

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY CRITICAL THINKING?

Why one of higher education's most familiar claims remains so unclear in practice

By: Gregory Stoup, VP Institutional Progress and Effectiveness
Cuyahoga Community College

A term everyone uses, few define clearly

American colleges speak with great confidence about critical thinking. It appears in mission statements, learning outcomes, accreditation reports, and strategic plans. Faculty describe it as a central aim of their teaching. Assessment frameworks claim to measure it. Employers say they need more of it. The phrase carries a quiet authority, as if its meaning were self-evident and widely shared.

Yet in ordinary conversation, that clarity quickly dissolves. Ask a group of faculty, administrators, and employers what critical thinking actually consists of, and the answers begin to drift. Some describe careful analysis of texts or data. Others emphasize problem solving or decision making. Still others speak about intellectual independence, skepticism, or creativity. Each of these gestures toward something important, though the boundaries between them remain indistinct.

The difficulty is not that critical thinking lacks substance. It is that the term has come to serve as a container for several related but not identical ideas. As a result, colleges often claim to teach it more precisely than they define it, and assess it more confidently than they can fully observe.

From general praise to disciplined judgment

A more careful reading of the scholarship offers a way forward. Across decades of work, a general pattern emerges. Critical thinking is best understood as a form of disciplined judgment. It involves interpreting information, weighing evidence, examining assumptions, considering alternative explanations, and arriving at conclusions that can be explained and revised. This definition shifts the conversation away from general praise and toward a set of intellectual acts that can be recognized in practice.

Seen in this way, critical thinking is not a personality trait or a vague intellectual posture. It is something that becomes visible when a person must decide what to believe or what to do under conditions of uncertainty. A student engaging in critical thinking does not simply repeat information or apply a familiar formula. The student asks what the evidence shows, what it does not show, how reliable the sources are, what assumptions are built into the argument, and how competing interpretations might be weighed. The resulting judgment is not merely asserted. It is explained, and it remains open to revision in light of stronger evidence or reasoning.

What critical thinking looks like in practice

This emphasis on observable judgment helps clarify what critical thinking looks like in day-to-day settings. In a classroom, it may appear when a student distinguishes between description and interpretation, identifies a missing piece of evidence in an argument, or revises a conclusion after encountering conflicting data. In a workplace, it may appear when an employee recognizes that a familiar metric no longer captures the underlying reality, questions the reliability of a data source, or explains a recommendation in light of competing stakeholder interests. In public life, it may appear when a citizen resists the pull of a compelling but weakly supported claim and instead asks how the conclusion was reached.

These are not abstract capacities. They are concrete behaviors that can be observed, practiced, and improved. They also reveal why the term becomes so diffuse in institutional use. Without attention to these specific acts, “critical thinking” easily becomes a placeholder for general intellectual quality rather than a description of what students are actually being asked to do.

Why knowledge and context matter

A second insight from the scholarship complicates the picture in a useful way. Critical thinking is often described as a transferable skill, though it does not operate independently of knowledge. Sound reasoning depends heavily on familiarity with the subject at hand. A student may reason effectively about historical sources and struggle to evaluate a scientific claim, or navigate a biological experiment with care and misinterpret a financial statement, because each domain carries its own patterns of evidence, standards of proof, and typical errors.

This does not mean that critical thinking cannot develop across contexts. It does suggest that it must be cultivated within them. The ability to weigh evidence in a laboratory is strengthened by repeated exposure to experimental design and data interpretation. The ability to evaluate arguments in a humanities course grows through sustained engagement with texts and competing interpretations. Transfer, when it occurs, is not automatic. It is the result of deliberate practice across varied settings, with attention to both the common structure of reasoning and the particular demands of each domain.

This insight helps explain why colleges can sincerely claim to emphasize critical thinking while still producing uneven results. A curriculum may map the outcome across dozens of courses, and assignments may be tagged to it, though the underlying work of helping students reason more effectively within disciplines and professions may remain uneven or implicit. Without a shared understanding of how critical thinking develops in practice, the institutional language can appear coherent while the student experience varies widely.

The limits of how we assess it

The question of assessment further sharpens the issue. Colleges frequently report that they assess critical thinking, though the methods used do not always capture the underlying capacity. Indirect measures, such as student self-reports, offer some insight into perception, though they do not show how students actually reason. Rubric-based assessments can be more informative when applied carefully, especially when they attend to evidence, assumptions, and conclusions in student work. Even so, the most compelling assessments tend to require students to engage in complex tasks that mirror real conditions, such as interpreting documents, evaluating claims, and constructing a reasoned response to a problem.

The distinction is consequential. It is one thing to state that critical thinking is valued. It is another to observe students making judgments under conditions of ambiguity, and to examine the quality of those judgments. When the latter becomes central, the conversation shifts from compliance with an outcome to the design of experiences that genuinely develop and reveal the capacity.

Beyond skill: the role of intellectual disposition

There is also a deeper dimension that is sometimes overlooked. Critical thinking is not only a set of skills. It involves dispositions as well. The willingness to seek out relevant evidence, to question one's own assumptions, to remain open to revision, and to tolerate uncertainty all shape how reasoning unfolds. A student may be able to identify an assumption in an assignment and still resist evidence that challenges a prior belief. In that sense, critical thinking includes a form of intellectual conduct, a way of engaging with ideas that extends beyond technique.

This combination of skill and disposition helps explain both the importance of critical thinking and the difficulty of cultivating it. It requires repeated practice, exposure to meaningful problems, and environments where questioning, revision, and explanation are expected and supported. It also requires a level of clarity about what the institution means when it invokes the term.

From institutional language to observable practice

That clarity is often what is missing. When critical thinking is treated as a general good, it is easy to affirm and difficult to enact. When it is defined more precisely as disciplined judgment, the implications become more concrete. Students must be asked to interpret information, evaluate evidence, examine assumptions, consider alternatives, and justify their conclusions. Faculty must design assignments that require these acts and provide feedback that strengthens them. Institutions must look for evidence of reasoning in student work, not simply evidence that the outcome was named.

Understood in this way, the question is less whether colleges value critical thinking and more whether they have translated that value into observable expectations and consistent practice. The term itself need not be abandoned. It does, however, need to be made more specific.

What colleges, employers, and public life require is not a vague commitment to thinking well. It is the ability to decide what to believe and what to do when the answer is not obvious, the evidence is incomplete, and the consequences matter. That capacity has long been described as critical thinking. It becomes meaningful when it is defined in terms of the judgments people are prepared to make and the reasoning they can bring to bear in making them.

Sources

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (n.d.). *VALUE rubric for critical thinking*. <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/critical-thinking>
- Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. University of Chicago Press.
- 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>
- Brookfield, S. D. (2012). *Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ennis, R. H. (1996). *Critical thinking*. Prentice Hall.
- Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction (The Delphi Report)*. American Philosophical Association. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED315423.pdf>
- Facione, P. A. (1995). *The disposition toward critical thinking: Its character, measurement, and relationship to critical thinking skill*. Insight Assessment.
- Halpern, D. F. (2014). *Thought and knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking* (5th ed.). Psychology Press.
- Kuhn, D. (1991). *The skills of argument*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, D. (1999). A developmental model of critical thinking. *Educational Researcher*, 28(2), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X028002016>
- Lai, E. R. (2011). *Critical thinking: A literature review*. Pearson Research Report. <https://images.pearsonassessments.com/images/tmrs/CriticalThinkingReviewFINAL.pdf>
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (n.d.). *Career readiness: Development and validation of the NACE career readiness competencies*. <https://www.nacweb.org/career-readiness/>
- National Research Council. (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13398>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Fostering students' creativity and critical thinking: What it means in school*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/62212c37-en>

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *The assessment of students' creative and critical thinking skills in higher education across OECD countries*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1a4cae5b-en>

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2019). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your learning and your life*. Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. Jossey-Bass.

Saavedra, A. R., & Opfer, V. D. (2012). *Teaching and learning 21st century skills: Lessons from the learning sciences*. Asia Society. <https://asiasociety.org/files/rand-21stcenturyskills.pdf>

Shavelson, R. J. (2010). *Measuring college learning responsibly: Accountability in a new era*. Stanford University Press.

Willingham, D. T. (2007). Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach? *American Educator*, Summer, 8–19. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Crit_Thinking.pdf

Zahner, D., et al. (2016). *Measuring critical thinking in higher education: Current state and next steps*. Council for Aid to Education. https://cae.org/images/uploads/pdf/Measuring_Critical_Thinking.pdf