



Proven benefits

What 361 independent studies measure when Educaplay enters the classroom

DOCUMENT	Evidence report for school leaders, ICT coordinators and procurement. Every figure links to the study that measures it.
DATE	8 September 2026
SCOPE	361 published academic studies investigating the use of Educaplay in the classroom, carried out by teachers and researchers with no connection to Educaplay, in 15 countries.
STUDY FINDER	All the studies, with filters by subject, level, country and year: educaplay.com/research/
CONTACT	support@educaplay.com

On one page

With Educaplay, your class takes part more and learns more. Don't take our word for it: 361 independent studies measure it, seven in ten published in 2025 and 2026, and they agree. More participation, more motivation, better results. This report sets out which problem it solves, with which figure, in which study, and also where it does not improve things.

STUDIES

361

FROM 2025–
2026

70%

WITH DATA

266

TOP-TIER
JOURNALS

8

COUNTRIES

15

How to read the figures in this report

Each finding gives the study design and the number of students in brackets. The first figure for each problem always comes from a study with a control group, the design that best separates the effect of Educaplay from everything else in the classroom (except in inclusion, where there are only case studies and they are reported as such). All 37 figures quoted have been checked against the original text of each study.



What it solves, with numbers

Each heading is a classroom problem. Below it, what a study measured when Educaplay entered that class.

"My students switch off after ten minutes"

With Educaplay they stay with you.

- In a 7th-grade English class, engagement rose from 68% to 90% between the first cycle and the second (action research, 28 students). [See study](#)
- 75 university students worked with Educaplay for a month and the improvement in motivation had 90% acceptance (pre/post survey). [See study](#)
- In an Indonesian secondary school, Educaplay was associated with almost half of motivation (46%, $p < 0.001$; regression, 60 students). [See study](#)

"Marks don't go up however much I explain"

They go up when students practise by playing.

- In high-school chemistry, the Educaplay group went from 5.02 to 9.31; the control group, from 5.20 to 6.23 (quasi-experimental with control group, 38 + 38 students, 8 weeks, $p = 0.03$; *Educación Química*, Q3). [See study](#)
- In 5th grade, the Educaplay class finished on 75.4 and the control class on 65.6 (quasi-experimental with control group, 50 students, $p = 0.007$). [See study](#)
- In 5th-grade science critical thinking: From 44.4 to 67.4 with Educaplay; the control group, from 34.6 to 47.8 (quasi-experimental with control group, 48 students, $p < 0.001$). [See study](#)

"Marking eats my afternoons"

Activities mark themselves and students see the result instantly. It is the most frequent use across the 361 studies: Assessing through play.

- 90 Nursing students: The group assessed with Educaplay scored 89.20 versus 69.07 for the paper-based group on case-based learning (quasi-experimental with control group, $p < 0.001$; Cohen's $d = 2.77$; *BMC Medical Education*, Q1). In that same study perceived stress rose; see "Where it isn't magic". [See study](#)
- In an Ecuadorian school, all 10 teachers surveyed believe it helps reading comprehension, although 7 in 10 had received no training (survey, 25 students and 10 teachers). [See study](#)
- In 4th grade, an English test built in Educaplay yielded 12 valid items and a reliability of 0.77 (test validation, 28 students). [See study](#)



"The vocabulary doesn't stick"

It sticks.

- In Ecuador, 60 secondary students retained more English vocabulary than the control group, with a very large effect size (quasi-experimental with control group; $F = 49$). [See study](#)
- In 11th grade, the Educaplay class rose from 75.13 to 86.52 in English vocabulary versus the control group (72.22 to 78.33), with a large effect size (quasi-experimental with control group, 72 students; $d = 1.85$). [See study](#)
- In a boarding school, 42 students went from an average of 55.71 to 94.48 in six sessions (single group, pre/post). [See study](#)
- Vocabulary +22% and grammar +15% in 7th grade (action research, 28 students). [See study](#)

"They read badly and write worse"

Practising with Educaplay, they build better sentences, read better and make fewer spelling mistakes.

- In 2nd grade, the Educaplay class built sentences better than the control class: 81.03 versus 72.37 in the post-test (quasi-experimental with control group; $t = 3.57$; $p = 0.001$). [See study](#)
- In 10th grade, language literacy rose by 8.65 points with projects supported by Educaplay (quasi-experimental with control group, 64 students). [See study](#)
- In upper basic education, 120 students went from 10% to 92.5% at the high level of language skills (pre/post, single group). [See study](#)
- Spelling too: From 68% to 93% in 6th grade (pre/post, 23 students). [See study](#)

"Maths scares them"

Playing, they lose the fear and gain accuracy.

- In 8th grade, the Educaplay group gained 33% in geometry accuracy and 2.04 points on average over the control group (quasi-experimental with control group, 141 students in four classes). [See study](#)
- In 2nd grade, motivation for maths went from 55% to 67.66% in the first cycle and to 81.56% in the second (action research, 20 students). [See study](#)
- In pre-school, the Educaplay group finished at "Achieved" and the control group at "In progress" (quasi-experimental with control group, 28 students; $U = 50$; $p = 0.009$). [See study](#)

"I have students with special needs and I can't reach them all"

Here the evidence is case studies, and we report them as such.

- Four 5th-grade students with intellectual disabilities went from 75% achievement in the first round to 100% in the second (action research, 4 students). [See study](#)
- Five 4th-grade students with intellectual disabilities improved their sentence building (single group, pre/post). [See study](#)
- In Portugal, a special-education teacher embedded Educaplay in a blog to remove distractions, in a case study in *Education Sciences* (Q1). [See study](#)



"At university nobody can get them moving"

They move. And they prefer the gamified course.

- 86 first-year Nursing students: Those who practised Anatomy with Educaplay crosswords improved their analysis and synthesis skills (from 4.16 to 5.27; $p = 0.006$) and the control group did not (quasi-experimental with control group, 54 + 32; *Educación Médica*, Scopus). [See study](#)
- 147 trainee teachers at a Spanish university improved learning and motivation significantly (pre/post, five months, $p < .05$; *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, Scopus Q2). Educaplay was one of five gamified tools in the programme. [See study](#)
- 354 university students preferred the course gamified with Educaplay to the traditional one (4.03 out of 5) and felt they learned more (4.23 out of 5) (survey; *TechTrends*, Springer, Q1). [See study](#)
- In Civil Law at the University of Alicante, of the 76 who responded (out of 233 participants), 78% enjoyed it and 63% would want it in other courses. [See study](#)

Peer-reviewed: Eight studies in top-tier journals

Eight of these studies have passed the toughest filter in research: Journals listed in Scopus or Web of Science, the two indexes that decide which scientific publications count. There, other researchers review every article before it is published, and the quartile says which quarter of its field the journal sits in: Q1 is the top 25% in the world.

Table 1: Educaplay in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science, from highest to lowest quartile

JOURNAL AND YEAR	QUARTILE	STUDY AND AUTHORS	WHAT IT MEASURED
TechTrends, 2025 · Springer	Q1	Gamification in Higher Education: A Case Study in Educational Sciences. José Alexis Alonso-Sánchez, Juan L. Núñez Alonso and Elisa Santana-Monagas.	354 university students preferred the course gamified with Educaplay (4.03 out of 5) and felt they learned more (4.23 out of 5). See study
Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2025 · Wiley	Q1	Is Gamification Effective for Women Who Wish to Learn Computer Programming? Claudio Cubillos, Rafael Mellado and Cecilia Nóbile.	Four-week randomised experiment with 32 women: No differences in learning, and more satisfaction without a leaderboard. See study
Education Sciences, 2022 · MDPI	Q1	Enablers and Difficulties in the Implementation of Gamification: A Case Study with Teachers. Inês Araújo and Ana Amélia Carvalho.	What helps most in implementing gamification: Previous experience with games, creativity and time to plan. What holds it back most: Devices, internet and lack of time. See study



PROVEN BENEFITS · EVIDENCE REPORT

JOURNAL AND YEAR	QUARTILE	STUDY AND AUTHORS	WHAT IT MEASURED
BMC Medical Education, 2026 · Springer	Q1	EducaPlay gamified digital assessment versus traditional assessment in undergraduate nursing education. Atefeh Shamsi, Reza Zaeri, Mehdi Raei, Mohammad Pourebrahimi and Fatemeh Delfani.	90 Nursing students (Iran), quasi-experiment: The group assessed with Educaplay scored 89.20 versus 69.07 on case-based learning ($p < 0.001$; Cohen's $d = 2.77$), with more satisfaction, motivation and interaction. Honest note: Not randomised, the group was 100% male, and only the immediate effect was measured. See study
Applied Sciences, 2024 · MDPI	Q2	Leveraging Gamification in ICT Education: Examining Gender Differences and Learning Outcomes in Programming Courses. Rafael Mellado, Claudio Cubillos, Rosa Maria Vicari and Gloria Gasca-Hurtado.	62 Chilean university students, Educaplay in both groups: Women learned more in the version without points or leaderboard ($p = 0.037$) and both sexes preferred that version. See study
Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 2025 · Anadolu Univ.	Q2	A Gamified Digital Framework in Higher Education: Impact on Learning and Motivation. Elena Carrión Candel, Cristina de la Peña and Beatriz Chaves-Yuste.	147 trainee teachers at a Spanish university: Significant gains in learning and motivation ($p < .05$). Honest note: Educaplay was one of five gamified tools in the programme. See study
Educación Química, 2024 · UNAM	Q3	Gamification for learning the nomenclature of metal oxides in high-school students (<i>Gamificación para favorecer el aprendizaje de la nomenclatura de óxidos metálicos en estudiantes de bachillerato</i>). Aníbal Gonzalo Galarza Chilán and Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldívar.	The Educaplay group went from 5.02 to 9.31; the control group, from 5.20 to 6.23 (38 + 38 students, $p = 0.03$). See study



JOURNAL AND YEAR	QUARTILE	STUDY AND AUTHORS	WHAT IT MEASURED
Educación Médica, 2019 · Elsevier	Scopus	Impact of digital resources on the learning and development of the Analysis and Synthesis competence (<i>Impacto de los recursos digitales en el aprendizaje y desarrollo de la competencia Análisis y Síntesis</i>). María Concepción Garrido Astray, Gema Santiago Gómez, Margarita G. Márquez, Lucía Poggio Lagares and Sofía Gómez Santos.	86 Nursing students: With Educaplay crosswords, analysis and synthesis rose from 4.16 to 5.27 ($p = 0.006$); the control group did not improve. See study

When Educaplay reaches a top-tier journal, it is almost always as a tool inside a gamification study, not as the headline. The bulk of the 361 studies lives in regional journals and theses; their strength is convergence, not the authority of a single citation.

How teachers get these results

The studies do not talk about Educaplay on its own. They talk about Educaplay inside ways of teaching you already know. These are the four that come up most.

- **Assessing through play.** The test turned into a game, marked instantly. It is the most frequent use and the one noticed soonest.
- **Competing in teams.** The Teams-Games-Tournament format, widely used in primary: Practice shared out and a good atmosphere. Careful with the leaderboard; see "Where it isn't magic".
- **Reinforcing at home.** Activities mark themselves, so they work as revision without the teacher marking every attempt.
- **Flipping the classroom.** Prepare the topic at home, practise in class.

Where it isn't magic

The same studies that measure improvements point out the limits. We report them because an honest draw is worth more than an improvement without a source.

- **It doesn't teach on its own.** Educaplay provides the game; learning depends on the lesson built around it. What helps most in adopting it, according to a Q1 study with teachers: Previous experience with games and digital tools, creativity and time to plan. What holds it back most: Devices, internet and lack of time. [See study](#)
- **The leaderboard doesn't work for everyone.** In Chile, with Educaplay in both groups, women learned more in the version without points or leaderboard ($p = 0.037$) and both sexes preferred that version (randomised experiment, 62 university students; *Applied Sciences*, Q2). [See study](#) Another experiment with 32 women



learning to program found no differences in learning, and satisfaction was higher without a leaderboard (*Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, Q1). [See study](#) The wider literature points the same way: A competitive game improved performance but raised anxiety (*Computers & Education*). [See study](#) That is why competition can be switched off in Educaplay.

- **Assessing through play also adds pressure.** The same Q1 Nursing study where Educaplay assessment boosted learning measured that perceived stress rose in the Educaplay group while it fell in the paper group. Performance and experience have to be looked at together. [See study](#)
- **Sometimes it's a draw.** Compared on creative thinking, Educaplay and Wordwall performed the same ($p = 0.788$). [See study](#)
- **The enthusiasm doesn't always last.** In one study, once the initial push wore off, interaction was moderate (65%) and use not very continuous (60%). [See study](#)
- **It needs a confident teacher.** Without prior training it delivers less: In one school, 70% of the teaching staff had received none. [See study](#)

And learning games in general, according to research

The above is what has been measured with Educaplay. This is what decades of research say about learning games in general, with the strongest source available in each case.

Table 2: Benefits of games in education, with their backing in the wider literature

BENEFIT	SOURCE	WHAT IT SAYS
Active engagement	Hamari et al., 2016, <i>Computers in Human Behavior</i> . See study	Engagement in the game has a clear positive effect on learning; the challenge must grow with the student.
Drives motivation	Sailer and Homner, 2020, <i>Educational Psychology Review</i> (meta-analysis). See meta-analysis	Effect of gamification on motivation $g = 0.36$ (16 studies, 2,246 students). Another meta-analysis found no extra motivation from serious games; that is why it matters that with Educaplay it is measured.
Better retention	Wouters et al., 2013, <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i> (meta-analysis, 77 studies). See meta-analysis	Serious games beat conventional instruction in learning ($d = 0.29$) and in retention ($d = 0.36$).
Trains problem-solving	Cai et al., 2025, <i>Journal of Computer Assisted Learning</i> (meta-analysis, 21 studies). See meta-analysis	Digital games improve problem-solving, $g = 0.65$.
Builds confidence	Hung, Huang and Hwang, 2014, <i>Journal of Computers in Education</i> . See study	In maths, the game improved achievement, self-efficacy and motivation.
Takes the fear out of mistakes	Plass, Homer and Kinzer, 2015, <i>Educational Psychologist</i> . See study	Failing at no cost is one of the design elements through which games make learning easier. It is a design principle, not a measured outcome.



Where, with whom and in which subjects

Two big clusters. Indonesia is the most frequent setting, almost always in primary and secondary and closely tied to teacher training. The second is the Spanish-speaking world, above all Ecuador, with theses and articles on reading, maths and science. The range runs from pre-school to university.

Table 3: Make-up of the 361 studies (a study may cover several subjects)

COUNTRIES	LEVELS	SUBJECTS
Indonesia 198 · Ecuador 102 · Colombia 17 · Spain 10 · Peru 5 · Mexico 2 · Portugal 2 · Chile 2 · Argentina, Philippines, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Uzbekistan and Iran 1 · No country 16	Primary 158 · Secondary 128 · Higher education 53 · Other 16 · Pre-school 6	Social studies 75 · Language 70 · Maths 61 · Science 61 · General 50 · Foreign languages 47 · Inclusion 5

How this report was built

The corpus gathers the published academic research that studies the use of Educaplay: Articles, theses and conference papers located in databases, repositories and academic search engines. All 361 studies have a verified link to the original; those without one were removed. For each we record title, original title, authors, subject, level, country, year and whether it provides data. The 37 figures in this report have been checked one by one against the full text of the study, and each gives the design and the sample size.

It is worth knowing what this body of research is. Most of it is published in open-access regional journals and in theses, often with small samples. None of the studies settles the question on its own. Their value lies in convergence: Hundreds of independent studies, by teachers and researchers with no connection to Educaplay, in very different education systems, reach the same conclusion again and again. When an effect repeats across classrooms that different, it stops being anecdotal. And when it doesn't repeat, we say so.

Do you have to justify Educaplay at your school?

Here is the evidence ready to cite: 361 independent studies, 266 with data, 8 in top-tier journals, across 15 countries and from pre-school to university. With their limits spelled out. Filter the study finder by your stage and subject, cite the study that fits, and take this report to the meeting.

[Open the study finder](#) · [See the "Proven benefits" page](#)

Data as of 8 September 2026. The corpus gathers published academic research that studies the use of the Educaplay platform; its make-up and figures may change as new publications are added. The studies cited are the work of their authors and were neither commissioned nor funded by Educaplay.