

2. Method of Approach

2.1. Desirable methods

2.1.1. The critical dialogue

I have written more than one million words on the internet for Daily censored and other sites. The lack of critical thinking never ceases to amaze me as I read comments by shills, trolls and other provocateurs. Not only do many people not have the ability to think critically, they cannot even dialogue effectively.

One reason is the inability to understand the use of language. Many people believe that when they use words, everyone has the same definition they do or worse, that they can look up a word in the dictionary and thus have a definition that applies to all situations and all people all the time. We use language believing that everyone has the same definition of terms that we do, or that a dictionary does. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As reasoning dies within the body of a culture that is dying in America, so too does the reasoning mind and this is why so much vitriol, hate, fallacies and irrationality abounds.

The internet is not a tool for dialogue. It is rather a tool for monologue with the belief that 'posting' is dialogue. Now, with the Massive Open Online Classes that promote irrationality and murders reasoning, it is hard to see how the art of critical thinking will survive — at least in North America. School is no longer a home for the mind; it is the house of 'capital' and obedience training.

We use the word 'dialogue' often in conversation. But just what does the term mean? The term dialogue is an old term that has its meaning within Greek origin. 'Dia' means "through or with each other" while 'logos' meaning "the word". The purpose of a critical dialogue, or what has been referred to elsewhere as a 'learning conversation', is to advocate critical inquiry into our everyday experience and what we take for granted, or assume, in our thinking. Thus, a critical dialogue is both one of advocacy

and inquiry. Advocacy lets us put forth our ideas and reasoning so that we might convince others of the truth and veracity of our position on issues. Inquiry is both an internal and external process that helps us see the ideas of others by drawing out their reasoning through questioning as well as developing an insight into our own thinking through critical dialogical reflection. Dialogue helps build shared understanding, shared vision and aspirations, as well as setting forth the principle differences or contradictions between multiple lines reasoning.

To dialogue ‘critically’ and effectively it is essential that we develop a repertoire of tools that allow us to compassionately inquire and advocate within the context of collaboration and critical reflection. These skills, or techniques, allow for skillful Socratic discussion that seeks to elicit reasoning as it may apply to problem solving or decision-making within specific contexts. One of the most important skills in developing effective and critical dialogue opportunities is to appreciate the necessity to suspend judgment when reasoning within different points of view. The ability to suspend judgment allows for critical listening and empathic understanding – and critical listening is the key to critical dialogue.

Learning to suspend judgment

Although we would like to think we should be non-judgmental, the fact is that there rarely is a moment when we are not engaged in some type of ‘sort and judge’ process; after all, isn’t that what makes us human? Think about it: You take an idea or ideas, talk to people about them, gather data and facts about them, sort, classify and evaluate the data and facts, make decisions and solve problems, right? Throughout your development as a person the process accelerates and you come to learn to make more effective judgments. Or do you? All judgments are the product of a mental process you are engaged in and how well you understand your mental processes and the manner in which you reason your way towards judgments within specific contexts will allow you to become a better decision-maker

and problem solver, i.e. a better critical thinker. After all, good decisions and well-crafted solutions to problems require that we form critical judgments, not uncritical judgments. But what's the difference?

Judgment differs from opinion in one very important way: Judgments require that we consider different points of view, evaluate reasons and evidence that may not agree with us, and learn the process of reasoning so we can look at our thinking and develop more sound and cogent judgments. Opinions, on the other hand, can be accomplished without considering different points of view and multiple perspectives; opinions require a different reasoning process than judgment making – opinions are fine and judgments certainly are not bad: you couldn't live your life without making either of them. However, judgments and opinions are very different and the processes we use to make them are equally as disparate.

Suspension of judgment is all about developing the ability to develop critical judgment — to learn to visualize our judgments and the processes we use to attain them while we consider fairly the points of view and perspectives of others. It requires not that we give up cherished opinions or thoughts on matters we feel are important, but that we try to maintain a critically reflective position when considering multiple perspectives. Suspension of judgment asks that we recognize the importance of listening critically to others not in the interest of defeating their ideas, but to truly understand how they might come to arrive at judgments that may be different than ours. In order to develop learning conversations that allow for creative thinking, suspension of judgment and the development of critical judgment is crucial, for uncritical judgmental thinking can serve to shut down listening, hijack conversations and therefore suffocate the consideration of other points of view.

Learning to suspend judgment is based not on simply courtesy and benign respect for another's points of view, although it is that; it is also grounded on the need for all of us to hear and see how others arrive at different judgments than we might arrive at so that we can fine-tune our own thinking and oxygenate our own thought-manufacturing process. Learning to listen to others and

learning effectively dialogue and develop learning conversations enriches personal effectiveness and the development of critical judgment processes that are aware of the practice of reasoning.

The automatic paths that our judgments often lead us down can be both functional and dysfunctional. Take the following example: If I am driving a car or performing some other fairly complex process, I want to be able to do all of this without the need for too much conscious effort. Therefore, I will automatically collect information and make choices and drive along without much endeavor at all. On the other hand, if I am trying to critically think and find some creative solution to a problem at work or in personal life, judgment manufacturing, or the habitual uncritical judgment process, can limit my ability to move in new directions or discover new and creative alternatives to problems because I will suffer from complacency in my thinking and thus may not entertain or generate alternative creative solutions to social and personal problems.

The automatic judgments we make can certainly help us by reducing the mental labor we must engage and put into service. This whole process of observing, interpreting and then making judgments can happen so rapidly that we are usually not aware of it; becoming aware of the process we use to arrive at our judgments, learning to slow down our thinking can make the thinking process more responsible, mindful and effectual. However, the downside of judgment manufacturing is that we can pigeonhole ourselves with old thoughts and thereby limit our ability to understand other people and grow as human beings precisely because we become prisoners of our perceptions.

Judgments help us develop unconscious filters that we use to interpret the world and decide what information, what assumptions and perspectives, what evidence we wish to consider, collect and utilize to live our lives. At some time we have all become aware that our judgments might have been limiting our ability to expand into new directions, find more satisfying learning conversations, and encourage a new-borne sense of wonderment about the world. When this happens we either shut down or we are forced to make conscious our judgment manufacturing process and examine the

assumptions that have led us to the judgments we have made. At this point, we begin to notice and consider new data, look for diverse perspectives on issues, develop an appreciation for evidence, explore un-chartered possibilities we might never have considered before, enhance our listening and dialogue, learn to examine our own assumptions and the reasons and origins for them, and develop new, refreshing relationships with people and the world — in short, we develop critical judgment.

Uncritical judgment is an echo chamber for itself

The inability to suspend judgment limits our ability to listen and as a result reduces our emotional intelligence by affecting our ability to empathize as well as depriving us of opportunities to learn and grow through and with others. Limiting listening opportunities means that people are not able to develop a critical understanding of information within their environment because judgment will often operate to fail to see that which disagrees with it; this is the notion of the halo affect. What happens is that when the mind has formed an uncritical judgment that will often listen only to what reinforces its own judgment, what we call a confirmation bias in logic, the inability to critically reflect and examine assumptions one has through the assumptions of others becomes compromised. This limits the ability of the mind to give other points of view a fair hearing in decision-making and problem solving processes and can assure that ‘impulsivity in thinking’ or ‘group think’ can become an unfortunate yet dominant mode of mental activity. In fact, the inability to suspend judgment until all views are fair-mindedly expressed can lead to what is referred to as a process of ‘confirmation bias’ whereby judgment seeks only to consider evidence that confirms itself: it listens to corroborate its world view, it collects and selects only the information that substantiates its world view, and it will bend evidence to fit within its world view and as a result, it reduces other points of view and information and data about the world to pre-ordained judgments that have often not been subjected to rigorous critical thinking.

Creating collaborative partnerships at work and in neighborhoods and in families signifies that critical thinking must be utilized to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting to avoid the pitfalls

associated with the psychological barriers to thinking critically. This requires that the human mind value and encourage diversity of thinking and engagement with multiple perspectives – that the mind understand the need for and the processes necessary for suspending judgment in the interest of creating critical judgment.

In order to be able to suspend judgment when necessary, critical thinking asks that we do a number of things. One, control our impulsivity in thinking. The mind wants to take shortcuts, jump from what it thinks is the problem to the solution, move fast and quickly and as a result, we often shoot from the hip making rapid-fire judgments that do not allow us to consider all sides of an issue. This can lead to our inability to listen to others, personally profit from multiple perspectives, misinterpret data and facts, and fail to take charge of our thinking. This is the essence of un-critical judgment; the propensity to act, then think and then act again as opposed to think, then act and then rethink.

Suspension of judgment asks that we give a fair hearing to ideas when we are engaged in the process of forming reasoned judgment; it asks that we see the whole picture when we are problem solving and engaged in decision-making; it asks us to look at how the parts relate to the whole and vice versa. Arriving at what can be called critical judgment is a process that requires not only the ability to suspend judgment but also a conception of what we do when we think and what others do; it asks us to consider that we might not have the best idea, the best way of proceeding, or that perhaps we might have overlooked something in our reasoning process. It calls upon us to embrace constructive doubt, for it is only through constructive doubt and critique that we are able and willing to look at other points of view regarding personal and social life.

We all can learn the art of suspension of judgment and thereby increase our ability to listen and dialogue with other people who hold a diverse collection of points of view. To do this, it is not necessary to stop our judgments but to learn the process of forming critical judgment — to be aware of the origins of our judgments and how we have derived them, to become sensitive to the reasons and evidence we

use or do not use to support our positions, to be sensitive to the fact that our judgments might not be the judgments others have and thus learn to reason within the points of view of others, and that we become aware of our process for thinking about how we have been manufacturing the judgments we have made and will continue to make all of our lives. It requires that we be willing to release, at least for some period of time, our time-held certainties, the arrogance that often accompanies these certainties, our ego-centric attachments to our assumptions and our world view, and to become aware of how our feelings arise and their origin – especially when engaged in dialogue or listening. Being detached from our judgments does not imply that we have to abandon what we feel is right or in our best interests; on the contrary, it is about creating critical opportunities to become more aware of our thinking, to become aware of the reasons others may give for their conclusions and the assumptions they might make regarding issues of complexity and controversy.

We all have the ability to learn to suspend judgment in the interest of entering into more caring relationships and in the interest of advancing our abilities to dialogue and listen to others so we might form processes for maturing our critical judgment. For critical thinking advocates, we must take the time to copiously examine our thinking through internal and external questioning opportunities. In this way, we may find that narrow-mindedness and limited growth are replaced with empathy and unlimited potential. However in a socio-centric society like the US, uncritical judgment wins. And with this 'win', we all lose.

2.1.2. Seminar

A seminar is, generally, a form of academic instruction, either at an academic institution or offered by a commercial or professional organization. It has the function of bringing together small groups for recurring meetings, focusing each time on some particular subject, in which everyone present is requested to actively participate. This is often accomplished through an ongoing Socratic dialogue with a seminar leader or instructor, or through a more formal presentation of research.

Normally, participants must not be beginners in the field under discussion (at US and Canadian universities, seminar classes are generally reserved for upper-class students, although at UK and Australian universities seminars are often used for all years). The idea behind the seminar system is to familiarize students more extensively with the methodology of their chosen subject and also to allow them to interact with examples of the practical problems that always occur during research work. It is essentially a place where assigned readings are discussed, questions can be raised and debates can be conducted. It is relatively informal, at least compared to the lecture system of academic instruction.

Increasingly, the term "seminar" is used to describe a commercial event (though sometimes free to attend) where delegates are given information and instruction in a subject such as property investing, other types of investing, Internet marketing, self-improvement or a wide range of topics, by experts in that field.

Seminar presentations are also intended for the improvement of technical knowledge of people. The presentations may also be uploaded in the internet for further reference by people.

There are many different types of seminars; however the two most popular seminars are Personal Development Seminars and Business Seminars.

Personal Development Seminars are intended for the improvement of personal growth of people. In these seminars, the speakers usually talk about psychology, philosophy, mindset and other topics that can help individuals grow as a person.

Business Seminars are seminars where speakers talk about business strategies, how to grow and succeed in business, business ideas, success stories, etc... These seminars are very helpful for business owners, entrepreneurs and anyone who would like to start their own business.

2.1.3. The case study

This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research may be removed.

In the social sciences and life sciences, a case study (or case report) is a descriptive, exploratory or explanatory analysis of a person, group or event. An explanatory case study is used to explore causation in order to find underlying principles. Case studies may be prospective (in which criteria are established and cases fitting the criteria are included as they become available) or retrospective (in which criteria are established for selecting cases from historical records for inclusion in the study).

Thomas offers the following definition of case study: "Case studies are analyses of persons, events, decisions, periods, projects, policies, institutions, or other systems that are studied holistically by one or more methods. The case that is the subject of the inquiry will be an instance of a class of phenomena that provides an analytical frame — an object — within which the study is conducted and which the case illuminates and explicates."

Another suggestion is that case study should be defined as a research strategy, an empirical inquiry that investigates a phenomenon within its real-life context. Case study research can mean single and multiple case studies, can include quantitative evidence, relies on multiple sources of evidence, and benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions. Case studies should not be confused with qualitative research and they can be based on any mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Single-subject research provides the statistical framework for making inferences from quantitative case-study data. This is also supported and well-formulated in (Lamnek, 2005): "The case study is a research approach, situated between concrete data taking techniques and methodological paradigms."

The case study is sometimes mistaken for the case method, but the two are not the same.

Case selection and structure

An average, or typical, case is often not the richest in information. In clarifying lines of history and causation it is more useful to select subjects that offer an interesting, unusual or particularly revealing set of circumstances. A case selection that is based on representativeness will seldom be able to produce these kinds of insights. When selecting a subject for a case study, researchers will therefore use information-oriented sampling, as opposed to random sampling. Outlier cases (that is, those which are extreme, deviant or atypical) reveal more information than the potentially representative case. Alternatively, a case may be selected as a key case, chosen because of the inherent interest of the case or the circumstances surrounding it. Or it may be chosen because of researchers' in-depth local knowledge; where researchers have this local knowledge they are in a position to "soak and poke" as Fenno puts it, and thereby to offer reasoned lines of explanation based on this rich knowledge of setting and circumstances.

Three types of cases may thus be distinguished:

- Key cases
- Outlier cases
- Local knowledge cases

Whatever the frame of reference for the choice of the subject of the case study (key, outlier, local knowledge); there is a distinction to be made between the subjestorical unity through which the theoretical focus of the study is being viewed. The object is that theoretical focus – the analytical frame.

Thus, for example, if a researcher were interested in US resistance to communist expansion as a theoretical focus, then the Korean War might be taken to be the subject, the lens, the case study through which the theoretical focus, the object, could be viewed and explicated.

Beyond decisions about case selection and the subject and object of the study, decisions need to be made about purpose, approach and process in the case study. Thomas thus proposes a typology for the case study wherein purposes are first identified (evaluative or exploratory), then approaches are

delineated (theory-testing, theory-building or illustrative), then processes are decided upon, with a principal choice being between whether the study is to be single or multiple, and choices also about whether the study is to be retrospective, snapshot or diachronic, and whether it is nested, parallel or sequential. It is thus possible to take many routes through this typology, with, for example, an exploratory, theory-building, multiple, nested study, or an evaluative, theory-testing, single, retrospective study. The typology thus offers many permutations for case study structure.

A closely related study in medicine is the case report, which identifies a specific case as treated and/or examined by the authors as presented in a novel form. These are, to a differentiable degree, similar to the case study in that many contain reviews of the relevant literature of the topic discussed in the thorough examination of an array of cases published to fit the criterion of the report being presented. These case reports can be thought of as brief case studies with a principal discussion of the new, presented case at hand that presents a novel interest.

Generalizing from case studies

A critical case is defined as having strategic importance in relation to the general problem. A critical case allows the following type of generalization, 'If it is valid for this case, it is valid for all (or many) cases.' In its negative form, the generalization would be, 'If it is not valid for this case, then it is not valid for any (or only few) cases.'

The case study is also effective for generalizing using the type of test that Karl Popper called falsification, which forms part of critical reflexivity. Falsification is one of the most rigorous tests to which a scientific proposition can be subjected: if just one observation does not fit with the proposition it is considered not valid generally and must therefore be either revised or rejected. Popper himself used the now famous example of, "All swans are white," and proposed that just one observation of a single black swan would falsify this proposition and in this way have general significance and stimulate further

investigations and theory-building. The case study is well suited for identifying "black swans" because of its in-depth approach: what appears to be "white" often turns out on closer examination to be "black."

Galileo Galilei's rejection of Aristotle's law of gravity was based on a case study selected by information-oriented sampling and not random sampling. The rejection consisted primarily of a conceptual experiment and later on of a practical one. These experiments, with the benefit of hindsight, are self-evident. Nevertheless, Aristotle's incorrect view of gravity dominated scientific inquiry for nearly two thousand years before it was falsified. In his experimental thinking, Galileo reasoned as follows: if two objects with the same weight are released from the same height at the same time, they will hit the ground simultaneously, having fallen at the same speed. If the two objects are then stuck together into one, this object will have double the weight and will according to the Aristotelian view therefore fall faster than the two individual objects. This conclusion seemed contradictory to Galileo. The only way to avoid the contradiction was to eliminate weight as a determinant factor for acceleration in free fall.

History of the case study

It is generally believed that the case-study method was first introduced into social science by Frederic Le Play in 1829 as a handmaiden to statistics in his studies of family budgets.

The use of case studies for the creation of new theory in social sciences has been further developed by the sociologists Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss who presented their research method, Grounded theory, in 1967.

The popularity of case studies in testing hypotheses has developed only in recent decades. One of the areas in which case studies have been gaining popularity is education and in particular educational evaluation.

Case studies have also been used as a teaching method and as part of professional development, especially in business and legal education. The problem-based learning (PBL) movement

is such an example. When used in (non-business) education and professional development, case studies are often referred to as critical incidents.

Ethnography is an example of a type of case study, commonly found in communication case studies. Ethnography is the description, interpretation, and analysis of a culture or social group, through field research in the natural environment of the group being studied. The main method of ethnographic research is through observation where the researcher observes the participants over an extended period of time within the participants own environment.

When the Harvard Business School was started, the faculty quickly realized that there were no textbooks suitable to a graduate program in business. Their first solution to this problem was to interview leading practitioners of business and to write detailed accounts of what these managers were doing. Cases are generally written by business school faculty with particular learning objectives in mind and are refined in the classroom before publication. Additional relevant documentation (such as financial statements, time-lines, and short biographies, often referred to in the case as "exhibits"), multimedia supplements (such as video-recordings of interviews with the case protagonist), and a carefully crafted teaching note often accompany cases.

2.1.4. Analysis of dilemmas

How do you decide what to do if you are presented with an ethical dilemma? There are two major approaches that you might draw from. One focuses on the practical consequences of your actions (consequentialist approach) and might be summed up rather brutally by the phrase "no harm, no foul". In contrast, the deontological approach would lead you to ask whether an action is, in itself, right. For example, does an action uphold a promise or demonstrate loyalty. The essence of deontological approaches is captured by the phrase "Let justice is done though the heavens fall." Whilst there is an extensive record of philosophical debate about the relative merits of these two positions, they can serve as useful starting points for complementary strategies of coping with ethical dilemmas.

1. What are the options?

- List the full range of alternative courses of action available to you.

2. Consider the consequences

Think carefully about the range of positive and negative consequences associated with each of the different paths of action before you. • Who/what will be helped by what you do? • Who/what will be hurt? • What kinds of benefits and harms are involved and what are their relative values? Some things (e.g. healthy bodies and beaches) are more valuable than others (e.g. new cars). Some harm (e.g. a violation of trust) is more significant than others (e.g. lying in a public meeting to protect a seal colony).

- What are the short-term and long-term implications?

Now, on the basis of your answers to these questions, which of your options produces the best combination of benefits-maximization and harm-minimization?

3. Analyze the action

You now have to consider each of your options from a completely different perspective. Disregard the consequences, concentrating instead on the actions and looking for that option which seems problematic. How do the options measure up against moral principles like honesty, fairness, equality, and recognition of social and environmental vulnerability? In the case you are considering, is there a way to see one principle as more important than the others?

4 Make your decision and act with commitment

Now, bring together both parts of your analysis and make your informed, decision. Act on your decision and assume responsibility for it. Be prepared to justify your choice of action. No one else is responsible for this action but you.

5. Evaluate the system

Think about the circumstances which led to the dilemma with the intention of identifying and removing the conditions that allowed it to arise.