

Group 19 Team A Project Paper.pdf

by CHANELL NG e0420753

Submission date: 18-Sep-2021 11:34PM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 1651441339

File name: Team_A_Project_Paper.pdf (288.57K)

Word count: 2870

Character count: 14761



ES2660 Communicating in the Information Age

CA1 Group Project Paper

Sectional Group 19: Team A

Name	Student ID
Song Ivan	A0237738R
Tan Yi Guan	A0217680A
Chong Wei Guan	A0235303U
Charisma Kausar	A0226593X
Chanell Ng	A0203547J

1. Introduction

In the first 6 weeks of this module, we have learned a lot about critical thinking, especially how to apply critical thinking skills and dispositions to better understand the intent of a source and to recognise and invalidate assumptions or fallacies, while also recognising valid assumptions. Through what we have learned, we have come to realise that critical thinking is essential in our daily lives, especially when working with online sources. However, applying critical thinking and understanding a source can be a complex process. There are many questions and skills that need to be applied. Therefore, with the knowledge we have gained, our team has developed a SOP to simplify the process of applying critical thinking when evaluating sources. This is done by providing a framework that is easy to remember and understand and will be a useful guide for evaluating any type of source.

This SOP is created based on the things we learned in class as well as the frameworks provided to us, Ennis (2015) and Paul and Elder (2020). We felt that Ennis' framework is clear and there is not much ambiguity in the way each disposition and ability is phrased. However, this framework contains far too much information. While it does help in covering more grounds in being a better critical thinker, it is difficult to remember and use in our daily lives. It also lacked a clear structure which makes it unintuitive for people who are new to the concept of critical thinking. As for Paul and Elder's, we liked that it was easy to apply since it summarises the things we should be looking for when breaking down or analysing an online article. However, like Ennis' framework, this framework has no clear structure to follow for new users and it is unintuitive to use since one could potentially be jumping around from element to element while breaking down a text using this framework.

2. SOP Creation Process

After reviewing all the frameworks provided to us over the course of these 6 weeks, we concluded as a group that there was no single framework that was necessarily better or more important than the others. Therefore, we decided that the best approach would be to combine the overlapping points of Ennis' and Paul and Elder's frameworks and structure them using Barrett's taxonomy. We felt that this approach offered us the most well-rounded SOP, building on the strengths of both frameworks while being robust enough to handle most forms of digital texts we will see online.

The next logical step after reviewing and selecting the frameworks on which to base our SOP upon is to create the SOP itself. We have divided this process into two parts: coming up with criteria to guide us in creating our SOP and developing the actual mnemonics that we will use to tie our SOP together. After much discussion, we have agreed on 3 main criteria that we want to meet. First, we decided that our SOP should contain no more than 5 key points. This is supported by scientific research that our brains can only process up to 7 things at a time, plus or minus 2 (Miller). We chose the lower limit because we wanted to ensure that our SOP is easy to remember. Our 2nd criterion was that it should be intuitive for people to use. For us, this meant that it should follow an approach that people normally use to analyse a source, to ensure that our SOP can be used by people who are not yet familiar with the idea of critical thinking. Finally, we wanted our SOP to be structured. A step-by-step approach not only improves clarity about how to use our SOP but is also less overwhelming for new users of our SOP, as it allows them to be guided into our framework. Now that we have a strong foundation to build our SOP upon, we can move on to the next step, which is to develop a mnemonic that connects all of our thoughts together.

While developing the mnemonic, we looked back at what we did in class and noted that ¹critical thinking cannot be learned in a short period of time, instead a journey of constant learning and discovery is required. There was also a consensus within our team that we felt learning critical thinking was intimidating at first because everything was so serious and there was no clear guidance on how to use the frameworks provided. Because of the reasons

mentioned above, we wanted our mnemonics to capture this essence of journeying and at the same time suggests a hint of fun and adventure. After much discussion, we settled on QUEST. QUEST stands for Questioning the source, Understanding the article, Examining the article, Summarize and Thoughts. QUEST is structured similarly to Barrett's taxonomy, where each level leads to a deeper understanding of the article and is meant to be used in a sequential manner. It also largely follows the flow of how a person would analyse an article where you would see the source first, read and understand it, see how credible its evidence is then finally formulating your own thoughts and conclusions.

	Guiding Questions	Ennis' Abilities	Paul and Elder's Elements of thought	Barrett's Taxonomy
Q	Classification of article? Credibility of author? Credibility of publisher? When was it published?	Point 5: Judge the credibility of the source	Information	Literal comprehension
U	What is the main idea of the text? What is the purpose of posting this article? Who is the article meant for? Is there any further clarification to be asked? What is the tone of text?	Point 3: Ask and answer clarification questions Point 6: Observe, and judge observation reports Point 7: Use background knowledge Point 11: Define terms, and judge definitions	Purpose, Question at issue	Reorganization, Inferential comprehension
E	What is the supporting evidence? Are there any fallacies, bias or assumptions made? Are the viewpoints balanced? Are there any counter arguments provided? Are there any alternative sources to cross reference?	Point 2: Analyse arguments Point 13: Attribute and judge unstated assumptions Point 15: Deal with fallacy labels	Points of view, Assumptions	Evaluation
S	Does the article make sense all together? What is the high-level overview of the article after analysing the context?	Point 9: Make, and judge inductive inferences and arguments Point 14: Think suppositionally	Inferences and interpretation, Concepts	Appreciation
T	How effective is the article for the target group? How effective is the article in conveying its purpose? How did I feel about the article? Has my stance changed after reading/viewing the article?	Point 9: Make, and judge inductive inferences and arguments Point 10: Make, and judge value judgements	Implications, Points of view	Appreciation

Table 1: Linking SOP to CT Frameworks

3. Application to Source 1

3.1 Key Points of Source

In this section of the paper, we will now apply QUEST in unpacking, analysing, and evaluating our chosen Source. The Source that we picked out is an online article by the Washington Post titled: "Misinformation on Facebook

got six times more clicks than factual news during the 2020 Elections, study says". The article can be accessed at this link: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/09/03/facebook-misinformation-nyu-study>

To give a brief introduction the source, it is an online article posted by the Washington Post on 5th September 2020. The main point of this article is to outline the state of misinformation on the Facebook social media platform and its negative effects on the consumers.

3.2 Evaluation of Source 1 using QUEST

The first step, **Question the source**, requires critical thinkers to locate, identify and recognize information and details that are explicitly stated in the source (or any other explicit detail or fact that requires the use of literal comprehension). Below are examples of guidelines and questions as well as its application to Source 1.

Guidelines and Questions	Application into Source 1
Classify the source	It is an online article
What is the genre of this article?	Fake news and misinformation
Who is the originator of this source?	The Washington Post: regarded as one of the leading daily American newspapers. The author is Elizabeth Dwoskin: Silicon Valley correspondent, focuses on social media and the power of the tech industry in a democratic society.
When was this source published?	5 th September 2021 (posted 10 months after the US Elections 2020)

Table 2: Question the source

The second step, **Understand the article**, requires critical thinkers use the ideas and information, his/her intuition, and personal experience to generate meaningful interpretations and inferences.

Guidelines and Questions	Application into Source 1
Main idea	Misinformation might be spread more widely than factual news on social media platforms like Facebook.
Purpose	Inform/educate readers on the possibilities that social media platform such as Facebook might deploy algorithms that favour misinformation as compared to factual news to generate more clicks.
Target audience	People that use social media platforms like Facebook as a source of information.
Other clarification questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What did the author mean by trustworthy news sources? 2. What are the requirements for a source to be classified as trustworthy? 3. What makes sources such as CNN or the World Health Organization that were mentioned in the article credible?

Table 3: Understand the source

The third step, **Examine the article**, requires critical thinkers to make evaluative judgements. This section focuses on the assumptions, fallacies, points of view, credibility of the source, and relevance of information.

Guidelines and Questions	Application into Source 1
Assumptions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Misinformation on Facebook is representative of other social media platforms 2. The author has assumed that the misinformation about COVID-19 vaccines may have changed the views of many Americans but there is no proof for this. 3. The author has assumed that misleading, inflammatory content that often reinforces the viewpoints of Facebook's viewers generate significantly more attention and clicks than mainstream news, but this is merely a claim by Facebook's critics.
Possible Bias	Elizabeth Dwoskin's past few articles criticise Facebook and their misinformation, hence it is possible that she has omitted some evidence that would lend credibility to Facebook.

Counter arguments	While the author mainly focuses on Facebook's misinformation issue, she does include alternative viewpoints to why the misinformation got a significantly higher number of impressions than factual news instead of solely blaming it on Facebook's algorithm. ⁶
Credibility	The article can be considered largely credible as it is reported based on a peer-reviewed study by researchers at the New York University (NYU) and Université Grenoble Alpes. The responses from Facebook were quoted from Joe Osborne, who oversees Corporate Communications at Facebook, and hence they are credible.
Alternative sources	While there are alternative news sources to cross reference this article, all of them mention The Washington Post as their primary source.

Table 4: Examine the source

In the fourth step, **Summarize**, we draft a brief high-level overview of the article from the knowledge gathered in the previous 3 steps.

This article was an informative and educative piece meant to inform readers about the potential dangers of coming across misinformation in social media. The arguments provided in the article are relevant to the main idea. It was largely credible though it might be a bit biased against Facebook.

The fifth and final step, **Thoughts**, requires critical thinkers to reflect on how they felt about the article and whether their stance has changed after reading the article.

The article has effectively given readers an idea of the prevalence of misinformation on social media platforms and how platforms like Facebook amplify this issue. This educates and warns the general public on the prevalence of fake news on platforms like Facebook.

3.3 Efficacy of the SOP

By following our SOP, we could assess and critically evaluate the online news article posted by Elizabeth Dwoskin. Firstly, we found out that the source is a highly accredited online news source, and we continued to read the article to find its main purpose and get a surface-level understanding of it. Then we verified whether the arguments made are valid by identifying any assumptions made or possible bias and checking credibility. Even though the article seemed highly credible, we realized that we still had to be highly aware of any potential bias in order to be active critical thinkers. This helped us effectively create a short summary of the article. All of these steps finally contributed towards helping us form our own opinions on the topic and becoming better critical thinkers.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Summarized Project Objective, SOP development and Testing Outcome

Our team's project objective is to develop an intuitive and structured SOP with a maximum of 5 key points that guide the user on the journey to actively develop Ennis' critical thinking dispositions and become a better critical thinker. This helps the user to be well-informed in this digital age by being able to identify credible, reliable sources amongst the prevalent fake sources available. By utilizing both Paul and Elder's elements of thoughts and Ennis' abilities, our team developed the five main points of our SOP, each branching off into their sub-points. Together they form the mnemonic QUEST and as the user goes through each step of QUEST, they will learn to develop the respective Ennis' dispositions.

After applying our SOP to the source text provided, we felt that the article was actually quite effective in convincing the intended audience to be less defensive about the adoption of AI into their workflow. The author has provided examples to substantiate his stance on how AI could have the potential to boost our work productivity and we felt that the examples raised were relevant and persuasive. However, we also recognized that the article was lacking an alternative point of view, causing it to be one-sided.

4.2 Interesting learning points after applying QUEST to source #2

Our team learned that it is important to assess the credibility of the author as the author's background may have influenced his/her stance which we had identified from the text. Identifying the target group and classifying the type of online source had also helped us in better understanding the context and purpose of the text. These steps allowed us to identify any potential bias in source #2. Furthermore, even though the article has cited multiple evidence to support the arguments made, we realized that it was lacking an alternative point of view which are the potential disbenefits of AI. There was also a lack of evidence (statistics/numbers) to support the point that AI increases workplace productivity. Thus, we realized that as critical thinkers, we would have to seek more information on this topic from another POV for our evaluation of the text to be more well-rounded.

4.3 Conclude efficacy of the SOP

All in all, our SOP is well-rounded as it incorporates the strengths of two different frameworks. By using Ennis' list of abilities to categorize the types of critical thinking displayed and Paul and Elder's Intellectual Standards to evaluate the quality of thinking demonstrated, a user can gain a deeper analysis of the text (McLean, 2005). Furthermore, QUEST is relatively easy to follow as not only is it clearly structured, it also builds on the flow of how a user would analyse a source when reading it for the first time. Lastly, our SOP is applicable to many different types of online sources such as articles, videos, social media posts and even academic articles such as journals. However, our team recognizes that we could try to apply our SOP on more types of sources such as posters to better evaluate its overall versatility.

Critical thinking is a habit of mind that needs to be developed over a long-term process of continuous learning and discovery. For this reason, it is important to routinely apply QUEST to the various online texts we see in our daily lives to improve our critical thinking skills and become better critical thinkers.

References

- MILLER G. A. (1956). The magical number seven plus or minus two: some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological review*, 63(2), 81–97.
- McLean, C. (2005). Evaluating Critical Thinking Skills: Two Conceptualizations. Retrieved from <http://www.ijede.ca/index.php/ijde/article/view/84>.
- Ennis R. (2015). Critical thinking A streamlined conception. In M.Davies et al. (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Thinking In Higher Education*
- C. Barrett, T. (1976). Taxonomy of Reading Comprehension. *Increasing Reading Comprehension Using Information Literacy Skills*.
- Paul, Richard, and Linda Elder. *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools*. 8th edition, Rowman and Littlefield, 2020.

Appendix

CA1 Group Project ² Distribution of Roles

Team member	Role in Project Paper	Role in OP
Song Ivan	Introduction	Speaker 1 (Introduction)
Tan Yi Guan	SOP Creation Process	Speaker 2 (SOP Creation Process)
Chong Wei Guan	Application of SOP Part 1	Speaker 3 (Application of SOP Part 1)
Charisma Kausar	Application of SOP Part 2	Speaker 4 (Application of SOP Part 2)
Chanell Ng	Conclusion	Speaker 5 (Conclusion)

Group 19 Team A Project Paper.pdf

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

1%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

3%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	"The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Thinking in Higher Education", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2015 Publication	1%
2	Submitted to National University of Singapore Student Paper	1%
3	Submitted to Leigh High School Student Paper	1%
4	www.washingtonpost.com Internet Source	1%
5	Submitted to Rose State College Student Paper	1%
6	Submitted to Saint Joseph's University Student Paper	<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On