3):33-45. Doi: 10.46827/ejes.v10i3.4696
22. Kotsis KT, Stylos G. Correlation of primary school students' misconceptions about concepts of mechanics with their mental age. Eur J Educ Stud. 2023; 10(1):77-90. Doi: 10.46827/ejes.v10i1.4619
23. Kotsis KT. Integration of artificial intelligence in science teaching in primary education: Applications for teachers. Eur J Contemp Educ E-Learning. 2024; 2(3):27-43. Doi: 10.59324/ejceel.2024.2(3).04
24. Vakarou G, Stylos G, Kotsis KT. AI for enhancing physics education: Practical tools and lesson plans. Int J Sci Math Technol Learn. 2024; 31(2):159-176. Doi: 10.18848/2327-7971/CGP/v31i02/159-176
25. Kotsis KT, Panagou D. Using alternative ideas for determining the learning curve on the concept of force. Eur J Sci Math Educ. 2022; 10(4):495-506. Doi: 10.30935/scimath/12251
26. Mishra P, Koehler MJ. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teach Coll Rec. 2006; 108(6):1017-1054. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x
27. Long D, Magerko B. What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. In: Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 2020, Honolulu. 1-16. Doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376727
28. Aravantinos S. Artificial intelligence in K-12 education: A systematic review of teacher preparation and professional development needs. Computers. 2026;

15(1):49. Doi: 10.3390/computers15010049
29. Tan X, Cheng G, Ling MH. Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional development: A systematic review. Comput Artif Intell, 2024, 100355. Doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100355
30. Williamson B, Eynon R. Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learn Media Technol. 2020; 45(3):223-235. Doi: 10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995
31. Stylos G, Kamtsios S, Kotsis KT. Assessment of Greek pre-service primary teachers' efficacy beliefs in physics teaching. J Sci Teach Educ. 2022; 34(1):44-62. Doi: 10.1080/1046560X.2021.2023959
32. Selwyn N. Data entry: Towards the critical study of digital data and education. Learn Media Technol. 2015; 40(1). Doi: 10.1080/17439884.2014.921628
33. Aljohani NR. Predicting at-risk students using clickstream data in the Open University Learning Analytics dataset. Sustainability. 2019; 11(24):7238. Doi: 10.3390/su11247238
34. Komljenovic J. The rise of education rentiers: Digital platforms, digital data and rents. Learn Media Technol. 2021; 46(3):320-332. Doi: 10.1080/17439884.2021.1891422
35. OECD. Artificial intelligence in education: policy perspectives. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Publishing, 2023. Doi: 10.1787/c74f03de-en