IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

THE DUALITY OF ONES THOUGHT

Priyasha Roy
Student
Department of CS & IT
Jain (deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India

Abstract: Human cognition is often shaped by conflicting perspectives, leading to internal confusion about personal beliefs and values. This paper investigates the concept of "dual thoughts," where individuals experience a tension between contrasting viewpoints, creating irony and uncertainty in decision-making. Drawing on established psychological theories such as the dual-process theory and cognitive dissonance, we explore how the brain initially struggles to process multiple perspectives simultaneously. System 1 thinking—quick, intuitive, and often biased—clashes with the more deliberate and reflective System 2, making it difficult for individuals to reconcile contradictory information.

This research emphasizes the cognitive challenges in overcoming the instinct to categorize thoughts as simply true or false, and how developing mental flexibility requires deliberate training. We argue that, over time, the brain can be conditioned to move beyond binary thinking and toward a more nuanced understanding of reality. By investigating the processes involved in managing "dual thoughts", this paper aims to provide insights into how individuals can learn to embrace complexity, enhancing their ability to think critically and empathetically in the face of conflicting beliefs and we have introduced AI in this vast field.

Index Terms - Cognitive Abilities, Dual Thoughts, Conflicting Ideas, Contradictory Beliefs.

I. INTRODUCTION

Human beings constantly face a multitude of conflicting viewpoints, from personal opinions to societal values, creating an internal struggle to maintain coherence in their beliefs. This dynamic of conflicting ideas, often referred to as "dual thoughts," highlights the complexity of human cognition, where multiple, often contradictory perspectives exist simultaneously. The tension between these viewpoints can lead to an ironic realization—while we seek truth or clarity, our minds are frequently caught between opposing beliefs, unsure of which to embrace.

The psychological foundations of "dual thoughts" are deeply rooted in dual-process theory, which suggests that human thinking operates on two distinct levels. System 1 represents fast, automatic thinking that relies on intuition and heuristics, whereas System 2 involves slower, more deliberate reasoning. In the context of dual thoughts, these systems are often at odds: System 1 may lead us to accept information that aligns with pre-existing beliefs, while System 2 urges us to reflect critically on that information, considering alternative perspectives.

At the same time, cognitive dissonance theory, first proposed by Leon Festinger, offers further insight into the discomfort that arises when individuals are confronted with contradictory beliefs. Cognitive dissonance occurs when a person holds two or more incompatible cognitions, leading to an uncomfortable emotional state. This dissonance can result in either the rejection of one belief in favour of another or a more complex

integration of both perspectives. In the case of dual thoughts, the irony lies in how the brain's natural inclination for certainty and consistency conflicts with the complexity of real-world experiences.

Despite the brain's initial resistance to managing these contradictory views, research has shown that cognitive flexibility can be cultivated over time. With deliberate effort, individuals can train their minds to go beyond simplistic true/false distinctions, developing a capacity to appreciate the subtleties of multiple perspectives. This process involves engaging System 2 thinking more frequently, overriding the automatic responses of System 1, and learning to navigate ambiguity without defaulting to cognitive shortcuts.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the mechanisms underlying dual thoughts and to examine how the brain can be trained to manage conflicting perspectives more effectively. By synthesizing insights from dual-process theory, cognitive dissonance, and related cognitive models, we seek to understand how individuals can develop the mental flexibility necessary to process complex information. Ultimately, this research aims to contribute to a broader understanding of how we can move beyond binary thinking and embrace a more nuanced, empathetic view of the world.

Key Theories Referenced:

1. **Dual-Process Theory**: Proposes two systems of thought—System 1 (fast, intuitive) and System 2 (slow, analytical)—often in conflict during decision-making.

2. **Cognitive Dissonance**: Describes the discomfort experienced when holding two contradictory beliefs, driving individuals to resolve the tension.

3. **Cognitive Flexibility**: The ability to adapt thinking to new and conflicting information, which can be developed through deliberate mental training.

II. Literature Review

Dual-Process Theory

Dual-process theory is one of the most widely accepted frameworks for understanding human reasoning. According to this theory, System 1 thinking is characterized by automatic, unconscious thought processes that are efficient but prone to biases (Kahneman, 2011). System 2, by contrast, involves conscious, deliberate reasoning that is slower but more accurate.

Research shows that while System 1 can be useful for quick, everyday decisions, it often leads to errors when complex or unfamiliar problems are encountered (Stanovich & West, 2000).

In the context of dual thoughts, System 1 typically favors cognitive shortcuts that reinforce existing beliefs, whereas System 2 requires effortful reflection to accommodate conflicting information. For example, if someone is presented with evidence that contradicts their political beliefs, System 1 may automatically reject the information, while System 2 would consider the evidence more carefully.

Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance theory Leon Festinger, 1957) suggests that individuals experience discomfort when they hold two contradictory beliefs or when their actions conflict with their values. This discomfort motivates individuals to reduce the dissonance, either by changing their beliefs or by rationalizing their behavior. For instance, a person who values environmental conservation might feel dissonance if they purchase a gas-guzzling car, leading them to either justify the purchase like, "It's more practical for my family") or change their behavior like, "I'll use public transport more often").

Cognitive dissonance provides a useful framework for understanding the discomfort individuals experience when grappling with dual thoughts. It highlights the tension between the desire for cognitive consistency and the reality of encountering contradictory information in everyday life.

Cognitive Flexibility

Cognitive flexibility refers to the ability to adapt thinking in response to changing environments or conflicting information. It is a crucial component of problem-solving and creative thinking. Studies have shown that individuals with high cognitive flexibility are better able to entertain multiple perspectives, think critically, and resolve conflicts between opposing views (Ionescu, 2012).

In the context of dual thoughts, cognitive flexibility enables individuals to move beyond binary thinking (true vs. false) and appreciate the nuances of different viewpoints. Developing this skill can help reduce the discomfort associated with cognitive dissonance and improve decision- making.

I. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study employed a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews to investigate how individuals process dual thoughts and resolve cognitive dissonance. The study was conducted in two phases: (1) an online survey assessing participants' cognitive flexibility and their experiences with dual thoughts, and (2) in-depth interviews exploring the mental strategies participants used to resolve conflicts between opposing beliefs.

Participants

A total of 25 participants (aged 18-ti5) were recruited from university student populations and community centers. Participants were screened for cognitive flexibility using the Cognitive Flexibility Scale (Martin & Rubin, 1995). Individuals with both high and low flexibility were included to explore differences in how they handle conflicting viewpoints.

Procedure

In the first phase, participants completed a survey that assessed their cognitive flexibility, experiences of cognitive dissonance, and strategies for dealing with conflicting thoughts. In the second phase, 20 participants ti10 with high cognitive flexibility, 10 with low cognitive flexibility) were selected for semi-structured interviews. These interviews focused on participants' experiences with dual thoughts, how they resolved cognitive dissonance, and whether they consciously engaged in System 1 or System 2 thinking.

Data analysis

Quantitative survey data were analyzed using correlational analysis to examine the relationship between cognitive flexibility and the ability to resolve conflicting thoughts. Qualitative interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify common strategies for managing dual thoughts.

Integration of AI in Dual Thought Analysis

AI and Cognitive Bias Analysis

AI-powered Natural Language Processing (NLP) can enhance the study of dual thoughts by analyzing participant responses for cognitive biases. NLP tools, such as sentiment analysis and topic modeling, classify responses into System 1 (intuitive) or System 2 (analytical) thinking, offering insights into how individuals instinctively or reflectively process conflicting viewpoints.

For instance, AI-driven tools like IBM Watson or GPT models can process textual responses to identify emotional tones, certainty levels, and contradictions. This quantitative assessment helps researchers measure cognitive flexibility and understand how individuals navigate dual thoughts.

Machine Learning for Predicting Cognitive Flexibility

Machine learning models can predict an individual's cognitive flexibility based on survey responses and decision-making patterns. Using techniques like Decision Trees, Support Vector Machines (SVM), or Neural Networks, AI can classify individuals as either prone to rigid or adaptive thinking when faced with conflicting beliefs.

Features such as response time, linguistic complexity, and argument structure provide valuable data for these models. Participants who give brief, automatic responses may favor System 1 thinking, whereas those engaging in detailed analysis are likely to use System 2 thinking.

AI-Based Training to Enhance Dual Thinking

AI-driven training systems can help individuals become more comfortable with contradictory information. A chatbot or virtual assistant can present conflicting arguments, encouraging users to engage in reflective reasoning. Such an AI system can:

- Pose challenging scenarios requiring reconciliation of opposing perspectives.
- Provide counterarguments that prompt deeper reflection.
- Offer real-time feedback on cognitive biases and strategies to improve cognitive flexibility.

This AI training model can be applied in educational and professional settings to cultivate critical thinking skills and ease cognitive dissonance. AI-Driven Detection of Cognitive Dissonance

AI can also detect cognitive dissonance through physiological analysis. If tools like EEG (electroencephalography) or eye-tracking software are available, machine learning models can identify brainwave patterns or pupil dilation fluctuations that indicate cognitive conflict. This can offer deeper insight into how individuals experience and resolve mental strain when processing contradictory beliefs.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative Findings

The survey results showed a significant positive correlation between cognitive flexibility and the ability to resolve dual thoughts ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$). Participants with higher cognitive flexibility reported greater ease in reconciling conflicting beliefs and less cognitive dissonance.

Participants with low cognitive flexibility were more likely to report feeling overwhelmed by conflicting information, often defaulting to System 1 thinking. They also reported higher levels of cognitive dissonance and a tendency to avoid or dismiss opposing viewpoints.

Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of the interviews revealed three key strategies participants used to manage dual thoughts:

- Reframing: Participants with high cognitive flexibility often reframed conflicting information as an opportunity for growth, using System 2 thinking to explore multiple perspectives.
- Rationalization: Participants with lower cognitive flexibility tended to rationalize inconsistencies, favoring System 1 responses to reduce cognitive dissonance.
- Integration: High-flexibility participants were more likely to integrate opposing beliefs, seeing both sides as valid in different contexts, whereas low-flexibility participants struggled to hold both views simultaneously.

The findings suggest that cognitive flexibility plays a crucial role in how individuals process dual thoughts and resolve cognitive dissonance. Participants with high cognitive flexibility were better able to engage System 2 thinking, allowing them to critically evaluate conflicting perspectives and reduce cognitive discomfort. In contrast, participants with lower flexibility were more prone to rely on System 1 thinking, which often led to oversimplified, biased conclusions.

These results align with previous research on dual-process theory, which highlights the importance of engaging reflective thinking to overcome cognitive biases (Kahneman, 2011). They also support Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance, demonstrating that individuals with greater cognitive flexibility experience less dissonance when encountering conflicting information.

REFERENCES

[1] Da Silva, Sergio. (2023). System 1 vs. System 2 Thinking. Psych. 5. 1057-1076. 10.3390/psych5040071..

[2]. Nadurak, Vitaliy. (2021). Dual-Process Theory as a Theory of the Classification of Information Processing Acts. Diametros. 10.33392/diam.1698

[3] Stanovich, Keith & West, Richard. (2002). Individual Differences in Reasoning: Implications for the Rationality Debate?. 10.1017/CBO9780511808098.026.

[4] Gronchi, Giorgio & Gavazzi, Gioele & Viggiano, Maria Pia & Giovannelli, Fabio. (2024). Dual-Process Theory of Thought and Inhibitory Control: An ALE Meta-Analysis. Brain Sciences. 14. 101. 10.3390/brainsci14010101.

[5] Evans, Jonathan. (2017). Thinking and Reasoning: A Very Short Introduction. 10.1093/actrade/9780198787259.001.0001.

[6] Zielonka, Piotr & Szymanek, Krzysztof & Dzik, Bartłomiej & Jakiela, Slawomir & Białek, Michał. (2024). THE HISTORY OF DUAL-PROCESS THINKING. 12. 11-51. 10.26106/9yrc-7k78.

[7] De Neys, Wim & Pennycook, Gordon. (2019). Logic, Fast and Slow: Advances in Dual-Process Theorizing. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 28. 096372141985565. 10.1177/0963721419855658.

[8] Ball, Linden & Thompson, Valerie & Stupple, Edward. (2017). Conflict and dual process theory: The case of belief bias.

[9] Zucchelli, Micaela & Trotti, Nicola & Pavan, Andrea & Piccardi, Laura & Nori, Raffaella. (2025). The Dual Process model: the effect of cognitive load on the ascription of intentionality. Frontiers in Psychology. 16. 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1451590.

[10] Evans, Jonathan & Stanovich, Keith. (2013). Dual-Process Theories of Higher Cognition. Perspectives on Psychological Science. 8. 223-241. 10.1177/1745691612460685.