

Higher-Order Thinking in Higher Education: A Conceptual Analysis

K. Lalnunsiami*
Pramod Kumar N**

*K. Lalnunsiami, Research Scholar, Mizoram University Phone: 9089704400 Email:
lalnunsiamikhawlhiring@gmail.com

**Pramod Kumar N, Associate Professor, Mizoram University Phone: 9491762833 Email:
drnpkmzu@gmail.com

Abstract

Higher-Order Thinking (HOT) is an essential element of contemporary education, particularly in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), where students must cultivate critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity to succeed in an ever more advanced world. It is essential to promote critical and innovative thinking in 21st-century education to enhance students' future global competence in technology and interdisciplinary studies. This paper focuses on the methods used to promote HOT, such as inquiry-based learning (IBL), problem-based learning (PBL), flipped classrooms, authentic assessments, and technology integration. The study also calls for curriculum reforms and faculty development at HEIs to bring in HOT to better adapt students to the HEI system to maximise their academic and professional performances. Bridging the gap for practitioners, this paper helps build competency-based, student-centric learning spaces in higher education by discussing barriers and opportunities that HOT create.

Keywords: Higher-Order Thinking (HOT), Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), Bloom's Taxonomy, 21st-Century Skills, Pedagogy.

Introduction

The importance of higher-order thinking (HOT) has been increasingly recognized as integral to higher education, which promotes educational attainment, innovation, and the development of skills for solving complex problems. While LOTS (lower-order thinking) focus on memorization, recall, and comprehension, HOT promotes deeper cognitive skills such as analysis, evaluation, and synthesis (Richland & Simms, 2015). The transition from LOTS to HOT is a shift in educational philosophy from passive styles of learning to more active and student-driven pedagogies (Brookhart, 2010). As the world transforms in unprecedented ways, the need for HOT in higher education, where critical thinking and problem-solving skills are requisite for professional and personal life, has become a pressing need (Barnett & Francis, 2012).

The traditional method of education has always focused on rote memorization, with students learning through memorizing facts—which are never put into question, nor challenged, nor presented for real-world application (Shukla & Dungsungnoen, 2016). This approach does not sufficiently equip learners with the skills needed in today's workplace, where adaptability, creativity, and analytical reasoning are highly sought after (Ball & Garton, 2005).

In addition, the digital age has changed not just how we learn but also how we share and learn from each other, which means our students need a critical eye when confronted with the large volume of information available online (McLoughlin & Mynard, 2009). The growing trends of artificial

intelligence, automation, and complexity across domains further highlight the importance of higher-level thinking for students to compete for jobs in a global, technology-based economy (Kim, Yi, & Hong, 2020). In light of these realities, HOT is no longer a welcome addition to higher education in many models—it is a requirement for achieving academic and professional success (Davies, 2015).

Statement of the problem

Despite the growing international emphasis on higher-order thinking (HOT), its implementation in higher education institutions remains limited by content-heavy curricula, standardized assessments, and lecture-based teaching that encourage rote learning rather than critical analysis, evaluation, and application. Although digital technologies can support interactive and adaptive learning, they are often underutilized for promoting HOT, leaving many students inadequately prepared to apply knowledge meaningfully in real-world contexts. These issues call for a systemic transformation of curricula, faculty training, and assessment methods to integrate HOTs into the higher education experience.

Objectives of the study

1. To assess the theoretical underpinnings of HOT
2. To examine the importance of HOT in HEIs
3. To explore the effects of HOT in HEIs'
4. To provide recommendations for developing pedagogical strategies of HOT in HEIs

Objective 1 Theory Underpinnings of Higher Order Thinking

Higher-order thinking (HOT) has a strong foundation in cognitive and educational theories, including those that describe how learners assimilate, evaluate and generate knowledge that goes beyond rote learning. Many theoretical models have emerged to aid in the understanding and operationalization of HOT in higher education institutions (HEIs) (Newmann, D.B., Tay, L., & Diener, E., 2014). Three of the leading frameworks in this regard are Bloom's Taxonomy, Piaget's Cognitive Development Theory, and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978).

These theoretical models highlight different aspects of HOT; e.g. the structure of knowledge, the evolution of thinking skills with cognitive development, and the role of social interaction in building deeper understanding. Collectively, the theories presented provide a dynamic framework for engaging with higher-order thinking in HEIs, and ensuring students acquire the critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity skills that underpin success in further education, professional practice, and the workforce (Barnett & Francis, 2012).

Bloom's Taxonomy and Revised Bloom's Taxonomy

Bloom's revised taxonomy of educational objective serves a guiding framework for curriculum design, instructional practices, and assessment in higher education institutions (HEIs). Adapting courses to go beyond lower-order cognitive tasks (e.g., memorization) to higher-order learning (e.g., critical analysis; creative problem solving) helps prepare students for what they are going to encounter in life (Brookhart, 2010). Studies indicate that students demonstrate greater problem-solving skills, deeper conceptual understanding, and greater academic performance when the learning tasks are organized around Bloom's higher-order domains (Shukla & Dungsungnoen, 2016). Therefore, aligning HEI curricula according to Bloom's Taxonomy leads the students to attain

the cognitive skills necessary for success in emerging interdisciplinary disciplines (Renaud & Murray, 2007).

Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development

Jean Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development (1972) gives crucial perspective on how students develop higher-order thinking and the various stages of growth through these stages of intellectual development. Piaget believed that cognitive maturity is an important theoretical basis behind solving problems and analytical reasoning. Unlike younger learners, who usually need tangible experiences to grasp concepts, people in the formal operational stage can handle abstract ideas, think about hypothetical situations, and use logical reasoning to resolve complex issues (Brookhart, 2010). This shift is necessary for higher education as students are expected to conduct critical analysis, research and synthesize knowledge from a vast pool of information (Murtonen & Balloo, 2019). According to Piaget's theory, educators should design learning experience that are challenging enough for students as it gradually moved from concrete examples (or hands-on) to abstract reasoning task (Yuliati & Lestari, 2018).

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

Cognitive development is a social process, states Vygotsky, as meaningful learning takes place by way of social interaction and collaborative activity (Brookhart, 2010). This reflects modern pedagogical practices that focus on peer learning, group discussions and cooperative problem-solving as effective means of growing HOT (Brierton et al., 2016). Become an active learner through interactive learning environments based on dialogue, debate and knowledge construction (McLoughlin & Mynard, 2009): Research has shown that students who learn in interactive environments display a significant amount of analytical and creative thinking compared to those who learn in isolated environments.

One of the core ideas behind the ZPD is scaffolding, where an instructor supports and builds a student's understanding to perform tasks slightly beyond their current abilities (Vygotsky, 1978). In HEIs, scaffolding can be utilised by implementing structured questioning, guided research projects and feedback-driven learning to promote higher-order cognitive engagement (Alkhatib, 2019).

Enabling collaborative learning spaces based on Vygotsky's learning theory is successful in supporting students' problem-solving, critical reasoning and creative innovation (Kim, Yi, & Hong, 2020). The combination of peer-assisted learning, real-world case studies, and cooperative problem-solving tasks helps create an environment in which students collaboratively construct knowledge, sharpen their reasoning skills, and engage in elevated forms of discourse (Murtonen & Balloo, 2019).

Objective 2 Importance of Higher-Order Thinking in Higher Education

Improving Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving Capabilities

The HOT concept is vital to fostering critical thinking skills and problem-solving abilities, both of which are integral for achieving success academically and in a practical sense. Therefore, HOT persuades students to actively make decisions and think logically, which helps them to weigh up a situation, consider different solutions, and decide what to do. This process includes more than a rote recall of information, and enables greater cognitive engagement and a more complex understanding of intricate issues (Brookhart, 2010). From how to assess the quality of evidence at hand, to how to frame their own position in relation to a body of evidence and the ideas of others, students are

learning to think critically about what is before them, and that they are putting into practice the way they put these skills into action when faced with new problems.

Research studies have shown how HOT can contribute effectively to cognitive skills/abilities especially in the areas of critical thinking, analytical reasoning and problem solving (Shukla & Dungsungnoen, 2016). It has been shown that engaging in higher-order thinking (HOT) practices, like analyzing case studies, solution of complex problems and applying theories in real-world settings, boosts and improves decision-making skills along with cognitive flexibility (Richland & Simms, 2015). Research has also indicated that students engaged in inquiry-based learning and problem-based learning (PBL) show improved retention of knowledge and the ability to apply novel knowledge in unfamiliar contexts (Brierton et al, 2016). Therefore, HOT not only teaches students to excel academically, but also teaches them the cognitive expertise they need to solve complex problems in work settings (Barnett & Francis, 2012).

Enhancing Creativity and Innovation

As a driving force in creativity and innovation, HOT also provides foundational competencies for the interdisciplinary and dynamic 21st-century workforce. Students learn how to generate new ideas and apply existing knowledge in novel ways (both analysis and evaluation) and to innovate (creation) by performing these activities (Ball and Garton, 2005). More than just saying common knowledge, the process described isn't just academic but is also used in problem-solving in the outside world, where the need to be able to think outside the box makes a difference in finding solutions to complex questions. HOT helps students both view issues through multiple lenses and integrate knowledge across domains, important in addressing complex problems that necessitate a grasp of different domains (Kim et al., 2020).

A concrete example where HOT comes into play is when it comes to interdisciplinary projects where students from various fields work together to solve global issues, including climate change, healthcare, and technology. Studies show that students involved in interdisciplinary collaboration are more prepared for developing unique solutions by leveraging different theoretical structures and problem-solving approaches (Vygotsky, 1978). Research shows that HOT practices encouraging in-depth thinking and creative approaches directly relate to the capacity to synthesise different perspectives and formulate new solutions (López & Whittington, 2014). Furthermore, HOT approaches such as design thinking and project-based learning allow students to create prototypes, test theories, and iterate on their ideas, providing inspiration which encourages the role of creativity and innovation (Meyer, 2003).

Educating Students on Global Competencies

HOT skills empower students to navigate the challenges of globalization, such as cross-cultural communication, multinational collaboration, and technological advances (McLoughlin & Mynard, 2009). Hybrid order thinking promotes analytical reasoning and flexibility in thinking, engaging learners so that their efforts can be applied across various contexts and allowing them to devise innovative but contextually appropriate solutions (Ball & Garton, 2005). This flexibility to discern and adapt information is especially needed as students pursue professions where they analyse disparate information, lead interdisciplinary teams, and develop prototypes of social innovation on a scale (Alkhatib, 2019). This allows full HOT, because HOT is the capacity of students today to help solve problems in society locally, but more importantly, allows them to engage with all global problems in mind.

Objective 3 Effects of Higher-Order Thinking on Problem Solving in HEIs

Traditional Teaching Methods

Conventional teaching styles that still prevail in numerous academic institutions pose a threat to the application of HOT in HEIs. Such strategies, which emphasize a lecture-focused instructional format, followed by drill-and-kill memorisation of information, do not facilitate the engagement of cognitive processes needed for HOT (Richland & Simms, 2015). Students in such traditional classrooms remain passive players, with lectures being focused on transmitting content to recipients rather than enabling the analytical, critical, and creative thought processes. This passive instruction dependency creates a need for knowledge to be reproduced instead of applied to complex real-world scenarios (Shukla & Dungsungnoen, 2016).

Moreover, the development of HOT is severely restricted by teacher-centred pedagogy. The content is primarily transferred from faculty (who hold the knowledge) to the students (who are expected to memorize this information and reproduce it in assessments). This approach limits opportunities for inquiry, exploration, and independent thought (in all zones a defining element of HOT; Ball & Garton, 2005). Studies have shown that such pedagogies reinforce surface-level learning over higher-order cognitive skills, the latter necessary for effective problem-solving, decision-making and creative thinking (Heron & Palfreyman, 2023). These limitations necessitate a pedagogical shift from traditional lecture-based models to active learning strategies that foster collaboration, critical thinking, and application of knowledge (McLoughlin & Mynard, 2009).

Standardized Testing & Static Assessment Models

The advent of HOT in HEIs in itself is a direct threat to the fact-based model of assessment over analytical and evaluative reasoning, which remains a dominant factor (Barnett & Francis, 2012). However, standardized tests — the ones used most often to measure student performance — are often MCQs (multiple-choice questions) or short-answer-type tests that assess only basic knowledge recall since creative problem-solving requires advanced cognition. Consequently, these assessments do not evaluate HOT, as they do not address higher-order thinking skills including those of critical thinking, creativity, and innovation (Newmann, 1990).

Likewise, rigid assessment models rooted in heavy summative exam pressure inhibit students from engaging in prolonged sustainable depth learning and comprehensive understanding. Research indicates that to measure HOT, performance-based assessments are significantly more powerful, where students must show that they can analyze, evaluate, and create (Richland & Simms, 2015). Authentic assessments such as case studies, portfolios, presentations, and collaborative projects can provide a better measure of HOT skills in students (Yuliati & Lestari, 2018). Such assessments are more authentic, similar to the real challenges students face, where applying knowledge in complex, real-world situations is required. The lack of teacher training and professional development is a critical barrier to the successful implementation of HOT in [Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)]. Many instructors, especially in traditional academic structures, were trained in pedagogies that rely on lecture and are more content-centred, which do little to facilitate HOT (Vygotsky, 1978).

Continued professional development is essential to help educators be prepared with the tools and strategies to motivate HOT (Brookhart, 2010). HEIs can ensure that instructors gain the required competencies through investing in faculty training, collaborative opportunities, and peer mentorship to prepare instructors to catalyze HOT development in students.

Objective 4 Development of Pedagogical Strategies of HOT in HEIs

Inquiry-Based and Problem-Based Learning (IBL & PBL)

IBL and PBL are powerful pedagogical strategies which encourage students to take ownership of their learning by investigating real-world problems and working to solve complex problems. Both approaches aim to move the focus from being centered around teachers and their delivery methods to making it student-led, where students should be the ones exploring their own questions, the solutions to them and the new understandings that arise as a result of their findings (Richland & Simms, 2015). Within this framework, IBL and PBL promote enhanced cognitive functioning, facilitating the cultivation of higher-level skills vital for higher-order thinking such as critical analysis, synthesis and creative problem-solving (Ball & Garton, 2005).

Research-based learning has a very strong effect on HOT. Similar to IBL, PBL encourages students to formulate research questions, gather applicable data, analyze the information, and use what they have discovered in realistic environments. Research-driven projects prepare students to be problem-solvers, critical thinkers, and able to transfer their learning to new situations (Shukla & Dungsungnoen, 2016). Integrating IBL and PBL into higher education curricula will develop a generation of knowledgeable students capable of applying their knowledge creatively and effectively in their careers (Murtonen & Balloo, 2019).

Flipped Classroom Model

The flipped classroom approach is a radical shift in the paradigm of education, where students are battered with information during classroom time in the conventional method. The traditional approach to teaching is to deliver lectures to students during in-class time and supplement it with assignments at home (Meyer, 2003). This can be especially powerful for higher-order thinking as students access content material on their own time before then analyzing, discussing, and collaborating around the concepts in class.

Previous case studies have established that flipped classrooms could lead to an increase in HOT engagement due to the increased number of opportunities for students to engage with the content and to apply their learning in a supportive environment. According to the study of Abosalem (2016), the students who engaged in a flipped classroom environment improved their analytical mentality and were more capable of assessing and applying information in class interactions. Additionally, this approach promotes peer learning and collaborative problem solving, which are important for achieving higher-order thinking skills (Ball & Garton, 2005).

Authentic and Performance-Based Assessments

Many conventional methods of assessment in post-education focus on memorization and retrieval rather than gauging the capacity of students to engage in higher-order thinking. Conventional assessments focus on factual recall, whereas authentic and performance-based assessments focus on applying knowledge and skills to address problems in real-life situations. Such assessments include activities that require students to bring together and apply their learning in complex, authentic contexts (Newmann, 1990).

Unlike conventional testing, which is often based more on memory than application, true assessments require students to critically interrogate complex data and associate information with conclusions. Implementing rubrics that assess students' different levels of cognitive engagement —

from basic recall to higher-order thinking (HOT)-specific tasks like analysis and creation — ensures students are assessed on their ability to engage in HOT. For instance, using a case study analysis methodology, students must analyze a condition, think of possible solutions, and come up with inventive approaches, which are valuable skills for problem-solving and decision-making in the real world (López & Whittington, 2014). With authentic tasks, learners experience applying critical thinking and creativity to overcome real challenges, preparing them better for career options (Kim et al., 2020).

HOT Development Process with a Focus on Technology Integration

Digital tools and adaptive learning platforms, for example, have the potential to bolster HOT development by enabling more personalized learning experiences and pathways for cognitive depth. Technology-based learning that adapts to individual students' needs contributes to personalized learning: adaptive learning platforms provide students with personalized feedback, customized learning paths, and interactive exercises (McLoughlin & Mynard, 2009) while fostering problem-solving and critical thinking. While students can explore content in those platforms at their own pace, they are also scaffolded in the face of increasing complexity, with clear emphasis on a deep understanding of higher-order cognitive processes.

Training and Development Programs for Faculty

Faculty training and development are critical components of enabling the successful integration of HOT into higher education. While many teachers are very experienced in content delivery, they may not understand how to create and engage in HOT activities. Thus, programs of faculty development are critical to providing instructors with the strategies and tools they need to promote HOT in their classrooms (Brierton et al., 2016). These programs can include faculty exposure to active learning pedagogies that promote HOT (e.g., problem-based learning, flipped classrooms, collaborative teaching) and the methods to measure this correlation.

Aside from formal training, opportunities for collaborative peer mentoring can be an effective means of fostering excellence and innovation in teaching. Teachers can benefit from peers by observing each other, creating co-teaching arrangements, and discussing pedagogy for refining how to elicit and nurture higher-order thinking (Alkhatib, 2019). Additionally, training programs for faculty should focus on the necessity of ongoing professional development, keeping educators up to date with the latest developments in the field of education, like new methods of teaching, latest technological tools, and research on HOT.

Future Research Directions

Future research may focus on the following areas:

1. Examine the effectiveness of HOT-oriented teaching across different disciplines, institutions, and cultural contexts.
2. Compare the impact of inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, flipped classrooms, and other active-learning strategies on students' HOT skills, engagement, and knowledge retention.
3. Investigate how HOT can be integrated into curriculum design and assessment through authentic, project-based, and performance-based tasks.

4. Explore how cultural background, educational practices, and language influence students' ability to engage in critical thinking and problem-solving.
5. Study the role of artificial intelligence and adaptive-learning tools in providing personalised scaffolding, feedback, and assessment for HOT development.

The implications of HOT for interdisciplinary research is an exciting path for future research. The modern challenges we face — climate change, public health crises, technological innovation — require solutions that draw from multiple disciplines. This study could lead to the establishment of a more comprehensive and insightful educational method that helps better prepare students to meet the demands of a rapidly changing and increasingly interconnected world (Davies, 2015).

Conclusion

As emphasized across the paper, HOT not only grounds students in complex academic problem-solving but also supports cognitive capabilities needed to compete in the global workforce, resulting in adaptable, analytic reasoning and innovative problem-solving (Richland & Simms, 2015). Through theoretical frameworks such as Bloom's Taxonomy, Piaget's Cognitive Development Theory, and Vygotsky's ZPD, HOT offers a foundational scaffold for developing higher-level thinking, and its implementation in diverse pedagogies has proven effective in the enhancement of student outcomes (Ball & Garton, 2005).

To implement HOT in higher education, the essential elements are pedagogical reforms and faculty training programs. This shift from traditional, teacher-centred practices to those that are focused on student learning is what enables new teaching methods, including inquiry-based learning (IBL), problem-based learning (PBL), and flipped classrooms, to promote active cognitive engagement. In addition, relevant assessments and technology incorporation are key to developing learning settings that stimulate higher-order thinking processes and encourage students to use knowledge in situations beyond school (Meyer, 2003).

This study looks into the transformative role that HOT could play at institutional and policy levels in reshaping approaches to teaching, designing curricula and framing assessments in higher education. Policy and educational leaders should not overlook the significance of HOT as it prepares learners to address real-life challenges of the 21st century; therefore, they need to respond by investing in faculty development programs, curriculum to enhance HOT, and digital tools that support HOT (Alkhatib, 2019). The need for HOT as part of the HEIs' curriculum is not just an academic agenda but a socio-economic necessity; as globalization progresses and technology advances at a lightning speed, there is a greater necessity for critical thinking and creativity that would differentiate success or failures in the global market.

References

- Abosalem, Y. (2016). Assessment techniques and students' higher-order thinking skills. *International Journal of Secondary Education*, 4(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsedu.20160401.11>
- Alkhatib, O. J. (2019, March). A framework for implementing higher-order thinking skills (problem-solving, critical thinking, creative thinking, and decision-making) in engineering & humanities. In *2019 Advances in Science and Engineering Technology International Conferences (ASET)* (pp. 1-8). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASET.2019.8714232>
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Complete Edition*. New York: Longman.

- Ball, A. L., & Garton, B. L. (2005). Modelling higher order thinking: The alignment between objectives, classroom discourse, and assessment. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 46(2), 58-69. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2005.02058>
- Barak, M., & Shakhman, L. (2008). Fostering higher-order thinking in science class: teachers' reflections. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 14(3), 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600802006079>
- Barnett, J. E., & Francis, A. L. (2012). Using higher order thinking questions to foster critical thinking: A classroom study. *Educational Psychology*, 32(2), 201-211. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/01443410.2011.638619>
- Bloom, B.S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook: The Cognitive Domain*. David McKay, New York.
- Brierton, S., Wilson, E., Kistler, M., Flowers, J., & Jones, D. (2016). A comparison of higher order thinking skills demonstrated in synchronous and asynchronous online college discussion posts. *Nacta Journal*, 60(1), 14-21. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/comparison-higher-order-thinking-skills/docview/1774548652/se-2>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How to assess higher-order thinking skills in your classroom*. Ascd. <https://www.daneshnamehicsa.ir/userfiles/files/1/7-%20How%20to%20Assess%20Higher-Order%20Thinking%20Skills%20in%20Your%20Classroom%20-%20Copy%201.pdf>
- Cañas, A. J., Reiska, P., & Möllits, A. (2017). Developing higher-order thinking skills with concept mapping: A case of pedagogic frailty. *Knowledge management & e-learning*, 9(3), 348. <https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2017.09.021>
- Condrat, V. (2018, December). Helping students develop higher order thinking skills. In *The use of modern educational and informational technologies for the training of professional competences of the students in higher education institutions (conference proceedings)* (pp. 238-242). <http://riora.usarb.md:8180/server/api/core/bitstreams/bf0f6920-fecf-4c37-b844-ad6b9c5d9a8d/content>
- Davies, M. (2015). A model of critical thinking in higher education. In M.B Paulsen (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 30*, 41-92.
- Heron, M., & Palfreyman, D. M. (2023). Exploring higher-order thinking in higher education seminar talk. *College Teaching*, 71(4), 252-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2021.2018397>
- Kim, H. J., Yi, P., & Hong, J. I. (2020). Students' academic use of mobile technology and higher-order thinking skills: The role of active engagement. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), 47. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030047?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Kim, M., & Hannafin, M. J. (2011). Scaffolding problem solving in technology-enhanced learning environments (TELEs): Bridging research and theory with practice. *Computers & Education* 56(2):403-417 DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.08.024>
- Lewis, A., & Smith, D. (1993). Defining higher order thinking. *Theory into practice*, 32(3), 131-137. <https://elearningproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Defining-Higher-Order-Thinking.pdf>
- McLoughlin, D., & Mynard, J. (2009). An analysis of higher order thinking in online discussions. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290902843778>
- Meyer, K. A. (2003). Face-to-face versus threaded discussions: The role of time and higher-order thinking. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 7(3), 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v7i3.1845>
- Murtonen, M., & Balloo, K. (Eds.). (2019). *Redefining scientific thinking for higher education: Higher-order thinking, evidence-based reasoning and research skills*. Springer Nature.

- Narayanan, S., & Adithan, M. (2015). Analysis of Question Papers in Engineering Courses with Respect to HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills). *American Journal of Engineering Education*, 6(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/ajee.v6i1.9247>
- Newmann, F. M. (1990). Higher order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale for the assessment of classroom thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(1), 41- 56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027900220103>
- Newmann, D.B., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2014). Leisure and Subjective Well-Being: A Model of Psychological Mechanisms as Mediating Factors. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 15:555-578 DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9435-x>
- Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. *Human Development*, 15(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000271225>
- Piaget, J (1972). *Psychology and Epistemology: Towards a Theory of Knowledge* (Reprint ed.). Penguin Books.
- Renaud, R. D., & Murray, H. G. (2007). The validity of higher-order questions as a process indicator of educational quality. *Research in Higher Education*, 48, 319-351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9028-1>
- Richland, L. E., & Simms, N. (2015). Analogy, higher order thinking, and education. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 6(2), 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1336>
- Shukla, D., & Dungsungnoen, A. P. (2016). Students' Perceived Level and Teachers' Teaching Strategies of Higher Order Thinking Skills: A Study on Higher Educational Institutions in Thailand. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(12), 211-219. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/30061/30876>
- Van den Berg, G. (2004). The use of assessment in the development of higher-order thinking skills. *Africa Education Review*, 1(2), 279-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18146620408566285>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4>
- Yuliati, S. R., & Lestari, I. (2018). Higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) analysis of students in solving HOTS questions in higher education. *Perspektif Ilmu Pendidikan*, 32(2), 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.21009/PIP.322.10>