



BES-103 CRITICAL THINKING

Styles of Critical Thinkers and Non-Critical Thinkers



COURSE INSTRUCTOR: SALAS AKBAR



Agenda

- Styles of Critical Thinkers
 - Analytical Thinkers
 - Source Evaluation
 - Independent Researcher
 - Questioning Assumptions
 - Balancing Evidence
- Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers
 - Acceptance without Questioning
 - Emotional Response
 - Reliance on Authority
 - Overgeneralization
 - Confirmation Bias

Critical thinkers and non-critical thinkers often exhibit different styles of thinking and approaching problems.

Styles of Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Analytical thinkers are great at solving tough problems by breaking them down into smaller parts, looking at each piece closely, and understanding how they fit together. They're good at seeing the connections between different parts of a problem and figuring out how they affect each other.
- ▷ Example: Planning a Camping Trip

Styles of Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Source Evaluation: A critical thinker would investigate the credibility of the study's source.
- ▷ They would consider factors such as the reputation of the researchers, the publication where the study is published, and any conflicts of interest.
- ▷ Example: Someone who approaches problems like a detective, carefully examining clues and evidence to solve a mystery.

Styles of Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Independent Research: Independent research is like exploring a topic all by yourself to learn new things and find answers.
- ▷ They might look for other studies on the same topic, expert opinions to get a broader understanding of the topic or situation.
- ▷ Example: Imagine a student exploring and studying how plants grow on their own, without guidance or help, to learn more about their development.

Styles of Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Questioning Assumptions: Involves challenging what we think is true to discover if there might be different or unexpected possibilities.
- ▷ Example: Consider the assumption that "the Earth is flat." Questioning this assumption led explorers and scientists to discover evidence that the Earth is actually spherical, not flat, through observations, expeditions, and scientific experiments over time.

Styles of Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Balancing Evidence: Balancing evidence involves impartially weighing and considering all available information to reach a fair and informed conclusion or judgment.
- ▷ Example: Imagine a detective investigating a crime. They collect and analyze fingerprints, interview witnesses, study the crime scene, and consider all the evidence before forming a theory about what happened. Balancing evidence in this scenario means weighing all the collected information to deduce the most likely sequence of events and the responsible party.

Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Acceptance without Questioning: Accepting something without questioning is like trusting a story without checking the facts behind it.
- ▷ Example: The detective blindly believed the main suspect's alibi without verifying it with other witnesses or evidence, potentially leading to an incorrect conclusion about the case.

Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Emotional Response: A non-critical thinker may be more influenced by emotional factors.
- ▷ Example: For instance, they might strongly support a viewpoint solely because it feels right emotionally, without considering factual evidence or reasoning.

Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Reliance on Authority: When non-critical thinkers trust something just because an important person says it's true, like believing a fact because a famous person stated it without verifying the information.
- ▷ Example: In a detective situation, a non-critical thinker might unquestionably trust a renowned detective's theory about a case without examining the evidence themselves, solely because of the detective's reputation, potentially overlooking crucial details or alternative conclusions.

Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Overgeneralization: Overgeneralization in non-critical thinkers is like saying "all fruits are sour" just because they tasted one sour fruit, without trying other types to see if it holds true for all fruits.
- ▷ Example: In a detective scenario, overgeneralization by a non-critical thinker might be immediately assuming that a specific group of people must be the suspects in a crime simply because they've encountered similar individuals from that group in previous cases, without thoroughly investigating all potential leads or considering other possibilities.

Styles of Non-Critical Thinkers

- ▷ Confirmation Bias: A non-critical thinker may seek out information that confirms their initial beliefs or desires.
- ▷ Example: Consider someone who firmly believes a specific diet is the healthiest option. They might only read success stories and positive reviews about that diet, dismissing any negative experiences or scientific studies suggesting potential drawbacks.

Evaluating a Wrecked Car

▷ Alex is a Critical Thinker

As an **analytical thinker**, Alex meticulously examines the wreckage, assessing impact points, skid marks, and vehicle damage, piecing together the sequence of events leading to the accident.

Being an **independent researcher**, Alex doesn't solely rely on the police report. They gather additional information from multiple sources—witness accounts, traffic cameras, and expert opinions—to form a comprehensive understanding of the crash.

Questioning assumptions, Alex doesn't immediately accept initial theories like driver error. Instead, they explore alternative possibilities such as mechanical failures or environmental factors to ensure all potential causes are thoroughly investigated.

In **balancing evidence**, Alex carefully weighs witness testimonies against physical evidence, cross-referencing data to construct a coherent narrative that aligns with all available information while considering different perspectives on what might have occurred.

Moreover, Alex's **source evaluation** skills come into play as they scrutinize the reliability of information, distinguishing between credible eyewitnesses and speculative accounts, ensuring only verified details are used to construct the most accurate reconstruction of the accident.

Evaluating a Wrecked Car

▷ Jake is a Non-Critical Thinker

Jake, a non-critical thinker, examines his wrecked car after an accident. **Without questioning** or critically evaluating the extent of the damage, he immediately concludes that the car is beyond repair solely based on the visible external damage and it was wrecked by his neighbor Alice who he does not like.

Jake's **emotional response** affects his judgment as he feels devastated by the sight of his beloved car in a wrecked state. His emotional attachment leads him to hastily declare the car irreparable without considering a professional assessment or potential hidden internal conditions. He keeps blaming Alice because he deep down believes she wants to destroy him after what he did to her pet cat 'Chimee'.

Reliance on authority emerges as Jake recalls a friend's statement about how devastated Alice was on her cat getting bald, he believes that she definitely took revenge. He unquestioningly accepts this friend's judgment, without seeking multiple opinions or consulting eyewitnesses.

Overgeneralization occurs as Jake assumes that Alice did it because he believes heart broken people take revenge for their loved ones. Jake overlooks the possibility that Alice might have forgiven him or maybe she has other important things to deal with instead of wrecking people's cars.

His **confirmation bias** surfaces as he selectively focuses on aspects that confirm his initial assumption that Alice is the real culprit. He is not ready to seek for further evidences.