© IJARW | ISSN (O) - 2582-1008
October 2025 | Vol. 7 Issue. 4
www.ijarw.com

INTEGRATING GAMIFICATION INTO THE CLASSROOM: THEORETICAL MECHANISMS FOR ENHANCING STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Luu Dat Phi[1], Nguyen Ha Minh Anh[2], Nguyen Do Thien Truc[3], Le Ngoc Dung4, Le Thi Tuong Vi[5], Do Thi Xuan Thu [6]

[1] *Independent Researcher, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*
[2,3,4,5,6] *Ho Chi Minh City University of Industry and Trade, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*

ABSTRACT

Although gamification has gained interest among researchers and practitioners, the mechanisms describing how gamification supports sustained student engagement are still scattered. This theoretical review synthesizes three major theoretical frameworks, including the Self-Determination Theory, Flow Theory, and the ARCS Model. This offers behavioral, cognitive, and affective nomenclature concerning engagement to explain how game elements (points, badges, challenges, and collaboration) stimulate engagement. The paper also analyses contextual factors/moderators such as age, culture, and technology that influence the effectiveness of gamification. The paper argues that gamification can foster intrinsically motivated engagement above extrinsic motivation if it is theory-driven and oriented toward solving particular issues. Consideration is thus given to a conceptual framework wherein the educator can place further consideration into the design of a sustainable and culturally responsive gamified learning environment.

Keyword: gamification, student engagement, self-determination theory, flow theory, ARCS model, educational psychology

1. INTRODUCTION

An aspect of the multiple perspectives defining student engagement is behavioral, emotional, or cognitive. Depending upon the type of engagement, it fosters learning outcomes. Academic attainment, perseverance, and moral development are some of the variables that relate to one's engagement in learning (McCormick et al., 2013). But, arrangements bound by memory tests rarely support an array of active participation and creative endeavors from the student (Khan & Ashraf, 2023; Amirova, 2025). Disengagement, boredom, and passive learning keep posing challenges for teachers (Macklem, 2014; Wong & Liem, 2022).

Gamification emerged as a pedagogical innovation that incorporates game elements such as points, badges, and leaderboards into non-game contexts to increase student engagement and learning outcomes (Dicheva et al., 2015; Christopoulos & Mystakidis, 2023; Triantafyllou et al., 2025). Whereas a significant portion of research about gamification has been concerned with short-term motivational outcomes, not as many authors have dwelt on the theoretical mechanisms that could explain how gamification actually brings about sustained engagement.

The present study attempts to overcome this gap by theoretically exploring the means of operation of gamification through these psychological frameworks: Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Flow Theory, and Keller's ARCS Model. SDT emphasizes gamified environments fostering autonomy, competence, and relatedness; Flow Theory focuses on challenge-skill balance and immediate feedback; and the ARCS model describes how attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction are maintained by appropriate game features. By connecting these theoretical perspectives, a conceptual model is proposed linking gamification design with multidimensional engagement outcomes. This discussion aims to provide some clarity about how the theoretical basis, rather than surface motivation, can render long-term and contextually adaptive gamification in education. In contrast to previous theories, which have occurred in fragments or various differentiations, this paper presents an overarching framework that synthesizes

psychological theories and instructional design theories and clarifies the mechanism through which gamification constructs its long-term engagement rather than short-term motivation or entertainment effects.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ENGAGEMENT

There are three fundamental theories forming the rationale to explain how gamification can harness student engagement: Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 1985), Flow Theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), and the ARCS model (Keller, 1987) (see Appendix). Although derived from motivational psychology, their combined force is precisely the very mechanism responsible for the engagement generated by gamified environments for learning at cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels.

According to SDT, learners increase their control and engagement when their basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are fulfilled within game elements involving choice, feedback, and cooperation. Flow Theory describes engagement as a deep immersion that happens when the challenges of learners are well-suited with their skills, an event that can be realized in gamified settings through adaptive difficulty, clear goals, and immediate feedback. Finally, according to the ARCS Model, instructional design principles relate to engagement through the learners' attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction, which can be supported through a well-designed system of rewards, meaningful challenges, and incremental achievements.

These perspectives, taken all together, build a complementary framework that explains how gamification increases engagement by coming to the aid of psychological needs, optimal learning experiences, and instructional design variables. This integration sets the theoretical groundwork behind the design of a gamified learning environment in which learners remain consistently interested, engaged, and persistent. Put simply, SDT posits the engagement generation concept; Flow posits how the process unfolds, with the balance of challenge versus skill; while the ARCS model prescribes engagement interventions for sustaining engagement in learners. This theoretical triangulation bases gamification in engagement theory rather than just motivation.

3. GAMIFICATION DESIGN IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Genres of games, being teaching methodologies, differ from gamification as an instructional design approach that applies selected game mechanics, such as points, badges, leaderboards, and challenges in non-game contexts. A gamified learning experience does not create full games; instead, it selectively applies these elements to motivate learners to remain engaged, enrich their learning experience, and collaborate with others (Zainuddin et al., 2020). It uses the attraction and motivation found in games, not for superficial rewarding but for pushing the user to participate, concentrate, and interact, which brings about better academic and social outcomes (Jaramillo-Mediavilla et al., 2024). Kapp (2013) offers a rather unfashionable definition that gamification constitutes the deliberate use of competition, badges, levels, and point scoring, instilled in an educational context to increase learner engagement and enjoyment.

Gamified systems, when aligned with the learning context, the learner profile, and instructional goals, are put into a continuous feedback loop during which students observe the progress of their learning, assess their performance in the learning process, and alter their learning strategies, thus affecting their competence and engagement (Qudsi, 2024). On the contrary, if implemented hastily, gamification can become a huge nuisance or an out-of-the-way distraction for learners, diverting their attention from learning goals (Ukgoda, 2025). In creating a working gamification for education, it becomes important to understand the interaction of game mechanics with engagement dimensions- behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and social-to foster active learning instead of passive participation. Table 2 provides a summary of game elements applicable in an educational setting, with types of engagement they are supposed to work on and their effect on learning.

Table 2. Game elements and their impact on student engagement

Game Element	Target Engagement Type	Impact on Learning/Behavior
Points	Behavioral	Encourages task completion, sustained participation, and goal-oriented effort
Badges	Emotional	Reinforces achievement, builds confidence, and strengthens commitment
Leaderboards	Behavioral/Agentic	Stimulates healthy competition and self-regulation
Quests/Challenges	Cognitive	Promotes problem-solving, critical thinking, and deep processing
Collaboration Tasks	Social	Enhances teamwork, communication, and peer support

4. FACTORS INFLUENCING GAMIFICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Cross-cutting dimensions such as fairness, cultural adaptation, technology, ethics, and sustainability offer worthwhile considerations in designing a gamification application. However, it is truly important to consolidate them into the factors directly influencing gamification in student engagement (Table 2). The effectiveness of gamified learning depends largely on the mutual alignment of game mechanics, learner characteristics, and pedagogical objectives, which activate attention, persistence, and participation by learners within the classroom context (Qudsi, 2024).

Engagement outcomes remain highly dependent on age group, subject matter of study, and educational objectives. Younger-goal learners may find it an enjoyable experience to engage in playful quests as learning stimuli with instant feedback; such a process nurtures curiosity and momentary attention. During later years, challenge-based and mastery models are increasingly encouraged to feed cognitive involvement and commitment. Therefore, splendidly gamified stimuli will be able to pattern those game elements that students will be ready for, developmentally, along with their curricular goals, with respect to the flourishing of deeper learner engagement and collaborative learning experiences (Qudsi, 2024).

The primary influential factors must be considered with care when designing gamified learning experiences (see Table 3). These factors include age and developmental stage as they dictate an appropriate level of challenge and the exact form of feedback to grab the attention of the learner. Subject area defines the choice of appropriate mechanics, such as problem-solving, competition, or collaboration. Learner characteristics, especially prior knowledge and style of cognition, are also of great influence as they directly affect the manner in which students perform the gamified tasks. Furthermore, culture determines preference for either competitive or cooperative structures, and the cultural background of students in interpreting cues to engagement. Technology access acts as a barrier to any attempt to incorporate aspects of any digital game in particular, which assures inclusiveness for digital test platforms. It is, of course, ethical considerations of fairness, transparency, and so forth that cement trust and prove the engagement for the long term.

Table 3. Factors influencing gamification effectiveness

Factor	Description	Impact on Gamification
Age group	Learners' developmental stage	Determines suitable challenge level and reward type
Subject area	Nature of the discipline	Influences types of game mechanics and engagement strategies

Factor	Description	Impact on Gamification
Student characteristics	Personality, motivation, prior knowledge	Affects responsiveness to gamified elements
Cultural background	Values, norms, collaboration preferences	Shapes design of tasks, competition, collaboration
Technology access	Availability of devices, internet	Enables or limits digital gamification options
Ethical considerations	Fairness, transparency	Influences trust, motivation, and intrinsic engagement

5. CLASSROOM PRACTICES AND PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES

Another imperative to properly gamify instruction is to strategize the infusion of certain game mechanics into a pedagogical design. This will serve the greater goal of offering multidimensional engagement to students. Gamification in higher education has been referred to as the simultaneous inclusion of several game-like elements within some instructional environment to increase co-activity, interaction, and cognitive involvement (Kabilan et al., 2023). Using Kahoot! and Quizizz for evaluation transforms it into exciting experiences through difficulty feedback, keeping students attentive, thus driving engagement behaviorally and further collaborative learning (Basuki & Hidayati, 2019). Similarly, a storyline approach to instructional design provides narrative continuity to purpose, compelling students to investigate, test, and refine knowledge collectively while resolving problems (Reiser et al., 2021). The techniques pitch fun into the learning while providing structure, monitoring, and meaningful rewards for ongoing engagement.

Moreover, when peer evaluation and group challenges are at stake, gamification actually fosters social interaction and accountability, so long as the activities are well-structured and goal-oriented (Hammar Chiriac, 2014). Gamification contributes to students' engagement on three levels such as behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Behaviourally, game-based reward systems tend to offer short-term reinforcement of active participation; however, in the long-term, arguably, effects will need to be in proper alignment with intrinsic learning goals (Kim & Castelli, 2021). Affectively, the opportunities inherent in a setting for accumulating points, badges, or level-ups help generate interest and emotional investment, while cognitively, those game mechanics, carefully tailored to a worthwhile challenge at hand, can enhance focus and problem-solving (Celasun & Kaya, 2025; Mullins & Sabherwal, 2020).

From a pedagogical perspective, the emphasis should be away from merely using gamification as a telling factor toward employing it as a learning design strategy to activate sustained engagement. When challenges, feedback, and progression are placed around genuine learning tasks rather than shallow competition, gamification becomes something else, an instrument for cognition and emotional engagement. Thus, instructors are encouraged to make gamified environments that strike a fine balance between fun and educational while engendering engagement theories such as Flow and ARCS, so that learning is meaningful and permanent.

6. CROSS-CUTTING DIMENSIONS

Gamification systems should be designed to ensure inclusivity and equity in engagement. For example, leaderboards are a common gamification mechanism that can be designed to encourage participation rather than competition. The use of macro and micro-level leaderboards that award different kinds of achievements will keep student motivation alive across contexts (Park & Kim, 2021). Still, consideration affecting the motivation of and honors being given to the student, nearly all the time, can deteriorate engagement. Therefore, rather than designing mechanisms that reward only outcomes, instructors should build upon collaboration, sustained effort, and progress. Such mechanisms can contribute to the equity and shared engagement of learners from various backgrounds and abilities through gamification.

The other cross-cutting dimension that shapes engagement is technology. Most gamified systems reside inside learning management platforms for real-time feedback and interactivity.

Notwithstanding, unequal access to digital tools and a steady connection may limit student engagement, especially in resource-constrained environments. To ensure inclusiveness, educators may go for some hybrid or low-tech gamification alternatives that uphold the same interactive principles instead of putting too much dependence on technology. The factor of cultural contexts also mediates how gamification influences engagement. Cultural norms- from individualism to collectivism- impart different degrees of receptiveness upon learners toward competition, creativity, and collaboration (Goncalo & Staw, 2006). Therefore, gamification methods should and ought to be molded to fit local cultural expectations, values, and interactional styles to optimize and maximize engagement outcomes. Lastly, an essential consideration remains in the ethics department. Games must avoid manipulation through overuse of reward-based conditioning and excessive psychological triggers. Transparent design ensures learners know and understand the worth of points or badges awarded in respect to a real learning outcome, and that they engage with these elements in a meaningful way rather than superficial engagement. When gamification works on an ethical and pedagogical basis, it becomes fun without losing its academic nature, which sustains a learner's engagement while at the same time not diminishing the standing of the subject matter.

7. RESEARCH AGENDA

There is a need to study the long-term impacts of gamification on levels of student engagement and learning outcomes. The majority of studies are intervention studies carried out over short-term periods or one-time implementational classroom studies that do not account for whether or not engagement remains beyond the phase of novelty. Longitudinal research, therefore, must be conducted to establish whether gamification continues to foster deep-level engagement, collaborative learning, and the development of intrinsic interest. A few questions include "*Does engagement sustain when gamification wears off?*", "*How does engagement vary for learners across different semesters or academic years?*" Another promising direction is to juxtapose digital and non-digital gamification within classroom contexts. Most of the studies consider digital tools, while non-digital ones might as equally effectively involve or might do so inclusively, particularly in very low-tech settings. An alternate study of how teachers combine analog with digital could lead to an engagement- and strengths-oriented gamification design.

Future studies need to look into contextual and cultural factors that impact engagement. That is to say, the efficacy of game elements could be different across age groups, subject disciplines, and sociocultural norms. For example, the competition-based element would engage engineering students but might be unsuitable for language or art education settings. Cross-cultural inquiries might shed light on the value of cooperation or competition within engagement mechanisms of gamified learning in respective countries. Additionally, complementary research ought to explicitly study the mechanisms of gamification design engagement outcomes through a theoretically grounded, mixed-methods approach. Observing classroom activity and combining those observations with surveys and qualitative interview procedures could work toward an integrated understanding whereby specified gamified elements, such as feedback, challenges, and rewards, may trigger the various cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of engagement. Such inquiries would further establish theoretical underpinnings and assist in applications in education.

8. CONCLUSIONS

This review contributes to expanding the domain of theory and pedagogy, stressing the emerging importance of gamification for engaging students in an educational setting. Bringing into play Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Flow Theory, and the ARCS model, it delineates how the gamified learning environment supports engagement at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels; however, it requires maintenance of a proper alignment of design elements with the needs of learners and instructional objectives. Rather than concentrating on motivation per se, the discussion focused on engagement being a dynamic outcome shaped through autonomy, challenge, feedback, and relevance. The review is also arguing that gamification should be treated as an adaptive pedagogical approach whose success depends on contextual factors like age, culture, or subject domain, instead of a one-size-fits-all solution. Whoever is executing the intervention, by balancing competition and collaboration, plus a bit of novelty and sustainability, very well might

promote participation and persistence in matters of learning. Shaping the necessity for a more systematic and longitudinal research agenda is the pursuit of cross-cultural distinctions, comparative modalities, and, most importantly, engagement mechanisms that are glued directly to measurable learning outcomes. This would lead to a better theoretical design of gamified learning environments and, as a consequence, toward a more precise application of gamification in educational practice. Such a theoretical synthesis serves as a unifying structure for explaining how gamification can create engagement in students beyond short-term motivation. By combining Self-Determination Theory, Flow Theory, and the ARCS Model, engagement is posited to arise out of need satisfaction, glorified experience, and alignment with relevance. Until now, this engagement model did not exist, thereby uniting psychological versus instructional perspectives and explaining how gamified educational environments can provide for sustained learner engagement in different contexts. Hence, teachers and researchers should consider gamification not just as an add-on but as a genuine pedagogical framework, informed by theory, that can sustain engagement, inform instructional design, and formulate probing questions for empirical inquiry on the long-term learning effects.

REFERENCES

[1]. Amirova, N. (2025). Traditional vs. non-traditional teaching in secondary education: A comparative analysis. *Porta Universorum*, *1*(3), 101-109. https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010309

[2]. Basuki, Y., & Hidayati, Y. (2019, April). Kahoot! or Quizizz: The students' perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 3rd English Language and Literature International Conferenc* (pp. 202-211).

[3]. Celasun, Z. G., & Kaya, S. Ü. (2025). Gamification in Education: Unlocking engagement and enhancing learning outcomes. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *24*(1), 59-63.

[4]. Christopoulos, A., & Mystakidis, S. (2023). Gamification in education. *Encyclopedia*, *3*(4), 1223-1243.

[5]. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow*. Harper and Row. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8_15

[6]. Dicheva, D., Dichev, C., Agre, G., & Angelova, G. (2015). Gamification in education: A systematic mapping study. *Journal of educational technology & society*, *18*(3), 75-88. https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.18.3.75

[7]. Goncalo, J. A., & Staw, B. M. (2006). Individualism–collectivism and group creativity. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *100*(1), 96-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.11.003

[8]. Hammar Chiriac, E. (2014). Group work as an incentive for learning–students' experiences of group work. *Frontiers in psychology*, *5*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00558

[9]. Jaramillo-Mediavilla, L., Basantes-Andrade, A., Cabezas-González, M., & Casillas-Martín, S. (2024). Impact of gamification on motivation and academic performance: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, *14*(6), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060639

[10]. Kabilan, M. K., Annamalai, N., & Chuah, K. M. (2023). Practices, purposes and challenges in integrating gamification using technology: A mixed-methods study on university academics. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(11), 14249-14281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11723-7

[11]. Kapp, K. M. (2013). *The gamification of learning and instruction fieldbook: Ideas into practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

[12]. Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and use of the ARCS model of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, *10*(3), 2-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02905780

[13]. Khan, Q., & Ashraf, S. (2023). Examination-centered approach instead of

student-centered; negative washbacks, spoiling real learning in education. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *45*(2), 93-106.

[14]. Kim, J., & Castelli, D. M. (2021). Effects of gamification on behavioral change in education: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(7), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073550

[15]. Macklem, G. L. (2014). Boredom and its relation to non-cognitive factors: Student motivation, self-regulation, engagement in learning, and related concepts. In *Boredom in the classroom: Addressing student motivation, self-regulation, and engagement in learning* (pp. 35-43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13120-7_5

[16]. McCormick, A. C., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2013). Student engagement: Bridging research and practice to improve the quality of undergraduate education. In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 28* (pp. 47-92). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5836-0_2

[17]. Mullins, J. K., & Sabherwal, R. (2020). Gamification: A cognitive-emotional view. *Journal of Business Research*, *106*, 304-314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.09.023

[18]. Park, S., & Kim, S. (2021). Leaderboard design principles to enhance learning and motivation in a gamified educational environment: Development study. *JMIR serious games*, *9*(2), 14-26. https://doi.org/10.2196/14746

[19]. Qudsi, H. (2024). Gamification in education: Boosting student engagement and learning outcomes. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, *5*(4), 686-693.

[20]. Reiser, B. J., Novak, M., McGill, T. A., & Penuel, W. R. (2021). Storyline units: An instructional model to support coherence from the students' perspective. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *32*(7), 805-829. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.1884784

[21]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78.

[22]. Triantafyllou, S. A., Georgiadis, C., & Sapounidis, T. (2025). Gamification in education and training: A literature review. *International Review of Education*, 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-024-10111-8

[23]. Ukgoda, H. (2025). Gamification in Education: Its Impact on Engagement, Motivation, and Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange (JETDE)*, *18*(3), 41-66. https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1803.03

[24]. Wong, Z. Y., & Liem, G. A. D. (2022). Student engagement: Current state of the construct, conceptual refinement, and future research directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, *34*(1), 107-138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09628-3

[25]. Zainuddin, Z., Chu, S. K. W., Shujahat, M., & Perera, C. J. (2020). The impact of gamification on learning and instruction: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Educational Research Review*, *30*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100326

Appendix

Table 1. *Theoretical frameworks underpinning gamification and student engagement*

Theory	Core Principles	Relevance to Engagement	Application in Gamified Learning
Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 1985)	Engagement is maximised when the basic psychological needs-autonomy, competence, and relatedness learners are satisfied.	Assuaging these needs enhances enduring behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engrossment-semantic relationships in this manner.	- Autonomy: giving a learner choices in quests or tasks. - Competence: using points, levels, and feedback on progress to give someone a feeling of mastery. - Relatedness: fostering team spirit, peer rewards, and cooperative challenges.
Flow Theory (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990)	Engagement is achieved when learners are able to experience a flow state that recognizes a proper proportion of challenge versus skill, involves clear goals, and ensures immediate feedback.	Facilitates deep concentration, immersion, and persistence among students in learning activities.	- Balance between challenge and skill: adaptive difficulty and pixel unlocking. - Clear goals: mission-based learning objectives. - Instant feedback: scoring systems, leaderboards, and badges.
ARCS Model (Keller, 1987)	The involvement will be compliant only when education grabs Attention, creates relevance, satisfies, induces Satisfaction.	Involves perception that can lead to engagement through thoughts and actions.	- Attention: drawing attention using curiosity, surprise, or interaction with visuals. - Relevance: finally, tying challenges with something from the real world or the learner's goal. - Confidence: scaffolding support and gradual accomplishments instilling efficacy. - Satisfaction: rewards, recognition on a mastery basis.