Email:

conference@houghtonstreetreview.com

Website:

www.houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

© 2026 International Online Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research. All Rights Reserved.

Editor-in-Chief:

Dr. Ewelum Johnson Nnadi

Managing Editors:

1.Harold Jan R. Terano

2.Dr. Mandakini Singla

3.Massoud Kaykhaii







GAMIFICATION AND INTERACTIVE PLATFORMS IN TEACHING PHILOSOPHY: DEVELOPING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' CRITICAL REASONING

Biybalaev Islombek Abdunazarovich
Independent researcher, Bukhara International University
E-mail: islombekbiybalayev@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6594-3567
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23569271

Abstract: The thesis analyses the use of gamification and interactive platforms (Kahoot!, Quizizz, Mentimeter) in philosophy classes not as a means of checking the recall of facts, but as a tool for identifying logical fallacies and weighing arguments. Drawing on D. Kahneman's distinction between System 1 and System 2, the thesis shows the risk that speed-based scoring rewards fast, intuitive thinking at the expense of deliberate reasoning. The author proposes a game format of "fast round – slow round – justification round" that alternates quick reactions with time for reflection and written justification.

Keywords: gamification, interactive platforms, critical reasoning, logical fallacies, philosophy teaching, System 1 and System 2, slow round

Annotatsiya: Tezisda falsafa mashg'ulotlarida geymifikatsiya va interaktiv platformalardan (Kahoot!, Quizizz, Mentimeter) faktlarni eslab qolishni tekshirish vositasi sifatida emas, balki mantiqiy xatolarni aniqlash va argumentlarni baholash quroli sifatida foydalanish masalasi tahlil qilinadi. D. Kanemanning 1-tizim va 2-tizim farqlanishiga tayanib, tezlikka asoslangan ball tizimi chuqur mulohaza hisobiga tezkor, intuitiv fikrlashni rag'batlantirishi xavfi ko'rsatiladi. Muallif tomonidan tezkor reaksiyani mulohaza va yozma asoslash uchun ajratilgan vaqt bilan almashtirib boradigan "tezkor raund – sekin raund – asoslash raundi" o'yin formati taklif etiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: geymifikatsiya, interaktiv platformalar, tanqidiy mulohaza, mantiqiy xatolar, falsafa o'qitish, 1-tizim va 2-tizim, sekin raund

Аннотация: В тезисах анализируется использование геймификации и интерактивных платформ (Kahoot!, Quizizz, Mentimeter) на занятиях по философии не как средства проверки запоминания фактов, а как инструмента выявления логических ошибок и взвешивания аргументов. Опираясь на различение Системы 1 и Системы 2 Д. Канемана, показан риск того, что начисление баллов за скорость поощряет быстрое интуитивное мышление в ущерб обдуманному рассуждению. Автором предложен игровой формат «быстрый раунд – медленный раунд – раунд обоснования», чередующий быстрые реакции со временем для рефлексии и письменного обоснования.

Ключевые слова: геймификация, интерактивные платформы, критическое рассуждение, логические ошибки, преподавание философии, Система 1 и Система 2, медленный раунд

Email:

conference@houghtonstreetreview.com

Website:

www.houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

© 2026 International Online Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research. All Rights Reserved.

Editor-in-Chief:

Dr. Ewelum Johnson Nnadi

Managing Editors:

1.Harold Jan R. Terano

2.Dr. Mandakini Singla

3.Massoud Kaykhaii







Introduction

When a lecture hall suddenly fills with music and students rush to tap the right colour on their phones, the teacher of philosophy may feel that the course has finally become lively. But what exactly has been activated: the students' reasoning, or only their reflexes? Interactive quiz platforms have quickly become part of university teaching in Uzbekistan, supported by the "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy, which calls for the wide use of digital technologies in education [1]. In philosophy, however, the value of a game depends on what it asks students to do. A quiz on the dates of al-Farabi's life checks memory; a game that asks students to find the hidden assumption in an argument trains thinking. This thesis examines how gamification can serve the second goal.

Main part

S. Deterding, D. Dixon, R. Khaled and L. Nacke define gamification as the use of game design elements in non-game contexts [2]. This definition is useful because it reminds us that gamification is not the same as playing a game: points, leaderboards, levels, timers and badges are elements that can be attached to any activity, including a weak one. If the underlying task is reproductive, the game elements only make reproduction more exciting. In terms of the revised Bloom's taxonomy by L.W. Anderson and D.R. Krathwohl, typical quizzes remain at the levels of remembering and understanding, while critical reasoning requires analysing and evaluating [3]. The first design decision, therefore, concerns the content of the questions rather than the choice of platform.

Philosophy offers rich material for questions of a higher level. Instead of "Who is the author of the theory of ideas?", a Kahoot! or Quizizz question may present a short argument and ask: "Which fallacy does this reasoning contain: hasty generalisation, appeal to authority, false dilemma or ad hominem?" Another type of question asks students to choose the premise that, if added, makes an argument valid, or to identify which of four statements would most seriously weaken a given claim. S. Toulmin's model of argument, with its claim, data, warrant, backing, qualifier and rebuttal [4], provides a convenient structure: a question may display a claim and its data and ask students to choose the hidden warrant. Mentimeter is suitable for a different purpose: its live scales and word clouds allow the group to show how convincing they find an argument before and after discussion, making a change of position visible.

Here, however, a serious risk appears. D. Kahneman distinguishes System 1, which works quickly, automatically and intuitively, and System 2, which is slow, effortful and deliberate [5]. Many quiz platforms award more points for faster answers and display a countdown timer. In a fact-recall quiz this is harmless, but in a task on fallacies it rewards exactly the kind of thinking that critical thinking should correct. A student who answers on first impression wins, while a student who rereads the argument and checks each option loses points. In this way the game can teach the opposite of what the philosophy course intends. H. Mercier and D. Sperber add another observation: individual reasoning is prone to confirmation bias, but people evaluate others' arguments much better in a group, where reasoning performs its argumentative function [6]. A purely individual race against the clock ignores this social dimension of reason.

Email:

conference@houghtonstreetreview.com

Website:

www.houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

© 2026 International Online Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research. All Rights Reserved.

Editor-in-Chief:

Dr. Ewelum Johnson Nnadi

Managing Editors:

1.Harold Jan R. Terano

2.Dr. Mandakini Singla

3.Massoud Kaykhaii







To address both problems, the author proposes a three-part game format "fast round – slow round – justification round". In the fast round, students answer a short series of questions with the timer and speed points switched on, as usual. This round serves as diagnostics: it shows the group's intuitive responses and, deliberately, includes items where the intuitive answer is attractive but wrong. In the slow round, the same or parallel items are presented again with speed scoring disabled (both Kahoot! and Quizizz allow the teacher to adjust timing and scoring settings) and with longer time limits; students first discuss each item in pairs before voting. In the justification round, the teacher shows the distribution of answers from the first two rounds, and each pair writes in Mentimeter or in a Moodle forum a one- or two-sentence explanation of why their final answer is correct and why the most popular wrong option is tempting. Points in this round are given for the quality of justification, assessed by simple criteria based on clarity and relevance. The comparison of the fast and slow rounds becomes a lesson in itself: students see their own System 1 at work and learn when to distrust it.

For example, in the topic "Society and man", the fast round may include an argument such as "Most successful people get up early; therefore getting up early makes people successful". Many students quickly choose a fallacy by its keyword without noticing the confusion of correlation and cause. In the slow round, pair discussion usually reveals the problem, and in the justification round students formulate it in their own words. P.A. Facione's Delphi consensus, which includes self-regulation among the core skills of critical thinking [7], gives a theoretical basis for this reflective step: the student does not only analyse the argument but also monitors his or her own way of answering.

The limitations of this approach should be acknowledged. Game elements can create competitive pressure that discourages weaker students; the leaderboard may be hidden or replaced with team scores. The novelty effect of platforms fades over time, so games should be used purposefully and not in every class. Finally, multiple-choice questions cannot replace extended writing; the format is a bridge to essays and discussions, not their substitute. The effect of the format will be examined in experimental work [the author's experimental data will be added].

Conclusion

1. Gamification in philosophy teaching is valuable only when game elements are attached to tasks of analysis and evaluation, such as identifying fallacies and weighing arguments. 2. Speed-based scoring carries the risk of rewarding System 1 thinking and must be consciously balanced. 3. The author's format "fast round – slow round – justification round" turns this risk into a learning resource by letting students compare their intuitive and reflective answers. 4. It is recommended to create a shared bank of fallacy and argument evaluation items for philosophy topics and to train teachers in configuring platform settings for reflective play.

References

1. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining "Raqamli O'zbekiston – 2030" strategiyasini tasdiqlash va uni samarali amalga oshirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida"gi Farmoni. 2020-yil 5-oktabr, PF-6079.

Email:

conference@houghtonstreetreview.com

Website:

www.houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

© 2026 International Online Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research. All Rights Reserved.

Editor-in-Chief:

Dr. Ewelum Johnson Nnadi

Managing Editors:

1.Harold Jan R. Terano

2.Dr. Mandakini Singla

3.Massoud Kaykhaii







2. Deterding S., Dixon D., Khaled R., Nacke L. From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining "gamification" // Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference. – Tampere, 2011.
3. Anderson L.W., Krathwohl D.R. (eds.) A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. – New York: Longman, 2001.
4. Toulmin S.E. The Uses of Argument. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
5. Kahneman D. Thinking, Fast and Slow. – New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
6. Mercier H., Sperber D. The Enigma of Reason. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
7. Facione P.A. Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of Educational Assessment and Instruction (The Delphi Report). – Millbrae, CA: California Academic Press, 1990.