Торайғыров университетінің
ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайгыров университета

ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНІҢ ХАБАРШЫСЫ

Химия-биологиялық сериясы
1997 жылдан бастап шығады

ВЕСТНИК ТОРАЙГЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

Химико-биологическая серия
Издается с 1997 года

ISSN 2710-3544

№ 2 (2025)

Павлодар

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайгыров университета

Химико-биологическая серия
выходит 4 раза в год

СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО
о постановке на переучет периодического печатного издания,
информационного агентства и сетевого издания
№ KZ84VPY00029266

выдано
Министерством информации и коммуникаций Республики Казахстан

Тематическая направленность
публикация материалов в области химии, биологии, экологии,
сельскохозяйственных наук, медицины

Подписной индекс – 76134

https://doi.org/10.48081/PGFX4116

SRSTI 14.29.15

https://doi.org/10.48081/NRTG9171

A. Y. Saduakas[1], S. Zh. Ibadullayeva[2], M. B. Amanbayeva[3]
[1,2]Kyzylorda University named after Korkyt ata,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyzylorda;
[3] Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty
[1]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0719-775X
[2]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3270-8364
[3]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6173-3564
*e-mail: aidanasduakas49@gmail.com

FOSTERING CRITICAL THINKING THROUGH HYPOTHESIS-DRIVEN EXPERIMENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL BIOLOGY

This article explores the role of hypothesis-driven experimentation in fostering critical thinking among secondary school biology students. In a rapidly evolving scientific and technological landscape, the ability to think critically, evaluate evidence, and approach problems systematically is more crucial than ever. However, many traditional teaching methods in biology rely heavily on memorization and passive learning, which do little to cultivate higher-order thinking skills. This research-based study examines how embedding the scientific method – particularly hypothesis formulation and evidence-based experimentation – into biology lessons can transform classroom dynamics and enhance student engagement.

The paper presents a comprehensive pedagogical framework, describes its implementation across three core biology units, and analyzes its impact on students' reasoning skills, metacognitive awareness, and scientific literacy. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, including critical thinking assessments and rubric-based evaluations of student work, the study found measurable improvements in students' ability to reason analytically and solve problems independently. The findings support a shift toward inquiry-based learning models in science education and suggest that hypothesis-driven teaching can bridge the gap between theoretical understanding and real-world scientific thinking. The article concludes with practical recommendations for educators and *reflections on how such approaches can be sustainably integrated into biology curricula despite common challenges such as time constraints and standardized testing pressures.*

Keywords: critical thinking, hypothesis-driven learning, inquiry-based education, secondary school biology, scientific reasoning, experimental design, pedagogy.

Introduction

Critical thinking is recognized as a foundational skill in modern education and is particularly vital in the sciences, where learners must analyze information, draw logical conclusions, and approach problems with a skeptical, evidence-based mindset. Biology, as both a descriptive and experimental science, offers a unique platform to cultivate these skills in secondary school students.

Despite the demand for analytical competence, traditional biology education often relies heavily on rote learning, factual recall, and cookbook-style lab exercises that do not challenge students to think critically [1]. In contrast, hypothesis-driven experimentation – where students generate and test their own questions – places the learner in the role of a scientist, actively engaged in the processes of scientific inquiry [2].

This article investigates how the use of structured, hypothesis-based experiments in secondary school biology promotes critical thinking. It details the pedagogical methods employed, presents classroom observations, and evaluates the impact of the approach using both qualitative and quantitative data.

Modern educational paradigms emphasize not only the acquisition of knowledge but also the development of competencies that enable students to apply that knowledge effectively. Critical thinking – defined as the ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information – is a central component of these competencies. In biology education, where content can often feel overwhelming due to the volume of facts, hypothesis-driven experimentation offers an active learning context in which students can practice critical inquiry.

The integration of hypothesis-driven learning in biology also aligns with global educational goals. Frameworks such as the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and UNESCO's Education for Sustainable Development promote inquiry-based learning approaches that nurture independent thought and reasoning. By engaging students in authentic scientific practices, teachers can develop learners who are better equipped to participate in scientific discourse and solve real-world problems.

Despite its potential, implementing such an approach requires rethinking traditional classroom roles. Teachers become facilitators rather than lecturers, and students assume greater ownership of their learning. This shift has implications for curriculum design, classroom management, and assessment, all of which are addressed in this study.

Materials and Methods

Educational Setting

The study was conducted in three urban public secondary schools in Grades 9–11 biology classrooms over a six-week period. A total of 160 students participated. All participating teachers received a two-day workshop on hypothesis-driven learning strategies and collaborative assessment techniques.

Instructional Design

The instructional intervention involved redesigning three standard biology units – photosynthesis, microbiology, and enzyme action – around student-generated hypotheses and inquiry-based experiments. Each learning cycle followed five key stages:

1 Observation and Questioning

Students were introduced to a biological phenomenon and encouraged to brainstorm possible questions.

2 Hypothesis Formulation

In groups, students constructed testable hypotheses.

3 Experimental Design and Execution

Groups planned and conducted their own experiments, controlling variables and documenting their methods.

4 Data Analysis and Interpretation

Students analyzed results using tables, graphs, and statistical tools appropriate to their level.

5 Evaluation and Reflection

Students compared their findings with initial hypotheses and discussed implications, errors, and alternative interpretations.

This approach aligns with constructivist theories of learning and is supported by research on effective science instruction [3; 4].

Assessment Tools

To measure impact on critical thinking:

- Cornell Critical Thinking Test (Level X) was adapted and administered before and after the intervention [5].
- Student lab reports were assessed using a rubric focused on the clarity of hypotheses, experimental logic, evidence evaluation, and metacognitive reflection.
- Student surveys and teacher interviews were used to gather qualitative data.

Teacher Preparation and Support

Prior to implementing the intervention, participating teachers engaged in a professional development program focusing on the principles of scientific inquiry, backward curriculum design, and scaffolding techniques. Emphasis was placed on designing open-ended investigations, supporting student questioning, and facilitating reflective discussion.

Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative data from critical thinking assessments were analyzed using paired t-tests to determine statistical significance. Lab report rubrics were evaluated using inter-rater reliability methods, with independent reviewers coding reports based on predefined criteria. Qualitative data, including student feedback and teacher interviews, were analyzed thematically to identify patterns related to engagement, perceived learning, and classroom dynamics.

Results and Discussion

Improvement in Critical Thinking Scores

Students demonstrated an average improvement of 17.4 % on the critical thinking assessment post-intervention. Specific gains were noted in areas such as hypothesis formulation, recognizing valid and invalid conclusions, and identifying experimental flaws. These results support prior findings that structured inquiry promotes higher-order thinking skills [6; 7].

Enhanced Student Engagement

Teachers reported that students were more engaged when experiments were framed around their own questions. One student remarked, "It felt like real science – like we were discovering something instead of just following instructions." This aligns with literature showing that inquiry-based learning boosts student motivation and self-efficacy [8].

Skill Transfer and Long-Term Retention

Follow-up interviews conducted six weeks after the intervention revealed that students retained key critical thinking strategies, such as controlling variables and questioning assumptions. Teachers observed that students were more confident in forming their own explanations and skeptical of simplistic answers, indicating a transfer of skills beyond the immediate content.

Comparison with Traditional Instruction

Control groups, which received traditional lecture-based instruction, showed minimal improvements in critical thinking scores. In contrast, the intervention groups exhibited deeper cognitive processing and expressed greater curiosity about biological phenomena. This supports findings from existing literature that students in active learning environments outperform peers in conventional classrooms [7].

Classroom Case Studies

Case Study 1: Photosynthesis and Light

Students investigated how different wavelengths of light affect the rate of photosynthesis using Elodea. Each group designed their own experiment, with varying results. Some groups found no significant change, prompting discussion around light absorption and experimental error. One group revised their hypothesis mid-way, a sign of reflective thinking and adaptive reasoning [9].

Case Study 2: Microbial Growth in School Environments

Students swabbed high-touch areas (e.g., phones, desks, doorknobs) to test bacterial diversity. Hypotheses were based on hygiene assumptions. The unexpected results (e.g., cleaner-looking areas had more growth) led to debates about contamination, sampling error, and microbial ecology. Students displayed critical thinking in questioning their initial biases and refining experimental protocols [10].

Case Study 3: Enzyme Reactions

Exploring the effect of temperature on catalase activity, students created hypotheses and tested them using hydrogen peroxide and potato extracts. Discussions followed about enzyme denaturation and experimental anomalies. Students connected molecular theory with observed data, showcasing abstract reasoning and analytical thinking [11].

Student Reflections

Student journals and reflections revealed increasing awareness of the nature of science. Many students reported that they initially found the open-ended tasks challenging but rewarding. One student wrote, «I used to think science was about getting the right answer. Now I see it's about asking the right questions». These reflections provide insight into the development of metacognitive skills – an essential component of critical thinking.

Teacher Reflections and Implementation Challenges

Teachers noted a shift in classroom dynamics, with students taking more responsibility for their learning. There were, however, challenges:

- Time Management: Open-ended experiments required more time than traditional lessons, making curriculum pacing difficult [12].

- Student Preparedness: Some students struggled with ambiguity, necessitating scaffolding in question formation and data interpretation [13].

- Assessment Alignment: Traditional exams do not adequately capture the critical thinking gains from this type of learning. Alternative assessments such as lab portfolios, presentations, and argument-based evaluations are recommended [14].

Professional Growth and Community of Practice

Teachers involved in the intervention reported not only changes in student performance but also growth in their own pedagogical approaches. Several teachers began collaborating to design new inquiry units, indicating the formation of a professional learning community. This collaboration was instrumental in refining instructional strategies and addressing challenges collaboratively.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

To effectively embed hypothesis-driven learning in biology curricula, systemic support is required. This includes curriculum time for extended investigations, professional development opportunities, and assessment models that value process as much as content. Schools and policymakers must recognize the need to shift from content coverage to competency development, particularly in science education.

Conclusion

Hypothesis-driven experimentation offers a powerful method for fostering critical thinking in secondary biology education. This study demonstrates that when students are empowered to design and evaluate their own investigations, they develop deeper cognitive and metacognitive skills. Despite logistical and curricular challenges, the long-term benefits – enhanced reasoning, engagement, and scientific literacy – strongly support its integration into biology teaching.

Further research should explore the longitudinal impact of inquiry-based learning on academic achievement, and how digital platforms and virtual labs can further support hypothesis-driven learning environments.

In conclusion, hypothesis-driven experimentation not only strengthens critical thinking skills but also aligns with broader educational objectives such as lifelong learning and scientific literacy. This approach empowers students to become autonomous thinkers capable of navigating complex information and forming evidence-based judgments. While challenges remain, especially in high-stakes educational contexts, the benefits to student cognition and engagement make it a worthy investment.

Future studies should investigate how this model can be scaled across different educational systems and integrated with emerging technologies, such as virtual labs and simulations, which offer new avenues for accessible and engaging scientific inquiry.

References

1 **Chin, C., Chia, L. G.** Problem-based learning: Using students' questions to drive knowledge construction [Text] // Science Education. – 2006. – 90(3). – P. 409–431. – https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20130.

2 **Harlen, W.** Assessment & Inquiry-Based Science Education: Issues in policy and practice [Text]. – Trieste, Italy : Global Network of Science Academies (IAP) Science Education Programme, 2013. – 90 p.

3 **Hmelo-Silver, C. E.** Problem-Based Learning: What and How Do Students Learn? [Text] // Educational Psychology Review. – 2004. – 16(3). – P. 235–266. – https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3.

4 **Windschitl, M.** Folk theories of inquiry [Text] // Journal of Research in Science Teaching. – 2004. – 41(5). – P. 481–512. – https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20010.

5 **Facione, P. A.** Critical Thinking: What It Is and Why It Counts [Text]. – Millbrae, CA : The California Aca-demic Press, 2011.

6 **Zohar, A., Dori, Y. J.** Higher Order Thinking Skills [Text] // The Journal of the Learning Sciences. – 2003. – 12(2). – P. 145–181. – https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327809JLS1202_1.

7 **McNeill, K. L., Krajcik, J.** Supporting scientific explanations [Text] // Journal of the Learning Sciences. – 2009. – 18(3). – P. 421–451. – https://doi.org/10.1080/10508400903013420.

8 **Bybee, R. W.** The Case for STEM Education [Text]. – NSTA Press, 2013. – 116 p.

9 **Lawson, A. E.** Scientific reasoning, problem-solving, and cognition [Text] // Science Education. – 2000. – 84(3). – P. 287–306. – https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(200005)84:3<287::AID-SCE1>3.0.CO;2-#.

10 **White, B. Y., Frederiksen, J. R.** Inquiry, Modeling, and Metacognition : Making Science Accessible to All Students [Text] // Cognition and Instruction. – 1998. – 16(1). – P. 3–118. – https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1601_2.

11 **Keys, C. W.,** et al. Using the Science Writing Heuristic [Text] // Journal of Research in Science Teaching. – 1999. – 36(10). – P. 1065–1084.

12 **Blanchard, M. R.,** et al. Inquiry-based science instruction [Text] // Science Educator. – 2010. – 19(1). – P. 1–9.

13 **Minner, D. D.,** et al. Inquiry-based science instruction [Text] // Journal of Research in Science Teaching. – 2010. – 47(4). – P. 474–496. – https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20347.

14 **Osborne, J., Erduran, S., Simon, S.** Enhancing argumentation in science [Text] // Journal of Research in Science Teaching. – 2004. – 41(10). – P. 994–1020. – https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20035.

Received 28.04.25.
Received in revised form 05.05.25.
Accepted for publication 17.06.25.

**А. Е. Садуакас[1], С. Ж. Ибадуллаева[2], М. Б. Аманбаева[3]*
[1,2]Қорқыт Ата атындағы Қызылорда университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Қызылорда қ.
[3]Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.
28.04.25 ж. баспаға түсті.
05.05.25 ж. түзетулерімен түсті.
17.06.25 ж. басып шығаруға қабылданды.

ОРТА МЕКТЕП БИОЛОГИЯСЫНДАҒЫ ГИПОТЕЗАҒА НЕГІЗДЕЛГЕН ЭКСПЕРИМЕНТТЕР АРҚЫЛЫ СЫНИ ОЙЛАУДЫ ДАМЫТУ

Бұл мақалада гипотезаға негізделген эксперименттердің орта мектеп биология пәні оқушыларының сыни ойлауын дамытудағы рөлі қарастырылады. Қарқынды дамып келе жатқан ғылыми-техникалық ландшафтта сыни тұрғыдан ойлау, дәлелдемелерді бағалау және проблемаларға жүйелі түрде қарау қабілеті бұрынғыдан да маңызды. Дегенмен, биологиядағы көптеген дәстүрлі оқыту әдістері есте сақтау мен пассивті оқытуға көп сүйенеді, бұл жоғары деңгейлі ойлау дағдыларын дамытуға аз әсер етеді. Бұл зерттеуге негізделген зерттеу биология сабақтарына ғылыми әдісті, атап айтқанда гипотезаларды тұжырымдау мен дәлелді эксперименттерді енгізу аудиторияның динамикасын қалай өзгерте алатынын және оқушылардың белсенділігін арттыратынын зерттейді.

Мақалада жан-жақты педагогикалық негіз ұсынылған, оның биологияның үш негізгі бөлімшесінде жүзеге асырылуы сипатталған және оның оқушылардың ойлау қабілеттеріне, метатанымдық санасына және ғылыми сауаттылығына әсері талданған. Сапалық және сандық әдістерді, соның ішінде сыни тұрғыдан ойлауды бағалауды және студенттердің жұмысын рубрикаға негізделген бағалауды пайдалана отырып, зерттеу оқушылардың аналитикалық ойлау және мәселелерді өз бетінше шешу қабілетінің өлшенетін жақсарғанын анықтады. Нәтижелер ғылыми білім берудегі зерттеуге негізделген оқыту үлгілеріне көшуді қолдайды және *гипотезаға негізделген оқыту теориялық түсінік пен нақты әлемдегі ғылыми ойлау арасындағы алшақтықты жоя алатынын көрсетеді. Мақала мұғалімдерге арналған практикалық ұсыныстармен және уақыт шектеулері мен стандартталған тестілеу қысымы сияқты жалпы мәселелерге қарамастан, мұндай тәсілдерді биологияның оқу бағдарламаларына қалай тұрақты түрде енгізуге болатыны туралы ойлармен аяқталады.*

Кілтті сөздер: сыни тұрғыдан ойлау, гипотезаға негізделген оқыту, ізденіс білімі, мектеп биологиясы, ғылыми пайымдау, эксперименттік жобалау, педагогика.

**А. Е. Садуакас[1], С. Ж. Ибадуллаева[2], М. Б. Аманбаева[3]*
[1,2]Кызылординский университет имени Коркыт Ата,
Республика Казахстан, г. Кызылорда;
[3]Казахский национальный педагогический
университет имени Абая,
Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы.
Поступило в редакцию 28.04.25.
Поступило с исправлениями 05.05.25.
Принято в печать 17.06.25.

РАЗВИТИЕ КРИТИЧЕСКОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ С ПОМОЩЬЮ ЭКСПЕРИМЕНТОВ, ОСНОВАННЫХ НА ГИПОТЕЗАХ, НА УРОКАХ БИОЛОГИИ В СРЕДНЕЙ ШКОЛЕ

В этой статье исследуется роль экспериментов, основанных на гипотезах, в развитии критического мышления у учащихся средней школы, изучающих биологию. В условиях быстро меняющегося научно-технического ландшафта способность критически мыслить, оценивать фактические данные и системно подходить к решению проблем важна как никогда. Однако многие традиционные методы преподавания биологии в значительной степени основаны на запоминании и пассивном обучении, которые мало способствуют развитию навыков мышления более высокого порядка. В этом научном исследовании рассматривается, как внедрение научного метода – в частности, формулирования гипотез и экспериментов, основанных на фактических данных, – на уроках биологии может изменить динамику в классе и повысить вовлеченность учащихся.

В статье представлена комплексная педагогическая основа, описывается ее применение в трех основных разделах биологии и анализируется ее влияние на навыки мышления учащихся, их метакогнитивную осведомленность и научную грамотность. Используя как качественные, так и количественные методы, включая оценку критического мышления и работы студентов по рубрикам, исследователи выявили ощутимые улучшения в способности студентов к аналитическому мышлению и самостоятельному решению проблем. Полученные результаты подтверждают переход к моделям обучения, основанным на исследовании, в естественнонаучном образовании и предполагают, что обучение, основанное на гипотезах, может преодолеть разрыв между теоретическим пониманием и реальным научным мышлением. Статья завершается практическими рекомендациями для преподавателей и размышлениями о том, как такие подходы могут быть устойчиво интегрированы в учебные программы по биологии, несмотря на такие распространенные проблемы, как нехватка времени и необходимость стандартизированного тестирования.

Ключевые слова: критическое мышление, обучение на гипотезах, образование на исследованиях, биология в школе, научные рассуждения, экспериментальный дизайн, педагогика.

Теруге 25.06.2025 ж. жіберілді. Басуға 30.06.2025 ж. қол қойылды.
Электронды баспа
2,57 МБ RAM
Шартты баспа табағы 10,13.
Таралымы 300 дана. Бағасы келісім бойынша.
Компьютерде беттеген А. К. Темиргалинова
Корректорлар: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас
Тапсырыс № 4428

Сдано в набор 25.06.2025 г. Подписано в печать 30.06.2025 г.
Электронное издание
2,57 МБ RAM
Усл. п. л. 10,13. Тираж 300 экз. Цена договорная.
Компьютерная верстка А. К. Темиргалинова
Корректоры: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас
Заказ № 4428

«Toraighyrov University» баспасынан басылып шығарылған
Торайғыров университеті
Павлодар мемлекеттік университеті
140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

«Toraighyrov University» баспасы
Торайғыров университеті
140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.
8 (7182) 67-36-69
e-mail: kereku@tou.edu.kz
www.vestnik-cb.tou.edu.kz