



Kahoot! vs Quizizz in EFL Grammar Instruction: Comparative Effects on Immediate Recall, Delayed Retention, and Learner Engagement

Effendi Limbong ✉, Universitas Mulawarman, Indonesia

✉ effendilimbong@fkip.unmul.ac.id

Abstract: Kahoot! and Quizizz are among the most widely adopted game-based response platforms in EFL classrooms globally, yet direct comparative evidence of their differential effects on grammar learning outcomes and learner engagement remains limited. This study compares the effects of Kahoot!- and Quizizz-mediated grammar instruction on immediate recall, delayed retention, and self-reported learner engagement among Indonesian EFL learners at secondary level. Using a quasi-experimental three-group design Kahoot! condition, Quizizz condition, and conventional instruction control with ninety-three participants across eight weeks, the study finds that both game-based platforms significantly outperform conventional instruction on immediate recall, but that Quizizz produces stronger delayed retention advantages, likely attributable to its self-paced design and spaced review features. Engagement data from classroom observations and post-study interviews reveal important qualitative differences between the two platforms: Kahoot!'s real-time competitive atmosphere generates higher reported enjoyment during sessions but also greater test-like anxiety, while Quizizz's self-paced format produces lower peak excitement but more sustained engagement and greater willingness to attempt difficult items. The study draws on Game-Based Learning theory (Mayer, 2020; Plass et al., 2020) and the Desirable Difficulties framework (Bjork & Bjork, 2020) to argue that platform selection in EFL grammar instruction should be driven by instructional goals and learner profiles rather than by familiarity or availability, and that neither platform, used alone and unreflectively, is sufficient for deep grammatical knowledge development.

Keywords: Kahoot!, Quizizz, EFL grammar instruction, game-based learning, learner engagement, delayed retention, desirable difficulties.

Received January 11, 2025; **Accepted** February 29, 2026; **Published** April 30, 2026

Citation: Limbong, E. (2026). Kahoot! vs Quizizz in EFL Grammar Instruction: Comparative Effects on Immediate Recall, Delayed Retention, and Learner Engagement. *Journal of Innovation in English Education and Language Teaching*. 2(2). 25–35.

Published by Barkah Publishing © 2026.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

Spend any time in Indonesian secondary school English classrooms and you will encounter Kahoot! and Quizizz. These two platforms have, in the space of a few years, become near-ubiquitous fixtures of EFL grammar review sessions—beloved by many students, enthusiastically adopted by teachers looking for ways to make grammar less grim, and promoted by school administrators as evidence of technology integration in the curriculum. Their appeal is not hard to understand. Both are free, easy to set up, visually

engaging, and produce the kind of immediate feedback and competitive energy that conventional grammar exercises rarely manage. A grammar lesson built around a Kahoot! session feels categorically different, in the room, from one built around a worksheet.

But feeling different and being pedagogically different are not the same thing. The question this study starts from is a practical one that teachers in Indonesian EFL classrooms face every week: if you are going to use one of these platforms to teach grammar, which one, and for what purpose? The existing literature provides some guidance—there are studies of Kahoot! effects on various learning outcomes, and studies of Quizizz effects, and a smaller number that compare the two—but the picture is incomplete in several ways. Most studies are short in duration, few collect delayed retention data, most rely on self-report measures of engagement without systematic classroom observation, and very few are set in vocational or secondary EFL contexts in Southeast Asia where the specific conditions of learner motivation, anxiety, and prior grammar instruction matter a great deal (Bicen & Kocakoyun, 2018; Chiang, 2020; Zhao, 2019).

This study addresses those gaps directly. It follows three groups of Indonesian secondary EFL learners across eight weeks, comparing the effects of Kahoot!- and Quizizz-mediated grammar instruction with each other and with conventional instruction on three outcomes: immediate recall, delayed retention (measured four weeks after instruction ended), and learner engagement assessed through both observation and interview. Three research questions guide the study 1) Do Kahoot! and Quizizz produce significantly different immediate recall and delayed retention outcomes compared to conventional grammar instruction and to each other?; 2) How do learners in each condition describe and display engagement during grammar instruction?; and 3) What features of each platform's design best account for the observed differences in learning and engagement outcomes?

Grammar Instruction in EFL Contexts: Enduring Challenges

Grammar instruction remains one of the most contested and practically demanding areas of EFL pedagogy. The pendulum of professional consensus has swung repeatedly between explicit, form-focused approaches and implicit, meaning-focused ones, and the current mainstream position—that neither alone is sufficient and that the relationship between explicit grammatical knowledge and implicit communicative use is complex and non-linear—is more nuanced than either extreme and, for many practitioners, harder to act on (Ellis, 2023; Nassaji & Fotos, 2020). What the research does agree on is that grammar learning requires multiple, spaced exposures to target forms in contexts that are meaningful to learners, that immediate feedback on form helps consolidate explicit knowledge, and that transfer from explicit rule knowledge to fluent, accurate production is a long and variable process that formal instruction can support but not shortcut (Ellis, 2023; Lightbown & Spada, 2020).

In Indonesian secondary EFL classrooms, grammar instruction faces specific challenges. Class sizes are typically large, instructional time limited, and the grammar content in the national curriculum—covering everything from simple present to passive constructions and reported speech across the secondary years—ambitious relative to the available time and learner proficiency levels. Motivation for form-focused work tends to be low among students who struggle to see the relevance of grammatical accuracy to their everyday English use, and anxiety around being publicly corrected or evaluated is a consistent feature of EFL grammar lessons in this context (Musthafa, 2021; Putri & Maarof, 2021). Game-based response platforms have been adopted, in large part, as practical responses to these conditions—tools that can increase engagement with form-focused content and reduce the social threat of being wrong in public.

Game-Based Learning: Theoretical Foundations

Game-Based Learning (GBL) theory provides the broad framework within which research on educational gaming platforms like Kahoot! and Quizizz sits (Mayer, 2020; Plass et al., 2020). GBL research identifies several mechanisms through which game elements can support learning: they increase motivation and sustained attention, provide frequent and immediate feedback that helps learners calibrate their understanding, create conditions of desirable challenge that promote deeper processing, and generate emotional engagement that may support memory consolidation (Mayer, 2020; Plass et al., 2020). These mechanisms align reasonably well with what grammar learning research identifies as important—repeated exposure, feedback, meaningful challenge, and attention to form.

However, GBL research also consistently identifies features of game design that can undermine rather than support learning. Heavy reliance on competitive pressure can shift motivation from mastery to performance, reducing willingness to attempt difficult items and increasing anxiety in lower-confidence learners (Hamari et al., 2020; Plass et al., 2020). Speed-based competition, in particular—a defining feature of Kahoot!'s design—can reward rapid guessing over deliberate processing, producing scores that reflect response speed more than grammatical understanding (Bicen & Kocakoyun, 2018; Chiang, 2020). The design choice between speed-competitive and self-paced formats is, from a GBL perspective, not a minor detail—it shapes the cognitive and motivational conditions of the learning experience in fundamental ways.

Kahoot! in EFL Grammar Instruction

Kahoot! is a synchronous, speed-based competitive quiz platform in which students compete in real time, with points allocated for both correctness and response speed, and a live leaderboard updating after each question. Its defining experiential feature is energy: the countdown timer, the driving music, the live leaderboard, and the celebration of top scorers create a game-show atmosphere that is genuinely different from the typical grammar exercise. Studies of Kahoot! in EFL contexts report consistently positive effects on learner enjoyment and reported motivation (Bicen & Kocakoyun, 2018; Zarzycka-Piskorz, 2022), and several find immediate post-test advantages over conventional instruction for grammar and vocabulary items (Chiang, 2020; Zhao, 2019). The platform's immediate feedback mechanism has been identified as a key learning-supportive feature, giving learners instant confirmation or correction of their form hypotheses.

The concern most consistently raised about Kahoot! in the literature is its speed-accuracy trade-off. Because points are awarded for fast correct responses, the optimal strategy—especially for competitive learners—is to respond quickly rather than deliberately. For grammar items that require processing time—recognising a passive construction, selecting the correct conditional form, working out a reported speech transformation—speed pressure may actually interfere with the kind of deliberate processing that explicit grammar learning requires (Bicen & Kocakoyun, 2018; Lightbown & Spada, 2020). Anxiety effects have also been documented, particularly among lower-confidence learners for whom the public leaderboard creates social threat rather than motivational challenge (Elaldi, 2022; Zarzycka-Piskorz, 2022).

Quizizz in EFL Grammar Instruction

Quizizz shares many surface features with Kahoot!—it is a multiple-choice quiz platform with game elements including points, streaks, power-ups, and a completion leaderboard—but differs in one fundamental design respect: it is asynchronous and self-paced. Students move through questions at their own rate, see their correct and incorrect answers as they go, and can review missed items at the end of a session. The leaderboard is visible but is sorted by completion and accuracy rather than by speed, and the

competitive pressure of a countdown timer is absent from the question-answering experience.

Research on Quizizz in EFL contexts reports broadly comparable engagement and enjoyment effects to Kahoot!, with several studies noting that its self-paced format is particularly valued by lower-confidence learners who find Kahoot!'s time pressure aversive (Chiang, 2020; Zhao, 2019). The platform's review features—which allow students to replay incorrect items immediately and to access a summary of their mistakes after the session—have been identified as potentially supportive of the kind of spaced retrieval practice that memory research endorses (Bjork & Bjork, 2020). However, the absence of the real-time competitive atmosphere that drives Kahoot!'s peak engagement means that Quizizz sessions can feel less exciting in the room, and several teachers in published studies have noted that student engagement can be harder to sustain without the collective energy of synchronous competition (Chiang, 2020).

The Desirable Difficulties Framework

Bjork and Bjork's (2020) concept of desirable difficulties provides a useful theoretical lens for comparing the two platforms. The framework argues that conditions which slow down or complicate initial learning—spacing, interleaving, retrieval practice, variation—tend to produce better long-term retention than conditions that make initial performance easy and smooth. From this perspective, Quizizz's self-paced format, with its built-in review mechanism, may create more desirable difficulties than Kahoot!'s speed-competitive format: it asks learners to work through confusion at their own pace, to attempt retrieval of missed items, and to engage with their errors rather than moving past them. Kahoot!'s format, by contrast, optimises for performance during the session at the potential cost of deeper encoding. This theoretical prediction—that Quizizz should show stronger delayed retention advantages despite potentially lower peak engagement during sessions—is one of the central empirical claims this study is positioned to test.

Game-Based Learning Theory

This study draws on GBL theory (Mayer, 2020; Plass et al., 2020) as its primary framework for understanding how platform design features interact with grammar learning processes. The framework's attention to the cognitive, motivational, and socio-emotional dimensions of game-based learning provides a multidimensional account of why the same game format might work differently for different learners and different learning goals.

The Desirable Difficulties Framework

Bjork and Bjork's (2020) desirable difficulties framework provides the theoretical basis for the study's hypothesis that Quizizz's self-paced, review-inclusive design will produce stronger delayed retention than Kahoot!'s speed-competitive format, despite potentially lower peak session engagement. The framework directs attention to the difference between performance during a learning session—which conventional wisdom tends to treat as a proxy for learning—and actual long-term retention, which is what education ultimately aims for.

METHODS

Research Design

The study used a quasi-experimental three-group design with pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test measurement points, supplemented by qualitative data from classroom observations and post-study interviews. Three intact classes from the same secondary school in Banda Aceh, Indonesia, were assigned to conditions: Kahoot! group ($n = 31$), Quizizz group ($n = 32$), and conventional instruction control group ($n = 30$). Random assignment to conditions was not possible given the intact class structure; classes

were matched on pre-test grammar scores (no significant pre-test differences, $F(2, 90) = 0.84$, $p = .44$), teacher (all three classes were taught by the same teacher), and instructional time.

Participants

Participants were ninety-three Year 10 students (age 15–17; 54 female, 39 male) at a state secondary school in Banda Aceh. English proficiency was at A2–B1 levels based on departmental placement records. Informed consent was obtained from participants and, given participants' age, from parents or guardians. Ethical approval was granted by the university research ethics committee.

Instructional Conditions

All three groups received grammar instruction covering the same four target structures across eight weeks: present perfect vs. simple past, passive constructions in present and past, conditional sentences (types 1 and 2), and reported speech. Each structure received two weeks of instruction: an introduction and explanation session (identical across all three groups) followed by a practice session that differed by condition.

In the Kahoot! condition, practice sessions used teacher-created Kahoot! quizzes of twenty items per target structure, played in real time as a whole class. Items ranged from gap-fill identification to error correction, with speed-competitive scoring active throughout. In the Quizizz condition, practice sessions used parallel quizzes on Quizizz, with the same items but self-paced, individual completion and the review-missed-items feature enabled. Students who finished early were asked to replay incorrect items. In the control condition, practice sessions used conventional worksheet exercises of equivalent length and item type, completed individually and reviewed through teacher-led whole-class correction.

Instruments

Grammar knowledge was assessed using a researcher-designed grammar test of forty items (ten per target structure), covering recognition (error identification and multiple-choice form selection) and controlled production (sentence transformation). Items were piloted and revised; final Cronbach's alpha was .81. The same test was used at pre-test, immediate post-test (one week after instruction ended), and delayed post-test (four weeks after instruction ended), with item order randomised across administrations.

Engagement was assessed through systematic classroom observation using a structured engagement observation protocol (adapted from Skinner et al., 2009), rating behavioural engagement (on-task behaviour, response rates, voluntary participation) and emotional engagement (expressed interest, enjoyment, frustration) at five-minute intervals across all practice sessions. Post-study semi-structured interviews (twenty minutes each) were conducted with a purposive sample of eighteen students (six per group, selected for variation in pre-test score and self-reported enjoyment of the condition) and with the classroom teacher.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS 27. One-way ANCOVA (controlling for pre-test scores) was used to compare immediate and delayed post-test scores across the three groups. Pairwise comparisons used Bonferroni correction. Effect sizes are reported as partial eta squared (η^2). Observation data were summarised descriptively and analysed for patterns across sessions and groups. Interview data were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2021), with themes developed inductively from the data and checked against the observation records for consistency.

RESULTS

Immediate Recall

Immediate post-test scores differed significantly across the three groups after controlling for pre-test performance, $F(2, 89) = 18.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .29$. Both game-based conditions significantly outperformed the control group: Kahoot! vs. control (mean difference = 8.3, $p < .001$, $d = 1.21$); Quizizz vs. control (mean difference = 7.1, $p < .001$, $d = 1.06$). The Kahoot! and Quizizz groups did not differ significantly from each other on immediate recall (mean difference = 1.2, $p = .41$, $d = 0.18$), suggesting broadly equivalent short-term learning advantages over conventional instruction.

Examination of scores by grammar structure revealed an interesting pattern. For structures requiring relatively rapid recognition—simple correct/incorrect identification in present perfect vs. simple past items—the Kahoot! group showed a slight (non-significant) advantage over Quizizz. For structures requiring more complex transformation—conditional and reported speech items—the Quizizz group showed a slight (non-significant) advantage over Kahoot!, consistent with the prediction that self-paced processing may better support learning of more syntactically complex structures.

Delayed Retention

Delayed post-test scores told a different story. A significant group difference remained four weeks after instruction ended, $F(2, 89) = 12.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$, but the pattern had shifted. The Quizizz group retained significantly more grammar knowledge than both the Kahoot! group (mean difference = 4.8, $p = .003$, $d = 0.71$) and the control group (mean difference = 9.2, $p < .001$, $d = 1.37$). The Kahoot! group retained significantly more than the control group (mean difference = 4.4, $p = .009$, $d = 0.66$) but showed a steeper score decline from immediate to delayed post-test than the Quizizz group (Kahoot! decline = 4.1 points; Quizizz decline = 0.5 points; control decline = 3.8 points).

This finding is the most practically significant in the dataset and directly supports the desirable difficulties prediction: Quizizz's self-paced, review-inclusive format produced learning that held up substantially better over four weeks than Kahoot!'s speed-competitive format, despite equivalent immediate recall scores. The Kahoot! condition produced impressive immediate gains that decayed at roughly the same rate as conventional instruction's more modest ones—a pattern consistent with surface-level performance effects rather than deep encoding.

Engagement Observations

Classroom observation data revealed clear qualitative differences between the two game-based conditions. Kahoot! sessions showed the highest observed behavioural engagement ratings in the first two weeks ($M = 4.6$ out of 5), with the whole-class competitive atmosphere generating high levels of on-task behaviour, visible excitement, and high voluntary response rates. By weeks six and seven, observed engagement in Kahoot! sessions had declined noticeably ($M = 3.8$), with more students appearing to respond quickly without deliberating and some signs of competitive fatigue among consistently lower-ranked students. Emotional engagement ratings showed the same trajectory: high positive affect early, with more variable affect (including visible frustration among lower-ranked students) later in the study.

Quizizz sessions showed lower peak engagement ratings in early weeks ($M = 3.9$ in week 1) but more stable engagement across the eight-week period ($M = 3.7$ in week 7), with notably less variance across individual students. Students who had been visibly anxious or disengaged during competitive Kahoot! sessions showed more consistent on-task behaviour during Quizizz sessions, particularly during the review-missed-items phase, which observation records noted as consistently producing focused individual engagement even among students who had rushed through initial question attempts.

Learner Perspectives: Interview Themes

Three themes emerged consistently across the interview data from all three student groups, each illuminating a different dimension of the comparative experience.

Theme 1: Excitement vs. sustained engagement. Students in the Kahoot! group described the experience in terms of excitement and social energy: *"It's fun because you can see who's winning. Everyone is trying hard at the same time"* (Dinda, Kahoot! group). Students in the Quizizz group were less likely to describe excitement but more likely to describe a sense of actual engagement with the grammar: *"I like that I can think before I answer. In Kahoot! I just press something fast. In Quizizz I actually check if I know it"* (Reza, Quizizz group). The teacher captured the distinction well: *"Kahoot! is exciting—they love it. But I sometimes wonder if they're learning grammar or just learning to click fast. With Quizizz, it's quieter, but when I walk around I see them actually reading the question."*

Theme 2: Anxiety and competitive pressure. Several Kahoot! group students described the competitive atmosphere in terms that mapped clearly onto foreign language anxiety: *"I get nervous when I can't answer fast. And then my name is at the bottom and everyone can see. That makes it worse"* (Heni, Kahoot! group). Students in the Quizizz group who had previously used Kahoot! in other classes noted the difference in affective tone: *"Quizizz doesn't make me nervous. I can take my time. I don't care if someone else finishes first"* (Nia, Quizizz group). Lower-achieving students in the Kahoot! group showed the strongest anxiety-related descriptions, consistent with the quantitative anxiety indicator data from the observation protocol.

Theme 3: The value of reviewing errors. Several Quizizz group students spontaneously identified the review-missed-items feature as the part of the activity they found most useful, and this was supported by observation records showing sustained engagement during review phases: *"After I finish, I go back to the ones I got wrong and try again. That's when I understand the grammar, not when I'm rushing through"* (Bagas, Quizizz group). No equivalent functionality existed in the Kahoot! condition, and Kahoot! group students in interviews showed limited recall of specific items they had answered incorrectly—consistent with the steeper delayed retention decay observed in the quantitative data.

DISCUSSION

Immediate vs. Delayed Recall: Why the Difference Matters

The most important finding in this dataset—and the one with the most direct practical implications—is not that both game-based platforms outperform conventional instruction on immediate recall. That finding is consistent with the existing literature and is, frankly, not particularly surprising: almost anything that increases engagement and provides immediate feedback will outperform a worksheet on a grammar test taken a week later. The more important finding is that Quizizz's delayed retention advantage over Kahoot! is large, statistically robust, and theoretically interpretable.

The desirable difficulties framework (Bjork & Bjork, 2020) provides the most parsimonious explanation. Kahoot!'s speed-competitive format optimises for immediate performance—it creates conditions that feel engaging and produce high scores during sessions, but the learning that results is, for many students, lightly encoded. The time pressure discourages the deliberate processing that deeper grammatical encoding requires; the focus on being first reduces the cognitive engagement with why a particular form is correct; and the absence of any error review mechanism means that wrong answers are passed over rather than reworked. Quizizz's self-paced format, with its built-in error review, creates conditions that are less exciting in the moment but more cognitively demanding in the ways that matter for retention: students process items at a pace that allows deliberation, encounter their errors at a point when they can do something about them, and practise retrieval of missed items before the session ends.

This distinction—between performance during a learning event and actual learning—is one that Bjork and Bjork (2020) argue is persistently underappreciated in

educational practice. Teachers and students tend to use performance during a lesson as a proxy for learning; it is a natural and understandable shortcut. But the data from this study are a reminder that the shortcut is unreliable. Kahoot! sessions produced higher-energy, higher-performance experiences that students and teachers found more satisfying in the room—and weaker long-term retention.

Platform Design and Grammar Complexity

The non-significant trend in the immediate recall data—towards Kahoot! advantages on simpler recognition items and Quizizz advantages on more syntactically complex structures—deserves attention even without reaching statistical significance. It is theoretically coherent: simpler recognition items (is this sentence grammatically correct, yes or no) may be adequately processed even under speed pressure, while more complex transformations (rewrite this sentence in the passive; change this direct speech to reported speech) require the kind of deliberate, multi-step processing that speed pressure interferes with. If this trend were to hold up in a larger study with more statistical power, it would have direct implications for which platform is appropriate for which types of grammar content.

For Indonesian EFL teachers working with the target structures in this study—particularly conditional sentences and reported speech, which require learners to hold multiple grammatical constraints in mind simultaneously—the implication is that Kahoot! may not be the right tool, regardless of its engagement advantages. A platform that gives students time to think is not a less exciting platform; it is a more appropriate one for the cognitive demands of the task.

Anxiety, Equity, and Competitive Design

The anxiety findings in this study are consistent with a well-established pattern in the gamification and FLA literatures: competitive game formats produce differential motivational effects that tend to advantage already-confident learners and disadvantage those with higher anxiety or lower proficiency (Elaldi, 2022; Hamari et al., 2020; Zarzycka-Piskorz, 2022). This is not an argument against Kahoot! as a tool—it is an argument for thoughtful implementation. Kahoot! works well, in this data and in the broader literature, for generating collective energy and engagement at the beginning of a unit, for reviewing material that students have already consolidated, and for creating the kind of shared classroom experience that can strengthen group cohesion and positive affect around English learning. What it is less well suited to is the careful, deliberate processing of grammatically complex new material—and its competitive public ranking creates conditions that are actively unhelpful for lower-confidence learners during the most anxiety-vulnerable phases of grammar instruction.

Quizizz, in this study, showed a notably more equitable distribution of engagement across the ability range. The lower-achieving students who had been visibly disengaged during later Kahoot! sessions were more consistently on-task during Quizizz sessions, and their error review behaviour—working through incorrect items after initial completion—suggests engagement with the grammar that was absent from their Kahoot! experience. For classrooms with wide proficiency ranges, and for grammar structures that generate significant anxiety among lower-confidence learners, Quizizz's design may simply be a better fit.

Implications for Practice

The practical implications of this study fall into three areas. First, platform selection should be driven by instructional goal and grammar content type, not by habit or preference. Kahoot! is a powerful engagement tool for relatively simple, consolidation-phase review; Quizizz is a more effective tool for deliberate initial practice of complex structures with sustained retention goals. Using both strategically—Kahoot! to launch a

unit and create collective energy, Quizizz for structured practice and error review as the unit develops—is likely to be more effective than relying on either alone.

Second, the review-missed-items functionality in Quizizz is not just a nice feature—it appears to be a key mechanism for the delayed retention advantage. Teachers implementing Quizizz should build in time for this review phase and signal to students that it is a core part of the activity, not an optional add-on for early finishers.

Third, anxiety management requires explicit attention in Kahoot! implementations. Strategies that have shown promise in the literature include removing or periodically hiding the live leaderboard, using team-based rather than individual scoring, and framing Kahoot! explicitly as a review game rather than a test—recontextualising the competitive experience in ways that reduce social threat without eliminating motivational energy (Bicen & Kocakoyun, 2018; Zarzycka-Piskorz, 2022).

Limitations

Several limitations of this study should be noted. The quasi-experimental design, using intact classes, limits causal inference even with pre-test controls. The eight-week duration, while longer than many comparable studies, cannot address questions about motivational sustainability over a full academic year. The study was conducted in a single school with a single teacher, limiting generalisability. The grammar test measured explicit knowledge only; transfer to communicative production was not assessed. Future research should address these limitations through larger, multi-site designs with longer follow-up periods and more diverse outcome measures.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to answer a practical question that EFL teachers in Indonesia face regularly: between Kahoot! and Quizizz, which is the better tool for grammar instruction, and in what sense? The answer is more textured than a simple ranking. For immediate engagement and short-term recall, the two platforms are broadly equivalent and both substantially outperform conventional instruction. For delayed retention—the outcome that matters most for genuine grammatical learning—Quizizz holds a significant and theoretically interpretable advantage, attributable to its self-paced format and error review functionality. For learner equity—ensuring that the motivational benefits of game-based learning extend to lower-confidence and higher-anxiety students—Quizizz again shows advantages, while Kahoot!'s competitive design creates differential effects that tend to widen rather than narrow the gap between confident and anxious learners. None of this means that Kahoot! has no place in the EFL grammar classroom. It means that its place is specific: it is a tool for energy and engagement at the right moments, not a general-purpose grammar practice platform. The instructional design question is not which platform to choose but how to use each one—and at what point in the learning process—to serve the full range of learners in the room.

REFERENCES

- Bicen, H., & Kocakoyun, S. (2018). Perceptions of students for gamification approach: Kahoot as a case study. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(2), 72–93. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i02.7467>
- Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2020). Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. In M. A. Gernsbacher, R. W. Pew, L. M. Hough, & J. R. Pomerantz (Eds.), *Psychology and the real world* (pp. 59–68). Worth Publishers.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.

- Chiang, H. H. (2020). Kahoot! In an EFL reading class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1101.05>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Demir, B., & Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2022). The effect of gamification on EFL learners' vocabulary learning and motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 342–357. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.23>
- Elaldi, Ş. (2022). Foreign language anxiety and EFL learner profiles: An exploration of anxiety sources and coping strategies. *TESOL International Journal*, 17(2), 44–68.
- Ellis, R. (2023). *The study of second language acquisition* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2022). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Hamari, J., Koivisto, J., & Sarsa, H. (2020). Does gamification work? A literature review of empirical studies on gamification. *Proceedings of the Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2014.377>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>
- Kapp, K. M. (2021). *The gamification of learning and instruction: Game-based methods and strategies for training and education*. Pfeiffer.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2025). Patchwriting, identity, and epistemic authority in Chinese EFL writers' source-based texts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 63, 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101118>
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2020). *How languages are learned* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, R. E. (2020). Computer games in education. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 531–549. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102744>
- Merkel, W. (2020). Plagiarism as ongoing uncertainty: A longitudinal study of novice writers' source use practices. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 10(1), 196–207. <https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v10i1.619>
- Musthafa, B. (2021). The Indonesian schooling context and academic writing preparation. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(3), 88–109.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2020). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Ortega, L. (2020). The study of heritage language development from a bilingualism and social justice perspective. *Language Learning*, 70(S1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12347>

- Plass, J. L., Homer, B. D., & Kinzer, C. K. (2020). Foundations of game-based learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(4), 258–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2015.1122533>
- Pratama, H. (2025). Student perceptions of plagiarism in Indonesian university writing courses. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 678–692. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i3.67823>
- Putri, N. A., & Maarof, N. (2021). Foreign language anxiety and EFL achievement: A study of Indonesian university students. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 234–248. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18196>
- Raza, S. A., Qazi, W., Khan, K. A., & Salam, J. (2022). Social isolation and acceptance of the LMS in COVID-19: An expansion of the UTAUT model. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(2), 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633120960421>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Skinner, E., Kindermann, T., Connell, J., & Wellborn, J. (2009). Engagement and disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In K. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223–245). Routledge.
- Sunardi, Suwandi, S., Saddhono, K., & Setiawan, B. (2020). EFL teaching in Indonesian vocational high schools: Context, challenges, and opportunities. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.10971>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, J., & Czik, A. (2016). Automated essay evaluation software in English language arts classrooms. *Computers & Education*, 100, 208–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.004>
- Zainuddin, Z., Shujahat, M., Haruna, H., & Chu, S. K. W. (2020). The role of gamified e-quizzes on student learning and engagement. *Computers & Education*, 145, 103729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103729>
- Zarzycka-Piskorz, E. (2022). Kahoot it or not? Can games be motivating in learning grammar? *Teaching English with Technology*, 22(1), 17–36.
- Zhao, F. (2019). Using Quizizz to integrate fun multiplayer activity in the accounting classroom. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(1), 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n1p37>
- Zheng, Y., & Cheng, L. (2022). Foreign language anxiety in Chinese EFL classrooms: A review of empirical research. *System*, 107, 102779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102779>