

Areas of The Delphi Model of Critical Thinking

ANALYSIS	EVALUATION	INFERENCE
<p>Examining Ideas (e.g. teasing out conceptual interrelationships with other ideas, implications, etc.)</p> <p>Identifying Arguments (e.g. being able to tell when someone is presenting reasons for a claim, being able to summarize in a succinct and coherent form, exactly what reasons are being offered, etc.)</p> <p>Analyzing Arguments (e.g. determining logical structure, being able to determine weak points and strong points regardless of one's own opinion about the conclusion, etc.)</p>	<p>Assessing Claims (e.g. weighing for initial plausibility, making reasonable benchmark assessments about potential significance, etc.)</p> <p>Assessing Arguments (e.g. determining the degree and quality of support lent to a claim by the reasons offered in its favor, assessing arguments according to logical criteria, etc.)</p> <p>Assessing Information Sources (e.g. determining whether or not a particular source is trustworthy, biased, conflicted, etc.)</p>	<p>Querying Evidence (e.g. determining whether or not evidence provided is relevant, or of sufficient credibility to be counted in judgment, etc.)</p> <p>Conjecturing Alternatives (e.g. to determine if other, plausible accounts might explain the evidence at hand, etc.)</p> <p>Drawing Conclusions (e.g. following out the logical implications of claims and/or evidence, even beyond what is asserted, etc.)</p>
INTERPRETATION	EXPLANATION	SELF-REGULATION
<p>Categorization (e.g. deciding whether a given claim is to be treated as fact or opinion, empirical or conceptual, etc.)</p> <p>Decoding Significance (e.g. making judgments of relative importance within a context, being able to tell what a speaker takes to be important, etc.)</p> <p>Clarifying Meaning (e.g. disambiguating key terms, establishing appropriate reference classes for vague terms, getting clear on what meaning is intended by the writer or speaker, etc.)</p>	<p>Stating Results (e.g. giving clear and coherent accounts of facts revealed by investigations, etc.)</p> <p>Justifying Procedures (e.g. defending methodological choices or selection of interpretive frameworks, etc.)</p> <p>Presenting Arguments (e.g. presenting reasoned defenses of judgments made, engaging in attempts at rational persuasion to get others to accept claims on logical or evidentiary grounds, etc.)</p>	<p>Self-examination (e.g. identifying biases in one's own thinking that lead one to ignore, under- or over-estimate, or distort evidence, making realistic assessments of one's own ability to think logically, becoming attentive to one's own metacognitive strengths and weaknesses, etc.)</p> <p>Self-correction (e.g. de-biasing, revision of early estimates according to evidence and reasons gathered from subsequent investigation, etc.)</p>

NB: Multiple pathways through these areas are possible for any given assignment. There is no need for a CT assignment to incorporate all areas, though it probably is desirable for students to encounter all areas at least once. Choose those that best integrate with your course content or disciplinary critical thinking methodology.