CRITICAL THINKING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: WHY UNIVERSITIES MUST MOVE BEYOND MEMORISATION

Ismoilov Ibrohimjon

Sophomore student at Karshi International University

ABSTRACT

Universities around the world claim to produce graduates who think independently, reason carefully, and solve problems creatively. In practice, however, the teaching methods dominant in many higher education institutions still reward students who reproduce information accurately over those who question it thoughtfully (Brookfield, 2012; Nilson, 2016). This article argues that critical thinking — understood as the disciplined ability to examine assumptions, weigh evidence, and reach well-reasoned conclusions — is not something that emerges automatically from years of university study (Facione, 1990). It must be deliberately cultivated through purposeful instructional design, assessments that demand reasoning rather than recall, and a classroom culture that treats uncertainty as intellectually productive rather than threatening (Bean, 2011; Mezirow, 1990). Drawing on a range of contemporary educational research, this article explores what critical thinking genuinely involves at the university level, why so many students arrive in higher education without it, and what specific changes in teaching, assessment, and institutional culture could make a meaningful difference (Halpern, 2014; Paul & Elder, 2019). The discussion is grounded in practical examples and concludes with a set of recommendations intended to be useful to students, instructors, and academic administrators alike (Tsui, 2002).

Keywords: critical thinking; higher education; active learning; university pedagogy; independent reasoning; assessment reform; intellectual autonomy; inquiry; metacognition; Uzbekistan

1. INTRODUCTION

Walking into a typical university lecture hall, one might observe the following scene: an instructor speaks from prepared notes, students write down what is said, and the understanding that will later appear on an examination consists largely of the ability to reproduce that content with reasonable accuracy. This model of education is so familiar that it is rarely questioned. Yet it rests on an assumption — that knowledge is something transferred from an expert to a learner — that modern learning science has given us strong reasons to doubt (Bransford et al., 2000; Freire, 1970).

The problem is not simply that lectures are boring or that students pay insufficient attention. The deeper issue is that passively receiving information and actively thinking about it are fundamentally different cognitive activities, and the skills associated with the latter do not develop on their own simply because a student has spent time in a classroom (Resnick, 1987; Vygotsky, 1978). Critical thinking — the capacity to interrogate ideas, detect weaknesses in arguments, consider alternative explanations, and form judgements that are genuinely one's own — requires practice, feedback, and an environment in which intellectual risk-taking is encouraged rather than penalised (Elder & Paul, 2010).

This matters enormously at the university level. Higher education is the stage at which young people are expected to transition from consumers of knowledge to contributors to it (King & Kitchener, 1994; Perry, 1970). Whether they are training to become doctors, engineers, economists, teachers, or lawyers, university graduates will encounter situations in which no textbook answer exists and in which the quality of their reasoning, not the quantity of their memorised facts, will determine the quality of their decisions (Dede, 2010; OECD, 2019).

This article takes seriously the claim that developing critical thinking is a core responsibility of higher education — not a luxury confined to elite research universities, and not a skill that some students happen to possess while others do not (Cottrell, 2017; hooks, 1994). It examines what critical thinking actually involves, why it tends to be underdeveloped in university students, and what evidence suggests can be done about it (Moon, 2008).

2. WHAT CRITICAL THINKING ACTUALLY MEANS IN A UNIVERSITY CONTEXT

The phrase "critical thinking" is used so frequently in educational mission statements and curriculum documents that it risks losing all precise meaning (Bailin et al., 1999). It is worth pausing to be specific about what it does and does not involve.

Critical thinking is not simply being negative or sceptical about everything. A student who reflexively dismisses every argument they encounter is not thinking critically — they are thinking lazily in a different direction (Paul & Elder, 2019). Nor is critical thinking a matter of intelligence alone. Many highly intelligent people hold beliefs they have never seriously examined, accept conclusions that fit their existing assumptions, and fail to notice when the evidence they cite does not actually support the claim they are making (Kahneman, 2011).

At its core, critical thinking involves several related but distinguishable intellectual activities. The first is analysis: the ability to break a complex idea, text, or situation into its component parts (Facione, 1990). The second is evaluation: the capacity to judge whether a piece of reasoning is sound and whether a conclusion follows from the premises offered in its support (Ennis, 1987, as cited in Halpern, 2014). The third is synthesis: the ability to draw together information from multiple, sometimes conflicting sources and construct a coherent, original position (Moon, 2008). The fourth — often underemphasised — is metacognition: the habit of monitoring one's own thinking and being willing to revise one's views in response to good reasons (Flavell, 1979; Zimmerman, 2002).

What distinguishes these activities from the kind of thinking rewarded by conventional university examinations is that they cannot be performed by memory alone (Brown et al., 2014). An assessment that asks students to apply a framework to a novel case they have not previously encountered, and to defend their application against objections, tests reasoning; an assessment that asks them to list the stages of that framework tests only recall. These are genuinely different cognitive demands (Nilson, 2016; Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014).

3. THE GAP BETWEEN EXPECTATION AND REALITY

Research conducted across a wide range of national contexts consistently finds that university students' critical thinking skills are weaker than both students and their instructors tend to assume (Tsui, 2002; King & Kitchener, 1994). One persistent finding is that students are often confident in their reasoning abilities while simultaneously demonstrating significant gaps in their capacity to evaluate arguments or distinguish a claim from the evidence offered in its support (Facione, 1990).

This overconfidence is not a character flaw. It is a predictable consequence of educational systems in which students are rarely asked to submit their reasoning to rigorous scrutiny (Brookfield, 2012). If assessments predominantly reward accurate recall and neatly structured summaries of course content, students learn — quite rationally — to invest their effort in developing those skills (Bean, 2011; Kuh et al., 2005). The habits of mind associated with critical thinking develop only when they are consistently demanded and rewarded (Elder & Paul, 2010).

The transition from secondary to higher education often exposes this gap sharply (Perry, 1970). Students who excelled in school by mastering content knowledge can find themselves disoriented when university instructors ask open-ended questions with no single correct answer, or expect written work that moves beyond description toward argument (King & Kitchener, 1994; Moon, 2008). The intellectual expectations of higher education, at its best, are qualitatively different from those of secondary schooling — but students are rarely given explicit guidance about what this difference involves (Cottrell, 2017).

A related challenge is disciplinary variation. Different academic fields have different standards of evidence and different conventions for constructing arguments (Bailin et al., 1999). Students who move between disciplines without understanding these conventions may apply inappropriate standards of reasoning without realising they are doing so. Critical thinking, in this sense, is not a single generic skill but a family of discipline-specific practices that share certain general features (Resnick, 1987; Halpern, 2014).

4. WHAT GETS IN THE WAY OF CRITICAL THINKING AT UNIVERSITY

4.1 The Pressure to Cover Content

One of the most powerful constraints on critical thinking in higher education is the pressure that instructors feel to cover a specified body of content within a limited number of contact hours (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014). When a course must move through fifteen weeks of material at a predetermined pace, there is limited time for the open-ended discussion, extended argumentation, and iterative revision that critical thinking development requires. Content coverage and depth of intellectual engagement are not always in conflict, but in practice, the demands of crowded syllabi frequently push toward breadth at the expense of depth (Nilson, 2016; Bean, 2011).

4.2 Assessment Design

Examination formats that prioritise the reproduction of factual information over the demonstration of reasoning skills create a powerful signal about what university really values (Kuh et al., 2005). When students know that their grade depends primarily on whether they can recall lecture content accurately, they concentrate their preparation on memorisation (Brown et al., 2014). Assessment reform is therefore not merely a technical matter of test design; it is a statement about what the institution believes education is for (Mezirow, 1990; Tsui, 2002).

4.3 Passive Classroom Norms

In many cultural and institutional contexts, there is an expectation — held by both students and instructors — that the appropriate posture of a student in a lecture is attentive passivity (Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994). Students who have been educated in traditions that emphasise deference to authority and correct answers over open-ended inquiry may find the invitation to think critically unfamiliar and even uncomfortable (Brookfield, 2012). Creating a classroom environment in which intellectual challenge is welcomed rather than perceived as disrespectful requires deliberate and sustained effort (Vygotsky, 1978; Kuh et al., 2005).

4.4 The Illusion of Understanding

Cognitive psychology has documented a widely occurring phenomenon in which people feel that they understand something more thoroughly than they actually do (Kahneman, 2011; Carey, 2014). Students who read a chapter and feel that they have understood it may be registering familiarity rather than genuine comprehension (Brown et al., 2014). This illusion of understanding is particularly pernicious for critical thinking development because it reduces students' motivation to engage in the effortful cognitive work that genuine understanding requires (Bransford et al., 2000; Flavell, 1979). Instructional strategies that make the limits of students' understanding visible — through testing, elaborative questioning, or the requirement to explain concepts in their own words — help to counteract this tendency (Zimmerman, 2002).

5. INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES THAT GENUINELY DEVELOP CRITICAL THINKING

5.1 Asking Questions That Have No Single Right Answer

Perhaps the simplest and most powerful shift an instructor can make is to move from questions that test recall to questions that demand reasoning (Paul & Elder, 2019; Elder & Paul, 2010). Asking students not only what a theorist argued but whether that argument is persuasive, what evidence would be needed to support or undermine it, and how it compares with competing positions requires students to do the intellectual work that critical thinking involves (Bean, 2011). This shift in questioning does not require the abandonment of content; it requires content to be treated as raw material for thinking rather than as an end in itself (Resnick, 1987; Nilson, 2016).

5.2 Assigning Tasks That Require Argument, Not Summary

Written assignments that ask students to summarise course material develop different skills from those that ask students to construct and defend an original argument (Bean, 2011; Moon, 2008). An essay that requires a student to take a position on a contested question, to anticipate and respond to objections, and to evaluate the quality of the evidence

they cite is doing something categorically different from an essay that asks them to explain what a theorist meant (Cottrell, 2017). Argument-based writing is essential for developing the reasoning capacities that higher education is supposed to produce (Tsui, 2002; Mezirow, 1990).

5.3 Making Thinking Visible Through Discussion

Structured classroom discussion, when designed well, externalises the reasoning process and makes it available for scrutiny in a way that silent individual work cannot (Vygotsky, 1978; Kuh et al., 2005). When students are asked to articulate their reasoning aloud, to respond to challenges from peers, and to revise their positions in light of the discussion, they are practising precisely the skills that critical thinking requires (Hmelo-Silver, 2004). Discussion formats that require students to present evidence for their positions, to steelman opposing views, and to identify the assumptions on which their arguments rest are far more productive than unguided open debate (Paul & Elder, 2019; Brookfield, 2012).

5.4 Teaching Students to Evaluate Sources

A significant component of critical thinking in the digital age is the capacity to assess the credibility and reliability of information sources (Wineburg & McGrew, 2019). University students frequently struggle to distinguish between a peer-reviewed research article and an opinion piece, or to recognise when a statistic is being presented in a misleading way (Dede, 2010; OECD, 2019). Explicitly teaching these evaluative skills — through guided practice with real examples rather than abstract description of what to look for — is an increasingly essential component of university-level intellectual education (Wineburg & McGrew, 2019).

5.5 Requiring Students to Reflect on Their Own Reasoning

Metacognitive practices — activities that ask students to think about how they are thinking — are among the most consistently effective tools for developing intellectual self-awareness (Flavell, 1979; Zimmerman, 2002). Reflective writing assignments that ask

students to identify the assumptions underlying their initial position, or to explain why they found a particular argument more persuasive than another, develop the habit of self-monitoring that distinguishes a critical thinker from an unreflective one (Moon, 2008; Mezirow, 1990). Such practices also help students develop the intellectual honesty to acknowledge when their reasoning has been inadequate (King & Kitchener, 1994).

6. THE STUDENT'S OWN RESPONSIBILITY

It would be misleading to suggest that the development of critical thinking is entirely the institution's responsibility. Students themselves play an indispensable role — and recognising this is itself an exercise in critical self-awareness (Zimmerman, 2002; Elder & Paul, 2010).

A student who reads only what is required, who never follows a footnote to its source, who accepts the first plausible explanation of something without asking whether it is actually the best explanation, and who regards intellectual discomfort as a sign that something has gone wrong rather than a signal that genuine thinking is occurring — such a student will not develop robust critical thinking regardless of how well their courses are designed (Carey, 2014; Brown et al., 2014).

The cultivation of intellectual curiosity, the willingness to sit with uncertainty, and the habit of subjecting one's own beliefs to the same scrutiny one applies to others' are dispositions that students must actively cultivate (Facione, 1990; Paul & Elder, 2019). The goal is not a state of perpetual radical doubt but the development of a default orientation toward ideas that combines genuine openness to being persuaded with appropriate resistance to being persuaded too easily (Bailin et al., 1999; Cottrell, 2017). That combination — intellectual humility and intellectual rigour simultaneously — is the hallmark of a genuinely educated mind (hooks, 1994; Mezirow, 1990).

For students at institutions like Karshi International University, where many are navigating the transition between educational traditions shaped by different expectations about the role of the learner, developing this orientation may require a conscious effort to

reframe what it means to be a good student (Perry, 1970; King & Kitchener, 1994). Being willing to disagree with a source, to ask a question to which the instructor does not have a ready answer, or to write an essay that reaches a conclusion different from the consensus view is not impertinence. It is intellectual growth (Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994).

7. CONCLUSION

This article has argued that critical thinking in higher education is neither automatic nor inevitable. It is the product of deliberate instructional choices, well-designed assessments, and institutional cultures that reward reasoning over recall (Facione, 1990; Bean, 2011; Tsui, 2002). Universities that genuinely wish to produce graduates capable of independent thought must be willing to examine their own practices honestly — to ask whether what they are actually teaching matches what they claim to value, and to make changes accordingly (Brookfield, 2012; Nilson, 2016).

For students, the message is both empowering and demanding. Empowering because it means that critical thinking is a learnable skill, not a fixed talent distributed unequally at birth (Elder & Paul, 2010; Zimmerman, 2002). Demanding because developing it requires effort, discomfort, and a willingness to be wrong (Carey, 2014; Moon, 2008). The universities and students that take this challenge seriously will be better positioned — intellectually, professionally, and civically — for the complex world they are being educated to navigate (OECD, 2019; Dede, 2010).

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). APA Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000

Bailin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. (1999). Conceptualizing critical thinking. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31(3), 285–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/002202799183133

Bean, J. C. (2011). Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (2012). Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions. Jossey-Bass.

Brown, P. C., Roediger, H. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2014). Make it stick: The science of successful learning. Harvard University Press.

Carey, B. (2014). How we learn: The surprising truth about when, where, and why it happens. Random House.

Cottrell, S. (2017). Critical thinking skills: Effective analysis, argument and reflection (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dede, C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st century skills. In J. Bellanca & R. Brandt (Eds.), 21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn (pp. 51–76). Solution Tree Press.

Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2010). Critical thinking development: A stage theory. Foundation for Critical Thinking. https://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/critical-thinking-development-a-stage-theory/483

Facione, P. A. (1990). Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. California Academic Press.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Herder and Herder.

Halpern, D. F. (2014). Thought and knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking (5th ed.). Psychology Press.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? Educational Psychology Review, 16(3), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. Routledge.

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter. Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1990). Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning. Jossey-Bass.

Moon, J. A. (2008). Critical thinking: An exploration of theory and practice. Routledge.

Nilson, L. B. (2016). Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

OECD. (2019). OECD future of education and skills 2030: OECD learning compass 2030. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2019). The miniature guide to critical thinking concepts and tools (8th ed.). Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.

Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Resnick, L. B. (1987). Education and learning to think. National Academy Press.

Svinicki, M., & McKeachie, W. J. (2014). McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers (14th ed.). Wadsworth.

Tsui, L. (2002). Fostering critical thinking through effective pedagogy: Evidence from four institutional case studies. Journal of Higher Education, 73(6), 740–763. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777179

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. Teachers College Record, 121(11), 1–40.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2