International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology (IJISIT)
Volume 3, No. 1 (2026) pp. 24-37
e-ISSN 3063-4156 | p-ISSN 3063-4172
DOI: 10.55123/ijisit.v3i1.60

AR-Enhanced Immersive Training for Maritime Crisis Management and Emergency Decision-Making

Irfan Faozun[1*], Ferro Hidayah[2], Titis Ari Wibowo[3]
[1,2,3]Maritime Institute, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran Jakarta, North Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received February 14, 2026
Revised May 14, 2026
Accepted June 15, 2026

Keywords:

Augmented Reality
Emergency Response Training
Maritime Safety Education
Immersive Learning
Crisis Management

ABSTRACT

Maritime emergency response training relies on expensive live fire drills costing $12,000-$18,000 per session with inherent safety risks, limited scenario variety, and scalability constraints serving maximum 12 students per drill, yet traditional simulator-based alternatives lack physical movement and coordination essential for muscle memory development in confined vessel spaces. This research presents the design and validation of augmented reality training systems overlaying digital emergency scenarios onto physical maritime training environments, enabling safe, scalable, high-fidelity crisis response training at Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran Jakarta. Employing design science research methodology with qualitative stakeholder evaluation, the study engaged maritime safety instructors (n=14), emergency response trainers (n=8), and students (n=24) through structured interviews and controlled training experiments examining skill development, learning transfer, and cost-effectiveness. The Microsoft HoloLens 2-based AR platform deployed across engine room simulators, vessel training compartments, and firefighting facilities generated immersive emergency scenarios including engine room fires, flooding, toxic gas releases, and man-overboard situations with real-time scenario adaptation based on trainee decisions. Thematic analysis revealed strong support for AR training enhancement, identifying critical themes of psychomotor skill development, scenario variety expansion, and training accessibility improvement. Pilot implementation with 180 students across 8-month period demonstrated equivalent learning outcomes to live drills on practical assessment scores (83.7 versus 84.2, p=0.61 not significant) while achieving 97% cost reduction ($47 versus $1,500 per student), 340% scenario variety expansion (17 versus 5 annual scenarios), and 450% student throughput increase (2,160 versus 480 annual training hours), contributing validated AR architectures and empirical evidence supporting immersive technology adoption in maritime safety education addressing training scalability, cost efficiency, and pedagogical effectiveness imperatives.

Corresponding Author:

Irfan Faozun
Maritime Institute,
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran Jakarta,
14150, North Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: irfan.faozun@stipmail.ac.id

1. Introduction

Maritime emergency response competency represents critical safety requirement for all seafaring professionals, with International Maritime Organization STCW Convention mandating comprehensive training in firefighting and fire prevention, elementary first aid, personal survival techniques, personal safety and social responsibilities, and security awareness demonstrating physical ability to don firefighting equipment within two minutes, operate breathing apparatus in smoke-filled environments, deploy survival craft under emergency conditions, perform cardiopulmonary resuscitation and treat shock, and coordinate team responses during simulated vessel casualties, yet delivering authentic high-fidelity emergency training confronts maritime academies with multiple critical challenges including prohibitive costs as live fire training exercises utilizing actual vessel compartments, burning materials, pressurized firefighting systems, and safety equipment consume $12,000-$18,000 per session for fuel, consumables, facility restoration, safety supervision, and emergency standby personnel, inherent safety risks as students experience actual fire exposure, toxic combustion products, high-temperature environments, physical exertion with breathing apparatus, and potential for thermal injury, smoke inhalation, or equipment failure creating liability concerns and institutional risk management constraints limiting training frequency and intensity, limited scenario variety as physical constraints and safety considerations restrict training to 4-5 pre-planned scenarios annually preventing exposure to diverse emergency types including electrical fires, fuel oil fires, accommodation fires, galley fires, cargo hold fires, engine room flooding, chemical releases, or combined casualties typical of actual maritime emergencies, and severe scalability limitations as intensive supervision requirements, facility capacity constraints, and equipment availability restrict maximum 12 students per training session creating throughput bottlenecks when maritime academies enroll thousands of students annually requiring STCW certification [1].

These live training limitations create persistent gaps in maritime emergency response preparation where graduates demonstrate procedural knowledge through written examinations and basic competency through limited hands-on exercises but lack extensive practical experience with diverse emergency scenarios, decision-making under stress with realistic time pressure and information uncertainty, muscle memory development for equipment operation in smoke and darkness where visual guidance unavailable, team coordination skills for multi-person emergency responses requiring communication, role assignment, and collaborative problem-solving under crisis conditions, and psychological preparation for physiological stress, fear, disorientation, and fatigue characteristic of actual emergencies substantially different from controlled training exercises where students know scenarios are simulations with instructors ensuring safety, creating confidence gaps where newly certified officers report feeling inadequately prepared for actual shipboard emergency responsibilities despite passing STCW assessment requirements [2].

Traditional maritime training simulator alternatives including bridge simulators for navigation emergencies, engine room simulators for machinery casualties, and cargo handling simulators for operational emergencies provide valuable cognitive skill development through scenario-based learning in realistic virtual environments, yet fundamentally lack physical movement, haptic feedback, spatial navigation in actual compartments, equipment manipulation requiring dexterity and force application, physiological stress from protective equipment weight and restricted breathing, and kinesthetic learning essential for emergency response muscle memory where procedural execution must become automatic rather than requiring conscious cognitive processing potentially compromised during actual crisis stress, limiting simulator training's effectiveness for psychomotor skill domains requiring physical practice and limiting transfer of simulator-learned procedures to actual vessel emergency performance [3].

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran Jakarta, Indonesia's premier maritime academy enrolling 3,500+ students annually across Navigation Officer, Marine Engineering Officer, and Maritime Business programs, operates comprehensive maritime safety training facilities including dedicated firefighting training ground with controlled burn compartments simulating accommodation fires, galley fires, and machinery space fires, damage control training facility with floodable compartments teaching emergency pumping and temporary repairs, lifeboat training area with launching davits and survival craft for sea-time exercises, first aid training laboratories with medical simulation manikins and equipment, and integrated bridge and engine room simulators supporting navigation and machinery emergency scenarios, representing approximately $12 million capital investment in safety training infrastructure serving 3,500 students who must complete mandatory STCW safety training modules totaling 160 hours per student before sea-time deployment [4].

Current safety training delivery at STIP Jakarta combines limited high-fidelity live exercises with extensive lower-fidelity alternatives including 4-5 annual live firefighting sessions per student cohort (480 annual total training hours serving 480 students, 12 students per 2-hour session, 40 sessions annually) consuming $520,000 annual operating budget ($12,000-$18,000 per session × 40 sessions) creating severe cost and scalability constraints preventing more frequent or diverse training, supplemental simulator-based training providing cognitive emergency response experience without physical skill development serving additional 1,200 students annually through 4,800 training hours, classroom theoretical instruction covering emergency procedures, equipment specifications, and regulatory requirements serving all 3,500 students through 14,000 annual contact hours, and video-based scenario analysis examining actual maritime casualties and emergency responses providing vicarious learning without hands-on practice, collectively providing baseline STCW compliance but acknowledged by institutional leadership, instructors, and students as inadequate preparation for actual emergency responsibilities that graduates will face aboard commercial vessels where emergency response competency directly impacts crew survival and vessel safety [5].

The fundamental research problem addresses the absence of scalable, cost-effective, high-fidelity emergency response training technologies capable of providing authentic psychomotor skill development through physical movement and equipment manipulation, diverse scenario exposure spanning varied emergency types and vessel configurations impossible with limited live training facilities, stress inoculation through realistic time pressure, information uncertainty, and decision consequences without actual danger, team coordination practice enabling multi-person emergency response rehearsal, and immediate performance feedback supporting learning optimization through iterative practice and skill refinement, all delivered at per-student costs enabling universal access rather than limited elite cohort training, implemented within resource constraints limiting expensive facility expansion or consumable-intensive live training frequency increases, and validated through rigorous assessment demonstrating equivalent or superior learning outcomes compared to traditional training methodologies justifying institutional investments in emerging educational technologies [6].

Augmented reality represents promising technological approach addressing these maritime emergency training challenges by overlaying computer-generated digital content including fire spread visualization, smoke dispersion simulation, equipment status indicators, team member positions, and mission-critical information onto physical training environments viewed through head-mounted displays enabling trainees to see both real physical surroundings including actual compartment geometry, equipment locations, egress routes, and team members, plus digital emergency scenario elements creating immersive experiences combining simulator scenario variety and complexity with physical training facility's authentic spatial navigation and equipment manipulation, generating hybrid reality training environments potentially offering advantages of both live exercises and simulator training while avoiding their respective limitations [7].

Specifically, this research investigates four interconnected questions establishing comprehensive investigation scope. First, what augmented reality system architectures effectively integrate digital emergency scenarios with physical maritime training facilities including engine room simulators, vessel training compartments, and firefighting grounds while maintaining scenario realism through photorealistic graphics and accurate physics simulation, user safety through awareness of physical hazards despite digital overlay distraction, multi-user coordination enabling 6-8 simultaneous trainees experiencing synchronized scenarios, and pedagogical effectiveness through scenario complexity calibration supporting progressive skill development from basic procedures to complex multi-casualty situations? Second, how do augmented reality training outcomes compare to traditional live fire exercises and simulator-based alternatives across learning domains including cognitive knowledge assessed through written examinations testing emergency procedure understanding, psychomotor skills evaluated through timed equipment operation proficiency under realistic conditions, affective learning measured through confidence self-assessments and stress management during simulated emergencies, and learning transfer quantified through performance on subsequent live training exercises or actual shipboard emergency drills demonstrating AR training's effectiveness preparing students for real-world application?

Third, what cost-effectiveness improvements result from augmented reality training substitution or supplementation of expensive live exercises including direct cost reductions from eliminated consumables, facility restoration, and safety supervision, indirect cost savings from increased training frequency enabled by AR scenario repeatability without resource depletion, throughput enhancements serving more students through scalable AR sessions versus capacity-constrained live exercises, and scenario diversity expansion creating training variety impossible with limited physical facilities and safety constraints? Fourth, how do stakeholders including maritime safety instructors, emergency response trainers, institutional administrators, and students perceive augmented reality training utility, acceptance, and limitations including instructor assessments of pedagogical effectiveness and curriculum integration requirements, trainer evaluations of skill development adequacy and safety training standards compliance, administrator analyses of cost-benefit ratios and regulatory acceptance considerations, and student experiences of learning engagement, confidence development, and technology usability when implemented in Indonesian maritime education contexts characterized by traditional training preferences emphasizing hands-on physical practice, limited technology infrastructure requiring robust low-maintenance systems, and cultural factors affecting immersive technology adoption including comfort with head-mounted displays and trust in virtual training effectiveness?

This research contributes significant theoretical and practical advances to augmented reality educational applications and maritime safety training scholarship while addressing critical gaps in immersive technology literature predominantly focused on pure virtual reality environments isolating users from physical surroundings rather than AR's hybrid approach preserving physical world interaction. Theoretically, it extends augmented reality frameworks predominantly developed for industrial maintenance training, medical procedure training, and military applications into maritime safety education requiring unique considerations including confined space navigation, team coordination in smoky environments limiting visibility, equipment operation requiring haptic feedback, and psychological stress preparation through scenario realism, demonstrating how AR architectures require fundamental adaptation for maritime training contexts substantially different from prior application domains. Methodologically, it validates rigorous comparative evaluation approaches measuring AR training outcomes against gold-standard live exercises through controlled experiments rather than purely descriptive case studies, establishing causality claims about AR effectiveness through experimental research designs comparing equivalent student populations randomly assigned to AR versus traditional training conditions, providing empirical evidence transcending anecdotal adoption reports common in educational technology literature.

Practically, the research delivers immediately deployable augmented reality training systems supporting Indonesia's maritime education safety training enhancement imperatives articulated in Ministry of Transportation strategic plans targeting universal high-fidelity emergency training access for all maritime students by 2028, while providing empirical evidence of AR training's impact on learning outcomes, cost efficiency, and scalability enabling evidence-based institutional decision-making about technology investments and training curriculum redesign. The validated Microsoft HoloLens 2 applications, training scenario designs, instructor facilitation protocols, and assessment methodologies inform AR adoption at Indonesia's 8 state maritime academies collectively training 12,000+ students annually requiring STCW safety certification, potentially benefiting regional ASEAN maritime education systems and global maritime training institutions facing identical emergency training challenges of cost, scalability, scenario variety, and skill transfer effectiveness.

The investigation employs mixed-methods design science methodology combining iterative augmented reality system development through requirements analysis identifying specific emergency training scenarios and learning objectives, hardware evaluation comparing AR headset options across field of view, resolution, ergonomics, and cost parameters, software development creating 3D emergency scenario content and real-time adaptation algorithms, integration engineering connecting AR applications to physical training facility sensors and equipment, and pilot testing with progressive student cohorts refining scenario design and pedagogical approaches, with comprehensive quantitative learning outcome measurement through controlled experiments randomly assigning students (n=180) to AR training (experimental group, n=90) versus traditional training (control group, n=90) comparing knowledge retention, skill proficiency, confidence levels, and learning transfer through standardized assessments, plus qualitative stakeholder evaluation through maritime safety instructor interviews (n=14 providing expert assessment of AR training pedagogical effectiveness and STCW compliance adequacy), emergency response trainer focus groups (n=8 evaluating practical skill development and safety training standards satisfaction), and student surveys and focus groups (n=24 providing user experience feedback on immersive technology usability, learning engagement, and confidence development), analyzing quantitative data through statistical hypothesis testing and qualitative data through systematic thematic analysis, ultimately informing evidence-based recommendations for augmented reality training deployment at scale across Indonesian maritime safety education supporting STCW compliance, student welfare protection, and workforce competency enhancement critical to maritime industry safety culture and accident prevention objectives.

2. Research Method

This research employs design science research methodology combined with experimental learning outcome evaluation, creating a rigorous systematic approach particularly suited for developing and validating educational technology artifacts through iterative cycles of system development, pilot testing, outcome assessment, and stakeholder validation, as established by Hevner et al.'s foundational framework adapted for augmented reality applications in vocational training contexts requiring both technical functionality validation and pedagogical effectiveness demonstration [8]. Design science methodology proves especially appropriate for immersive training technology research where innovation success depends not only on AR system technical performance including graphics quality, tracking accuracy, and multi-user synchronization, but critically on learning outcome equivalence or superiority compared to established training methods, instructor pedagogical integration capability, student acceptance and engagement, and demonstrated cost-effectiveness justifying institutional technology investments requiring qualitative investigation alongside quantitative performance and learning outcome metrics [9].

The research integrates AR system technical evaluation, rigorous experimental learning outcome measurement through controlled comparison studies, and comprehensive qualitative stakeholder assessment employing structured protocols, recognizing that educational technology platforms must satisfy diverse requirements spanning technical specialists evaluating system robustness and scalability, subject matter experts assessing training fidelity and skill transfer adequacy, instructors determining pedagogical utility and curriculum integration feasibility, institutional administrators analyzing cost-benefit ratios and regulatory compliance, and students experiencing learning effectiveness and technology usability [10].

The research population comprises three distinct stakeholder groups essential for holistic AR training system validation. The maritime safety instructor group (n=14) includes firefighting instructors (n=5) certified as STCW trainers delivering fire prevention and firefighting courses, damage control instructors (n=3) teaching emergency pumping and temporary repair procedures, survival craft instructors (n=3) conducting lifeboat training and personal survival techniques, first aid instructors (n=2) providing medical emergency response training, and integrated emergency response coordinators (n=1) managing multi-scenario casualty drills, selected to represent diverse emergency training specializations and averaging 11.7 years maritime safety training experience with backgrounds including former shipboard safety officers, firefighting specialists, and emergency medical technicians.

The emergency response trainer group (n=8) consists of specialized training facility operators managing firefighting grounds (n=3), damage control facility (n=2), lifeboat training area (n=2), and first aid laboratories (n=1), with technical expertise in training equipment operation, safety supervision during live exercises, facility maintenance, and regulatory compliance for training infrastructure, averaging 8.3 years emergency training facility management experience, selected to provide operational perspective on AR training integration with physical facilities and assessment of whether AR-trained students demonstrate adequate physical skill proficiency during subsequent live exercises requiring hands-on equipment operation.

The student experimental population comprises 180 STIP Jakarta students from Navigation Officer (n=90) and Marine Engineering Officer (n=90) programs enrolled in mandatory STCW basic safety training courses during August 2023-March 2024 academic year, representing second-year students (average age 20.3 years, range 19-23) having completed foundational maritime education but not yet received advanced emergency response training, with random assignment to AR training experimental group (n=90, 45 navigation + 45 engineering students) or traditional training control group (n=90, 45 navigation + 45 engineering students) enabling controlled comparison of training methodologies while controlling for student characteristics, prior knowledge, and motivation through randomization. Additional student focus group participants (n=24, 12 from experimental group + 12 from control group) provided detailed qualitative feedback on learning experiences, technology usability, and training preparation adequacy through semi-structured discussions following training completion and practical assessments.

Research instruments integrate automated AR system performance metrics, standardized learning outcome assessments enabling experimental comparison, and structured qualitative data collection protocols. The primary technical instrument comprises Microsoft HoloLens 2-based augmented reality training platform selected following systematic hardware evaluation comparing HoloLens 2 against Magic Leap 2, Varjo XR-3, and Meta Quest Pro across criteria including field of view (HoloLens 52° diagonal adequate for training scenarios), resolution (2K per eye sufficient for text legibility and hazard identification), tracking accuracy (sub-centimeter precision enabling accurate equipment interaction), ergonomics (weight distribution supporting 45-60 minute training sessions without excessive fatigue), durability (IP50 rating adequate for training facility environment), multi-user capabilities (supporting 8 synchronized users essential for team training), and total cost of ownership ($3,500 per device plus $280 annual software/support versus $5,500-$8,900 alternatives).

The AR software platform developed using Unity 3D game engine implements five core emergency training scenarios including engine room fire response requiring fire detection, alarm activation, breathing apparatus donning, fire classification, extinguisher selection, attack approach, and evacuation coordination across 12-step procedure, accommodation fire response involving passenger evacuation, smoke control through HVAC manipulation, fire boundary establishment, hose team coordination, and search-and-rescue operations across 15-step procedure, machinery space flooding scenario requiring damage assessment, emergency pump activation, temporary patching, bilge system operation, and watertight integrity maintenance across 10-step procedure, toxic gas release requiring atmospheric monitoring, ventilation procedures, personal protective equipment selection, casualty evacuation, and medical first aid across 8-step procedure, and man-overboard emergency involving alarm procedures, lifeboat deployment, rescue vessel maneuvering, casualty recovery, and medical stabilization across 11-step procedure, each scenario incorporating real-time physics simulation for fire/smoke/water spread, adaptive difficulty adjustment based on trainee performance, and collaborative multi-user coordination requirements.

Independent variables systematically manipulated through experimental design include training methodology (AR training experimental condition versus traditional live/simulator training control condition), emergency scenario types (fire, flooding, toxic gas, man-overboard, combined casualties), training intensity (single-scenario practice, multi-scenario rotation, stress inoculation progressive difficulty), and student

e- ISSN 3063-4156 | p-ISSN 3063-4172

characteristics including program specialization (navigation versus engineering), prior emergency experience, and technology familiarity measured through pre-training surveys. Dependent variables measured encompass cognitive learning assessed through written examinations testing emergency procedure knowledge, equipment specifications, and regulatory requirements using 50-item multiple choice tests developed from STCW assessment guidelines, psychomotor skill proficiency evaluated through practical performance assessments measuring equipment operation speed and accuracy during timed exercises including breathing apparatus donning time (target <2 minutes STCW requirement), fire extinguisher operation proficiency (accuracy of extinguisher selection, approach technique, and application method), and emergency coordination effectiveness (team communication quality, role assignment clarity, and task completion efficiency) scored by certified assessors using standardized rubrics, affective outcomes including confidence self-assessments using 10-point Likert scales and stress management measured through heart rate variability during training exercises, and learning transfer quantified through performance on subsequent live training exercises where AR-trained students attempt traditional live drills enabling direct comparison of skill retention and application [11].

Qualitative instruments utilize semi-structured interview protocols for maritime safety instructors featuring 75-minute sessions exploring AR training pedagogical effectiveness assessing whether digital scenarios provide adequate fidelity for procedure learning and decision-making practice, skill transfer adequacy evaluating whether AR-trained students demonstrate competent physical skill performance during subsequent live exercises, STCW compliance confidence determining instructors' assessment of whether AR training satisfies regulatory requirements for hands-on practical training, curriculum integration considerations identifying how AR training sequences with traditional training components, and instructor training requirements for facilitating AR exercises and interpreting student performance data.

Emergency response trainer focus group discussion guides structure 90-minute sessions examining physical skill development adequacy assessing whether AR training produces muscle memory and equipment familiarity comparable to live training, safety training standards compliance evaluating whether AR scenarios provide realistic hazard exposure and stress preparation, live exercise performance observations comparing AR-trained versus traditionally-trained students' proficiency during hands-on exercises, facility integration logistics addressing how AR training coordinates with physical training facility usage and maintenance schedules, and technology sustainability concerns including equipment maintenance, software updates, and long-term operational costs.

Student survey instruments deploy 40-item questionnaires combining Likert-scale ratings measuring perceived learning effectiveness, confidence development, technology usability, and training realism, with open-response questions assessing learning experience quality, technology barriers encountered, and preparation adequacy for shipboard emergency responsibilities. Student focus group guides organize 60-minute discussions exploring immersive technology experiences including HoloLens comfort during extended sessions, scenario realism perceptions, team coordination challenges in AR versus physical environments, learning engagement comparing AR to traditional training, confidence development through repeated AR scenario practice, and emergency response preparation adequacy assessing self-perceived readiness for actual shipboard emergencies [12].

Data collection proceeded through five sequential phases aligned with design science development cycles and experimental research protocols. Phase one conducted comprehensive requirements analysis through preliminary consultations with 8 maritime safety instructors, 4 emergency response trainers, and 12 students from previous cohorts identifying specific emergency training scenarios requiring enhancement, learning outcome priorities, STCW compliance requirements, technical constraints from physical training facilities, and pedagogical considerations for AR integration with existing curriculum, generating detailed functional specifications for AR training system including scenario content requirements, user interface design principles, multi-user coordination protocols, and instructor facilitation tools.

Phase two implemented AR system development including Unity 3D content creation developing 3D models of vessel compartments, emergency equipment, fire/smoke/water effects, and user interface elements totaling 18,000 3D assets and 47 interactive scene configurations, HoloLens 2 application programming implementing spatial mapping, gesture recognition, multi-user networking, and real-time scenario adaptation algorithms comprising 127,000 lines of C# code, integration with physical training facilities including sensor connections to actual firefighting equipment enabling hybrid scenarios where trainees manipulate real equipment triggering digital scenario responses, and progressive pilot testing with 3 initial student volunteers (August 2023), 12 students in small-group trials (September 2023), and 36 students in cohort-scale exercises (October 2023) identifying usability issues, technical bugs, and pedagogical improvements incorporated through iterative refinement cycles.

Phase three executed controlled experimental study implementing random assignment of 180 students to experimental (AR training, n=90) or control (traditional training, n=90) groups using random number generation stratified by program specialization ensuring equivalent navigation/engineering distribution across conditions, delivering differential training interventions where experimental group completed 12 hours AR training across 6 two-hour sessions over 3-week period experiencing all five emergency scenarios with progressive difficulty and team coordination complexity, while control group completed equivalent 12 hours traditional training combining 4 hours live firefighting exercises, 4 hours simulator-based scenarios, and 4 hours classroom instruction reflecting standard STIP Jakarta curriculum, with both groups receiving identical pre-training preparation materials and post-training assessment procedures ensuring experimental equivalence except for core training methodology manipulation.

Phase four conducted comprehensive learning outcome assessment beginning with cognitive knowledge examination administered immediately post-training measuring emergency procedure retention, equipment knowledge, and regulatory understanding through 50-item multiple choice tests scored automatically with reliability analysis demonstrating Cronbach's alpha 0.87 indicating good internal consistency, followed by practical skill assessments conducted 1-week post-training where certified assessors blind to experimental condition scored students' physical performance on breathing apparatus donning speed, fire extinguisher operation proficiency, and team emergency coordination effectiveness using standardized rubrics with inter-rater reliability established through dual assessment of 20% of students achieving Cohen's kappa 0.82 indicating substantial agreement, culminating in learning transfer evaluation where all students attempted identical live firefighting exercise in actual training facility 3-weeks post-training enabling assessment of whether AR versus traditional training better prepares students for hands-on emergency response under realistic conditions [13].

Phase five executed comprehensive stakeholder evaluation through maritime safety instructor interviews conducted after instructors observed both AR-trained and traditionally-trained students' practical assessment performance enabling comparative judgments, emergency response trainer focus groups convened following live exercise observations where trainers witnessed both groups' hands-on proficiency, and student surveys/focus groups collected immediately after practical assessments when learning experiences remained fresh and students could compare AR versus traditional training preparation adequacy, with all qualitative data systematically transcribed, coded, and analyzed for thematic patterns [14].

Data analysis employed triple-track methodology integrating AR system technical performance evaluation, rigorous statistical hypothesis testing for experimental learning outcome comparison, and systematic qualitative thematic analysis. AR system performance metrics calculated technical indicators including average frame rate (57 fps exceeding 30 fps minimum for smooth user experience), tracking accuracy (spatial drift <2cm over 30-minute sessions maintaining scenario registration with physical environment), multi-user latency (67ms average synchronization delay enabling real-time team coordination), and system reliability (98.7% successful session completion rate with 1.3% crashes or connection failures).

Learning outcome statistical analysis employed independent samples t-tests comparing AR experimental group versus traditional control group means across cognitive knowledge examination scores, practical skill assessment scores (breathing apparatus donning time, extinguisher operation proficiency, team coordination effectiveness), confidence ratings, and live exercise transfer performance, with effect sizes calculated using Cohen's d quantifying magnitude of differences beyond statistical significance, and multiple comparison corrections using Bonferroni adjustment controlling family-wise error rate when conducting multiple hypothesis tests across various outcome measures. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) examined whether training effectiveness varied across student subgroups defined by program specialization (navigation versus engineering), prior emergency experience levels (none, limited, moderate), or technology familiarity (low, medium, high digital literacy), testing for interaction effects between training methodology and student characteristics.

Thematic analysis of qualitative data proceeded through systematic multi-stage coding processes beginning with initial open coding where two independent researchers reviewed interview transcripts, focus group recordings, and survey narratives identifying emergent themes without predetermined categories, generating initial codebooks achieving inter-coder reliability Cohen's kappa 0.81 indicating substantial agreement, followed by axial coding organizing themes into hierarchical structures spanning pedagogical effectiveness dimensions, technology acceptance factors, and implementation consideration categories, cross-group comparative analysis examining theme consistency across instructor, trainer, and student perspectives, and narrative synthesis integrating qualitative findings with quantitative outcome statistics developing comprehensive interpretations connecting stakeholder perspectives to measured learning effectiveness [15].

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results and Analysis

The augmented reality emergency response training system demonstrated substantial effectiveness across technical performance metrics, learning outcome indicators, and cost-efficiency measures during 8-month pilot implementation with 180 students at STIP Jakarta. Comprehensive evaluation encompassing controlled experimental comparison, practical skill assessments, learning transfer evaluation, and multi-stakeholder qualitative feedback revealed equivalent learning outcomes to traditional training while achieving dramatic cost reductions, throughput increases, and scenario variety expansion, validating AR as viable alternative to expensive live training exercises for maritime emergency response education.

The Microsoft HoloLens 2-based AR platform achieved strong technical performance validating architecture design decisions. Average frame rate maintained 57 fps during emergency scenarios involving complex particle effects for fire/smoke/water simulation, dynamic lighting, and multiple simultaneous users, exceeding 30 fps minimum threshold for comfortable immersive experiences and preventing motion sickness affecting 4.2% of users during pilot testing (8 of 190 total participants including 180 students plus 10 instructor/trainer testers) comparable to 3-5% baseline motion sickness rates documented in AR/VR literature. Spatial tracking accuracy measured through regular calibration tests demonstrated <2cm drift over 30-minute training sessions maintaining accurate registration of digital scenario elements with physical training facility geometry essential for realistic equipment interaction and spatial navigation. Multi-user synchronization latency averaged 67ms enabling real-time team coordination where multiple trainees see synchronized scenario state and each other's positions/actions without disruptive delays, adequate for coordinated emergency responses though not achieving <20ms thresholds required for competitive gaming applications. System reliability reached 98.7% successful session completion rate with only 13 system failures across 1,003 total training sessions (180 students × 6 sessions = 1,080 planned sessions, 77 student absences, 1,003 completed, 13 crashes) attributable to network disruptions (7 incidents), HoloLens battery depletion (4 incidents), and software bugs (2 incidents) subsequently resolved through network infrastructure upgrades and software patches.

Table 1: Augmented Reality System Technical Performance

AR System Performance Metric	Measurement	Threshold	Assessment
Average Frame Rate	57 fps	>30 fps minimum	Excellent performance
Spatial Tracking Accuracy	<2cm drift per 30 minutes	<5cm acceptable	Excellent precision
Multi-User Synchronization Latency	67ms average	<100ms target	Good coordination capability
System Reliability (Session Completion)	98.7% (1,003/1,003 attempted)	>95% target	Excellent stability
Motion Sickness Incidence	4.2% (8/190 participants)	<5% acceptable	Within normal range
User Satisfaction (Technology)	8.1/10.0 average	>7.0 target	Strong acceptance

Learning outcome experimental comparison revealed equivalent cognitive and psychomotor skill development between AR training (experimental group, n=90) and traditional training (control group, n=90) across all measured dimensions, validating AR training's pedagogical effectiveness while offering substantial cost and scalability advantages. Cognitive knowledge examination scores averaged 82.4/100 (SD=11.2) for AR group versus 83.1/100 (SD=10.8) for traditional group, with independent samples t-test revealing no statistically significant difference (t(178)=0.43, p=0.67, Cohen's d=0.06 negligible effect size), confirming equivalent emergency procedure knowledge retention regardless of training methodology. Practical skill assessment comparing breathing apparatus donning time, fire extinguisher operation proficiency, and team coordination effectiveness demonstrated nearly identical performance with AR group averaging 83.7/100 composite score (SD=12.4) versus traditional group 84.2/100 (SD=11.9), again showing no significant difference (t(178)=0.28, p=0.78, d=0.04 negligible effect), indicating AR training develops hands-on skills equivalently to traditional methods despite digital rather than physical fire exposure during training.

Confidence self-ratings revealed interesting pattern where AR group initially reported slightly lower confidence immediately post-training (7.8/10.0 versus 8.3/10.0 for traditional, p=0.04 marginally significant) potentially reflecting awareness of digital versus physical training distinction, however following live transfer exercise where both groups attempted identical hands-on firefighting drill, confidence levels converged (8.5/10.0 AR versus 8.7/10.0 traditional, p=0.52 not significant) as AR-trained students recognized their physical skill competency matched traditionally-trained peers, suggesting confidence develops through successful performance demonstration rather than training methodology alone.

Most critically, learning transfer evaluation where all students attempted identical live firefighting exercise 3 weeks post-training demonstrated equivalent hands-on performance with AR-trained students achieving 81.3/100 average score (SD=13.6) versus traditionally-trained students 82.7/100 (SD=12.8) on assessor ratings of fire approach technique, extinguisher application effectiveness, safety protocol adherence, and emergency communication quality, with no statistically significant difference (t(178)=0.71, p=0.48, d=0.11 negligible effect), providing compelling evidence that AR training successfully transfers to physical skill application in authentic emergency response contexts despite lack of actual fire/smoke exposure during training, addressing primary concern about whether digital training adequately prepares students for real-world equipment operation and physiological stress.

Table 2: Experimental Learning Outcome Comparison (NS = Not Significant, Sig. = Significant)

Learning Outcome Measure	AR Training Group (n=90)	Traditional Training (n=90)	Statistical Comparison
Cognitive Knowledge Exam (/100)	82.4 (SD=11.2)	83.1 (SD=10.8)	t(178)=0.43, p=0.67, d=0.06 (NS)
Practical Skills Assessment (/100)	83.7 (SD=12.4)	84.2 (SD=11.9)	t(178)=0.28, p=0.78, d=0.04 (NS)
Confidence (Post-Training, /10)	7.8 (SD=1.4)	8.3 (SD=1.2)	t(178)=2.56, p=0.04, d=0.38 (Sig.)
Confidence (Post-Live Exercise, /10)	8.5 (SD=1.1)	8.7 (SD=1.0)	t(178)=0.64, p=0.52, d=0.19 (NS)
Live Exercise Transfer (/100)	81.3 (SD=13.6)	82.7 (SD=12.8)	t(178)=0.71, p=0.48, d=0.11 (NS)
Overall Pass Rate (>70 threshold)	91% (82/90 students)	93% (84/90 students)	$\chi^2(1)$=0.31, p=0.58 (NS)

Subgroup analysis examining whether AR training effectiveness varied across student characteristics found no significant interactions between training methodology and program specialization (navigation versus engineering students showed equivalent AR training benefits, F(1,176)=0.82, p=0.37), prior emergency experience levels (students with none, limited, or moderate prior experience all demonstrated equivalent learning from AR versus traditional training, F(2,174)=1.34, p=0.26), or technology familiarity levels (students with low, medium, or high digital literacy showed similar AR training outcomes, F(2,174)=0.91, p=0.40), indicating AR training effectiveness generalizes across diverse student populations rather than benefiting only technologically-sophisticated or previously-experienced subgroups, important finding supporting universal AR training deployment rather than selective application for particular student demographics.

Cost-effectiveness analysis revealed dramatic advantages favoring AR training. Direct cost per student decreased 97% from $1,500 for traditional training (combining $880 live firefighting exercise costs for fuel, consumables, facility restoration, safety supervision across 12 students per session = $73/student live training + $420 simulator time + $600 instructor time + $407 facility/equipment depreciation) to $47 for AR training ($23 HoloLens device depreciation over 5-year expected life, $12 software licensing and maintenance, $8 instructor facilitation time given 16 students per AR session versus 12 per traditional session, $4 facility costs), generating $1,453 savings per student representing $261,540 total savings for 180 pilot cohort and projected $5,099,400 annual savings for 3,500 STIP Jakarta students requiring safety training.

Scenario variety expansion represented additional qualitative benefit difficult to quantify financially but highly valued by instructors and students, with AR training enabling exposure to 17 distinct emergency scenarios (5 baseline scenarios × 3 complexity variations + 2 combined-casualty scenarios) versus 5 scenarios typically experienced in traditional training limited by physical facility configurations, safety considerations restricting certain emergency types, and resource constraints preventing scenario repetition, providing students substantially broader emergency response preparation without additional cost or safety risk, particularly valuable for rarely-encountered but high-consequence emergencies like toxic gas releases or combined fire-flooding casualties impractical to reproduce in live training but readily simulated in AR.

Student throughput improvements enabled by AR scalability reached 450% increase, with traditional training serving 480 students annually through 40 sessions × 12 students per session = 480 annual capacity limited by firefighting ground availability, safety supervision requirements, and instructor scheduling, while AR training capacity reached 2,160 students annually through 135 sessions × 16 students per session enabled by HoloLens inventory supporting 16 simultaneous users and flexible scheduling in any suitable physical space rather than specialized firefighting facility, critical scalability advantage for addressing STIP Jakarta's enrollment growth targets doubling student population from 3,500 to 7,000 by 2030 requiring proportional safety training capacity expansion.

Table 3: Cost-Effectiveness and Scalability Comparison

Cost-Effectiveness Indicator	Traditional Training	AR Training	Improvement
Direct Cost per Student	$1,500	$47	97% reduction ($1,453 savings)
Annual Training Budget (3,500 students)	$5,250,000	$164,500	$5,085,500 annual savings
Emergency Scenarios Accessible	5 standard scenarios	17 diverse scenarios	240% expansion
Annual Student Throughput Capacity	480 students	2,160 students	450% increase
Training Hours per Student	12 hours (fixed)	12-36 hours (flexible repetition)	Unlimited practice capability
Facility Scheduling Flexibility	Limited to firefighting ground availability	Any suitable physical space	Substantial constraint reduction

Comprehensive qualitative evaluation revealed strong endorsement balanced with implementation considerations. Maritime safety instructor perspectives (n=14) demonstrated 93% support (13 of 14 endorsing continued AR training usage, 1 preferring traditional methods exclusively). Six dominant themes emerged: Pedagogical Effectiveness Validation emerged as instructors' primary finding, with faculty confirming AR-trained students demonstrated equivalent knowledge and skill proficiency to traditionally-trained students during practical assessments, addressing initial skepticism about whether digital training could substitute physical fire exposure, with several instructors noting surprise that AR training achieved comparable outcomes given absence of actual heat, smoke, and physiological stress during training exercises, attributing effectiveness to scenario realism, repetition enabling practice beyond traditional training frequency, and immediate performance feedback supporting rapid skill refinement.

Scenario Variety Appreciation constituted second theme, with instructors enthusiastically endorsing 17 AR scenario variety versus 5 traditional scenarios enabling exposure to diverse emergency types including rarely-encountered situations like toxic gas releases, electrical fires, or combined casualties impractical to reproduce safely in physical training but readily created in AR, noting particular value for preparing students for unpredictable real-world emergencies where responders cannot predict specific situations they'll encounter, requiring broad competency across emergency types rather than narrow proficiency in limited scenarios, with AR providing comprehensive preparation previously impossible within resource and safety constraints.

Repetition and Deliberate Practice represented third priority, with instructors valuing AR's unlimited repeatability enabling students to practice identical scenarios multiple times refining techniques, correcting mistakes, and building muscle memory versus traditional training's limited repetition due to cost and logistic constraints typically providing single exposure to each scenario type, noting that deliberate practice with iterative refinement represents established learning principle from expertise development research rarely achievable in traditional maritime safety training but readily implemented through AR enabling students to progress from novice to proficient performance through repeated practice cycles.

Performance Analytics Enhancement emerged fourth theme, with instructors appreciating AR system's automated performance tracking providing detailed metrics including response time breakdowns for each procedural step, equipment selection accuracy, safety protocol adherence, and team coordination quality quantified through objective measurements versus subjective instructor observations during traditional training limited by human attention capacity and memory constraints preventing comprehensive student performance documentation, enabling data-driven instructional feedback identifying specific improvement areas and progress tracking across training sessions demonstrating learning trajectories.

Confidence Development Concerns constituted initial concern subsequently resolved, with 9 of 14 instructors initially worried that AR training's digital nature might produce overconfident students unprepared for actual emergency stress, however following live transfer exercise observations where AR-trained students performed equivalently to traditionally-trained peers, instructors' confidence concerns dissipated, noting students developed realistic self-assessment through AR scenario challenges and recognized transfer applicability through successful live exercise performance, with some instructors suggesting hybrid approach combining AR training for breadth of scenario exposure with limited live training for psychological preparation and confidence validation providing optimal preparation balancing cost efficiency with authentic experience.

STCW Compliance Confidence formed final theme, with instructors split regarding regulatory acceptability of AR training substituting for live exercises mandated by STCW requirements specifying "practical instruction and experience," with 8 of 14 instructors confident that demonstrated equivalent learning outcomes justify AR training's STCW compliance, while 6 instructors concerned that regulatory authorities might require traditional live training regardless of educational effectiveness, recommending institutional engagement with Ministry of Transportation and IMO technical committees to establish formal AR training acceptance for STCW compliance pending regulatory clarification, noting that pioneering institutions like STIP Jakarta could provide evidence supporting regulatory modernization recognizing technology-enhanced training equivalence.

Representative instructor assessment: *"Initial skepticism dissolved watching AR-trained students perform identically to traditionally-trained students during live firefighting exercise—their equipment operation, fire approach, extinguisher technique, and team coordination showed no deficiencies despite never experiencing actual fire during training. AR's 17 scenario variety versus our traditional 5 provides substantially broader emergency preparation, while unlimited practice repetition enables skill refinement impossible with expensive live training. Confident AR training meets educational objectives, though regulatory acceptance remains uncertain requiring Ministry clarification."* [Instructor 8]

Emergency response trainer perspectives (n=8) provided operational validation with 88% support (7 of 8 endorsing AR training integration). Five major themes emerged: Physical Skill Transfer Confirmation emerged primary, with trainers observing AR-trained students demonstrated competent hands-on equipment operation during live exercises including proper breathing apparatus donning techniques, fire extinguisher handling and operation, hose deployment and maneuvering, and safety protocol execution without requiring additional remedial instruction beyond typically provided to traditionally-trained students, validating AR training's psychomotor skill development capability despite digital training environment.

Safety Awareness Adequacy constituted second theme, with trainers noting AR-trained students exhibited appropriate safety consciousness during live exercises including situational awareness of physical hazards, proper protective equipment usage, team communication maintaining coordination, and emergency egress route identification, indicating AR training successfully develops safety mindset and hazard recognition rather than creating complacency or false confidence in digital training's protective environment.

Efficiency Advantages Recognition represented third priority, with trainers appreciating AR training's throughput improvements enabling more students to receive high-fidelity emergency training without corresponding increases in firefighting ground usage, consumable costs, or trainer supervision workload, freeing limited live training facility capacity for final validation exercises and specialized scenarios requiring physical experience while AR handles majority of repetitive practice training.

Facility Integration Logistics emerged fourth theme, with trainers identifying optimal hybrid approach where AR training provides initial skill development and scenario variety exposure, followed by limited live exercises for confidence validation and psychological preparation creating cost-effective blended training model maximizing both technologies' advantages while minimizing respective limitations, recommending 10-12 hours AR training followed by 2-3 hours live training providing comprehensive preparation at fraction of traditional full-live-training costs.

Technology Sustainability Concerns formed final theme, with trainers questioning long-term AR system maintenance requirements including HoloLens hardware refresh cycles (expected 5-year device lifespan), software updates maintaining compatibility with evolving operating systems and Unity engine versions, technical support for troubleshooting system issues beyond trainers' expertise, and content updates incorporating new emergency response procedures or equipment as industry practices evolve, recommending dedicated technical staff or vendor service contracts ensuring reliable ongoing operation beyond pilot phase potentially dependent on researcher support.

Student perspectives (n=24 focus groups, plus n=180 survey responses) revealed strong acceptance with 89% positive assessment (160 of 180 survey respondents rating AR training effectiveness ≥7/10). Six dominant themes emerged: Engagement and Motivation Enhancement emerged as students' primary appreciation, with AR training's immersive scenario realism, game-like challenges, and immediate feedback creating engaging learning experiences perceived as more interesting and memorable than classroom lectures or repetitive traditional drills, with several students noting AR training motivated diligent practice and skill refinement versus passive compliance during mandatory traditional training.

Confidence Development Through Repetition constituted second theme, with students valuing unlimited AR scenario practice enabling them to progress from initial confusion to confident proficiency through repeated attempts correcting mistakes and refining techniques impossible in traditional training's single-exposure scenarios, noting that confidence in live exercise performance stemmed from extensive AR practice developing procedural automaticity where emergency responses became instinctive rather than requiring conscious recall under stress.

Scenario Diversity Appreciation represented third priority, with students recognizing value of 17 AR scenario variety providing exposure to diverse emergency types preparing them for unpredictable real-world situations versus traditional training's limited scenarios potentially leaving knowledge gaps in untrained emergency types, expressing greater readiness for shipboard responsibilities given comprehensive AR training coverage.

Technology Usability Challenges emerged as implementation barrier, with 31% of students (56 of 180) initially struggling with HoloLens gesture controls, spatial interaction concepts, or head-mounted display comfort requiring additional orientation and practice before proficient AR system usage, though 94% of initially-challenged students (53 of 56) achieved comfortable proficiency by second or third training session indicating learning curve rather than persistent usability barrier, with remaining 3 students experiencing persistent motion sickness preventing continued AR training requiring accommodation through traditional training access.

Physical Realism Limitations constituted acknowledged weakness, with students recognizing AR training lacked actual heat exposure, smoke inhalation, breathing apparatus breathing resistance, and equipment weight typical of live training, creating initial concern about whether AR preparation would prove adequate, however following successful live exercise performance where students found physical challenges manageable given AR-developed procedural knowledge and mental preparation, concerns diminished with 87% of students (156 of 180) concluding AR training provided adequate preparation balanced against cost and safety advantages.

Future Career Preparation formed final theme, with students viewing AR training exposure as valuable professional development introducing contemporary training technologies they might encounter in progressive shipping companies adopting immersive training systems, plus demonstrating STIP Jakarta's commitment to modern maritime education enhancing institutional reputation potentially improving employment prospects, with some students suggesting AR training experience as resume highlight distinguishing them from graduates of institutions using only traditional training methods.

Notable student reflection: *"Initially skeptical whether AR 'video game' training could prepare us for real emergencies, but unlimited practice repetition developed confident procedural knowledge and muscle memory. Successfully completing live firefighting exercise proved AR training's effectiveness—felt fully prepared for physical challenges given extensive AR practice establishing automatic responses. Appreciated exposure to 17 diverse emergency scenarios providing comprehensive preparation versus traditional training's limited variety, plus AR training demonstrated STIP Jakarta's modern approach to maritime education."* [Student 14, Navigation Officer Program]

3.2 Discussion

The research findings comprehensively address the original research questions while revealing implementation insights with broader implications for augmented reality adoption in vocational safety training and maritime emergency response education. The demonstrated equivalent learning outcomes between AR training and traditional methods across cognitive knowledge (82.4 versus 83.1, $p=0.67$), practical skills (83.7 versus 84.2, $p=0.78$), and learning transfer to live exercises (81.3 versus 82.7, $p=0.48$) provides compelling empirical evidence that augmented reality effectively develops emergency response competencies without actual hazard exposure, contradicting traditional assumptions that physical fire/smoke/heat experience proves essential for skill development, instead validating scenario-based learning through realistic digital simulation combined with physical environment navigation and equipment manipulation [11].

The 97% cost reduction ($1,500 to $47 per student) combined with 450% throughput increase (480 to 2,160 annual student capacity) demonstrates AR training's transformative potential for addressing maritime education's persistent emergency training scalability challenges, enabling universal high-fidelity training access previously impossible within resource constraints limiting expensive live exercises to small elite cohorts, supporting national workforce development objectives requiring doubled maritime officer production from current levels while maintaining rigorous safety training standards essential for professional competency and industry safety culture [12].

The 240% scenario variety expansion (5 to 17 accessible emergency scenarios) addresses critical training breadth limitation where traditional methods' physical and safety constraints prevent comprehensive emergency type coverage, potentially leaving graduates unprepared for rarely-encountered but high-consequence situations like toxic gas releases or combined casualties, with AR enabling exposure to full emergency response spectrum preparing graduates for unpredictable real-world situations characteristic of maritime operations where responders cannot predict specific emergencies they'll face, requiring broad adaptable competency rather than narrow proficiency in limited predictable scenarios [13].

However, stakeholder-identified implementation considerations including 31% initial technology usability challenges requiring enhanced orientation training, 4.2% motion sickness affecting small user subset requiring alternative training accommodation, regulatory acceptance uncertainty regarding STCW compliance interpretation requiring Ministry of Transportation and IMO clarification, and sustainability requirements including 5-year hardware refresh cycles, ongoing software maintenance, and technical support capacity development, highlight that technical pedagogical effectiveness alone proves insufficient for sustainable AR training deployment without corresponding investments in user training infrastructure, regulatory advocacy, technology support capacity, and organizational change management addressing instructor role evolution from content deliverers to learning facilitators and student mindset shifts from passive instruction recipients to active self-directed learners [14].

The finding that AR training initially produced slightly lower confidence ratings (7.8 versus 8.3 post-training, p=0.04) but equivalent confidence following successful live exercise performance (8.5 versus 8.7, p=0.52) suggests confidence develops through demonstrated competency rather than training methodology alone, indicating optimal approach combines AR training for skill development breadth with limited live training for confidence validation through successful physical performance, creating cost-effective hybrid models maximizing both technologies' advantages while addressing respective limitations, potentially providing superior preparation compared to either methodology alone through complementary strengths integration [15].

The observed equivalent AR training effectiveness across diverse student subgroups including navigation versus engineering specializations, varied prior emergency experience levels, and different technology familiarity levels demonstrates AR's broad applicability rather than selective benefit for particular demographics, important finding supporting universal deployment rather than targeted application for technologically-sophisticated or previously-experienced students, though implementation should provide enhanced orientation support for technology-unfamiliar populations ensuring equitable access and success for all students regardless of prior digital literacy or immersive technology exposure [16].

4. Conclusion

This research successfully designed, implemented, and validated augmented reality emergency response training systems achieving equivalent learning outcomes to traditional live training across cognitive knowledge (82.4 versus 83.1, p=0.67), practical skills (83.7 versus 84.2, p=0.78), and learning transfer to physical exercises (81.3 versus 82.7, p=0.48) while achieving 97% cost reduction from $1,500 to $47 per student, 450% throughput increase from 480 to 2,160 annual student capacity, and 240% scenario variety expansion from 5 to 17 accessible emergency types, demonstrating AR training's effectiveness addressing maritime education's persistent emergency training challenges of cost, scalability, and comprehensiveness. Comprehensive stakeholder validation across maritime safety instructors, emergency response trainers, and students revealed 89-93% endorsement coupled with implementation considerations including technology usability learning curves, regulatory acceptance uncertainty requiring STCW compliance clarification, and sustainability requirements for long-term operation beyond pilot phases. The Microsoft HoloLens 2-based platform successfully delivered 1,003 training sessions serving 180 students across 8-month pilot demonstrating technical reliability (98.7% session completion), pedagogical effectiveness (equivalent outcomes to traditional training), and cost efficiency ($5.1 million projected annual savings for 3,500 student population), contributing validated AR architectures, training scenario designs, experimental evaluation methodologies, and empirical evidence supporting immersive technology adoption in maritime safety education addressing Indonesia's workforce development imperatives requiring doubled maritime officer production while maintaining rigorous STCW competency standards essential for maritime industry safety culture and accident prevention critical to blue economy sustainability and seafarer welfare protection.

REFERENCES

[1] International Maritime Organization, *STCW Convention Including 2010 Manila Amendments*. London, UK: IMO Publishing, 2017.
[2] A. Manuel and T. Baumler, "Digital transformation in maritime education and training: Challenges and opportunities," *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, vol. 19, pp. 495-513, 2020.
[3] M. B. Simanjuntak, T. Handayani, and S. Soejatminah, "Effectiveness of maritime safety training methods," *Journal of Maritime Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 45-62, 2023.
[4] STIP Jakarta, *Safety Training Facility Assessment Report 2024*. Jakarta: STIP Jakarta, 2024.
[5] Ministry of Transportation Republic of Indonesia, *Maritime Education Development Strategic Plan 2020-2030*. Jakarta: Directorate General of Sea Transportation, 2020.
[6] K. Christensen, G. Nugues, and N. R. Hansen, "Safety culture in maritime industry," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Human Factors in Ship Design*, London, UK, 2018, pp. 45-56.
[7] R. T. Azuma, "A survey of augmented reality," *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 355-385, 1997.
[8] A. R. Hevner, S. T. March, J. Park, and S. Ram, "Design science in information systems research," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 75-105, 2004.
[9] M. Billinghurst, A. Clark, and G. Lee, "A survey of augmented reality," *Foundations and Trends in Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 8, no. 2-3, pp. 73-272, 2015.
[10] J. W. Creswell and V. L. Plano Clark, *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2018.

e- ISSN 3063-4156 | p-ISSN 3063-4172

[11] P. Milgram and F. Kishino, "A taxonomy of mixed reality visual displays," *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, vol. E77-D, no. 12, pp. 1321-1329, 1994.
[12] D. Gašević, S. Dawson, and G. Siemens, "Let's not forget: Learning analytics are about learning," *TechTrends*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 64-71, 2015.
[13] J. Bacca et al., "Augmented reality trends in education: A systematic review," *Educational Technology & Society*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 133-149, 2014.
[14] M. Akçayır and G. Akçayır, "Advantages and challenges associated with augmented reality for education," *Educational Research Review*, vol. 20, pp. 1-11, 2017.
[15] R. S. Baker and P. S. Inventado, "Educational data mining and learning analytics," in *Learning Analytics*, J. A. Larusson and B. White, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 61-75.
[16] C. Dede, "Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning," *Science*, vol. 323, no. 5910, pp. 66-69, 2009.