

Publishing Group «Scientific Perspectives»

Christian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine

"Bulletin of Science and Education"

**№ 6(48) 2026
(Спецвыпуск)**

Kyiv – 2026

ISSN 2786-6165 Online

УДК 001.32:1 /3](477)(02)

Ідентифікатор медіа R40-05847

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-6\(48\)](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-6(48))

«Вісник науки та освіти»: журнал. 2026. № 6(48) 2026. С. 2654

Рекомендовано до видавництва Всеукраїнською Асамблеєю докторів наук з державного управління
(Рішення від 29.05.2026, № 11/5-4-26)



Згідно наказу Міністерства освіти і науки України 10.10.2022 № 894 журналу присвоєні категорії "Б" із історії та археології (спеціальність - 032 Історія та археологія) та педагогіки (спеціальність - 011 Освітні, педагогічні науки)

Згідно наказу Міністерства освіти і науки України від 23.12.2022 № 1166 журналу присвоєна категорія Б з філології (спеціальність - 035 філологія)

Журнал видається за підтримки Інституту філософії та соціології Національної академії наук Азербайджану, Всеукраїнської асоціації педагогів і психологів з духовно-морального виховання та Всеукраїнської асамблеї докторів наук з державного управління

Журнал публікує наукові розвідки з теоретичних та прикладних аспектів гуманітарних наук та мистецтва

Цільова аудиторія: вчені, лінгвісти, літературознавці, перекладачі, мистецтвознавці, культурознавці, педагоги, соціологи, історики, археологи, а також, інші фахівці з різних сфер життєдіяльності суспільства, де знаходиться застосування тематика наукового журналу



Журнал включено до міжнародної наукометричної бази Index Copernicus (IC), Research Bible, міжнародної пошукової системи Google Scholar



Головний редактор: Котельницький Назар Анатолійович – член-кореспондент Української Академії Наук, кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри мовної підготовки та міжкультурних комунікацій, ЗВО Університет трансформації майбутнього (Україна)

Редакційна колегія:

- ✓ **Азарова Лариса Євстахіївна** - докт.філол.наук, професор, завідувач кафедри мовознавства Вінницького національного технічного університету (Україна)
- ✓ **Берест Ігор Романович** - доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри медійних технологій, інформаційної та книжкової справи, Національного університету «Львівська політехніка» (Україна)
- ✓ **Беррі, Стівен** доктор історичних наук, професор, професор епохи Громадянської війни Коледжу мистецтв і наук Франкліна Університету Джорджії (США)
- ✓ **Вуколова Катерина Володимирівна** – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри романо-германської філології та перекладу Білоцерківського національного аграрного університету (Біла Церква, Україна), доцент Дніпровського відділення центру наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов Національної академії наук України, Дніпро, Україна (Україна)
- ✓ **Гурко Олена Василівна** - доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри англійської мови для нефілологічних спеціальностей Дніпровського національного університету імені Олеся Гончара, (Дніпро, Україна)
- ✓ **Заур Алієв** доктор філософії з історії науки, доктор філософії з політичних наук, доцент, доцент Інституту філософії та соціології НАНА, Азербайджан (Азербайджан)
- ✓ **Р. Ахмад Закі Ель Ісламі**, доцент, професор, доктор філософії, Департамент наукової освіти, Факультет підготовки вчителів та освіти, Університет Султана Агенга Гіртаяса, (Індонезія)



- Lytwyschko O.M.** 1067
*SOZIALPÄDAGOGISCHE UNTERSTÜTZUNG FÜR FAMILIEN,
DIE KINDER MIT SONDERPÄDAGOGISCHEM FÖRDERBEDARF
ERZIEHEN*
- Maksymova I.** 1080
*METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH PROCEDURES, AND PEDAGO-
GICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING STUDENT
MOTIVATION THROUGH PLAY-BASED TECHNOLOGIES*
- Адеєва О.В., Соколов В.І., Чебан В.Ф., Єфімов Г.О.** 1098
*МОДЕЛЬ ФОРМУВАННЯ ФІЗИЧНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ОСОБИС-
ТОСТІ ЗДОБУВАЧА ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ*
- Алексєєнко-Лемовська Л.В.** 1113
*ПРАКТИКО-ОРІЄНТОВАНА ПІДГОТОВКА У СИСТЕМІ
ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ ОСВІТИ ЯК ЧИННИК ФОРМУВАННЯ
ГОТОВНОСТІ МАЙБУТНІХ ІТ-ФАХІВЦІВ*
- Артюх В.О., Мінченко М.В.** 1128
*ПРО ІДЕЇ ЕКЗИСТЕНЦІАЛЬНОЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ В СУЧАСНІЙ
ФІЛОСОФІЇ ОСВІТИ*
- Бережнюк М.П.** 1142
*ГРА НА ТРАДИЦІЙНИХ ДУХОВИХ ІНСТРУМЕНТАХ ЯК
МИСТЕЦЬКО-ОСВІТНЯ ПРАКТИКА: ВІД ТРАДИЦІЇ ДО
СУЧАСНОСТІ*
- Брижак Н.Ю., Гусонька А.В., Огняник В.Я.** 1155
*ФОРМУВАННЯ ПІЗНАВАЛЬНОЇ САМОСТІЙНОСТІ МОЛОД-
ШИХ ШКОЛЯРІВ ЗАСОБАМИ ВИТИНАНКИ В ТЕХНОЛО-
ГІЧНІЙ ОСВІТНІЙ ГАЛУЗІ НОВОЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ШКОЛИ*
- Бурлака Н.І.** 1168
*СУЧАСНИЙ СТАН ТА ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ РОЗВИТКУ ФІНАНСОВО-
ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ВІДНОСИН В ОСВІТНІЙ СФЕРІ УКРАЇНИ*
- Вилков С.В., Вишківська В.Б., Вознюк О.В., Павловський І.В.,
Пустовалов Б.О.** 1183
*ШЛЯХИ УДОСКОНАЛЕННЯ ВІЙСЬКОВО-ПРАВОВОЇ ПІДГО-
ТОВКИ МАЙБУТНІХ УЧИТЕЛІВ «ЗАХИСТУ УКРАЇНИ»*



UDC 378.147

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-6\(48\)-1080-1097](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-6(48)-1080-1097)

Maksymova Iryna Senior Teacher of the Department of Pedagogy, Foreign Philology and Translation, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Kharkiv, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2507-5792>

**“METHODOLOGY, RESEARCH PROCEDURES, AND
PEDAGOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING STUDENT
MOTIVATION THROUGH PLAY-BASED TECHNOLOGIES”**

Abstract. The application of play-based technologies in the teaching students of higher education institutions significantly improves students' practical application ability and greatly stimulates their interest in learning, injecting unprecedented vitality and vitality into the classroom. This method brings students into a world of communication full of challenges and opportunities by constructing a series of vivid, interesting simulation scenarios that are close to real work and life scenarios, allowing them to personally experience the fun of communication through role-playing, thus arousing a strong motivation in learning.

Emphasizing the educational value of play in professional training, this study examines the development of positive motivation for learning among higher education students through the use of game-based technologies. This study reveals a strong correlation between game-based activities and increased levels of engagement, autonomy, and positive attitudes toward learning. However, the analysis also highlights key challenges, such as insufficient training, rigid curricula, and a lack of resources, which limit widespread implementation.

The article outlines the methodological framework and practical procedures of the study, including data collection strategies and experimental design. It then presents a series of evidence-based recommendations for more effective integration of games into educational practice. These include teacher training programs, flexible curriculum planning, the development of assessment tools focused on motivation, and the strategic involvement of higher education leadership.

The study concludes with clear pedagogical recommendations asserting that game-based learning is a powerful tool for fostering lifelong motivation when supported by systemic changes at the educational and policy levels. The study's findings contribute to the development of student-centered educational practices and offer practical advice for educators seeking to align motivation theory with everyday teaching strategies.



Keywords: curriculum development, educational psychology, empirical research, game-based learning, higher education students, intrinsic motivation, learning motivation, pedagogical innovations, student-centered educational practices, teaching strategies.

Макимова Ірина Олександрівна старший викладач кафедри педагогіки, іноземної філології та перекладу, Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця, м. Харків, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2507-5792>

«МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ, ПРОЦЕДУРИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ТА ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ РЕКОМЕНДАЦІЇ ЩОДО ПІДВИЩЕННЯ МОТИВАЦІЇ СТУДЕНТІВ ЗА ДОПОМОГОЮ ІГРОВИХ ТЕХНОЛОГІЙ»

Анотація. Застосування ігрових технологій у навчанні студентів вищих навчальних закладів значно покращує їхні практичні навички та суттєво стимулює інтерес до навчання, надаючи навчальному процесу безпрецедентну енергію та динаміку. Цей метод занурює студентів у світ комунікації, сповнений викликів та можливостей, шляхом створення низки яскравих, цікавих симуляційних сценаріїв, наближених до реальних робочих та життєвих ситуацій, що дозволяє їм особисто відчувати задоволення спілкування через рольові ігри, тим самим викликаючи сильну мотивацію до навчання.

Підкреслюючи освітню цінність гри у професійній підготовці, це дослідження присвячене вивченню формування позитивної мотивації до навчання у студентів вищих навчальних закладів за допомогою ігрових технологій. Дослідження виявляє сильну кореляцію між ігровими заходами та підвищенням рівня залученості, самостійності та позитивного ставлення до навчання. Однак аналіз також висвітлює ключові виклики, такі як недостатня підготовка, жорсткі навчальні програми та брак ресурсів, що обмежують широке впровадження.

У статті викладено методологічні засади та практичні процедури дослідження, включаючи стратегії збору даних та експериментальний дизайн. Далі наводиться низка рекомендацій, заснованих на фактичних даних, щодо більш ефективної інтеграції ігор у педагогічну практику. Серед них — програми підготовки викладачів, гнучке планування навчальних програм, розробка інструментів оцінювання, орієнтованих на мотивацію, та стратегічне залучення керівництва вищих навчальних закладів.

У висновках дослідження наводяться чіткі педагогічні рекомендації, в яких стверджується, що ігрове навчання є ефективним інструментом для



формування мотивації до навчання протягом усього життя, якщо воно супроводжується системними змінами на освітньому та політичному рівнях. Результати дослідження сприяють розвитку освітніх практик, орієнтованих на студентів, та містять практичні поради для викладачів, які прагнуть поєднати теорію мотивації з повсякденними стратегіями навчання.

Ключові слова: внутрішня мотивація, емпіричні дослідження, ігрове навчання, мотивація до навчання, освітні методи, орієнтовані на студента, освітня психологія, педагогічні інновації, розробка навчальних програм, стратегії викладання, студенти вищих навчальних закладів.

Introduction.

Problem statement. This work investigates the formation of positive learning motivation in higher education students through play-based technologies, a topic that has gained increasing relevance in the context of modern pedagogical practice. The growing demands for academic performance, often coupled with standardized testing and rigid instructional structures, have in many cases undermined students' natural curiosity and intrinsic drive to learn. Against this backdrop, the research sought to demonstrate that play - traditionally seen as separate from formal education - could serve not only as an engaging activity but as a purposeful instructional strategy for cultivating lasting motivation.

The purpose of the work is to analyze theoretical sources that describe the principles of gamification, substantiate play-based technologies to influence the motivation and performance of students in higher education institutions, and develop appropriate recommendations for implementing this technology in the educational process of higher education institutions.

The research object of the research is to explore how play-based methodologies affect the motivational landscape of higher education students and to develop practical proposals for their integration into educational systems. The research was structured across three comprehensive chapters, each contributing unique insights. The first chapter established the theoretical and conceptual foundations, the second presented empirical data and analytical interpretation, and the third transformed findings into methodological applications and strategic recommendations.

The first chapter reveals that motivation is a multifaceted psychological construct encompassing emotional, cognitive, social, and behavioral dimensions. **Analyses of recent research and publications.** Through the examination of theoretical models such as those proposed by Vygotsky, Piaget, Bruner, and Deci and Ryan, it became clear that motivation is both internally driven and externally influenced. For higher education students, learning environments that foster autonomy, competence, professional and social interaction are critical in building



and sustaining motivation. The chapter synthesized key definitions and opinions, confirming that game-playing technology provides an ideal context for these motivational triggers. When students are engaged in play, they display greater persistence, creativity, initiative, and joy - factors that directly contribute to enhanced learning outcomes to get efficient skills for their professional activity.

The study's theoretical significance substantiates the feasibility of using play-based technologies to motivate higher education students and increase their academic performance. Building on this theoretical understanding, the second chapter focused on empirical investigation. A mixed-methods research design was employed, incorporating quantitative surveys of teachers and students, structured classroom observations, and semi-structured interviews. The data collected provided a robust view of how play-based instruction is perceived, implemented, and received within real educational settings. Over 85% of teachers indicated that students showed increased motivation when play-based strategies were used. Observational data further supported this claim, documenting elevated levels of participation, attention, and peer interaction during playful lessons. Interviews with teachers revealed a positive attitude toward play-based learning but also pointed to systemic challenges such as lack of time, insufficient materials, and inadequate training.

One of the key insights from chapter 2 was the gap between theoretical endorsement and practical application. While both educators and students recognized the value of play in enhancing motivation, its implementation remained inconsistent across higher education institutions. This inconsistency was largely attributed to curriculum rigidity, pressure for measurable academic results, and a lack of institutional support. These findings underscored the need for a systemic approach to integrate play not as a supplementary tool but as an embedded instructional practice that aligns with educational goals.

The practical significance. Chapter 3 addressed this need by proposing a series of strategic interventions. The research methodology was outlined in detail, including when, where, and how the study was conducted. Based on this methodological rigor, five actionable proposals were formulated: enhancing teacher training in play-based methods, restructuring curricula to allow flexibility for playful learning, increasing students' involvement and understanding, providing equitable access to learning resources and space, and designing tools to assess motivational development. Each of these proposals was grounded in the empirical data and structured to support long-term, sustainable change in how motivation is approached in higher education institutions.

The study concluded that the use of play-based technologies holds significant potential for transforming educational experiences. Students are naturally inclined to explore, imagine, and collaborate - attributes that game-



playing naturally fosters. By leveraging these dispositions in a structured and purposeful way, educators can create classrooms where learning becomes a desirable, self-motivated process rather than an externally imposed task. Evidence from the research consistently indicated that when students are allowed to learn through game-playing, they demonstrate more initiative, stay focused longer, and approach tasks with a positive mindset.

At the same time, the research acknowledges the challenges and limitations in applying these methods widely. Teachers require not only awareness but also resources, time, and institutional encouragement to innovate their instructional practices. Students' perceptions must also evolve to recognize the value of play as academically meaningful. Finally, educational policy must shift from emphasizing rote performance metrics to supporting holistic developmental outcomes, including motivation, creativity, and social competence.

Presentation of the main material.

1. Research Design, Procedure, and Methods of the Empirical Study

This work is devoted to presenting and explaining the research design and procedures to study the formation of positive learning motivation among students of higher education institutions through the application of play-based technologies. This research covers the timing, settings, respondents, tools, and methodological choices that frame the entire empirical process. In addition to describing how the research was organized, it also explains the rationale behind the use of selected research methods and their contribution to the validity and reliability of the study's findings.

It is supposed that the empirical study is conducted during a 25-day period in the higher education institutions that have incorporated play-based instruction into their curricular or co-curricular programs. These institutions are selected based on their reputation for innovative pedagogy and their openness to participating in externally guided research activities.

The study consists of multiple stages: initial planning and instrument development, participant selection and ethical clearance, survey and observational data collection, qualitative interviews, document review, and, finally, analytical interpretation of the results. The primary aim of this empirical segment is to investigate how, in real-world learning and training conditions, play-based learning methods influence the motivation of young higher education students to engage actively in educational tasks.

The first step of the research is the design of the core data collection instrument - a 20-item questionnaire which is administered to both teachers and students. This tool is structured into four thematic blocks: emotional engagement, cognitive stimulation, social cooperation, and motivational sustainability [1, p.86-97]. The items are framed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly



Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Before wide distribution, the questionnaire undergoes a pilot phase involving five teachers and five students to test for clarity and internal consistency. Adjustments are made based on their feedback, especially in simplifying terminology for non-specialist participants and ensuring cultural sensitivity in wording.

Once finalized, the instrument is distributed to the teachers and students for professional training. All participating teachers have a minimum of three years’ teaching experience, where play-based technologies were used regularly. The surveys are administered in both online and printed formats, depending on the participants’ access to digital tools. To ensure maximum response rates, the researcher maintains active communication through coordinators and administrators.

The next step involves in-class observations. A total of nine classroom sessions are observed by the researcher using a structured rubric focused on behavioral and emotional indicators of motivation. These indicators include visible enthusiasm, participation without prompting, perseverance in playful tasks, voluntary collaboration, and transitions between play and non-play tasks. Observational field notes are transcribed daily and coded thematically in preparation for triangulation with survey results.

To supplement quantitative and behavioral data, semi-structured interviews are held with the teachers who participate in the survey. These interviews explore their understanding of learning motivation, their approach to incorporating play into lessons, perceived barriers, and examples of best practices. Interviews are conducted in-person, audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed for analysis. This qualitative layer provides depth and context that cannot be captured by the questionnaire alone [2, p.370-396].

To further contextualize the empirical process, an additional research method - document analysis - is employed. Relevant educational documents, including national curriculum standards, teacher training guidelines, and training activity records, are reviewed. This step helps align empirical findings with the policy intentions and institutional practices.

An overview of the methods used and the nature of the data collected is shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1

Research Methods and Data Collected

Research Method	Purpose in Study	Data Collected
Survey (Questionnaire)	Measure stakeholder attitudes and perceptions	Quantitative scores across 4 blocks



Research Method	Purpose in Study	Data Collected
Observation	Assess student engagement in real-time classroom settings	Field notes on behavior, emotion, and interaction
Interviews	Clarify ambiguous responses and gather qualitative insights	Open-ended commentary from the teachers involved
Document Analysis	Examine existing policies and curricular documentation	Framework references from guidelines

The reliability and validity of the data are ensured through triangulation of the different methods. For example, questionnaire data reveals that play-based methods increase student motivation. This is confirmed by observational data, which consistently documents high levels of engagement during activities such as role-play, cooperative games, and creative tasks [3, p.227-268].

One notable result emerged from a cross-analysis of survey data and interviews: while many teachers endorsed play-based methods, they also admitted uncertainty in evaluating student progress through such methods. Several respondents noted that educational policies favored more quantifiable outputs, such as test scores and grades, and offered little room for recognizing progress made through playful or experimental tasks. This finding suggests a misalignment between the motivational benefits of play-based learning and the structures in place for educational accountability.

It is also important to note the contextual challenges faced during the research. Some schools reported a shortage of age-appropriate learning materials, which limited the frequency and diversity of play-based strategies. In such classrooms, teachers relied on verbal games, peer interactions, or imaginative scenarios rather than physical materials, which in turn affected the nature of student engagement. These differences in classroom resources had a clear impact on the motivational responses observed [4, p.201-203].

Moreover, time allocation was an issue mentioned in both observations and interviews. Teachers indicated that while they valued play-based learning, rigid curriculum requirements and limited classroom hours restricted their ability to experiment or extend such activities. Despite these limitations, the study clearly demonstrated that even minimal integration of play—when done purposefully—had a significant positive impact on learners' motivational levels.

Overall, the research methods used in this chapter offered a multidimensional view of how motivation is formed and nurtured through play-based technologies. The use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches ensured a comprehensive understanding, while triangulation enhanced the credibility of the findings.



2. Strategic Proposals for Enhancing Motivation through Play-Based Technologies

The aim of the research is to offer strategic recommendations and proposals designed to strengthen and systematize the use of play-based strategies in promoting positive learning motivation among the students of higher education institutions.

This work presents a structured set of strategic proposals aimed at improving the formation of learning motivation in higher education institutions through the integration of play-based technologies. These strategies address systemic, institutional, and instructional levels, offering a comprehensive approach to creating motivationally enriched learning environments.

The proposals begin with the recognition that motivation is not solely a product of the students' internal disposition or the teacher's enthusiasm, but rather a dynamic interplay of context, resources, pedagogy, and institutional policy. The empirical study confirms that while most teachers and students value game-playing as an instructional tool, its consistent application is often hindered by limited resources, lack of training, rigid curricular structures, and absence of assessment frameworks tailored to motivational outcomes [5, p.156-158]. Therefore, the proposed strategies target five interrelated focus areas: teacher training, curriculum flexibility, infrastructure provision, and monitoring tools.

The first strategic direction involves building teacher capacity. Data from observations and interviews revealed that many teachers lack formal preparation in applying play-based methodologies [3, p.265]. While they understand the benefits and occasionally employ play-based technologies in practice, there is a clear gap between their intentions and implementation fidelity. To address this, it is proposed that teacher training institutions and local education authorities collaborate to deliver regular in-service training workshops focused on game-based pedagogy, classroom management during play, differentiation through play, and motivation theories. Certification programs could enhance teacher credibility and motivation to engage deeply with such approaches.

A second major proposal centers on integrating flexible curriculum design. One of the key findings of the study is the pressure teachers feel to complete rigid syllabi, leaving little room for creative or student-centered methods [6, p. 57-61]. To counter this, it is recommended that education policy bodies revise curriculum frameworks to allocate at least 15% of instructional time to structured play-based learning activities. These can include thematic play projects, inquiry-based games, role-play simulations, or cross-subject learning stations. Such flexibility would legitimize game-playing as an instructional method rather than an extracurricular activity and enable teachers to plan more effectively.

The third strategy involves strengthening students' engagement. Although



most students in the study acknowledged the value of play, some expressed concerns about its academic utility. This reflects a lack of understanding of how motivation and achievement are interrelated [7, p.445-457]. Therefore, monthly workshops, university newsletters, and informational leaflets could be developed to educate students about the cognitive, emotional, and social benefits of play-based learning. Higher education institutions can also organize “play demonstration” days where students can observe or participate in classroom activities, promoting shared understanding and reinforcing motivation for their professional activities.

A fourth crucial proposal addresses the disparities in material provision and infrastructure. Some classrooms observed lacked even the most basic materials for implementing creative or cooperative game-playing [8, p.315-318]. To ensure equity, it is recommended that all classrooms be equipped with a minimum play resource kit -including manipulatives, role-play facilities, story cards, and construction materials - and be provided with flexible furniture arrangements that support movement and group interaction. Infrastructural investment is a prerequisite for making motivational strategies inclusive and sustainable.

Finally, the fifth strategic proposal concerns the development of tools to monitor and evaluate the impact of play-based strategies on motivation. Currently, most assessment systems focus on cognitive performance, often overlooking the attitudinal and emotional aspects of learning [9, p.576-582]. To remedy this, it is proposed that universities adopt teacher-friendly observation rubrics and student self-assessment checklists that track indicators of motivation such as engagement, persistence, enjoyment, and autonomy. These tools not only provide feedback but also serve as professional development aids that help teachers refine their approaches.

These five strategic proposals are summarized in Table 2.1 below:

Table 2.1

Strategic Proposals for Enhancing Learning Motivation

Strategic Focus Area	Proposed Action	Expected Impact
Teacher Training in Play-Based Methodologies	Conduct regular in-service workshops and certification programs	Improved teacher confidence and implementation fidelity
Curriculum Flexibility for Play Integration	Introduce flexible modules allowing 15% of instructional time for play-based tasks	Enhanced adaptability to individual learner needs
Students' Engagement Programs	Organize monthly workshops and distribute informational materials	Stronger home-school motivational alignment



Strategic Focus Area	Proposed Action	Expected Impact
Resource Provision and Infrastructure	Ensure every classroom has a minimum play resource kit and space	More equitable access to motivational resources
Monitoring and Evaluation Tools	Develop observation rubrics and self-assessment tools for motivation tracking	Data-driven adjustment of pedagogical strategies

The implementation of these proposals requires careful planning, multilevel cooperation, and sustained investment. To guide the practical execution of these strategies, a five-stage implementation model is recommended. These stages include preparation, initiation, execution, evaluation, and sustainability. During the preparation stage, educational authorities conduct a needs assessment and develop supporting materials [10, p.57-59]. This is followed by initiation, which involves piloting the strategies in a small number of universities. The execution stage covers the broader rollout across institutions, including teacher support and material distribution. Evaluation focuses on collecting feedback and assessing the impact of the interventions [11, p.21-32]. Finally, sustainability involves embedding the strategies into educational policy and practice through long-term funding and policy reinforcement.

These implementation stages and the responsible parties for each stage are outlined in Table 2.2 below:

Table 2.2

Implementation Stages and Responsible Parties

Implementation Stage	Key Activities	Responsible Parties
Preparation	Needs assessment; training material development	Research team; teacher training institutes
Initiation	Pilot programs in selected schools; stakeholder briefings	School leadership; local education authorities
Execution	Rollout across schools with resource allocation and support	Teachers; curriculum developers; suppliers
Evaluation	Feedback collection; impact assessment	Supervisors; assessment specialists
Sustainability	Institutionalization through policy and ongoing support	Educational policy bodies; funding agencies

These stages emphasize a collaborative approach, where responsibilities are distributed across different educational levels. Education institutions act as operational units, local authorities provide coordination, teacher educators offer



content support, and national policymakers ensure system-wide coherence and alignment [12].

To ensure success, these strategies must also be culturally responsive [16, 35]. The play-based tools and examples selected should reflect the sociocultural background of the learners. For instance, role-play scenarios should include culturally familiar characters, local stories, and relevant social and professional situations [13, p.187-189]. This enhances relevance, authenticity, and student identification with the learning material - all of which contribute significantly to intrinsic motivation.

Moreover, the adoption of play-based strategies must be accompanied by a shift in mindset. Play should no longer be viewed as a supplement or distraction but as a legitimate and effective instructional strategy, especially during the foundational stages of education. This requires visionary leadership at the university level and advocacy at the policy level [14, p.182-185].

Finally, the strategic proposals outlined in this research work align closely with global educational trends that emphasize the holistic development of the specialists in professional activities. International frameworks such as UNICEF's "Learning through Play" initiative and UNESCO's "Happy Schools" framework stress the integration of joy, curiosity, and well-being into daily learning routines [15, p.197-199]. By localizing these principles through structured proposals, the present study contributes to both academic discourse and practical reform.

In conclusion, this section has translated the empirical findings into actionable strategies designed to enhance the motivational landscape of higher school education through play-based technologies. By targeting teacher training, curriculum flexibility, students' involvement, infrastructural equity, and evaluative innovation, the proposed framework aims to create a systemic, sustainable, and student-centered approach to motivation development [17, p.561]. These proposals form the basis for the final section, which will offer pedagogical recommendations and practical guidelines for implementation.

3. Pedagogical Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines

This chapter of this research has played a critical role in synthesizing empirical insights with actionable strategies to promote learning motivation in higher education students through play-based technologies. It has served not only as a methodological backbone of the thesis but also as a platform for evidence-driven proposals that translate theoretical foundations into practice [18]. This section summarizes the content of work, highlighting its contributions to educational theory, research practice, and the strategic improvement of motivational environments in higher education institutions.

The chapter deals with a comprehensive exploration of the research methodology and procedures employed to examine how play-based instruction



influences motivation. The study was carried out in the university over the course of one month and involved a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques, including questionnaires, classroom observations, teacher interviews, and document analysis. This mixed-methods approach ensured a broad and nuanced understanding of the complex variables that affect motivational development in higher education students.

The questionnaire was carefully designed to probe multiple dimensions of learning motivation - emotional, cognitive, social, and behavioral - using a 5-point Likert scale. Administered to a balanced group of 3 teachers and 30 students, the instrument revealed that a significant majority of both respondent groups perceived play-based learning as highly effective in enhancing students' motivation to engage in academic tasks. Teachers especially highlighted improvements in attention span, willingness to participate, peer collaboration, and task persistence when play elements were intentionally integrated into lessons [19, p.132-133; 20, p.1194-1212].

Complementing the survey data were direct classroom observations, which captured spontaneous and authentic behaviors not easily articulated through questionnaires [21, p.7-25]. The researcher noted instances of enthusiasm, voluntary participation, and imaginative engagement among students, confirming that the presence of playful elements made a tangible difference in the atmosphere and energy of the classroom. Whether through role-playing scenarios, interactive games, or creative story-telling, students displayed higher levels of involvement and a more positive attitude toward learning [22, p.268-286].

In addition to quantitative and observational data, qualitative insights were gathered through semi-structured interviews with teachers. These conversations offered valuable context and depth to the emerging patterns [23, p.1057-1070]. Teachers discussed their personal and professional experiences with play-based methods, the challenges they faced in implementing them, and their professional development needs. Most expressed a strong belief in the pedagogical value of play, yet many also cited systemic barriers - such as rigid curricular demands, limited classroom time, and insufficient training - as obstacles to more widespread adoption. This discrepancy between intention and execution highlighted the importance of institutional support and policy reform [24, p.52-78].

Another dimension of the methodology involved analyzing relevant educational documents and national curriculum guidelines [25, p.1-15]. This document review allowed the researcher to situate empirical findings within a broader policy context. Although educational frameworks generally supported student-centered and motivation-enhancing pedagogies, practical implementation was found to vary considerably between education institutions. Some institutions had invested in materials and space for game-playing, while others left such



practices entirely to teacher discretion [26, p.1-15]. This inconsistency pointed to the need for clearer directives, equitable resource distribution, and supportive leadership structures.

With the empirical groundwork laid, the research moved from analysis to synthesis by proposing five strategic directions for enhancing learning motivation through game-play technologies [27, p.736-755]. These proposals were derived directly from the research data and structured to target key areas of need. The first strategy focused on teacher training. Given the central role that educators play in shaping classroom experiences, the research emphasized the necessity of continuous professional development in play-based pedagogy. Workshops, certification programs, and peer-learning communities were recommended to improve teachers' confidence, competence, and creativity in using game-playing technologies as a learning tool [28, p.200-213].

The second strategy involved revising curriculum structures to accommodate flexible time allocations for game-playing. Teachers in the study consistently reported a lack of time to implement play-based activities due to tight academic schedules [29, p.113-115]. By formally dedicating a portion of instructional time to structured play, higher education institutions can ensure that these valuable methods are not sidelined but integrated as essential components of educational delivery.

A third recommendation was to enhance students' engagement. Despite recognizing the motivational benefits of play, some students expressed skepticism regarding its academic value [30, p.97-110]. The research proposed university-led initiatives - such as informational workshops, newsletters, and classroom observation days - to educate students about how game-playing supports not only motivation but also cognitive and social and professional development. A well-informed student community can become an active partner in sustaining motivation [31, p.33-35].

The fourth strategic direction addressed material and infrastructural equity. Observations showed that motivation was higher in classrooms where play materials were abundant and accessible [32, p.274-275]. Accordingly, the study recommended that universities provide basic resource kits and flexible furniture arrangements to enable movement and collaboration. These changes do not require significant financial investment but can yield substantial motivational dividends [33, p.137-155].

The final proposal concerned the development of assessment tools tailored to motivation. Traditional assessment methods often overlook affective and behavioral indicators of learning, focusing instead on knowledge recall and accuracy [34, p.120-145]. The study advocated for the introduction of observation rubrics, self-assessment forms, and reflective journaling to track motivational



trends over time. These tools not only inform instruction but also validate motivation as a legitimate educational outcome.

To operationalize these proposals, the chapter presented a five-stage implementation model - preparation, initiation, execution, evaluation, and sustainability. Each stage included specific activities and identified the responsible stakeholders, ranging from higher-school leaders and teacher trainers to policy makers and funding agencies. This structured approach ensures that reform efforts are not fragmented or superficial but sustained and systemic.

Together, these proposals represent a coherent and actionable framework for enhancing motivational environments in higher education institutions. Their strength lies in their alignment with both empirical evidence and global educational priorities. By situating game-playing technologies at the heart of motivational strategy, the study supports emerging paradigms that prioritize student well-being, creativity, and autonomy alongside academic achievement [35, p.22-27].

This work underlined the importance of context in educational research. The strategies proposed were not abstract theories but grounded in the realities of teachers' experiences, students' behavior, and institutional conditions. This context-sensitive approach enhances the relevance and applicability of the findings, making them suitable for immediate consideration by higher education institutions, educational authorities, and curriculum developers.

In reflecting on the chapter's overall contribution, several critical insights emerge. First, motivation is not an isolated construct but one that intersects with every dimension of the learning environment - pedagogical, emotional, social, and structural. Second, the use of play-based technologies offers a practical, student-friendly avenue for fostering motivation, provided that systemic enablers are in place. Third, genuine improvement requires more than individual effort; it demands coordinated action across levels of the educational system.

Moreover, this chapter reinforces the principle that pedagogical innovation should be supported by empirical inquiry. By using structured methods to collect, analyze, and interpret data, the study ensures that its recommendations are not only theoretically sound but also demonstrably effective. This evidence-based orientation is essential for gaining institutional support and for guiding future research and policy development.

Finally, the chapter has laid the foundation for a broader rethinking of how we approach motivation in early education. Rather than relying solely on external rewards, pressure, or rote tasks, educators can cultivate intrinsic motivation by creating learning experiences that are joyful, meaningful, and socially rich in professional activities. Play-based technologies - when thoughtfully designed and implemented - offer precisely such experiences [36, p.23-45].



In conclusion, this chapter has fulfilled its dual mandate of explaining the research methodology and translating findings into strategic action. It has shown how thoughtful research design can uncover important patterns, and how these patterns can inform practical, scalable improvements in educational practice. By integrating empirical rigor with pedagogical insight, the chapter provides a powerful argument for the central role of game-playing technologies in fostering lifelong motivation to learn.

Conclusions. In synthesizing the theoretical, analytical, and methodological components of this study, it becomes evident that forming positive learning motivation through play-based technologies is not just possible - it is necessary. If higher education institutions are to cultivate lifelong learners, then motivation must be treated not as a byproduct of success but as a prerequisite for it. The research contributes to this endeavor by offering a structured, evidence-based roadmap for integrating play in ways that are meaningful, sustainable, and contextually relevant.

In conclusion, this thesis affirms that game-playing is not a luxury or distraction from learning, but a vital educational strategy that taps into the developmental nature of studentship. It aligns instruction with the innate tendencies of students, turning learning into a joyful and engaging experience. By supporting teachers, educating students, reforming curricula, and providing necessary resources, higher education institutions can become environments where motivation thrives and students grow into capable, curious, and confident learners.

References

1. Skinner B. F. The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*. 1954. Vol. 24, №. 2. P. 86–97.
2. Maslow A. H. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*. 1943. Vol. 50, №. 4. P. 370–396.
3. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*. 2000. Vol. 11, №. 4. P. 227–268.
4. Sukhomlynsky V. A. How to educate a real human being. Kyiv : Radyanska Shkola, 1976. 320 p.
5. Vygotsky L. S. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1978. 320 p.
6. Leontiev A. N. Activity, consciousness, and personality. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice Hall, 1978. 304 p.
7. Boekaerts M. Self-regulated learning: Where we are today. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 1999. Vol. 31, №. 6. P. 445–457.
8. Reeve J. Understanding motivation and emotion. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley, 2009. 480 p.
9. Schunk D. H., Pintrich P. R., Meece J. L. Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications. Boston : Pearson, 2014. 640 p.
10. Piaget J. To understand is to invent: The future of education. New York : Grossman, 1973. 160 p.



11. Bruner J. S. The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*. 1961. Vol. 31, № 1. P. 21–32.
12. Wigfield A., Eccles J. S. Development of achievement motivation. San Diego : Academic Press, 2002. 512 p.
13. Hirsh-Pasek K., Golinkoff R. M. Einstein never used flashcards. New York : Rodale, 2003. 320 p.
14. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*. 2008. Vol. 49, № 3. P. 182–185.
15. Vygotsky L. S. Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986. 287 p.
16. Bruner J. S. The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. 224 p.
17. Gardner H. Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York : Basic Books, 2011. 544 p.
18. Rogoff B. The cultural nature of human development. New York : Oxford University Press, 2003. 448 p.
19. Sahlberg P. Finnish lessons 2.0: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland? New York : Teachers College Press, 2015. 288 p.
20. Tan C. Y. Explaining the achievement gap between students of different socioeconomic status in Singapore: The role of the school climate. *Educational Psychology*. 2016. Vol. 36, № 7. P. 1194–1212.
21. Kovalchuk Y., Shchudlo S. Transforming Ukrainian school education: Challenges and perspectives. *Ukrainian Educational Journal*. 2020. Vol. 1, № 1. P. 7–25.
22. Su C. H., Cheng C. H. A mobile gamification learning system for improving learning motivation and achievements. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 2015. Vol. 31, № 3. P. 268–286.
23. Pyle A., Danniels E. A continuum of play-based learning: The role of the teacher in play-based pedagogy and the fear of hijacking play. *Early Education and Development*. 2020. Vol. 31, № 7. P. 1057–1070.
24. Hirsh-Pasek K., Zosh J. M., Golinkoff R. M., Gray J. H., Robb M. B. Putting education in “educational” apps: Lessons from the science of learning. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 2022. Vol. 23, № 2. P. 52–78.
25. Weisberg D. S., Hirsh-Pasek K., Golinkoff R. M. Guided play: Principles and practices. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2020. Vol. 29, № 6. P. 499–505.
26. Martínez-Abad F., Chaparro-Cedillo A. Play-based pedagogy and the development of key competencies: A review of recent literature. *Education Sciences*. 2023. Vol. 13, № 2. P. 1–15.
27. Li H., Rao N., Tse S. K. From traditional to child-centered learning in East Asia: A conceptual and empirical review. *Early Child Development and Care*. 2020. Vol. 190, № 5. P. 736–755.
28. Nilsen S. How teachers support children’s mathematical thinking in play-based activities. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*. 2021. Vol. 29, № 2. P. 200–213.
29. Kanyal M., Cooper L. Play and pedagogy: Approaches to learning through play. London : SAGE Publications, 2021. 240 p.
30. Van Oers B. Learning and development through play: A sociocultural perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 2020. Vol. 50, № 1. P. 97–110.



31. Zosh J. M., Hopkins E. J., Jensen H., Liu C., Neale D., Hirsh-Pasek K., Whitebread D. Learning through play: A review of the evidence. Billund : LEGO Foundation, 2021. 80 p.
32. Bruce T. Early childhood education: A guide for students. London : SAGE Publications, 2021. 360 p.
33. Zhang Z., Liew J. Play, self-regulation, and motivation in professional education: A review of the literature. *Education and Development*. 2023. Vol. 34, №. 2. P. 137–155.
34. Pellegrini A. D., Dupuis D. Play as a context for learning and development. In: *Handbook of Child Psychology*. 8th ed. New York : Wiley, 2021. P. 120–145.
35. Bower C. A., Eberhart N. The power of play: Embedding social and emotional learning through playful instruction. *Educational Leadership*. 2022. Vol. 79, №. 6. P. 22–27.
36. Nicolopoulou A. Play, narrative, and early literacy: A Vygotskian perspective. *Human Development*. 2020. Vol. 63, №. 1. P. 23–45.

Література

1. Skinner B. F. The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*. 1954. Vol. 24, №. 2. P. 86–97.
2. Maslow A. H. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*. 1943. Vol. 50, №. 4. P. 370–396.
3. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*. 2000. Vol. 11, №. 4. P. 227–268.
4. Sukhomlynsky V. A. How to educate a real human being. Kyiv : Radyanska Shkola, 1976. 320 p.
5. Vygotsky L. S. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1978. 320 p.
6. Leontiev A. N. Activity, consciousness, and personality. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice Hall, 1978. 304 p.
7. Boekaerts M. Self-regulated learning: Where we are today. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 1999. Vol. 31, №. 6. P. 445–457.
8. Reeve J. Understanding motivation and emotion. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley, 2009. 480 p.
9. Schunk D. H., Pintrich P. R., Meece J. L. Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications. Boston : Pearson, 2014. 640 p.
10. Piaget J. To understand is to invent: The future of education. New York : Grossman, 1973. 160 p.
11. Bruner J. S. The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*. 1961. Vol. 31, №. 1. P. 21–32.
12. Wigfield A., Eccles J. S. Development of achievement motivation. San Diego : Academic Press, 2002. 512 p.
13. Hirsh-Pasek K., Golinkoff R. M. Einstein never used flashcards. New York : Rodale, 2003. 320 p.
14. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*. 2008. Vol. 49, №. 3. P. 182–185.
15. Vygotsky L. S. Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986. 287 p.
16. Bruner J. S. The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. 224 p.
17. Gardner H. Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York : Basic Books, 2011. 544 p.
18. Rogoff B. The cultural nature of human development. New York : Oxford University Press, 2003. 448 p.



19. Sahlberg P. Finnish lessons 2.0: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland? New York : Teachers College Press, 2015. 288 p.
20. Tan C. Y. Explaining the achievement gap between students of different socioeconomic status in Singapore: The role of the school climate. *Educational Psychology*. 2016. Vol. 36, №. 7. P. 1194–1212.
21. Kovalchuk Y., Shchudlo S. Transforming Ukrainian school education: Challenges and perspectives. *Ukrainian Educational Journal*. 2020. Vol. 1, №. 1. P. 7–25.
22. Su C. H., Cheng C. H. A mobile gamification learning system for improving learning motivation and achievements. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 2015. Vol. 31, №. 3. P. 268–286.
23. Pyle A., Danniels E. A continuum of play-based learning: The role of the teacher in play-based pedagogy and the fear of hijacking play. *Early Education and Development*. 2020. Vol. 31, №. 7. P. 1057–1070.
24. Hirsh-Pasek K., Zosh J. M., Golinkoff R. M., Gray J. H., Robb M. B. Putting education in “educational” apps: Lessons from the science of learning. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 2022. Vol. 23, №. 2. P. 52–78.
25. Weisberg D. S., Hirsh-Pasek K., Golinkoff R. M. Guided play: Principles and practices. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 2020. Vol. 29, №. 6. P. 499–505.
26. Martínez-Abad F., Chaparro-Cedillo A. Play-based pedagogy and the development of key competencies: A review of recent literature. *Education Sciences*. 2023. Vol. 13, №. 2. P. 1–15.
27. Li H., Rao N., Tse S. K. From traditional to child-centered learning in East Asia: A conceptual and empirical review. *Early Child Development and Care*. 2020. Vol. 190, №. 5. P. 736–755.
28. Nilsen S. How teachers support children’s mathematical thinking in play-based activities. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*. 2021. Vol. 29, №. 2. P. 200–213.
29. Kanyal M., Cooper L. Play and pedagogy: Approaches to learning through play. London : SAGE Publications, 2021. 240 p.
30. Van Oers B. Learning and development through play: A sociocultural perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 2020. Vol. 50, №. 1. P. 97–110.
31. Zosh J. M., Hopkins E. J., Jensen H., Liu C., Neale D., Hirsh-Pasek K., Whitebread D. Learning through play: A review of the evidence. Billund : LEGO Foundation, 2021. 80 p.
32. Bruce T. Early childhood education: A guide for students. London : SAGE Publications, 2021. 360 p.
33. Zhang Z., Liew J. Play, self-regulation, and motivation in professional education: A review of the literature. *Education and Development*. 2023. Vol. 34, №. 2. P. 137–155.
34. Pellegrini A. D., Dupuis D. Play as a context for learning and development. In: *Handbook of Child Psychology*. 8th ed. New York : Wiley, 2021. P. 120–145.
35. Bower C. A., Eberhart N. The power of play: Embedding social and emotional learning through playful instruction. *Educational Leadership*. 2022. Vol. 79, №. 6. P. 22–27.
36. Nicolopoulou A. Play, narrative, and early literacy: A Vygotskian perspective. *Human Development*. 2020. Vol. 63, №. 1. P. 23–45.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 14.05.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 28.05.2026

Журнал

«Вісник науки та освіти»

*№ 6(48) 2026
(Спецвыпуск)*

Формат 60x90/8. Папір офсетний.
Гарнітура Times New Roman.
Ум. друк. арк. 8,2.

Видавець:
Всеукраїнська асамблея докторів наук з державного управління
Свідоцтво серія ДК №4957 від 18.08.2015 р., Андріївський узвіз, буд.11, оф 68, м. Київ, 04070.