*Article*

**AUGMENTED REALITY IN HERITAGE APPS. CURRENT TRENDS IN EUROPE**

**Ursula Luna1, Pilar Rivero2 and Naiara Vicent1,\***

1 University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU (Spain); ursula.luna@ehu.com; naiara.vicent@ehu.com

2 University of Zaragoza (Spain); privero@unizar.es

**\*** Contact: privero@unizar.es

Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

**Abstract:** Although AR has come to play an increasingly important role in a wide range of areas, its use remains rather limited in the realm of heritage education. This paper sets out to analyze which heritage-related apps can be found in Europe that partly or wholly use AR as a tool to help users learn about different types of heritage. This study is divided into three parts: Phase 1 consists of the search for and inventorying of apps; in phase 2, apps are sorted and evaluated to produce a study sample; in phase 3, we carry out a statistical-descriptive analysis focused on three variables: description of the apps, type of heritage addressed and the use of AR. Our study has only identified a limited number of such apps and we use this sample both to paint a portrait of the current state of the question and also to highlight certain observable trends. The results show that most such apps use AR to reconstruct spaces and buildings and, to a lesser extent, objects. Many of these apps use an academic mode of communication to provide a temporal perspective of monumental and (mainly) historical heritage. The paper also outlines future lines of research dedicated to finding more apps that could be used to increase the current sample size. This would allow for a more comprehensive assessment of such apps from an educational point of view. Several case studies are proffered in order to highlight the keys to successful use of AR in heritage apps.

**Keywords:** Augmented Reality; heritage; mobile learning; mobile applications.

**1. Introduction**

At the turn of the century when Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) had already acquired great importance in most sectors of society, the first proposals for their use in educational and heritage contexts began to appear. The spread of Internet access and mobile devices, such as tablets and smartphones, resulted in these new technologies being democratized. Indeed, this led to the development of tools that provided the general public with previously unprecedented access to information, with mobile applications (hence forth simply ‘apps’) being the most widespread manifestation of this trend. Today, the educational potential of these types of devices and programs is no longer debatable [1], since their use in both formal and non-formal educational settings has become an undeniable fact. Mobile learning and e-learning have made it possible to adapt content to every type of user, by improving pedagogical processes and allowing for a type of learning which is social and collaborative and in which communication is multilateral and horizontal [2].

Expanding beyond their original use in industry during the nineteen-nineties [3], more complex elements, such as VR, AR and variations on these, have been taken up more widely for a variety of uses over the past decade. The spread of these tools in recent decades has led to an abundance of research and publications on the potential of AR [4]. Nonetheless, as other authors have pointed out [5], there have been relatively few studies addressing the use of AR in education: there is not only a widespread lack of theoretical reflection on the issue [6] but also a belated application of this new technology in education when compared to its use in other fields [7]. In fact, only a 2016 study from Spain has really begun to delve into the issue, by showing that only 12.6% of analyzed apps with heritage content made use of AR [8].

Accordingly, this is an important fledgling field of study in which work must continue to be done, especially given the advantages that various virtual tools can offer in the area of education and heritage [9]. So, the main purpose of this exploratory study is to address the current state of European heritage education apps that make use of AR. As far as we are aware, this is the first Europe-wide study on this topic and it will include a brief examination of applications for mobile devices that are currently on available, with a description of their main features and the use that they make of AR for heritage purposes. The specific objectives of this study are:

1. To find and inventory heritage-related open-access apps of European origin that use AR.

2. To carry out a statistical-descriptive analysis of these apps in order to outline their main characteristics.

3. To identify predominant trends in how the identified heritage apps make use of AR.

**2. Heritage education, apps and Augmented Reality**

The spread of mobile devices, such as tablets and smartphones, and improvements to Internet access have prompted changes in not only how we research and conserve heritage but also how we share and teach it [8]. Indeed, Museums have led the way in experimenting with ways that these new technologies can be used as educational tools, while also touting these innovations as part of their strategy to the democratize culture [10] [11]. Accordingly, we can see the shift from the use of the traditional audio guides to PDAs [12], and then finally to apps that are developed for mobile devices. The fruitfulness of all these devices for education has been widely documented over recent decades [13] [14], and so has their unsurpassed usefulness in heritage teaching-learning processes.

The growing use of mobile devices for all sorts of tasks has led to a boom in the app-development industry. This type of software allows people to not only access important information but also to communicate in new ways with other social agents [15]. However, the dearth of research and critical evaluation of the use of heritage-related apps in education—including important questions like whether or not they incorporate any kind of virtuality—must be stressed [8] [16]. Moreover, the studies that have been conducted tend to focus excessively on technical aspects [12] or are aimed at tourism [9] [17]. There are few proposals for the integration of these heritage resources into the sphere of formal educational apart from some trials [18]. This strongly contrasts with what has occurred in other types of technology, which have been applied in school contexts [19] [20], both at basic educational levels and in the training of future teachers [21] [22].

There are, however, some hotbeds of activity in Spain [8] [15] [18] [23] and the United Kingdom [11] [24] [25], where interesting in-depth studies have been conducted on the evaluation of heritage apps. These show that for the main part apps are developed by organizations such as museums and archeological sites, where the advantages that mobile devices offer visitors can easily be exploited [25] [26]. In the case of Spain, the government has been the main driver in this type of app development, followed by public museums and then foundations and associations [8]. A growing number of educational partnerships have flourished between private companies, public administrations and formal educational establishments, among others [27]. These applications vary considerably: some offer an route to follow in a museum or heritage space, outdoor routes, quizzes and even more complex gamification approaches, whereas others simply provide information about heritage assets, whether in the form of texts, videos or other resources [15]. Data collected in Spain show the prominence of apps that suggest a planned visit, while those that give information about specific heritage features come in a distant second place [8]. Another study of museum apps from around the globe shows that they are mainly used to provide guided tours for exhibitions and furnish practical information about visits [11].

Of all the uses and tools that apps offer, various types of virtualization have had the greatest impact, and of those AR stands out most of all. Devices’ greatly enhanced abilities, 3D sensor equipment and graphics technologies enable AR to be used easily and comfortably, thereby facilitating them to reach a wider market [30].


If we turn to the use of this tool in educational contexts, previous studies have demonstrated how AR has enabled students to better understand reality, observe elements from a variety of points of view and create scenarios that facilitate simulation or the contextualization of information, to name just a few benefits [6] [27]; however, it is also true that the most recent studies often find notable contradictions in the advantages that AR has to offer education [5].

With respect to the use of AR in heritage contexts, useful studies have hailed from Spain [30], Italy [17] [29], Greece [31] [32], the Czech Republic [33], Taiwan [26] [34], Korea [35] [36] and Malaysia [37]. It should not be forgotten that many of these initiatives resulted from the first AR and VR projects funded by the European Union at the beginning of the 2000s, such as Lifeplus [38], Archeoguide [39], Itacitus [17] and Ancient Pompeii [37] [38].

Recent research shows that these tools can lead to visitors better understanding cultural heritage [35]. When used as a guide, they can offer content customization [8], which enables substantially more engagement and interaction with heritage than other tools provide [25] [29]. Similarly, visitors tend to find these tools to be more interesting, fun, and immersive [26]. There is no doubt that this is appealing, as is clearly demonstrated by previous research [40].

But AR has much more to offer: it can enable spaces, buildings, and monuments that no longer exist to be recreated [6] [9] [41]; it can allow for an object to be viewed in its entirety or in part without the possibility of an object suffering any damage [26] [31] [42]; it can provide a touristic route enhanced with superimposed information that elucidates places of interest [31] [43]; it can provide visitors with a virtual tour guide [31]; and it can even contain games in which AR superimposes actions on reality [25] [31]. Given these possibilities, one of the fields that can benefit the most from the use of mobile is archeology. Those working in this field already anticipated that VR and AR would play a prominent role in public outreach and education [3]. The possibility of recreating objects or spaces that no longer exist for visitors at sites or heritage-presentation areas was the driving motivation for taking up digital devices imbued with this type of technology.

Technology has progressively changed and advanced so as to enable access to AR, which can be activated in some apps by scanning QR codes or other user markers [7] [22] [33] (see Image 1), while in others this is done through activating GPS [22] [31]. Other devices such as Google Glasses [11] and other types of goggles have also been used for this purpose—though these run into greater limitations since they constitute yet another costly gadget that users must obtain.



**Image 1**. The app Arquitecture gotique/romane in action, which is accessed by scanning downloadable codes.

Finally, we must stress that currently it is quite difficult to make scientifically supported judgments about the use of apps and AR in heritage education. On the one hand, the rapid pace at which digital technology continues to develop leads to constant changes and novelties. This makes it rather difficult to carry out a long-term study on the topic; when such studies are conducted, they cannot be totally up-to-date [40]. In education, therefore, we find a series of major ongoing projects that are somewhat idiosyncratic and specific, because they are developed by private or local entities and do not form part of a broader action plan [18]. On the other hand, developing new software tools requires funding that in many cases is hard to come by, since such projects are very costly for many heritage institutions [16]. In other words, economic resources are a *sine qua non* for the development of a quality tool which are based on clear educational goals and which can be changed and improved following the analysis of results [18]. Furthermore, apps and AR also need to overcome technical difficulties, which is no small feat given that there are currently a wide variety of mobile devices with a range of screen sizes and processing powers. Such details often make it impossible to design apps that run on all devices and operating systems [29].

**3. Method**

In the quest to paint the landscape of open-access European heritage apps that use AR, we have conducted an exploratory study that has determined the main features of relevant apps. In so doing, we have performed a frequency analysis of the data collected for each of the apps based on statistical-descriptive research.

The research process was based on the SHEO (Spanish Heritage Education Observatory) method [44], which was created to analyze heritage education programs and will be explained momentarily. The process of adapting this method to the present study parallels that found in the work of Gillate, Vicent, Gómez-Redondo & Marín-Cepeda [45]. More specifically, in this study we have only carried out the first three phases proposed by the SHEO method, that is the phases devoted to the inventorying, selection, and analysis of AR apps. We have compiled a specific factsheet for the last of these phases, which was adapted to better suit the study and analysis of the sample.

*3.1. Phase 1. Finding and inventorying relevant apps*

The first phase was based around the search for European apps with heritage content that wholly or partially use AR. We only examined apps that could be downloaded, and we discarded any apps that either could only by used on specific a device provided by an institution or required some sort of accessory (whether bought or freely available). This phase of the project closely followed the methodology employed by Economou & Meintani [11] and Ibáñez-Etxeberria & Kortabitarte [8], which combines a bibliographic search on both specialized websites as well as the main mobile app distribution platforms.

The bibliographic search relied on the usual databases mentioned in research journals—ProQuest, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), SSCI and Dialnet—and additionally other reports on apps and mobile learning. A careful search was conducted in Google Play and the Apple Store in English, Spanish, French, Italian and German using combinations of “AR” and the words “heritage”, “museum”, “archeology”, “architecture”, and “art.” Searches were also conducted using the specific names of spaces or heritage assets mentioned in the bibliographic search and on specialized websites. It should also be mentioned that searching app platforms itself simultaneously led to the discovery of new apps that could be included in this study, thanks to the recommendations made by the platform based on the desired subject matter and also due to finding other products offered by certain developers.

This phase was fully carried out during February 2019 and produced the preliminary sample used in this study. All in all, 61 apps were found.

*3.2. Phase 2. Selection and final sample*

Phase 2 of this investigation involved identifying apps that should be weeded out from the sample.

To do so, we employed a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria adapted from the above-mentioned SHEO method (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the final sample.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inclusion criteria | Exclusion criteria |
| The app is for mobile devices | Technical error |
| Integrates AR use | Not available in the main stores or has disappeared |
| Addresses European heritage | Is a duplicate app |

The first criterion for excluding an app is the presence of a technical error or failure that prohibited the use of the app during the period of analysis. The second exclusion criterion, non-availability, means that it was not possible to download the app at the time that we were searching for and inventorying applications, either because it was no longer available in the stores or because it had been a pilot project and was no longer available on any app sales platform. In other words, the search of bibliographic databases or other sources often showed that some apps existed, but they were not available for use during the dates the study was conducted. As for the third exclusion criterion, an app was labeled a duplicate under two circumstances: first when it was produced by a developer that also offered a similar product with the only change being the use of different heritage object. Second, an app was considered a duplicate when the provider also offered different apps with the same content, but in different languages—for example, a museum app in English, German and Spanish.

As a result, first the inclusion criteria were applied in this phase to establish the initial or pre-sample and subsequently the exclusion criteria were applied (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Initial sample and reasons for exclusion used to determine the main sample

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | App name | Reason for exclusion | No. | App name | Reason for exclusion |
| 1 | 3D Çatal Höyük | 3 | **32** | L'Ara com'era AR cube |  |
| 2 | 3D NEOLITICKÁ NÁDOBA | 3 | **33** | Liguria Heritage AR |  |
| 3 | 3D NEOLITICKÝ HROB | 3 | **34** | Llegendes en familia | 2 |
| 4 | 3D NEOLITICKÝ RONDEL | 3 | **35** | London History AR |  |
| 5 | AGINCOURT 600 AR | 2 | **36** | Lorca Renace | 2 |
| 6 | Antonine Wall |  | **37** | Lunt Meadows AR Explorer |  |
| 7 | Apptaula |  | **38** | MACH 3D Museo Arqueológico Chelva |  |
| 8 | ARmuseum | 2 | **39** | Musei di Viggiano AR |  |
| 9 | Architecture gotique-romane |  | **40** | Museo Carlos V |  |
| 10 | Asturica Emerge |  | **41** | Museu FTPJ |  |
| 11 | Barcelona Modernisme |  | **42** | Museu Guarda |  |
| 12 | Caistor roman town AR |  | **43** | Neolit v Bylanech | 2 |
| 13 | Casa Batlló | 2 | **44** | OTE Museum AR |  |
| 14 | Casa Grotta VR AR |  | **45** | Porthkerry Country Park AR app | 2 |
| 15 | Castellones de Ceal RA |  | **46** | PUGLIAREALITY+ | 2 |
| 16 | Cástulo Virtual |  | **47** | Roma in tabula |  |
| 17 | Chevré 3D |  | **48** | Sorolla Museum AR |  |
| 18 | Città Ideale AR | 2 | **49** | Stonehenge Experience | 2 |
| 19 | Ciutadella Ibèrica Calafell |  | **50** | StreetMuseum | 2 |
| 20 | Conoce Irún |  | **51** | Suton Hoo | 2 |
| 21 | Der sprechende Kelte |  | **52** | Svijanský zámek AR | 3 |
| 22 | ENTER Mölndal Tulebosjön |  | **53** | Talking Ravenna | 1 |
| 23 | Fuendetodos |  | **54** | Temple Newsam AR |  |
| 24 | Geogaming Barcelona | 2 | **55** | Terrassa Augmentada | 2 |
| 25 | Glamorgan Heritage Coast AR |  | **56** | Timetraveler The Berlin Wall Augmented Lite |  |
| 26 | Guideo | 2 | **57** | UAR Urban Augmented Reality | 2 |
| 27 | HMS Caroline AR Experience | 2 | **58** | Urdaibai oka app |  |
| 28 | Imageen Tarraco |  | **59** | William Lindley AR |  |
| 29 | Inmersion1418 | 2 | **60** | Window On The World Augmented Reality |  |
| 30 | Italicaap | 2 | **61** | Zálezlice |  |
| 31 | La ruta del galeón | 2 |  |  |  |

Legend: 1= Technical error; 2= Not available; 3= Duplicate

This process (Table 2) produced the final sample of 35 apps from the 61 inventoried in Phase 1. This was the total number of applications obtained and then used during the analysis phase, on which the present exploratory study is based.

*3.3. Phase 3: Analysis*

We then devised an app-analysis tool for Phase 3, which was based on the factsheet created by the GIPyPAC group (Grupo de Investigación en Patrimonio y Paisajes Culturales –Heritage and Cultural Landscape Research Group), a research team that has for years studied and analyzed apps related to heritage education in Spain. This phase began with a comprehensive study of the categories and dimensions proposed by other authors [15]. We then added new categories and dimensions that were specifically useful for analyzing heritage apps. In this case, those relating to the use of AR were added, with the original factsheet adapted to better meet the specific needs of this research project.

We settled on three different dimensions and 15 variables in the factsheet for the descriptive study of the apps (Table 3) in order to identify current trends and future lines of research. We recorded observations in a template created using a spreadsheet, while the data were processed using the SPSS statistical analysis program.

The Description-Metadata dimension, which consists of 7 variables, and the heritage dimension (variables 8 through 11) were taken from the ARSMULEP project factsheet [15], which belongs to the previously mentioned research group GIPyPAC. The apps’ descriptive data are collected within the first dimension. V1 indicates the type of entity promoting the app. This can be a private company, the public administration, a museum/heritage presentation site, a university/other training center, a collective, a citizen association/privately-led project, or, finally, an entity resulting from collaboration between different public administrations. This same dimension indicates the country in which the app has been developed (V2), the year that it was launched (V3) and the year that it was last updated (V4) according to the information provided in the stores. Next, we include the operating systems with which the app is compatible (V5). As for the type of app (V6), apps are distinguished between those that suggest a route or a self-guided route through a heritage area or museum, those that show a heritage object or objects and, finally, apps that offer a game. Within this final category, we have introduced further distinctions between games, such as contests/quizzes, serious games, roleplaying games, simulation games and action/adventure games. Lastly, the audience at which apps are targeted is recorded in V7, which distinguishes between those that are aimed at the general public and those that are meant for a specific type of user.

The second dimension is related to heritage and analyzes heritage typology (V9), the perspective (V10) and the purpose of communication (V11), for which we have adopted the indicators proposed by the EDIPATRI (Education and Interpretation of Heritage) Research Group at the University of Huelva, Spain [46]. This research team works on heritage education and has established a set of criteria for analyzing educational programs dealing with heritage. The third dimension, which refers to the use and prominence given to AR in the app, is composed of 4 variables that had been previously set out in research on virtuality, heritage, and education. The types of use that can be made of AR (V12) are for reconstructing heritage objects or items, reconstructing buildings and monuments, recreating actions from the past such as crafts or customs, recreating spaces and, finally, recreating important people or fantasy objects who can be observed in AR and can provide specific explanations or act as guides during a tour as well as furnish additional information about a heritage space or element [9] [25] [41] [42]. With respect to activating AR, this can be done by scanning a QR or other type of code, by geolocation or by using accessories such as AR headsets [6] [7]. V14 addresses the technical requirements for AR use in the app. The applications that have to be used *in situ* are differentiated from those that can be used through downloaded codes or other methods of activating AR. Lastly, V15 indicates how much prominence is given to AR in the app. AR can be the sole or main tool, feature strongly or fairly strongly, or be a simple accessory in the application to which barely any prominence is given at all.

**Table 3**. Study object: Dimensions and variables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dimension | | Variables | |
| D1 | Descriptive | V1 | Type of entity promoting the app |
| V2 | Country |
| V3 | Year app was launched |
| V4 | Year of latest update |
| V5 | Operating system |
| V6 | Type of app |
| V7 | Target audience |
| D2 | Heritage | V8 | Heritage chronology |
| V9 | Typology of heritage referred to |
| V10 | Heritage perspective |
| V11 | Purpose of the heritage communication process |
| D3 | AR usability | V12 | Type of AR use |
| V13 | Method of AR activation |
| V14 | Technical requirements |
| V15 | Prominence given to AR in the app |

**3. Results**

The statistical-descriptive analysis has produced the following results based on the analyzed dimensions of the total sample.

*4.1. Descriptive dimension*

In the results for the descriptive dimension, we found that the most common type of entity (V1) for app development is museums, which were responsible for the creation of 42.9% of the sample (n=15). Museums are followed by private companies (n=7; 20.0%), and public administrations (n=5; 14.3%). Next, come the apps arising out of collaborations between different agents, such as between a university and a museum or the public administration and a museum (n=4; 11.4%), those created by a university or research group (n=3; 8.6%) and, finally, those developed by individuals (n=1; 2.9%).

With respect to the country in which the apps are developed (V2), a high percentage were found to hail from Spain with 37.1% (n=13), followed by the United Kingdom (n=7; 20.0%) and Italy (n=4; 11.4%). Other countries had produced less apps in the sample: France (n=3; 8.6%), Germany (n=2; 5.7%), Portugal (n=2; 5.7%), Austria (n=1; 2.9%), the Czech Republic (n=1; 2.9%), Greece (n=1; 2.9%) and Sweden (n=1; 2.9%).

When it comes to the year that the inventoried apps were created (V3), the same percentages have been found for 2018 (n=10; 28.6%) and 2015 (n=10; 28.6%), which are the highest values. The lowest values are for 2014 (n=3; 8.6%) and 2013 (n=1; 2.9%). If we observe the years when the apps were last updated (V4), the highest frequency can be found in 2018 (n=10; 28.6%), and this value progressively falls as you look further back in time. Thus, in 2017 there are eight apps updated (22.9%); in 2016, seven (20.0%); in 2015, four (11.4%) and then, in 2014, two (5.7%). Lastly, we found 4 apps that have been updated in the current year, 2019 (11.4%).

As far as the operating systems for which these apps are available (V5) are concerned, most apps are available for Android and iOS (n=19; 54.3%), while nine apps are only available for iOS devices (n=9; 25.7%) and seven exclusively for Android systems (n=7; 20.0%).

As for the types of apps inventoried (V6), a high percentage is tools for recommending a visit, either indoors or outdoors (n=27; 77.1%). To a lesser extent, there are apps that focus on a specific heritage object or element (n=6; 17.1%) and the rest are mainly aimed at providing specific information about a fact or event (n=2; 5.7%). To conclude the descriptive dimension, we found that all the apps (n=35; 100%) are targeted at the general public, with different levels of adaptation depending on the user (V7).

*4.2. Heritage dimension*

Moving on to the second dimension, heritage, we have collected an extremely wide range of data about the historical periods treated in these heritage apps (V8). The highest percentage of apps offers information about heritage in Antiquity (n=10; 28.6), followed by those that combine the heritage of different chronological stages (n=9; 25.7%). Third place is shared by Prehistory (n=5; 14.3%) and Contemporary Era apps (n=5; 14.3%), while in last place we find apps dealing with the Middle Ages (n=3; 8.6%) and the Early Modern Period (n=3; 8.6%).

An analysis of heritage typology (V9) shows that most applications are geared towards history (n=18; 51.4%), followed by heritage more broadly (n=7, 20%) and artistic heritage (n=7, 20.0%). To a lesser extent, we find ethnological heritage (n=4; 11.4%) and, in last place, natural heritage (n=1; 2.9%).

The aim of the heritage perspective variable (V10) is to determine the perspective that these apps take towards the heritage that they elucidate. The most common perspectives are temporal-historical (n=13; 37.1%) and monumental (n=8; 22.9%). To a lesser extent, we find a perspective geared towards diverse points of view (whether cultural or natural; n=5; 14.3%) and an aesthetic perspective (n=5; 14.3%) (Image 2). Lastly, there is a single case of a fetishist-exceptionalist perspective (n=1; 2.9%), which means that something is valued for being rare or unique.



**Image 2.** The Sorolla Museum’s use of AR. Source: Google Play

With respect to the type of communication (V11), nearly all apps are academic (n=33; 94.3%), i.e. they focus on conveying cultural facts and information. The purpose of conservation—which is, precisely, what drives ideas on the need to conserve the cultural artifacts of everyday life—takes a very distant second place (n=2; 5.7%).

*4.3. AR usability dimension*

With respect to the final dimension, which addresses the usability of AR in heritage apps, V12 (Table 4) shows that 65.7% of the apps wholly or partially include some type of reconstruction of heritage spaces, monuments or other places of interest (n=23; 65.7%), followed by apps that use AR to view objects (n=14; 40.0%) or to add written information about a physical object that the visitor can see on-site (n=10; 28.6%).

**Table 4.** Uses of AR in the app (V12)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use of AR | Frequency | | | Percentage | | |
| Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total |
| Object | 14 | 21 | 35 | 40.0% | 60.0% | 100% |
| Building/monument | 23 | 12 | 35 | 65.7% | 34.3% | 100% |
| Actions | 7 | 28 | 35 | 20.0% | 80.0% | 100% |
| Fantasy | 1 | 34 | 35 | 2.9% | 97.1% | 100% |
| Guide | 7 | 28 | 35 | 20.0% | 80.0% | 100% |
| Additional person | 4 | 31 | 35 | 11.4% | 88.6% | 100% |
| Written information | 10 | 25 | 35 | 28.6% | 71.4% | 100% |

V13 relates to how apps activate AR. In most cases, users activate AR by scanning a code (n=19; 54.3%). This is followed by apps in which AR can be used in conjunction with GPS (n=14; 40.0%). There is only a minimal use of QR codes (n=1; 2.9%); this is also the case with apps that only need to be downloaded and the device’s camera activated to view the heritage item (n=1; 2.9%).

The requirements for using the AR tool (V14) are, in most cases, being *in situ* (n=29; 82.9%) compared to 17.1% (n=6) of apps for which this is not a requirement. A small percentage of apps allow the tool to be used anywhere (n=5; 14.3%) by using codes provided by the developer, while only one of the apps (2.9%) allows for AR to be used by simply activating the mobile device’s camera.

With respect to the prominence or importance given to AR in the app (V15), the highest percentage corresponds to apps in which AR is the main and only tool (n=15; 45.7%), followed by a high prominence in proportion to other elements offered in the app (n=10; 28.6%). The percentage of apps that affords medium prominence to AR (n=4, 11.4%) is the same as for apps in which AR is barely given any prominence at all and is not much more than a mere add-on (n=4, 11.4%).

**4. Discussion of results**

We are well aware that this study only provides a first and approximate picture that will need to be complemented and expanded upon as more apps are planned and developed. That said, it is equally true that given the dearth of other studies, the present article has used the sample of currently available apps to offer relevant information about the main characteristics of open-access and free heritage apps from Europe that make use of AR. Accordingly, the descriptive portion of the present study reveals that museums, the institutions entrusted with protecting and interpreting patrimony, are the entities that most frequently develop this type of application. As Economou & Meintani [11] have highlighted, these are precisely the institutions that first championed the exploitation of digital technologies as tools for display, research, and learning. In this case, museums and heritage presentation spaces have found AR to be an ideal tool for meeting the public’s demand for better ways to understand heritage. AR is also dynamic and attractive, a fact that leads to more people visiting such spaces to learn about what new tools and technologies have to offer. Furthermore, this ties in with tourism and marketing considerations [9] [17]. The importance of collaboration between different entities must also be highlighted: this type of cooperation stands out as a fruitful option for the future and can even be seen as an attractive strategy, thanks to the opportunity for multiple sectors to work together as well as for obtaining necessary funding from a variety of sources.

In relation to this idea, it has been noted that the countries that have developed most applications are precisely those where major studies have been carried out in the field of apps—though this could be put a bit differently: the places where this field has been most pursued are also those where the greatest amount of literature has been produced on the topic. This in turn could enable the apps that have been created to be more easily identified. In contrast, it is more difficult to find products of this type in places where research has not yet been published. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the present study has solely focused on the five majority languages in Europe, which might also influence the fact that Spain and the United Kingdom are the countries that are most widely represented. The fact that we have only been able to study applications that are currently available has limited the opportunity to learn about other previously developed applications that have disappeared, either because they have not been updated or because they have not been considered to be sustainable. In fact, the data confirm what some authors have previously stated [8] [40]: the pace at which technology is advancing and the lack of applications that are sustainable over time mean that many have reached their expiration dates. At the most technical level, we must stress that almost half of the apps cannot currently be used on both of the main operating systems, a fact that makes it difficult for a large number of users to access them.

It should also be highlighted that one of these apps’ objectives should be adaptability to different users [2] [8] [13] and hence to exploit the opportunities offered by mobile learning and mobile devices. However, none of those that have been analyzed offers adaptation levels, even though some started out by highlighting that they are targeted at specific audiences, such as children or teenagers. So, the pattern of traditional analogical products can be said to be repeating itself and that the opportunity to exploit the potential that this type of technology has to offer is being squandered. This analogical aspect becomes all the more visible when other aspects of these apps are highlighted. Coinciding with other results obtained from the assessment of apps more generally [8] [11], the majority of apps employing AR features only offer itineraries. This result is not totally unexpected, given that AR enables the reconstruction of scenarios that enhance the understanding of heritage; this is especially enriching in the case of itineraries. However, the opportunity may have also been lost to showcase heritage, to be able to interact with heritage and with the community that exists around it by means of hybrid proposals that complement any given planned visit. In contrast, an academic tone still predominates in these apps: this makes the user little more than a receiver of information and means that the level of interactivity is low [46]. While these apps can be labeled as educational, they do not fully meet the standards of what it means to be truly educational, since they omit aspects that are central to the learning process, such as engagement, self-learning (based on reflection, investigation as well as spaces for experimentation and simulation) and the other elements that have been shown to stimulate the learning of students and other users alike. Perhaps the use of AR as a business lure has played an outsized role on the development of this technology in heritage contexts: as a result, much attention has been dedicated to technical aspects and functionality of these apps, while educational and informative-planning concerns have often taken a back seat.

The content that these apps deal with is mainly historical heritage, which is presented from a temporal, monumental heritage perspective. As Vicent *et al.* have stated [9], this is due to archeological sites being the main users of this tool, since it allows for now-lost objects and elements from the to be reconstructed. This issue is related to the fact that a very high percentage of applications recommend routes for visitors and can only be used *in situ*, either by scanning codes or by activating GPS. Apps of this type are created to interpret heritage at a specific point in time that coincides with visiting a particular heritage space. The use of AR allows for guided visits to become journeys to the past. All of this prevents access to heritage from geographical locations other than the site itself.

Unlike VR, which can create immersive environments, AR requires of real spaces. Consequently, we could be tempted to conclude that the very nature AR encourages that it is used *in situ*. Even if this is the case, there is another possibility that allows AR to interact with real spaces through the use of videos, photos (as in the case of the app Imageen Tarraco) or even without the need to interact with determined elements. That said, if developers do not provide tags for download or access on a website, it becomes all the more difficult for these tools to be integrated into educational spaces such as the classroom. There is an extremely limited number of apps that enhance a visit by exploiting the potential of play or simulation, even though their effectiveness in cognitive processes has been clearly demonstrated [27]. One exception that can be highlighted is the “Architecture Gothique/Roman” app [18], a game-based AR app designed to be used in the classroom.

**5. Conclusions**

We can conclude that today there are very few heritage apps have met the inclusion criteria laid out in this study. This small sample size precludes a truly exhaustive study of heritage apps using AR. Nevertheless, we have been able to paint a general picture in broad-brush strokes through the study of the sample. Though this group is limited, it has nevertheless generated some important data that ought to be further studied. As mentioned in the previous section of this paper, the use of AR in apps has an incredible potential to provide new ways of seeing and understanding heritage, even if at present we have detected a general lack of educationally sophisticated design.

Having completed the first Europe-wide study of open-access apps with heritage content, we can now outline the common characteristics and features of apps that use AR and provide a snapshot of the current trends in Europe:

1. The main entities developing these apps are museums and other heritage presentation sites (V1).

2. They have mainly been developed in Spain, the United Kingdom and Italy, in 2015 and 2018 (V2, V3, V4), although the majority of apps become outdated over time.

3. They are not fully adapted to multiplatform systems (V5).

4. They can be used during both indoor and outdoor visits (V6).

5. They cannot be adjusted to meet various levels of user knowledge (V7).

6. They largely focus on heritage from Antiquity (V8).

7. Historical heritage is the main focus, which is treated from a temporal, monumental perspective (V9, V10).

8. The tone and type of communication is almost exclusively academic (V11).

9. AR is used for the reconstruction of spaces and monuments. It is also often used to view heritage objects or items (V12).

10. Apps are activated by scanning codes and, to a lesser extent, by activating GPS. A large percentage of apps require users to be *in situ* (V13, V14).

11. AR is usually the only or at least principal use of the app; if not, it usually features very prominently in the application (V15).

The developed apps have also been identified as being targeted at tourists or occasional visitors. Hardly any apps are available that can be used in the classroom. Lastly, this is an exploratory study framed in a very specific and limited geographical (Europe) and temporal (2019) context, and so we must be aware of any resulting research limitations. For example, the fact that the analyzed apps had to be available in the app stores at the time that we carried out our research limited and considerably reduced the sample size. Digital technologies always run into the same issue, namely their shelf life: since apps have a short lifespan and are often linked to very specific projects that render them unsustainable [4], the speed at which these technologies are developed is faster than the speed of research and the publication process. If the results of user experiences are not published, then it becomes very difficult for apps contributions to be included in any future research. In this case, apps that did not work or were not available in app stores were discarded, which means that the oldest apps have not been taken into account. The nonexistence of studies of these apps and, even more so, of any evaluation of their uses in the area of heritage education prevents any comprehensive comparison including older digital applications. Another additional limitation has been the search languages. Had the number of languages included in the search been higher, the sample would probably have also been larger. This means that a more comprehensive search needs to be undertaken in more languages, an undertaking that would require a European project with participants from a variety of countries where searches can be carried out in other EU languages.

To conclude, we think that the educational opportunities for heritage learning and teaching that both AR and mobile devices provide deserve further research and scholarly attention. Proposed future lines of research include continuing the analysis of these apps to identify those that are successful and so establish the key features that enable AR apps to be created and used that are suitable for the learning and teaching of heritage. The search for and inventorying of more applications should also continue in a broader geographical and temporal framework so as to keep the inventory up to date. Work will be done to integrate these types of tools into formal and informal educational contexts. This ought to be coupled with various forms of app assessment that examines aspects such as uses, educational functions and perceived user satisfaction of the learning processes (as has already been done in some cases [18]). Lastly, we would like to highlight the importance of evaluating this type of tool, since this leads to improvements in AR apps’ development and usage in education. We agree with Economou & Meintani [11] that it is not only a question of incorporating new technologies into heritage but also that their use should have some well defined objectives and meet specific educational needs that go beyond the purely informative and contemplative.

**Author Contributions:** "Conceptualization, U.L. and P.R.; Methodology, U.L. and N.V.; Research, U.L. and P. R.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, U.L. and P.R.; Writing – Review & Editing, U.L., P.R. and N.V.”.

**Acknowledgments:** This research has been made possible by funding from MINECO-ERDF (European Union) via the following projects: “Evaluación de programas y evaluación de aprendizajes en los ámbitos no formal e informal de la Educación Patrimonial” (Evaluating programs and evaluating the learning of Educational Heritage in non-formal and informal settings) (EDU2015‐65716‐C2‐2‐R) and "Educomunicación web 2.0 del Patrimonio" (Edu-communication web 2.0 for heritage) (EDU2016-78163R); from the University of the Basque Country via the GIPyPAC research group project “ARSMULEP. APPs, Redes Sociales, dispositivos móviles y ubiquitous learning en Educación Patrimonial” (ARSMULEP. Apps, social networks, mobile devices and unibquitious learning in heritage education) (EHU 15/06), (IT931-16, PPG 17/68. University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Spain); and from the ARGOS research group project “Educomunicación web 2.0 del Patrimonio” (Edu-communication web 2.0 for heritage) (EDU2016-78163R), (Government of Aragón, SS50\_17R. University of Zaragoza, Spain, IUCA, and ERDF 2014-2020 "Construyendo Europa desde Aragón" (Building Europe from Aragón)).

**References**

[1] Kukulska-Hulme, A. Mobile Usability in Educational Context: What have we learnt? *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning* **2017**, 8(2).

[2] Sharples, M.; Taylor, J.; Vavoula, G. A Theory of Learning for the Mobile Age. In *The Sage Handbook of Elearning Research*, 2nd ed.; Andrews, R., Haythornthwaite, C., Eds.; Sage: London, United Kingdom, 2006, pp. 221‐247.

[3] [Behringer, R.; Klinker, G.; Mizell, D.](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) *Augmented reality. Placing artificial objects in real scenes*, 1st ed.; A K Peters: Natick, Massachusetts, United States of America, 1999.

[4] White, M.; Liarokapis, F.; Darcy, J.; Mourkoussis, N.; Petridis, P.; Lister. Augmented Reality for Museum Artefact Visualization. Proceedings of the 4th Irish Workshop on Computer Graphics, Eurographics Ireland Chapter, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, 29-30th April 2013.

[5] Akçayır, M; [Akçayır](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X16300616#!), G. Advantages and challenges associated with augmented reality for education: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Research Review* **2017***,* 20, 1-11. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X16300616> (accessed on 21 January 2019).

[6] Cabero Almenara, J.; Barroso Osuna, J. Los escenarios tecnológicos en Realidad Aumentada (RA): posibilidades educativas. [*Aula abierta*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)**2018***, 47(*3), 327-336. Available online: <https://www.unioviedo.es/reunido/index.php/AA/article/view/11997> (accessed on 11 February 2019).

[7] Prendes, C. Realidad Aumentada y educación: análisis de experiencias prácticas. *Pixel-Bit. Revista de Medios y Educación* **2015***,* 46, 187-203. Available online: <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/pixel/article/viewFile/61619/37631> (accessed on 2 February 2019).

[8] Ibáñez-Etxeberria, A. y Kortabitarte (2016). Apps, Redes Sociales y dispositivos móviles en educación patrimonial*.* Available online: <http://www.culturaydeporte.gob.es/planes-nacionales/dam/jcr:4cc8d5a2-3084-409e-a134-b46b62f7126e/apps-y-socialmedia-en-educacionpatrimonial.pdf> (accessed on 15 February 2019).

[9] Vicent, N.; Rivero, P.; Feliu, M. Arqueología y tecnologías digitales en educación patrimonial. *Educatio Siglo XXI: Revista de la Facultad de Educación* **2015***, 33*(1), 83-102. Available online: <https://revistas.um.es/educatio/article/view/222511> (accessed on 23 February 2019).

[10] Asenjo Hernández, M. E. Aprendizaje informal y nuevas tecnologías: análisis y medición del constructo de interactividad en contextos de exposición del patrimonio. Doctoral Thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, 3 March 2014.

[11] Economou, M.; Meintani, E. Promising beginnings? Evaluating museum mobile phone APPs. In *Re-thinking technology in museums 2011. Emerging Experiences*, Proceedings of the International Conference, University of Limerick, Ireland, 26-27 May 2011; Luigina Ciolfi, Katherine Scott, Sara Barbieri, Eds.; University of Limerick: Limerick, Ireland 2011; 87-101. Available online: [www.idc.ul.ie/techmuseums11/paper/paper8.pdf /](http://www.idc.ul.ie/techmuseums11/paper/paper8.pdf%20/) (accessed on 2 February 2019).

[12] Vicent, N. (2013) *Evaluación de un programa de educación patrimonial basado en tecnología móvil.* Doctoral Thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, 19 July 2013.

[13] Kukulska-Hulme, A.; Sharples, M.; Milrad, M.; Arnedillo-Sánchez, I.; Vavoula, G. Innovation in Mobile Learning: a European perspective. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning* **2009,** *1(1),* 13-35.

[14] [Sevillano Fuertes,](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) M. A. De la excavación a la vitrina: historia de un pequeño Museo. [*Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)***,* 2017,** *35,* 1053-1061. Available online: <http://www.man.es/man/dms/man/estudio/publicaciones/boletin-man/MAN-Bol-2017E/MAN-Bol-2017-35-116.pdf> (accessed on 16 February 2019).

[15] Kortabitarte, A.; Ibáñez-Etxeberria, A.; Luna, U.; Vicent, N.; Gillate, I.; Molero, B.; Kintana, J. Dimensiones para la evaluación de aprendizajes en *APP*s sobre patrimonio. *Pulso. Revista de educación* **2017***, 40,* 17-33. Available online: <https://revistas.cardenalcisneros.es/index.php/PULSO/article/view/252> (accessed on 4 February 2019).

[16] Asensio, M.; Santacana, J.; Pol, E. *APP*LE project (*APP* learning evaluation): Primeros resultados de un estudio hecho en la Ciudadela Ibérica de Calafell. *Didácticas Específicas* **2017**, *17*, 8‐38. Available online: <https://repositorio.uam.es/xmlui/handle/10486/680795> (accessed on 4 February 2019).

[17] Bonacini, E. La realtà aumentata e le app culturali in Italia: storie da un matrimonio in mobilità. [*Il Capitale culturale, Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)*,* **2014,** *IX*, 89-121. Available online: <https://riviste.unimc.it/index.php/cap-cult/article/view/740> (accessed on 10 March 2019).

[18] Kortabitarte, A.; Gillate, I.; Luna, U.; Ibáñez‐Etxeberria, A. Las aplicaciones móviles como recursos de apoyo en el aula de Ciencias Sociales: estudio exploratorio con el app “Architecture gothique/romane” en Educación Secundaria [Mobile applications as support resources in the Social Sciences classroom: Exploratory study with the app “Architecture gothique/romane” in Secondary Education]. *ENSAYOS, Revista de la Facultad de Educación de Albacete* **2018***, 33(1),* 65-79. Available online: <http://www.revista.uclm.es/index.php/ensayos> (accessed on 28 January 2019).

[19] Hylén, J. [*Turning on Mobile Learning in Europe*](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002161/216165E.pdf), 1st ed. UNESCO: Paris, France, 2012. Available online: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000216165> (accessed on 1 February 2019).

[20] Dykes, G.; Knight, H. R. *Mobile learning for teachers in Europe: exploring the potential of mobile technologies to support teachers and improve practice,* 1st ed. UNESCO: Paris, France, 2012. Available online: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000216167_eng> (accessed on 1 February 2019).

[21] Cózar Gutiérrez, R.; del Moya Martínez, M.; Hernández Bravo, J. A.; Hernández Bravo, J.R. Tecnologías emergentes para la enseñanza de las ciencias sociales. Una experiencia con el uso de realidad aumentada en la formación inicial de maestros. *Digital Education Review* **2015,** *27*, 138-153. Available online: <http://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/der/article/view/11622> (accessed on 11 February 2019).

[22] Cabero Almenara, J.; Barroso Osuna, J. The educational possibilities of Augmented Reality. [*NAER: Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)**2016***, 5(*1), 44-50. Available online: <https://naerjournal.ua.es/article/view/v5n1-7> (accessed on 6 February 2019).

[23] Ibáñez Etxeberria, A; Kortabitarte, A; De Castro, P.; Gillate, I. Competencia digital mediante apps de temática patrimonial en el marco DigComp. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del profesorado* **2019***, 22*(1), 13-27. Available online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331257854_Competencia_digital_mediante_apps_de_tematica_patrimonial_en_el_marco_DigComp> (accessed on 2 May 2019).

#### [24] Economou, M.; Pujol, L. [Educational tool or expensive toy? Evaluating VR evaluation and its relevance for virtual heritage](about:blank). In New Heritage: New Media and Cultural Heritage, 1st ed.; [Kalay,](https://www.routledge.com/products/search?author=Yehuda%20Kalay) Y., Kvan, T., Affleck, J., Eds.; London, United Kingdom, 2008; pp. 242-260.

[25] Angelopoulou, A.; Economou, D.; Bouki, V.; Psarrou, A.; Jin, L.; Pritchard, C.; Kolyda, F. Mobile Augmented Reality for Cultural Heritage. In *MobileWireless Middleware, Operating Systems, and Applications. 4th International ICST Conference, Mobilware 2011 London, UK, June 22-24, 2011,* 1st ed.;Venkatasubramanian, N., Getov, V., Steglich, S., Eds.; Springer, New York, United States of America, 2012, pp. 15-22..

[26] Chang, Y.; Hou, H.; Pan, C.; Sung, Y.; Chang, K.; Apply an Augmented Reality in a Mobile Guidance to Increase Sense of Place for Heritage Places. *Educational Technology & Society* **2015***, 18*(2), 166–178. Available online: <https://www.j-ets.net/ETS/index.html> (accessed on 2 March 2019).

[27] Álvarez Morales, E.; Bellezza, A.; Caggiano, V. Realidad aumentada: Innovación en educación. *Didasc@lia: Didáctica y Educación* **2016,** 7(1), 195-212.

[28] Wu, H. K.; Lee, S. W. Y.; Chang, H. Y.; Liang, J. C. Current status, opportunities and challenges of augmented reality in education. *Computers & Education* **2013***,* 62, 41-49. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131512002527> (accessed on 27 February 2019).

[29] Clini, P.; Frontoni, E.; Quattrini, R.; Pierdicca, R.; Nespeca, R. Real/Not Real: Pseudo-Holography and Augmented Reality Applications for Cultural Heritage. In [*Handbook of Research on Emerging Technologies for Digital Preservation and Information Modeling*](https://www.igi-global.com/book/handbook-research-emerging-technologies-digital/148481)*,* 1st ed.; Ippolito, A., Cigola, M., Eds.; IGI Global, Hershey, United States of America, 2017, pp. 201-227.

[30] Luna, U.; Ibáñez-Etxeberria, A.; Rivero, P. El patrimonio aumentado. 8 apps de Realidad Aumentada para la enseñanza-aprendizaje del patrimonio. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado* **2019,** *94*(33.1), 43-62. Available online: <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/RIFOP/article/view/72088> (accessed on 4 May 2019).

[31] [Chatzidimitris, T. ; Kavakli, E. ; Economou, M. ; Gavalas, D.](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) Mobile Augmented Reality edutainment applications for cultural institutions. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Information, Intelligence, Systems and Applications · IISA 2013, Mikrolimano, Greece, 10-12 July 2013; [Bourbakis](https://dblp.org/pers/hd/b/Bourbakis:Nikolaos_G=), N. [G., Tsihrintzis](https://dblp.org/pers/hd/t/Tsihrintzis:George_A=), G. A., Virvou, M., Eds.; IISA: Greece, 2013. Available online: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6623726> (accessed on 15 March 2019).

[32] Keil, J.; Pujol, L.; Roussou, M.; Engelke, T.; Schmitt, M.; Eleftheratou, U. A Digital Look at Physical Museum Exhibits: Designing Personalized Stories with Handheld Augmented Reality in Museums. Proceedings of the 2013 Digital Heritage International Congress (DigitalHeritage),Marseille, France, 28 Oct.- 1 Nov. 2013; Jianping, C., Ying, Z., Juan, W., Eds.; Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers: Piscataway, NJ, United States of America, 2013. Available online: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6744836> (accessed on 25 February 2019).

[33] Unger, J.; Kvetina, P. An On-Site Presentation of Invisible Prehistoric Landscapes*. Internet Archeology* **2013***, 43*.

[34] Chang, K.; Chang, C.; Hou, H.; Sung, Y.; Chao, H.; Lee, C. Development and behavioral pattern analysis of a mobile guide system with augmented reality for painting appreciation instruction in an art museum. *Computers & Education* **2015**, *71*, 185-197. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131513002868> (accessed on 16 January 2019).

[35] [Chung, N.; Han, H.;Joun, Y.](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) Tourists’ intention to visit a destination: The role of augmented reality (AR) application for a heritage site. [*Computers in Human Behavior*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) **2014**, *50,* 588-599. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563215002101> (accessed on 16 January 2019).

[36] [Chung, N.; Lee, H.; Kim, J.; Koo, C.](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) The Role of Augmented Reality for Experience-Influenced Environments: The Case of Cultural Heritage Tourism in Korea. [*Journal of Travel Research*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)**2018***, 57*(5), 627-643. Available online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0047287517708255> (accessed on 16 January 2019).

[37] [Noh, N., Sunar, M. S., Pan, Z.](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/?r=references%7CMainLayout::init)A Review on Augmented Reality for Virtual Heritage System. In Learning by Playing. Game-based Education System Design and Development, 4th International Conference on E-Learning and Games, Edutainment 2009, Banff, Canada, August 9-11, 2009. [Chang](https://dblp.uni-trier.de/pers/hd/c/Chang:Maiga), M, Kuo, R., [Kinshuk](https://dblp.uni-trier.de/pers/hd/k/Kinshuk:), [Chen](https://dblp.uni-trier.de/pers/hd/c/Chen:Gwo=Dong), G. D., [Hirose,](https://dblp.uni-trier.de/pers/hd/h/Hirose:Michitaka) M., Eds.; Springer: New York, United States of America, 2009, 50-61.

[38] [Papagiannakis, G](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init). ; [Ponder, M](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init).; [Molet, T](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init).; [Kshirsagar, S](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init).; [Cordier, F](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init). ; [Magnenat-Thalmann, M](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init). ; [Thalmann, D](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/default.aspx?r=references%7CMainLayout::init). LIFEPLUS: Revival of life in ancient Pompeii, Virtual Systems and Multimedia. In *Proceedings of VSMM 2002*. Proceedings of the Virtual Heritage Media Art and Creative Technology Media and VR Technology Wireless Life and Culture Virtual Medicine (VSMM 2002), Gyeongrj, Korea, 25-27 September 2002*.*

[39] Vlahakis, V.; Karigiannis, J.; Tsotros, M.; Gounaris, M.; Almeida, L.; Stricker, D.; Gleue, T.; Christou, I. T.; Carlucci, R.; Ionnadinis, N. (2001). ARCHEOGUIDE: First results of an Augmented Reality, Mobile Computing System in Cultural Heritage Site. Proceedings of the 2001 Conference on Virtual Reality, Archeology, and Cultural Heritage, Glyfada, Greece, November 28-30, 2001. [Arnold](https://dblp.org/pers/hd/a/Arnold:David_B=), D. B., [Chalmers](https://dblp.org/pers/hd/c/Chalmers:Alan), A., [Fellner](https://dblp.org/pers/hd/f/Fellner:Dieter_W=), D. W., Eds.; ACM New York: New York, United States of America, 2001, 131-140.

[40] Asensio, M.; Castro, Y.; Asenjo, E.; Pol, E.; Rodríguez, J.A.; Paredes, P.; Cabrera, A.; Rodríguez, I.; Villar, C. Cómo aprender disfrutando de la ‘Cocina Valenciana’: un modelo de evaluación para el diseño de dispositivos de realidad aumentada. In *La cocina valenciana del Museo Nacional de Artes Decorativas. Una relectura a través de la tecnología de Realidad Aumentada, 1st ed.;* Cabrera, A., Rodríguez, I. Villar, C., Eds.; Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte: Madrid, Spain, 2013, 153‐187. Available online: <https://sede.educacion.gob.es/publiventa/la-cocina-valenciana-del-museo-nacional-de-artes-decorativas-una-relectura-a-traves-de-la-tecnologia-de-realidad-aumentada-/patrimonio-historico-artistico-artes-decorativas/14591C> (accessed on 18 January 2019).

[41] Petrucco, C.; Agostini, D. Teaching our cultural heritage using mobile augmented reality. [*Je-LKS. Journal of e-Learning and Knowledge Society*](http://www.refworks.com/refworks2/?r=references%7CMainLayout::init) **2016**, *12*(3), 115-128.

[42] Imbert-Bouchard D.; Llonch N.; Martín Piñol, C.; Osácar, E. Turismo cultural y apps. Un breve panorama de la situación actual. *HeryMus. Heritage y Museography* **2013**, *13,* 44-54. Available online: <https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Hermus/article/view/313393> (accessed on 19 January 2019).

# [43] Furata, H.; Takahashi, K.; Nakatsu, K.; Ishibashi, K.; Aira, M. A mobile application system for sightseeing guidance using augmented reality. Procedings of [the 6th International Conference on Soft Computing and Intelligent Systems, and The 13th International Symposium on Advanced Intelligence Systems](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/mostRecentIssue.jsp?punumber=6495582), Kobe, 20-24 Nov 2012.

[44] Fontal, O. The Spanish Heritage Education Observatory. *Cultura y Educación –Culture and Education* **2016***, 28*(1), 254-266. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/11356405.2015.1110374> (accessed on 15 January 2019).

[45] Gillate, I.; Vicent, N.; Gómez- Redondo, C.; Marín- Cepeda, S. Características y dimensión educativa en apps de educación patrimonial. Análisis a partir del método OEPE. *Revista de Estudios Pedagógicos* **2017***, 43*(4), 115-136. Available online: <http://revistas.uach.cl/index.php/estped/article/view/1793> (accessed on 28 January 2019).

[46] Martín-Cáceres, M. J.; Cuenca, J. M. Educomunicación del patrimonio*.* [*Educatio siglo XXI: Revista de la Facultad de Educación*](https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/revista?codigo=6177)**2015,** *33*(1), 33-54. Available online: <https://revistas.um.es/educatio/article/view/222491> (accessed on 15 January 2019).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| copyRight | © 2019 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). |