

Revealing EFL Students' Perception towards the Implementation of *Kahoot!* in Learning Narrative Text at the Secondary School Level

Melina Cahyaningtyas^{1*}, Nur Chakim²

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

*Corresponding Author

e-mail address: melinacahyaningtyas@outlook.com

DOI : 10.21107/prosodi.v17i1.14772

Received 09 June 2022; Received in revised form 30 March 2023; Accepted 30 March 2023;

Published 10 April 2023.

ABSTRAK

Perkembangan teknologi informasi dan komunikasi terjadi sangat masif dalam beberapa dekade terakhir. Perkembangan ini memungkinkan guru untuk memanfaatkan aplikasi berbasis internet seperti *Kahoot!* sebagai alat belajar. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengungkapkan persepsi siswa tingkat menengah tentang penggunaan *Kahoot!* dalam mempelajari teks naratif. Partisipan dari penelitian ini adalah 66 siswa SMP di Sidoarjo. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kuantitatif untuk mengumpulkan dan menganalisis data. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa melihat *Kahoot!* dengan cara yang positif. Siswa menemukan *Kahoot!* sebagai alat pembelajaran yang dapat membantu mereka meningkatkan aktivitas mereka di kelas dengan lingkungan yang menarik, sehingga menghasilkan prestasi akademik yang lebih baik.

Kata Kunci: *Kahoot!*, aplikasi berbasis internet, teks naratif

ABSTRACT

Information and communication technology development has been massive in the last decades. This development allows teachers to utilize internet-based applications such as *Kahoot!* as a learning tool. This present study was conducted to reveal the perception of secondary level students about the use of *Kahoot!* in learning narrative text. The participants of this study are 66 students of a junior high school in Sidoarjo. The study uses the quantitative method to collect and analyze the data. This study shows that students see *Kahoot!* in a positive way. They find *Kahoot!* as a learning tool that may help them improve their activities in class with an engaging environment, resulting in higher academic achievement.

Keywords: *Kahoot!*, internet-based application, narrative text

BACKGROUND

The emergence of learning English as an international language has made the Indonesian education curriculum includes English as a subject taught at almost all levels. At the primary school level, English is a local content or an additional subject to improve students' competence in English. Moreover, junior high school and senior high school students begin to receive English as a compulsory subject in the first year until the third year of school. Thus, the majority of Indonesian students learn English for six years.

Although Indonesian students have been learning English for more than six years, a survey of the English Proficiency Index conducted by Education First (2020) shows that Indonesia scores 453, 74th of 100 countries globally, and this score is in the 15th rank in Asia out of 24 countries. This score is not in line with the length of studying English in school years. One English material taught in secondary schools is narrative text. Secondary school students begin to learn this material in the third year of junior high school, divided into several topics (Permendikbud 37 Tahun 2018, 2018). Despite the given fact, students still find problems in narrative text. Several studies show that students find difficulties in reading narrative text because of a lack of language knowledge, motivation, and background knowledge. Moreover, students find difficulties in comprehending the intrinsic details of narrative text and making inferences from the story given (Khoirunnisa, 2019; Sari, 2019; Yuvirawan et al., 2021).

Teachers are expected to discover new and fun ways to create an engaging environment to study and overcome the previously mentioned problems. According to Wang and Tahir (2020), teachers may use several approaches to create an engaging learning environment for the students, including breaking the class into smaller groups, questioning the audience, using written material, organizing debates, guest talks, and reaction panels.

In the last decades, the development of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has been massive. This massive development encourages students to explore the internet independently. Therefore, students are considered digital natives, and they are born to be familiarized with technology and its further development. Cakrawati (2017), in her study about the use of online learning platforms, states that these platforms provide the students with the features which allow them to work independently yet share their ideas through group discussion.

Several studies have described the adverse effects of utilizing internet-based applications. Despite its development, the internet-based application also has adverse effects on students as individuals. A study conducted by Arkoful and Abaidoo (2015) shows that utilizing the internet as a teaching medium causes students to feel remoteness between teacher and student, lack of communication skills, inefficiency in practical skills, risk of plagiarism, and increased cost of accessing the material from the internet. Moreover, Dina and Ciornei (2013) also describe that internet-based learning leads to excessive learning individualism, deterioration of the teacher's role in learning, favoritism to the students with analytic thinking but not those with synthetic thinking, and hindrance for the students in developing creative ability and entrepreneur spirit.

Using digital technology to transform classrooms into an engaging environment is not new. The use of ICT in learning attracts students' attention, facilitates students' learning process, helps to improve students' vocabulary knowledge, and promotes

meaningful learning (Yunus et al., 2013). Additionally, this technological tool opens up new potential due to its benefit since it offers a more personalized, instant, and engaging learning experience, such as *Kahoot!* in EFL classrooms. Despite its adverse effects, the internet provides numerous websites that English teachers may utilize to aid their teaching activities to increase student's engagement and motivation with the material taught.

Kahoot! is an internet-based application used in schools, universities, and other educational institutions. In 2012, Versvik, Brand, and Brooker developed this educational application as a project at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Later, they collaborated with Professor Alf Inge Wang and Åsmund Furuseth to establish the improved version of *Kahoot!* (Wang & Tahir, 2020). *Kahoot!* has successfully emerged as a website that provides many facilities for its users.

Kahoot! offers its users to create quizzes, share them with other users, and use existing quizzes created by others. *Kahoot!* users may also modify the shared quizzes. The games may be played individually or in a team using their personal computers, laptops, smartphones, and tablets. Teachers may use *Kahoot!* during the class activities with the students. Teachers may set students' activities to do outside the classroom. The goal of *Kahoot!* activities help students understand the material given by answering with the correct answer as quickly as possible to get as many points as possible.

This development of teaching using internet-based applications shows a positive perception from the students. Several researchers have studied the effects of *Kahoot!* on education, which shows that *Kahoot!* improves the academic results, improves class attendance, fewer late arrivals to class, higher course material downloads, improves classroom dynamics, and higher final grades (Fotaris, Mastoras, Leinfellner & Rosunally, 2016; Sarkar & Manzo, 2017)

The use of *Kahoot!* also motivates the students to pay more attention in class, provides the students with an enthralling class experience, allows students to take a break from long- hour classrooms, stimulates students to interact with the teacher and their peers, and improves material preparation before class (Licorish, George, Owen & Daniel, 2018; Wang & Tahir, 2020)

Nowadays, EFL teachers maximize internet-based applications such as *Kahoot!* as their teaching aid to promote learning activities and students' enthusiasm for learning English. For example, in a university's Chinese EFL reading class study, the participants show positive attitudes toward implementing *Kahoot!* in the EFL reading class (Chiang, 2020).

In the Indonesian context, research on the use of *Kahoot!* for teaching English shows that after using *Kahoot!* for teaching, the students are very enthusiastic about joining the class; they are more excited about coming to the class, and they pay more attention to English and are interested in learning more about what they have learned and want to tell others about it (Budiati, 2017).

Gender difference plays a role in the diverse perception between male and female students. Because of the different perception between male and female, teachers are expected to strengthening the students' character by utilizing technology (Darmaji et al., 2022). A study conducted by Ismail and Mohammad (2017) shows that gender difference is found in Malaysian medical education. Moreover, the study found that both genders show different perceptions of *Kahoot!* in promoting students' motivation. However, another research conducted by Chiang (2020) reveals that

gender difference is not found. Both male and female students share the same perception of using *Kahoot!*.

The previously mentioned studies about *Kahoot!* reveals that only a few researchers study secondary students' perceptions. Thus, the author conducted this research based on the curiosity of knowing secondary school students' perception of *Kahoot!*. Moreover, the English teacher in a state junior high school in Sidoarjo had not yet implemented *Kahoot!* in classroom activities. This evidence was obtained from the author's experience during the teaching internship program, in which students stated they were not familiar with this web-based application since their teacher had not implemented it yet.

Additionally, to create a new learning atmosphere, the author used *Kahoot!* in teaching narrative text and focused on students' vocabulary. The author utilized this application for teaching during the teaching internship program to promote students' enthusiasm and boost their understanding by creating a fun learning atmosphere.

This study finds out students' perceptions towards *Kahoot!* as a medium to teach the narrative text. In addition, the present study also finds out the students' enthusiasm during the teaching process. The research is limited to the students' perception of *Kahoot!* as a teaching medium.

The author conducted the research based on the following research questions: (1) How is the students' general perception of *Kahoot!* as the media for achieving effective learning and creating engaging content in learning narrative text?; (2) How is the students' perception of using *Kahoot!* in learning narrative text towards their enthusiasm, motivation, and interest?; (3) Is there any gender difference in the students' perceptions of *Kahoot!*?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs survey research by using online questionnaires. Survey research is conducted in six steps; planning, defining the population, sampling, constructing the instrument, completing the survey, and processing the data (Ary et al., 2014, p. 405).

The research population was 216 third-grade students of a state secondary school in Sidoarjo, consisting of twelve classes in the 2021/2022 academic year. The author chose the population based on the student's experience after using *Kahoot!* in learning narrative text.

This research used purposive sampling to determine the participants for this study. Purposive sampling is a probability sampling in which the participants are randomly chosen from a population; hence each participant has the same opportunity to be the sample (Ary et al., 2014, p. 169). As seen in Table 1, the participants consist of 38 female students and 28 male students. Therefore, the sample of the research is 66 students from different classrooms.

Table 1. Participants of the Study

	N	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Female	38	57.6	57.6	57.6
Valid Male	28	42.4	42.4	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

The author collected the data through questionnaires in Google Forms filled by the participants. The questionnaires include statements about how they perceive *Kahoot!* and their level of enthusiasm. It is presented on a five-point Likert Scale. The total of questions, adapted from Chiang (2020), is 19. They filled out the questionnaires based on their agreement scale from the statements given. There are five scales (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree. Furthermore, the author used SPSS to analyze the collected data to obtain accurate results for the study.

DISCUSSIONS

A. General Perception of *Kahoot!*

This part of the study analyzes general perception data from the participants. Table 2 shows students' perception that correlates with practical learning and engaging content presented by *Kahoot!*. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 represent students' perception of *Kahoot!* in promoting effective learning. Additionally, items 6, 7, 10, and 11 represent students' perception of *Kahoot!* in providing engaging content.

Table 2. Students' General Perceptions of *Kahoot!*: Effective Learning and Engaging Content

	Items	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Q01	<i>Kahoot!</i> improves the effectiveness of learning narrative text.	66	4.23	.675	2	5
Q02	<i>Kahoot!</i> increases success in learning narrative text.	66	4.44	.611	3	5
Q03	<i>Kahoot!</i> motivates cooperative learning.	66	4.44	.636	2	5
Q04	<i>Kahoot!</i> assist students in achieving active learning.	66	4.48	.561	3	5
Q05	Using <i>Kahoot!</i> can cultivate students' confidence to participate in classroom activities.	66	4.44	.659	3	5
Q06	<i>Kahoot!</i> can provide students with richer thematic content.	66	4.35	.568	3	5
Q07	The use of pictures in <i>Kahoot!</i> makes it easier for learners to understand the content.	66	4.44	.682	2	5
Q08	Using <i>Kahoot!</i> in activities enables students to comprehend the course's theme easily.	66	4.38	.651	2	5
Q09	<i>Kahoot!</i> can improve students' ability to think quickly.	66	4.58	.583	3	5
Q10	The use of video in <i>Kahoot!</i> can attract learners' attention.	66	4.39	.579	3	5
Q11	Button color harmony in <i>Kahoot!</i> is obvious.	66	4.55	.637	3	5

Adapted from Chiang (2020)

As seen in Table 2, compared to the traditional teaching method, participants agree that *Kahoot!* promotes success in learning narrative text (\bar{x} =4.44, SD=.611) and

effectiveness in learning narrative text ($\bar{x}=4.23$, $SD=.675$). Moreover, students also show a positive perspective of *Kahoot!* in terms of stimulating cooperative learning ($\bar{x}= 4.44$, $SD=.636$), cultivating students' confidence in participating in classroom activities ($\bar{x}=4.44$, $SD=.568$), and achieving active learning ($\bar{x}=4.48$, $SD=.561$).

Students agree that *Kahoot!* provides engaging content for the students with richer thematic content ($\bar{x}=4.35$, $SD=.568$), the use of pictures to ease learners ($\bar{x}=4.44$, $SD=.682$), and the use of videos ($\bar{x}=4.39$, $SD=.579$). They also agree that the button color harmony is apparent ($\bar{x}=4.44$, $SD=.637$). Moreover, students also agree that *Kahoot!* helps them to understand the theme of the course ($\bar{x}=4.38$, $SD=.651$). The students strongly agree that *Kahoot!* helps them to think quickly ($\bar{x}=4.58$, $SD=.583$).

This study reveals that students give positive feedback on the general perception of *Kahoot!* as the media for effective learning and creating engaging content in learning narrative text. These students agree that learning narrative text by using *Kahoot!* helps them promote their academic result by achieving effective learning. Moreover, *Kahoot!* also promotes students' participation in the classroom. This result supports previous studies, which show that *Kahoot!* helps students achieve high final grades and improve class dynamics (Fotaris et al., 2016; Sarkar et al., 2017; Licorish et al., 2018). This finding lies in one possible reason; the students feel confident in themselves since they are *digital natives* who have been used to using technology from an early age.

B. Students' Perception of Enthusiasm, Motivation, and Interest in using *Kahoot!*

This part of the study presents analyzed data on students' perception of enthusiasm, motivation, and interest in using *Kahoot!* in learning narrative text. Item 12 represents students' interest in the topic. Items 15, 18, and 19 represent students' enthusiasm for using *Kahoot!* for learning narrative text. Lastly, items 13, 14, 16, and 17 represent students' motivation in learning the topic by using *Kahoot!*.

As shown in Table 3, the participants agree that *Kahoot!* increases interest in curriculum topics ($\bar{x}=4.29$, $SD=.696$); in this case, the curriculum topic used is narrative text. Moreover, these students agree that *Kahoot!* helps them retain learning for a longer time ($\bar{x}=4.44$, $SD=.611$).

Table 3. Students' Perception of Enthusiasm, Motivation, and Interest in using *Kahoot!*

	Items	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Q12	<i>Kahoot!</i> increases interest in curriculum topics.	66	4.29	.696	2	5
Q13	<i>Kahoot!</i> makes activities more fun.	66	4.56	.530	3	5
Q14	Using <i>Kahoot!</i> in teaching can improve students' learning motivation.	66	4.50	.588	2	5
Q15	<i>Kahoot!</i> 's timed answer method can stimulate students' excitement.	66	4.52	.614	3	5
Q16	<i>Kahoot!</i> 's scoring system motivates students to become one of the top five.	66	4.59	.526	3	5
Q17	Using <i>Kahoot!</i> in class encourages learners.	66	4.53	.561	3	5

	Items	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Q18	Compared with the traditional learning environment, <i>Kahoot!</i> helps students retain learning for a longer time.	66	4.44	.611	3	5
Q19	<i>Kahoot!</i> can promote learning persistence in classroom activities.	66	4.35	.595	3	5

Adapted from Chiang (2020)

They strongly agree that *Kahoot!* makes activities more fun ($\bar{x}=4.56$, $SD=.530$), improves their learning motivation ($\bar{x}=4.50$, $SD=.588$), stimulates their excitement with the timed answer method ($\bar{x}=4.52$, $SD=.614$), motivates them to become the top five students ($\bar{x}=4.59$, $SD=.526$), and encourages them in class ($\bar{x}=4.53$, $SD=.561$). Moreover, *Kahoot!* promotes learning persistence in the classroom ($\bar{x}=4.35$, $SD=.595$).

The present study shows students' perception of enthusiasm, motivation, and interest after teaching-learning activities using *Kahoot!* at the secondary school level is positive. *Kahoot!* increases students' interest in the topic given. Students accept that *Kahoot!* makes the activities more fun and exciting for them. *Kahoot!* also promotes learning persistence in classroom activities and helps students retain learning for a longer time. These findings align with the previous study that indicates the use of *Kahoot!* motivates the students to pay more attention in class and improves classroom dynamics (Fotaris et al., 2016; Licorish et al., 2018; Wang & Tahir, 2020). The possible reason for this finding is that these students, as digital natives, had a high interest after knowing that they learned narrative text by using *Kahoot!*, therefore, their motivation and enthusiasm in learning narrative text are also significantly increased.

C. Gender Differences

The author uses t-tests to analyze the gender difference in the participants' perceptions of *Kahoot!*. The result of this analysis is considered significant if the p value is less than 0.05 ($p < .05$). The p value is symbolized as (p) to simplify the result.

Table 4 shows gender differences between male and female students in their perception for each item. It shows that gender difference is seen in item 19. The p value from item 19 is .045, which is lower than 0.05. On the other hand, item 1 to item 18 shows that there is no significant difference in both male and female students' perception since the p values for these items are higher than 0.05.

Table 4. Gender Differences

Item	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q01	Female	38	4.24	.751	.023	.133	.894
	Male	28	4.21	.568			
Q02	Female	38	4.42	.642	-.043	-.282	.779
	Male	28	4.46	.576			
Q03	Female	38	4.42	.599	-.043	-.271	.787
	Male	28	4.46	.693			

Item	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t value	Sig. (2-tailed)																																																																																																																																																																																				
Q04	Female	38	4.47	.603	-.026	-.187	.852																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.50	.509				Q05	Female	38	4.34	.669	-.229	-1.407	.164	Male	28	4.57	.634	Q06	Female	38	4.34	.582	-	-.105	.916	Male	28	4.36	.559	.015	Q07	Female	38	4.50	.604	.143	.839	.405	Male	28	4.36	.780	Q08	Female	38	4.42	.599	.100	.612	.543	Male	28	4.32	.723	Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369	Male	28	4.50	.638	Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045
Q05	Female	38	4.34	.669	-.229	-1.407	.164																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.57	.634				Q06	Female	38	4.34	.582	-	-.105	.916	Male	28	4.36	.559	.015	Q07	Female	38	4.50	.604	.143	.839	.405	Male	28	4.36	.780	Q08	Female	38	4.42	.599	.100	.612	.543	Male	28	4.32	.723	Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369	Male	28	4.50	.638	Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548								
Q06	Female	38	4.34	.582	-	-.105	.916																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.36	.559				.015	Q07	Female	38	4.50	.604	.143	.839	.405	Male	28	4.36	.780	Q08	Female	38	4.42	.599	.100	.612	.543	Male	28	4.32	.723	Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369	Male	28	4.50	.638	Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																				
Q07	Female	38	4.50	.604	.143	.839	.405																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.36	.780				Q08	Female	38	4.42	.599	.100	.612	.543	Male	28	4.32	.723	Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369	Male	28	4.50	.638	Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																	
Q08	Female	38	4.42	.599	.100	.612	.543																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.32	.723				Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369	Male	28	4.50	.638	Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																													
Q09	Female	38	4.63	.541	.132	.904	.369																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.50	.638				Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194	Male	28	4.29	.535	Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																									
Q10	Female	38	4.47	.603	.188	1.312	.194																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.29	.535				Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504	Male	28	4.61	.629	.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																					
Q11	Female	38	4.50	.647	-	-.673	.504																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.61	.629				.107	Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492	Male	28	4.36	.731	.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																	
Q12	Female	38	4.24	.675	-	-.691	.492																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.36	.731				.120	Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																														
Q13	Female	38	4.61	.495	.105	.795	.429																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.50	.577				Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675	Male	28	4.46	.693	Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																											
Q14	Female	38	4.53	.506	.062	.421	.675																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.46	.693				Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																							
Q15	Female	38	4.53	.647	.026	.171	.865																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.50	.577				Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831	Male	28	4.61	.497	.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																																			
Q16	Female	38	4.58	.552	-	-.214	.831																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.61	.497				.028	Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709	Male	28	4.50	.577	Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																																															
Q17	Female	38	4.55	.555	.053	.374	.709																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.50	.577				Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079	Male	28	4.29	.600	Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																																																												
Q18	Female	38	4.55	.602	.267	1.784	.079																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.29	.600				Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																																																																								
Q19	Female	38	4.47	.603	.295	2.041	.045																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Male	28	4.18	.548																																																																																																																																																																																							

* $p < .05$

From the result, this present study found no statistically significant difference between the female and male students' perception of *Kahoot!*. Both male and female students' perception is positive toward the use of *Kahoot!* in teaching narrative text. This result aligns with the study conducted by Chiang (2020), which shows no

significant difference between males and females in EFL college students. In contrast, a study conducted by Ismail and Mohammad (2017) shows a significant gender difference between male and female students.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, this study aims to reveal secondary level students' perception of the use of *Kahoot!* in learning narrative text as a material in the English subject. Gender differences and students' enthusiasm are also discussed. This study shows that students give positive feedback towards the use of *Kahoot!* in both general perception and their enthusiasm.

Gender differences discussed in this present study also show no statistically significant difference between the perception of female and male students. Both female and male students have almost the same perception regarding the use of *Kahoot!* in the classroom.

This study is limited to small-scale purposive sampling in a secondary school in Sidoarjo. The author suggests a broader sampling for a generalized result. Moreover, the author also suggests a further interview of students' perceptions to understand their hindrance in using *Kahoot!* as a language learning tool.

REFERENCES

- Arkorful, V., & Abaidoo, N. (2015). The role of e-learning, advantages and disadvantages of its adoption in higher education. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 12(1), 29–42.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2014). *Introduction to research in education (9th edition)* (L. Ganster & M. Kerr (eds.); 9th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Budiati, B. (2017). ICT (Information and Communication Technology) Use: Kahoot Program for English Students' Learning Booster. *Education and Language International Conference*.
- Cakrawati, L. M. (2017). Students' Perceptions on the Use of Online Learning Platforms in EFL Classroom. *English Language Teaching and Technology Journal* (ELT-Tech Journal, 1(1), 22–30.
- Chiang, H.-H. (2020). Kahoot! In an EFL Reading Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1101.05>
- Darmaji, D., Astalini, A., Kurniawan, D. A., & Aldila, F. T. (2022). Gender and Perception: Implementation of Web-based Character Assessment in Science Learning. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 6(1), 131–142.
- Dina, A., & Ciornei, S.-I. (2013). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Computer Assisted Language Learning and Teaching for Foreign Languages. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 76, 248–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.107>
- EF Education First. (2020). EF EPI EF English Proficiency Index. *EF EPI EF English Proficiency Index*.
- Fotaris, P., Mastoras, T., Leinfellner, R., & Rosunally, Y. (2016). Climbing up the leaderboard: An empirical study of applying gamification techniques to a computer programming class. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*.
- Ismail, M. A.-A., & Mohammad, J. A.-M. (2017). Kahoot: A Promising Tool for Formative Assessment in Medical Education. *Education in Medicine Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2017.9.2.2>

- Permendikbud 37 Tahun 2018, JDIH Kemendikbud (2018).
- Khoirunnisa, A. (2019). Students' Difficulties in Comprehending Narrative Text. *TELL: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal*, 7(2), 65–74.
- Licorish, S. A., Owen, H. E., Daniel, B., & George, J. L. (2018). Students' perception of Kahoot!'s influence on teaching and learning. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-018-0078-8>
- Sari, G. R. (2019). Students' Perception on Reading Comprehension Problems in Narrative Text. *In Digital Repository Universitas Jember* (Issue September 2019). Jember University.
- Sarkar, N., Ford, W., & Manzo, C. (2017). Engaging digital natives through social learning. *ICSIT 2017 - 8th International Conference on Society and Information Technologies, Proceedings*.
- Wang, A. I., & Tahir, R. (2020). The effect of using Kahoot! for learning – A literature review. *Computers and Education*, 149, 103818. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103818>
- Yuvirawan, M. F., Listia, R., & Amelia, R. (2021). Students' Problems in Reading Narrative Text. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences Education (ICSSE 2020)*, 525(Icsse 2020), 95–98. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210222.013>